

REFORMED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: CHARLOTTE

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE WORKS OF THE WORLD? A TEXT CRITICAL  
EXAMINATION OF II PETER 3:10

SUBMITTED TO DR. KRUGER  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
NT522: HEBREWS – REVELATION

BY  
RYAN RICHARDSON  
MAY 2017



# WHAT HAPPENS TO THE WORKS OF THE WORLD? A TEXT CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF II PETER 3:10

## Introduction

Few events stir such a morbid fascination to Christians as the Day of the Lord. The church seems to be stirred to curiosity over an event that is described in language foreign to the modern reader. However, in spite of this curiosity, it seems most tend to put the event out of mind as an event that is too odd to be understood. One thing that has clouded the Day of the Lord in mystery to text critical scholars is what happens to the “works of the world” on that day. Addressed in II Peter 3:10, the extant manuscripts provide a huge range of readings of what happens to “the world and the works in it,”<sup>1</sup> with readings saying that they will be “εὑρεθήσεται,” “εὑρεθήσεται λυόμενα,” “οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται,” “ἀφανισθήσονται,” and “κατακαήσεται.”<sup>2</sup> Beyond these, scholars have suggested numerous conjectural emendations further muddying the already murky textual waters.<sup>3</sup> Given the already rampant confusion about the Day of the Lord, it is a worthwhile endeavor to see if this issue concerning what happens to the works of the world on that day can be resolved.

## Text and Approach

The UBS text reads: “Ἦξει δὲ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν ἧ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται.” My translation of the this text is: “But the Day of the Lord will come as a thief, then the heavens with a great noise will pass away, but the elements, burning up, will be broken apart, and the world and the works in it will not be found.” I offer the full verse to give some context, however the last clause is the one primarily in view for our text critical considerations. Translations of this passage are pretty scattered but most refuse to incorporate the negative οὐκ

---

<sup>1</sup> My translation. The Greek and the options for translation will be discussed shortly.

<sup>2</sup> Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 706.

<sup>3</sup> Aaron K. Tresham, “A Test Case for Conjectural Emendation: 2 Peter 3:10d,” *MSJ* 21,1 (2010): 55-79. Tresham comments on a long list of scholars who have suggested that words have been excised, replacement word options, and so forth. While some of the prominent positions and options will be considered, this list is expansive and cannot be covered in full here.

that appears in the UBS; to list just a few to demonstrate this variety, the NASB renders the clause “the earth and its works will be burned up,”<sup>4</sup> the ESV reads “the earth and the works that are done on it will be exposed,” and the NIV reads “the earth and everything done in it will be laid bare.” Given the disagreement over how this text should be handled, this paper will first give a proper orientation to this debate by examining the background and context of II Peter 3:10. Then discussion will turn to an examination of the external evidence to review the readings of various manuscripts. Next, attention will be given to the internal evidence to look for coherency and consistency among themes and language used by Peter and elsewhere in the New Testament. Finally, the paper will turn to implications and exegesis in order to properly understand what happens to the works of the world on the Day of the Lord in the context of II Peter 3:10.

### **Background of II Peter 3:10**

In order to appropriately understand the text critical issue in II Peter 3:10, a few words must be said about this epistle’s author and his purpose as they affect his style. The authorship of II Peter is widely disputed, however this paper will operate under the assumption that it was written by the apostle, Peter.<sup>5</sup> Given this, we should expect (and indeed, find) the epistle to be fluent in Jewish themes from the Old Testament.<sup>6</sup> Going beyond this, and more relevant for our discussion, it bears looking to Peter’s purpose and the context of this passage to see how it fits in the epistle and contributes to Peter’s point. The easiest way to identify Peter’s point is by analyzing the false theology of his opponents that Peter identifies. Why his opponents themselves are shrouded in mystery, Peter highlights their core tenets: they denied Christ’s return

---

<sup>4</sup> This essentially matches the KJV.

<sup>5</sup> An examination of whether Peter actually wrote this epistle goes far beyond the scope of this paper, and would require an examination all on its own. In short, my view is that pseudepigraphy would not have been permissible to early Christians and would have been viewed as a lie and thus as sin. In light of this, writing a distinctly Christian letter under a false name would have been paradoxical for them. For consideration, the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* which while considered fairly orthodox and written to combat heresies of the day were rejected by the early church as canonical, and the author later confessed to forgery over conviction for his deception – see Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003), 270-271. For examples of more detailed arguments in favor of Petrine authorship, see Charles Bigg, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (ICC; Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1978), 242-243. and Gene L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 139-150. Green also notes arguments from E. Green, J.A.T. Robinson, M. Green, Guthrie, G. Green, Moo, J. Charles, Waltner, Kruger, and Schreiner who also argue for Petrine authorship. For a counterargument, see J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (BNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 235-237.

<sup>6</sup> Important for our considerations especially as our text in question echoes Psalms, Job, Daniel, and Isaiah.

and, consequently, a future judgment. On this basis, they justified their licentious morality – the payoff for their beliefs.<sup>7</sup> Peter thus writes to combat these false teachers. For more immediate context, Peter’s argument to this point has challenged the denial of a coming judgment, but now turns to explain why that judgment has been delayed – specifically, as an act of God’s mercy – however, after that delay, Peter reassures the church in our passage that the eschatological judgment is coming and what it will look like.<sup>8</sup>

This bears a couple of consequences for our passage. First, due to Peter’s Jewish upbringing, we should expect any possible allusions to the Old Testament in our text to be more than coincidental. Rather, they are likely intentional references and should bear weight in our discussion.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, we should expect whatever reading to be understandable in the context of God’s coming judgment. However, before we consider the internal evidence any further, the external evidence will be considered first.

### **External Evidence**

Unfortunately, the manuscript tradition seems to be as varied as the modern translations and interpretations are.<sup>10</sup> Further, due to modern scholarship’s tendency to discount the authenticity of II Peter, research on the manuscripts of the epistle is sorely lacking.<sup>11</sup> That said, an analysis of this external evidence is particularly important in considering our text as translators and interpreters have altered their choices as more manuscripts have been discovered in recent years.<sup>12</sup> In order to outline this information in a more organized fashion, there is an appendix at the end of this paper that lists how the manuscripts and church fathers have handled the text.

---

<sup>7</sup> Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 277.

<sup>8</sup> Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 324.

<sup>9</sup> Certainly not absolute weight as scribes could have altered the text in consideration to align with the Old Testament, however it would be consistent with Peter’s Hebraic style demonstrated throughout the epistle – see Green, *Jude and 2 Peter*, 145.

<sup>10</sup> For a brief overview see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 706.

<sup>11</sup> Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 253.

<sup>12</sup> For additional discussion on the value of the external evidence see – Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 124-140. For further discussion of how handling the translation of this text has evolved, see Al Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” *WTJ* 49 (1987): 405-407.

## Manuscript Evidence

Of immediate notice, κατακαήσεται<sup>13</sup> is far and away the majority reading and was received in the Textus Receptus.<sup>14</sup> For a long time, this reading went unquestioned to modern scholarship, but then through the Codices, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, the reading of εὑρεθήσεται<sup>15</sup> was discovered. These discoveries opened something of a floodgate to other early witnesses of this reading as well, including Clement's early attestation.<sup>16</sup> Additionally, further witnesses have been discovered with even more variant readings, including ἀφανισθήσονται,<sup>17</sup> οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται,<sup>18</sup> εὑρεθήσεται λύομενα,<sup>19</sup> or just omitting the clause entirely.<sup>20</sup> These discoveries have divided the opinions of many scholars, interpreters, and translators and as has already been noted, these disagreements have not been resolved.<sup>21</sup>

Clearly, a closer examination is needed, and upon doing so it is my opinion that a more hopeful outlook for a resolution exists than current scholarship might suggest. First, it should be noted that ἀφανισθήσονται is an extremely minority witness, and is unlikely to be the original reading of the text.<sup>22</sup> Given this, it can be safely assumed to not be original to the text, and out of scholarship, only one loose translation has taken it to be.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> “will be burned up”

<sup>14</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 406. Hence the KJV translation.

<sup>15</sup> “will be found” – note, this is without the negative, οὐκ, that appears in the UBS

<sup>16</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 406.

<sup>17</sup> “will disappear”

<sup>18</sup> “will not be found”

<sup>19</sup> “will be found dissolved”

<sup>20</sup> G. Van Den Heever, “In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10,” *NeoT* 27,1 (1993):108. While Van Den Heever notes the omission of the clause in some manuscripts, few scholars address these, likely because it is so incredibly unlikely to be the original reading. While a further discussion of the difficulty of the various readings will happen in detail when we consider the internal evidence, it bears noting here that some of the readings are so odd at first glance that the probability a scribe would have created them from thin air is virtually nonexistent. Given this and the lack of scholarship investigating it as a viable option, while it is a slightly more prevalent reading, it will not be considered in our examination of the external evidence.

<sup>21</sup> Tresham, “A Test Case for Conjectural Emendation: 2 Peter 3:10d,” 67.

<sup>22</sup> Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 706.

<sup>23</sup> Namely, the TEV - Tresham, “A Test Case for Conjectural Emendation: 2 Peter 3:10d,” 68.

The rest of the manuscript evidence is slightly less clear. The other two minority variants – οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται and εὑρεθήσεται λύόμενα – seem to be attempting to communicate the same concept – that the works of the world will not exist after the heavens pass and the elements are broken up. Additionally,  $\mathfrak{B}^{72}$  provides the oldest witness to II Peter with the reading of εὑρεθήσεται λύόμενα.<sup>24</sup> Finally, some scholars have found good support for the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading;<sup>25</sup> it would be a simple solution to explain all the other readings if οὐκ had dropped from the text extremely early in the manuscript tradition.<sup>26</sup> However, if one of these readings is original, it is odd that it does not appear more broadly.<sup>27</sup>

That brings us to the κατακαήσεται reading. This reading is still favored by many translations – including the KJV, RSV, NKJV, and NASB – and still has widespread acceptance among translators as the reading with the majority support.<sup>28</sup> When examined purely from the external evidence, due to the overwhelming majority, κατακαήσεται provides a strong candidate, though it does perhaps lack compared to the other options when dating is considered.<sup>29</sup>

Finally, we come to the εὑρεθήσεται reading. While not as widespread as the κατακαήσεται reading, it does find strong early support.<sup>30</sup> The εὑρεθήσεται reading also has the benefit of being included in quite a few more witnesses than the other early readings. Further, scholars have regarded some of these early witnesses to have been transcribed with a high degree

---

<sup>24</sup> Tresham, “A Test Case for Conjectural Emendation: 2 Peter 3:10d,” 67

<sup>25</sup> To list just a few: Bigg, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 213. Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965), 160. Tord Fornberg, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*, trans Jean Gray (Coniectanea biblica; Lund: GWK Gleerup, 1977), 76.

<sup>26</sup> Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, 160. This solution will be examined more in detail later when the internal probabilities are examined.

<sup>27</sup> Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco: Word, 1983), 317.

<sup>28</sup> Van Den Heever, “In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10,” 108.

<sup>29</sup> Scholars have been much less charitable towards the κατακαήσεται reading than translators. Most of this however is due to a consideration of the internal evidence rather than the external evidence. For example, see Frederick W. Danker, “II Peter and the Psalm of Solomon 17:10,” *ZNW* 53,1 (1962): 84. “That a scribe should have altered a word like κατακαήσεται or one of the other readings into a more difficult εὑρεθήσεται to secure a sophisticated verbal echo appears extremely improbable, especially in view of the number of the variants which document the efforts made in the direction of a *lectio facillior*.”

<sup>30</sup> Indeed, even after the discovery of  $\mathfrak{B}^{72}$ , many scholars still “reckon it the oldest reading.” Van Den Heever, “In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10,” 108. As in the case of rejecting κατακαήσεται, the case for considering εὑρεθήσεται the oldest reading in spite of any older available manuscripts is rooted in an examination of the internal evidence.

of care and accuracy.<sup>31</sup> Considering this, purely from the external evidence, the two primary candidates for the original reading then are εὑρεθήσεται or κατακαθήσεται. It now bears looking to the testimony of a church father to see additional support for the εὑρεθήσεται reading.

## II Clement's Testimony<sup>32</sup>

Beyond the convoluted testimony of the manuscripts, the evidence provided in the church fathers merits looking to as well. While they do not carry the inerrant, authority of the Scriptures, they do provide an early testimony to the tradition of the text and its originality to Luke.

Of particular note, the witness in *II Clement 16:3*<sup>33</sup> stands above the rest. His 2<sup>nd</sup> century<sup>34</sup> testimony gives us an exposition on the text that will merit reflecting on later:

Therefore, brethren, since we have found no small opportunity for repentance, seeing that we have time, let us turn again unto God that called us, while we have still One that receiveth us. For if we bid farewell to these enjoyments and conquer our soul in refusing to fulfill its evil lusts, we shall be partakers of the mercy of Jesus. But ye know that the day of judgment cometh even now as a burning oven, and the powers of the heavens shall melt, and all the earth as lead melting on the fire, and *then shall appear the secret and open works of men*. Almsgiving therefore is a good thing, even as repentance from sin. Fasting is better than prayer, but almsgiving better than both. And love covereth a multitude of sins, but prayer out of good conscience delivereth from death. Blessed is every man that is found full of these. For almsgiving lifteth off the burden of sin. (emphasis mine)<sup>35</sup>

Here, II Clement not only states that the works of men will appear, but also gives his interpretation of our text. While the author's language does not exactly match that of II Peter, his

---

<sup>31</sup> Kurt and Barbara Aland note that κ, B, and 1175 are all Category I witnesses that "are of a very special quality which should always be considered in establishing the original text." Kurt and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 159-161.

<sup>32</sup> It is far beyond the scope of this paper to discuss whether II Clement was actually written by Clement of Rome. What matters here for our purposes is the age of the witness. For further information on the authorship of II Clement, see J.B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 41.

<sup>33</sup> Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 365.

<sup>34</sup> Lightfoot and Harmer date II Clement pretty solidly into the second century – 120-140 AD. Lightfoot and Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 41.

<sup>35</sup> Quoted in J.B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 92. I am not endorsing the author's view of what might at first brush seem like penance from sin through almsgiving.



reference is hardly mistakable.<sup>36</sup> Considering the extremely early date of II Clement, and his willingness to interpret the text in his own words, the author's witness provides further strong support the εὔρεθήσεται reading. If κατακαθήσεται had been the original text, it seems likely that II Clement would have interpreted the passage in a way to suggest it's originality instead of εὔρεθήσεται.

Based off of this, the external evidence alone already starts to build good support for the reading of εὔρεθήσεται. While the widespread reading of κατακαθήσεται seems support its originality to the text, its lack of support among early manuscripts and the early church fathers does hamper its support from the external evidence. Additionally, the minority readings do not have enough textual support to be considered original to the text. However, in order to further build the case for the εὔρεθήσεται reading, especially in light of the strong support for κατακαθήσεται from the majority of the manuscripts, the internal evidence should now be considered.

### **Internal Evidence**

In examining the internal evidence, there two important categories that should be considered: transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities. Given that the two major variant readings have very little in common, there will be minimal discussion on accidental scribal change. Rather, discussion will focus on the possibility of intentional scribal change due to doctrine or confusion. Afterward the structural, linguistic, and literary style will be considered to see whether it holds to Petrine patterns and can be validated with other passages within the Petrine Corpus.<sup>37</sup> After this, possible parallels outside of the Petrine corpus in the rest of Scripture will be considered.

---

<sup>36</sup> Note II Clement uses the word φανήσεται in place of εὔρεθήσεται – for the full Greek of the text in question see, Lightfoot and Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 51. That said, few scholars question Clement's reference here. For example see Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 319; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 386; Wolters, "Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10," 411; and R.E. Picirilli, "Allusions to 2 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers," *JSNT* 33 (1988): 64.

J.N.D. Kelly disagrees on account that "the subject is the revelation of the true character of men's deeds by the refining fires of the last judgment." However, given that the possibility of that understanding is not ruled out here in the II Peter passage with the proper use of theology and interpretation, however that will be covered later under the interpretation of the text. See Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 365.

<sup>37</sup> It should be noted here that due to the extremely small amount of material in the Petrine corpus, this discussion will be somewhat limited and it's value should be weighted less than other arguments from based on an author's writing corpus.

## Transcriptional Probabilities

Before opening discussion of intentional scribal change, however, a brief word should be said about the possibility of an accidental change. The only readings that have much in common are the οὐκ εὔρεθήσεται, εὔρεθήσεται λύόμενα, and εὔρεθήσεται readings. It is possible that a homoeoteleuton occurred in relation to the words οὐκ and λύόμενα.<sup>38</sup> However, if it did and one of those words was accidentally dropped in the manuscript tradition,<sup>39</sup> it is still odd that those readings are not more widely supported.<sup>40</sup> However, given the possibility, scholars consider it the best option if εὔρεθήσεται cannot be explained.<sup>41</sup>

Moving on to the possibility of intentional scribal change, there are a few important points to be made. First, the more “difficult reading” is probably closer to the original as scribes would tend to smooth out text.<sup>42</sup> Additionally, some have observed that the shorter reading is to be preferred. However, this preference should be carefully applied – often the scribes would omit text as well.<sup>43</sup> Finally, and most importantly for our discussion here, the reading that best explains how the others came to be is the most likely to be the original.

In analyzing these points, the εὔρεθήσεται reading is certainly the harder one, as it seems to make the least sense in the context of the passage. No scholar contests this point, and scholars

---

<sup>38</sup> Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, 160.

<sup>39</sup> Providing the “simple solution” noted earlier – the word would have had to have been dropped extremely early in the manuscript tradition however, given the aforementioned witness noted in the early second century. Scholars have tended to favor the οὐκ εὔρεθήσεται reading over the εὔρεθήσεται λύόμενα reading due to the brevity of the word οὐκ. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317

<sup>40</sup> Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 706.

<sup>41</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317.

<sup>42</sup> Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 314. Metzger and Ehrman note that scribes would generally alter the text to make it easier to read.

<sup>43</sup> Epp and Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 14. Fee notes that the scribes would tend to add text, but subtract if they found something that they would find theologically disagreeable. For further discussion on the see Eldon Jay Epp, “Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century,” in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. David Alan Black (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 27-30. Epp further points out the problems with following this principle without exception.

tend to be deeply cynical about it's meaning – in the words of Van Den Heever, “[ἐυρεθήσεται] is devoid of meaning in this context.”<sup>44</sup>

Taking a strict approach to applying the “shorter reading” rule would tend to suggest the text's omission entirely, however this does not explain how the other readings came to be, and no scholar considers the text's absence to be original. Rather, given our transcriptional probability rules, it can be safely assumed that scribes intentionally deleted the clause due to confusion about what the text meant.<sup>45</sup>

Moving on to consider the other readings, ἀφανισθήσονται is an easy reading, and is unlikely to be the original reading of the text. It would not be able to explain how the other readings came to be, and likely arose due to confusion over what the original meaning of the text was.<sup>46</sup> Given this, it can be safely assumed to not be original to the text.

It also bears reconsidering the οὐκ ἐυρεθήσεται and ἐυρεθήσεται λύόμενα readings with the possibility of an intentional change in mind as it has been seen that an accidental change could have easily taken place. The main problem with the considering the οὐκ ἐυρεθήσεται reading as purely accidental is it's lack of attestation in any Greek manuscripts. Rather, scholars have assumed it to be intentional scribal change or possible emendation because they thought what they were copying was incorrect.<sup>47</sup> The ἐυρεθήσεται λύόμενα reading is attested in the Greek – and very early in the Greek at that – and so escapes the problem with the οὐκ ἐυρεθήσεται reading. However, as will be seen, it has its further problems that make it an unlikely candidate.<sup>48</sup>

Finally, that brings us to the κατακαίσεται reading. As with the the ἀφανισθήσονται reading, the primary issue is that it is difficult to see how the other readings arose from

---

<sup>44</sup> Van Den Heever, “In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10,” 108. I use this quote to make a point, though I do not share Van Den Heever's cynicism.

<sup>45</sup> It is an interesting observation that our text provides the perfect example why the shorter reading rule should be applied, but done so carefully. Our text demonstrates how scribes would add words to smooth it out and give their own meaning as in the cases of οὐκ ἐυρεθήσεται and ἐυρεθήσεται λύόμενα, but also just delete the text entirely if they could not understand the meaning.

<sup>46</sup> Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 314.

<sup>47</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317. Bauckham notes, “οὐκ ἐυρεθήσεται... [has] no chance of preserving the original reading.”

<sup>48</sup> Namely, it has problems when considering its intrinsic probabilities that will be addressed in the next section.

κατακαήσεται if it was the original.<sup>49</sup> Despite its support among translators, many scholars have found this hurdle to be insurmountable and have rejected the κατακαήσεται reading on this basis alone.<sup>50</sup>

Ultimately, this is all speculation, and we cannot know the minds of the scribes who were copying the text. However, the εύρεθήσεται reading continues to find support, not only from the external evidence as demonstrated earlier, but also now among the transcriptional probabilities as well. Now it bears considering the intrinsic probabilities and whether there is any reason to prefer one text over another when the rest of Scripture is considered and applied to the intrinsic probabilities of the text.

### Intrinsic Probabilities – Arguments Within the Petrine Corpus

In opening the discussion on the intrinsic probabilities – whether there are any inherent attributes to support one reading or another – we will first look briefly at arguments drawn from the Petrine corpus. This discussion will look to see if any of the readings are to be preferred due to their match with themes, grammar, and language within the Petrine corpus.

First, as we noted in discussing the background of II Peter and the immediate context, it should be reaffirmed that the immediate context necessitates the reading to be understandable in the context of the coming Day of the Lord. This has actually led to the crux of the problem, as the most probable reading demonstrated to this point – εύρεθήσεται – does not seem to make much sense at first pass. Thus it now bears considering the intrinsic probabilities for the variant readings to see which should be preferred.

Here, the strongest support for the κατακαήσεται reading is revealed. It seems to be the reading that is most fitting of the context of the passage, satisfying the anticipation of destruction

---

<sup>49</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317.

<sup>50</sup> Though I did not find any scholar that makes this argument, it is *possible* that a scribe found κατακαήσεται problematic. If he was thinking about good works in the world (such as those done by God's people), then he would not want them to be destroyed. However, this would only directly account for the appearance of the εύρεθήσεται reading. Thus, this change would have also had to have been extremely early in the text's history, as the other readings would then have had to have been subsequently altered from the εύρεθήσεται reading. This conflicts with the current manuscript evidence which signifies εύρεθήσεται as an early reading than κατακαήσεται. Though, this does not rule out the possibility of future discoveries.

Further, if this was the case, it is also odd that a scribe elected to change κατακαήσεται to εύρεθήσεται. This paper will argue later that εύρεθήσεται refers to God's judgment. If a scribe did alter the passage to read εύρεθήσεται, then why would he not have used the more perspicuous and prolific κρίνω?

built in the surrounding verses, and still has widespread acceptance as such.<sup>51</sup> The passage surrounding the text builds a strong context of a fiery judgment. This judgment does not readily seem to be the “smelting” process that some scholars have proposed,<sup>52</sup> but at least superficially seems to be a violent judgment day – the heavens pass with a “roar,” and this fire does not seem to be a slow, intense burn but an explosion. In the words of Van Den Heever, “The world does not end with a ‘meltdown’ but with a big bang.”<sup>53</sup> And this violent view of the Day of the Lord is perpetuated through II Peter as well – referencing God’s violent destruction in the Old Testament acts of the flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah,<sup>54</sup> and moving on to see that destruction as analogous to the final day when sinners will be destroyed.<sup>55</sup> This intrinsic probability within the Pauline corpus has thus had strong sway over translators who have tended to prefer this reading to the others.<sup>56</sup>

There is a unique challenge presented when considering the internal evidence of the οὐκ εὔρεθήσεται and εὔρεθήσεται λύόμενα readings. Specifically, their similarity to the εὔρεθήσεται can make it difficult to distinguish which reading should be preferred. However, that said, some things can be loosely judged from the Petrine corpus, particularly in relation to the εὔρεθήσεται λύόμενα reading.<sup>57</sup> It has been noted that Peter has the tendency to repeat words to emphasize a point, and this point has made scholars reconsider the εὔρεθήσεται λύόμενα reading as a serious

---

<sup>51</sup> Curtis P. Giese, *2 Peter and Jude* (Concordia Commentary; Saint Louis: Concordia, 2012), 185. Apparently, one commentator found this support to be strong enough to support the reading as the original – Hermann von Soden. However, the commentary – *Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas* – is in German, which unfortunately has not yet been added to my language repertoire, and I cannot read his full argument. For reference of his position, see Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317. Alternatively, if you happen to know German, see von Soden’s commentary directly – H. von Soden, *Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas* (HKNT 3; Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1899).

<sup>52</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 409.

<sup>53</sup> Van Den Heever, “In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10,” 113.

<sup>54</sup> II Peter 2:5-8

<sup>55</sup> II Peter 2:12; Van Den Heever sees this recurring theme as persuasive enough to doubt εὔρεθήσεται as original, though he believes that original text to be lost entirely, and the only recourse to be emendation. Van Den Heever, “In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10,” 115-117.

<sup>56</sup> This logic also follows for the ἀφανισθήσονται reading, and as such we will not devote extra space for it here, especially given how much less support it has received by comparison. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317.

<sup>57</sup> Support for the οὐκ εὔρεθήσεται when considering the intrinsic probabilities is found more outside of the Petrine corpus and will be covered later.

option, even though it does not exhibit strong external support.<sup>58</sup> However, in this case the repetition goes beyond Petrine style and begins to become burdensome. *λύω* already appears in various forms three times in as many verses, and even for Peter, the repetition starts to become unwieldy and awkward.<sup>59</sup> That said, these options make much more apparent sense than *εὑρεθήσεται* for similar reason as the *κατακαήσεται* reading, culminating in the obliteration of the works of the world and that they will be not be found following their destruction on the Day of the Lord.

Given the support the other readings find in examining the Petrine intrinsic probabilities, it now bears considering whether the *εὑρεθήσεται* reading finds any such support. While much of the argument for the *εὑρεθήσεται* comes from the rest of scripture, Bauckham notes that our context deals not only with the destruction of the world, but also deals with the judgment of the wicked for their sin. Yes, they will be destroyed, but they are destroyed because they are judged and found wanting before a holy and perfect God. In fact, it contrasts neatly with Peter's exhortation to the church in vs. 14 "to be found"<sup>60</sup> righteous before God. Further, the idea of "being found" does appear elsewhere in the Petrine corpus as a reference to one's standing before God – namely I Peter 1:7, where the righteous are tested and may be found resulting in Christ's further glorification.<sup>61</sup> In order to come to this understanding, one does have to make one other leap however – the physical "γῆ"<sup>62</sup> does not naturally refer to humanity, especially in its contrast to the spiritual "οὐρανοὶ."<sup>63</sup> Thus, some scholars have pushed back against the *εὑρεθήσεται* reading noting that it is inappropriate that the "earth" as an object of God's creation,

---

<sup>58</sup> Carsten Peter Thiede, "A Pagan Reader of 2 Peter: Cosmic Conflagration in 2 Peter 3 and the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 82.

<sup>59</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317. "In spite of our author's tendency to repeat words the clumsy repetition of *λύεσθαι* three times in vv 10-11 is unlikely." Note, not all scholars agree for example, Thiede: "Although the reading of *ᾤ*<sup>72</sup> less clumsy than commonly thought, should be taken more seriously." Thiede, "A Pagan Reader of 2 Peter: Cosmic Conflagration in 2 Peter 3 and the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix," 82. However, Thiede ultimately concedes that "an unsupplemented *εὑρεθήσεται* ... would indeed appear to make exegetical sense."

<sup>60</sup> *εὑρεθῆναι* – the infinitive form of *εὕρισκω*. This actually much more neatly fits the Petrine style of repetition without being cumbersome. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 320.

<sup>61</sup> Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 386.

<sup>62</sup> "land" or, more appropriately for our passage, "earth" – the nominative of our verb in question.

<sup>63</sup> "the heavens"

independent from the wicked, being subject to God’s judgment. However, if one also takes into consideration that all creation was subjected to the fall and that the earth has become the stage for the actions of fallen humanity throughout time, there is an appropriateness to seeing the works here to be the wicked works of men that will be found before the Lord and judged.<sup>64</sup>

In summary, while all of the readings find fair to good support from the intrinsic probabilities from within the Petrine corpus, there is also no reason to discount the εὑρεθήσεται reading as original to the text. While it may not be as readily apparent as the other readings, the εὑρεθήσεται reading also makes good sense in the context of the Day of the Lord and the coming judgment. Taken with the other evidence examined so far, there is still very good reason to believe that it is the original Petrine language. As a closing argument, this paper will now examine the intrinsic probabilities from the rest of Scripture.

#### Intrinsic Probabilities – Arguments Outside of the Petrine Corpus

Discussions to find support for the various readings outside of the Pauline corpus are vast. Scholars have found connections all over Scripture as the Day of the Lord was promised in the Old Testament. Given the limitations of the Petrine Corpus, it is now worth considering evidence from the rest of Scripture that might support one reading over another.

Beginning our discussion with the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading,<sup>65</sup> scholars have found strong support for it in the rest of scripture noting connections found in Ps 37:36, Job 20:8, Dan 11:19,<sup>66</sup> Is 35:9, and Rev 16:20.<sup>67</sup> Ps 37:35-36 talks of a wicked man “not being found” in the same way as II Peter seems to anticipate – while initially thriving in this fallen world, he will not last and be destroyed in such a way that he will not be found.<sup>68</sup> Zophar’s speech in Job 20:8 does similarly, with the wicked man who had prospered being destroyed and as such will not be found.<sup>69</sup> Dan 11:19,<sup>70</sup> Is 35:9,<sup>71</sup> and Rev 16:20<sup>72</sup> are generally more broad in their language, but

---

<sup>64</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 320.

<sup>65</sup> Most of the intrinsic probability support for the εὑρεθήσεται λυόμενα reading is drawn from within the Petrine corpus and so it will not be covered here.

<sup>66</sup> Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, cc.

<sup>67</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317.

<sup>68</sup> LXX = “οὐκ εὑρέθη;” MT = “אָפּגָב?”

<sup>69</sup> LXX = “οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῆ;” MT = “אָפּגָב? אָל?”

provide good comparisons of apocalyptic language using terminology to favor the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading. Dan 11:19 prophetically refers to a king not being found after his fall. Is 35:9 perhaps more specifically fits with our contrasting context of the righteous and the wicked; it speaks of the way of the righteous and how beasts will not be found upon it. Rev 16:20 – speaking of mountains not being able to be found – is a somewhat less comparable situation as Isaiah, but provides another good reference for apocalyptic preference for the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading. Taken together, these references provide numerous parallels throughout Scripture to the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading. These parallels provide strong intrinsic support for the reading, and based upon this evidence alone, some scholars have been partial to this reading.<sup>73</sup> However, given its lack of external support, it should only be seriously considered as a “second place candidate” if εὑρεθήσεται fails to commend itself.<sup>74</sup>

Somewhat surprisingly, scholarship has done very little investigation into the intrinsic probabilities of the κατακαήσεται reading from the rest of Scripture. Likely, this is due to the general consensus that the κατακαήσεται reading can be disregarded on the basis of the transcriptional probability problems related to it. In my own study, there could be some possible connections made in other uses in the NT, but these connections are tangential at best and nothing to directly parallel are usage here. I Cor 3:15 seems to parallel when it speaks of the works of a man who builds his foundation on anything other than Christ will be burned up; the parallel to works here seems to be noteworthy. Rev 8:7 provides an apocalyptic connection where part of the world is burned up. Rev 18:8 also gives another apocalyptic parallel where Babylon is burned up. Outside of these, there are numerous other looser parallels to note the world appears prolificly at the conclusion of some of Christ’s parables referring to the chaff and weeds being burned up, as well as one use in Heb 13:11 that refers to sacrificial animals being burned up. Despite its appearance throughout the NT, there are only a handful of Septuagint

---

<sup>70</sup> LXX = “οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται;” MT = “אֵינָהּ נִמְצָאָה”

<sup>71</sup> LXX = “οὐδὲ μὴ εὑρεθῆ;” MT = “אֵינָהּ נִמְצָאָה”

<sup>72</sup> “οὐκ εὑρέθησαν”

<sup>73</sup> Most notably, Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, 160. And Bigg, *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, 213.

<sup>74</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 317.



uses of the word in various forms. Generally, it appears in relation to sacrifices,<sup>75</sup> and the burning up of offerings for sin. Outside of the context of the presence of sin in these passages, there seems to be very little that can be seen to parallel to our text in question. There is one occurrence with a *possible* antithetical parallel that might be drawn in Dan 3:27<sup>76</sup> which uses a form of the word with the negative<sup>77</sup> to refer to how Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were not burned in the fire. If one made a *big* stretch, one *might* be able to make the case that God sparing them from being burned up on account of their faithfulness could contrast with the wicked being burned up. But this seems unintuitive to say the least, and no scholar I know of tries to make this case. Generally however, what little research on the matter that is out there, prefers to find κατακαήσεται to be out of touch with the biblical eschatology “which speaks of a redemption and renewal of the creation, not of its annihilation.”<sup>78</sup> Overall, I find the possible parallels to κατακαήσεται to be uncertain, and the lack of secondary literature on the topic makes me wary of making a strong case for κατακαήσεται in reference to its intrinsic probabilities drawn from the entirety of Scripture.

Finally, we come to a consideration of the intrinsic probabilities for the εὑρεθήσεται reading. Scholarly discussion on the matter has been sprawling. Due to the strong external evidence and transcriptional probabilities that support the εὑρεθήσεται reading, scholars have tried to find numerous explanations for what it actually means and how it fits the context. Generally, discussion on the matter falls into a three camps – the first view takes εὑρεθήσεται as

---

<sup>75</sup> Ex 29:14, 34; Lev 9:11

<sup>76</sup> 3:94 in the LXX

<sup>77</sup> οὐ κατεκάησαν

<sup>78</sup> Note, this view requires viewing γῆ as referring to the physical creation, not as the works of men noted in reference to the εὑρεθήσεται reading. Craig A. Blaising, “The Day of the Lord Will Come: An Exposition of 2 Peter 3:1-18,” *BS* 169 (2012): 398. Blaising is the only article I could find that made even a passing reference to the intrinsic probabilities of the κατακαήσεται reading. I do think it’s probably too simplistic to completely disregard the κατακαήσεται reading due to not seeing the world annihilated at the end. While I agree with Blaising’s principle that creation will be redeemed and renewed, it is possible, as already noted, to take γῆ as referring to the “stage of human history.” And as demonstrated from a few of the Revelation passages, there are things in relation to the world that do get burned up.

I could not find even a passing reference to any work done on ἀφανισθήσονται likely because no one seriously considers it as a plausible reading. There are references to it used elsewhere in the NT in somewhat similar contexts – namely in Acts 13:41 talking of scoffers disappearing, or Matt 6:19 where moth and rust cause earthly treasures to disappear. But no scholar makes these connections, and given the lack of reference in the OT, especially in any apocalyptic literature, I feel less comfortable making those connections than I do about stating any possible parallels than I do about the κατακαήσεται reading.

a reference to the works of the world being found by God’s judgment, rendering the meaning “will be made manifest before God and his judgment.”<sup>79</sup> This view does require the understanding of “γῆ” as the “stage of human history” as noted above. In order to build this case, scholars use a variety of texts that cannot be exhaustively covered here. However, in brief, the texts used fall into three categories to build tangential parallels: first, the category of “sin or righteousness (or synonyms) being found;”<sup>80</sup> second, the category of “someone being found righteous [or sinful];”<sup>81</sup> and third, the category of a “criminal ... [being] detected, discovered ... or caught.”<sup>82</sup> Examples from the first category include Ps 17:3, which provides an example of David praying for God to test his heart for he will “find it”<sup>83</sup> righteous, as well as Rev 14:5, which provides an apocalyptic usage where deceit will not be “found” in the righteous.<sup>84</sup> Examples from the second category include Dan 5:27, where Daniel proclaims that Belshazzar has been “weighed and found wanting;”<sup>85</sup> and Rev 5:4, where no one is “found”<sup>86</sup> worthy to read from a scroll except for the Lion of the Tribe of Judah. Examples from the final category include Deut 22:22,28 referring to a people being “found”<sup>87</sup> in the sin of adultery, and Jer 50:24 where Babylon is “found”<sup>88</sup> and caught in a trap because they opposed the Lord. While it can be seen that these categories run tangential to the use in II Peter, the texts provide enough context to allow a fairly intuitive transition to see a legal connotation within the semantic range of εὑρεθήσεται. This connotation could possibly be drawn out even further given the passive voice

---

<sup>79</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 318.

<sup>80</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 318-319. Bauckham includes I Sam 25:28; 26:18; I Kgs 1:52; Ps 17:3 (16:3 in the LXX); Jer 2:34; Ezek 28:15; Zeph 3:13; Mal 2:6; Luke 23:4; John 18:38; 19:4; Acts 13:28; 23:9; 24:20; and Rev 14:5 in this category.

<sup>81</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 319. Here Bauckham includes Dan 5:27; I Cor 4:2; and Rev 5:4.

<sup>82</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 319. Bauckham lists Ex 22:8; Deut 22:22,28; Jer 50:24; and Ezra 10:18.

<sup>83</sup> MT = “נִצְּרָה;” LXX = “εὑρέθη”

<sup>84</sup> “εὑρέθη”

<sup>85</sup> MT = “תִּשְׁקָל וְנִשְׁקָל;” LXX = “εὑρέθη”

<sup>86</sup> “εὑρέθη”

<sup>87</sup> MT = “נִצְּרָה;” LXX = “εὑρεθη” in vs. 22; MT = “נִצְּרָה;” LXX = “εὑρη” in vs. 28

<sup>88</sup> MT = “נִצְּרָה;” LXX = “εὑρέθης”

used in the verb to imply that this is God who is finding the works of the world, and bringing them under judgment.<sup>89</sup> The second camp in scholarship reads an implicit question into the text, thus yielding a meaning close to the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading and translated as “the earth the works it contains – will they be found?”<sup>90</sup> This camp largely relies on reading the negatives forward the negatory uses found in the LXX forward by implication here.<sup>91</sup> There are two instances of usage in question form – Prov 20:6<sup>92</sup> and Prov 31:10,<sup>93</sup> but in both cases, the interrogative appears in the Hebrew text, and it appears in the LXX in the latter case. Further, Peter has not demonstrated an aversion to using interrogatives elsewhere – for example, I Pet 4:18 employs ποῦ within a broadly similar context.<sup>94</sup> Thus this camp is unpersuasive.<sup>95</sup> The final camp sees a metallurgic connotation to εὑρεθήσεται in this context. This camp argues that instead of destruction, the works of the world will be purified as by smelting. This view thus rejects the understanding of “γῆ” as the “stage of human history,” but holds to it as the physical world that God created. The destruction in our passage then is more analogous to the flood – which wreaks great destruction, but cleanses the world of the wicked.<sup>96</sup> In order to achieve this view, this camp begins with the context of our verse to show that “πυρούμενοι” is one used elsewhere in the context of a smelting furnace.<sup>97</sup> From here, this camp uses this setting to read Mal 3:2-4, referring to God refining his people as gold and silver, forward into our text and its

---

<sup>89</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 319.

<sup>90</sup> Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 364.

<sup>91</sup> Thus there is significant crossover with the intrinsic probabilities discussed in relation to the οὐκ εὑρεθήσεται reading. This work will not be duplicated here, I will only discuss the two instances found in Proverbs that are phrased as questions.

<sup>92</sup> “But a man of faithfulness who can find?” MT = “אִישׁ אֱמֻנָה יִמָּצֵא;” LXX = “εὑρεῖν.” It is interesting to note that the interrogative appears in the MT, but not in the LXX.

<sup>93</sup> “An wife of strength, who can find?” MT = “אִשָּׁה אֱמֻנָה יִמָּצֵא;” LXX = “τίς εὐρήσει.” Here by contrast, the LXX does appear with the interrogative.

<sup>94</sup> “If the righteous is scarcely saved, what will become of the ungodly and the sinner?” Gk = “καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σῶζεται, ὁ ἀσεβῆς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται”

<sup>95</sup> Schreiner, *I, 2 Peter, Jude*, 386. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 318.

<sup>96</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 408.

<sup>97</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 409. Wolters notes Zech 13:9 in the LXX and Rev 1:15.

surrounding verses, thus yielding in vs. 14 when Peter urges the church “to be ‘found’<sup>98</sup> without spot or blemish” as an exhortation with a metallurgic undertone of refinement.<sup>99</sup> However, while this interpretation has the advantage of a simpler understanding of “γῆ,” it does not adequately handle the idea of the works in the world, nor does it handle the transition from the smelting of humans to the smelting of the physical world.<sup>100</sup> Further, this camp has conceded that the semantic range of εὐρίσκω cannot be support elsewhere from Greek, but only when one reads forward the Hebrew נִצָּח forward into εὐρίσκω.<sup>101</sup> As such, the first camp is most persuasive, and also presents the best case for the εὐρεθήσεται reading from the intrinsic probabilities outside the Petrine corpus. When taken this way, the parallels made are as strong as the οὐκ εὐρεθήσεται reading if not more so.

While individual pieces of evidences might be used to support different readings, taken all together, the εὐρεθήσεται reading finds consistent support across all of the different categories of evidence. This support for the εὐρεθήσεται reading combined with a lack of a sound argument to reject the reading leads to a preference of it the as the original Petrine word choice. Bearing that in mind, it is now worth considering what impact this reading has on Christian theology, and why reading the text this way is important.

### **Implications and Reflection**

Thus, having argued for the εὐρεθήσεται reading, reflection must be made on why it matters and what the church stands to gain by understanding the text this way. Most notably, this reading highlights God’s sovereignty in the Day of the Lord. The passive voice used by Peter here, if one of the other readings were preferred, comparatively decentralizes God’s role in the handling of the wicked. In the other readings, the wicked pass away as a consequence of the upheaval the world undergoes when the Lord returns. While he remains the ultimate cause of their destruction in these readings, he is secondary to the fires of destruction. In the εὐρεθήσεται reading however, the wicked are found directly by God and exposed to his judgment. God’s role in what happens

---

<sup>98</sup> “εὐρεθῆναι”

<sup>99</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 410.

<sup>100</sup> Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 387.

<sup>101</sup> Wolters, “Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10,” 412.

to the wicked becomes centralized and highlighted.<sup>102</sup> In this reading, God’s identity as the perfectly just and omniscient Judge is revealed. The wicked have nowhere to hide following the destruction described in these verses, and the all-knowing and just God will judge them according to their works.<sup>103</sup> Anything they thought they had done in secret will be revealed and be found by God, and they will be condemned for it.

However, beyond just God’s role towards the wicked, it also reframes how we can understand the destruction portrayed in this passage. When we understand the world as the “stage of human history,” it also highlights how creation has been subjugated by the sin of humanity. It shows that it was not just humans that were affected by the Fall, but rather the curse extended over all of creation, and that creation longs for the coming judgment when the sons of God will be revealed and sin and its effects will be no more. Taken with the climax of the judgment of the wicked rather than their burning up or disappearance, the upheaval the world experiences is not primarily about its destruction, but rather about the judgment of the wicked.<sup>104</sup> Perhaps somewhat ironically, this also satisfies the eschatology of those who prefer the smelting understanding of *εὔρεθήσεται*. On the far side of this upheaval, the world does emerge cleansed.

So what are Christians to make of these implications? I think first and foremost is the implication Peter himself draws just a couple verses later: to “be diligent to be found by him without spot or blemish, and at peace.” Peter has assured us of the coming Day of the Lord, when God will judge the wicked, and this logically flows into an exhortation – that we are not to be found among the wicked, but rather to be found righteous. Second, it gives us hope – we have assurance that when the Day of the Lord comes, that sin and pain and death will pass away and the world will indeed be purified from all of these consequences of the Fall, and finally, the dwelling place of God will be with man and we will be his people and he will be our God.

### **Conclusion**

In closing, this text critical issue pushes us to mine the depths of Scripture. This labor reveals both a convicting truth on the redemptive historical timeline, but also one from which we draw hope – that Christ will come again to judge the living and the dead. This will be a day of great

---

<sup>102</sup> Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 330.

<sup>103</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 319.

<sup>104</sup> Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 319-320.

fear for many, but for Christians it also heralds the day of our Savior's return. This return should drive us to pursue holiness and continue in our sanctification sure that Christ who began the world of justification in us will bring it to completion. Thus, we may be presented as the pure and spotless bride of Christ in our corporate identity as the church through Christ's imputed righteousness. The Westminster Shorter Catechism, Question 38 captures this perfectly: What benefits do believers receive from Christ as the resurrection? Answer: At the resurrection, believers being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity.

## Appendix

οὐχ εὐρεθήσεται	εὐρεθήσεται	εὐρεθήσεται λόμενα	ἀφανισθήσονται	Κατακαθήσεται/ Κατακαθήσονται	Clause Omitted
syr <sup>ph</sup> mss	ⲛ	Ⲫ <sup>72</sup>	C	A	Speculum
cop <sup>sa, v</sup> vid	B			048	Ψ
	K			5	it <sup>z</sup>
	P			1243	vg <sup>ww, st</sup>
	1175			1735	Jerome <sup>vid</sup>
	1448			2492	Pelagius
	1739 <sup>txt</sup>			33	
	1852			81	
	syr <sup>ph, mss</sup> txt, h <sup>mg</sup>			307	
	arm <sup>mss</sup>			436	
	Origen			442	
				642	
				1611	
				1739	
				2344	
				Byz	
				Lect	
				it <sup>ar</sup>	
				vg <sup>cl</sup>	
				syr <sup>ph, mss</sup> mg, h, pal	
				cop <sup>bo</sup>	
				eth	
				geo	
				slav	
				Cyril	
				Augustine	

## Bibliography

- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2nd ed. Translated by Errol F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Bigg, Charles. *The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1978.
- Bauckham, Richard J. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 50. Waco: Word, 1983.
- Blaising, Craig A. "The Day of the Lord Will Come: An Exposition of 2 Peter 3:1-18," BS 169 (2012): 387-401.
- Danker, Frederick W. "II Peter and the Psalm of Solomon 17:10." ZNW 53,1 (1962): 82-86.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century." Pages 17-76 in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by David Alan Black. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Epp, Eldon Jay and Gordon D. Fee. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Fornberg, Tord. *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society: A Study of 2 Peter*. Translated by Jean Gray. Coniectanea biblica. Lund: GWK Gleerup, 1977.
- Giese, Curtis P. *2 Peter and Jude*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia, 2012.
- Green, Gene L. *Jude and 2 Peter*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. Black's New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Lightfoot, J.B. and J.R. Harmer. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Picirilli, R.E. "Allusions to 2 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers." JSNT 33 (1988): 57-83.



- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1, 2 Peter, Jude*. New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003.
- Thiede, Carsten Peter. "A Pagan Reader of 2 Peter: Cosmic Conflagration in 2 Peter 3 and the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix," JSNT 26 (1986): 79-96.
- Tresham, Aaron K. "A Test Case for Conjectural Emendation: 2 Peter 3:10d." MSJ 21,1 (2010): 55-79.
- Van Den Heever, G. "In Purifying Fire: World View and 2 Peter 3:10," NeoT 27,1 (1993):107-117.
- Von Soden, H. *Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas*. Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr, 1899.
- The Westminster Confession of Faith*. 3rd ed. Lawrenceville: Committee for Christian Education and Publications, 1990.
- Wolters, Al. "Worldview and Textual Criticism in 2 Peter 3:10," WTJ 49 (1987): 405-407.