

“From Peter...”—1 Peter 1:1-2

Brandon Holiski
Southern Oaks Baptist Church
November 21, 2021

[What follows is the transcript of a sermon. It was originally intended to be heard, not read, so the tone is more conversational than academic. It has only been loosely edited, so forgive any grammatical, syntactical, or spelling errors. If you have questions please contact Southern Oaks Baptist Church through their official website, www.welovethegospel.com.]

Take a Bible and meet me in 1 Peter, chapter 1...

Have you ever visited a place as an adult that you once lived in when you were a kid? Did you have an opportunity to talk with people who knew you as a child, but have not encountered you as an adult? Isn't that awkward? For me that happened when, as an adult, I would visit New Mexico.

Usually there were a few kinds of people I would encounter. There were always those people I would see who seemed surprised that I even graduated high school and that I was not in jail right now. I remember visiting once when my wife and I were in college. There was always this weird thing that happens when I introduce my wife to family I haven't seen since childhood or to people at family reunions. For context, my wife is a beautiful woman. So there is this thing that happens more often than I like to admit, but old buddies will come up to me or distant cousins and say things like, "Dude, is that your wife? Really? Seriously?" They are genuinely shocked that someone like her would agree to marry someone like me. And, I'm not going to lie, it can make you feel a little insecure because you start thinking, "Man, am I really that ugly?" But every time I look at photos of us I'm confronted with the fact that she is way out of my league...I guess it's a good thing that she didn't marry me for my looks...or money...or smarts...or, wait, why did she marry me? Does this every happen to anyone else? (husbands, go ahead and nod your head in agreement. You're welcome).

And then there are always some people I encounter (almost always family members) who still look at you as the 13 year old version of yourself. So to them you will always be the irresponsible kid you were back when they knew you. You can't seem to escape that mold in their minds. Parent sometimes struggle with this with their kids. They remember all those childish things you did as a kid and all your embarrassing moments. I'm a father of three and I collect that stuff. Can I just say, I'm glad parents didn't have cell phones and camera phones when I was a kid. That would have been horrible for me now. But my kids, on the other hand, growing up would invite me to film stuff. "Daddy, Daddy, are you getting this on camera?" "Sure am, honey (but in ten years you're going to wish I hadn't)...keep going!" I just save that stuff up, store it, index it, back it up on the external hard drive because in all likelihood there is going to come a day when I'm going to want to bring those things up and embarrass my kids. I mean, isn't that the reason you have kids? Maybe to scare away potential suitors. Maybe at their wedding. Maybe when they have kids, I'll pull out all those videos that begin, "When I have kids, I will never..." and show them to the grandkids.

Occasionally, you visit family and friends you haven't seen in years, and you discover that they are genuinely proud of you. They're amazed, but in a good way. They're happy to see what you have done with your life, how you came to know the Lord, or how you have matured and have a family of your own. They are amazed at the transformation that God has done in your life.

In a way, that is kind of how I feel when I think about Peter. He's one of those guys whose story is recorded for us uncensored, in all of the embarrassing details. But if you read it from beginning to end, you cannot help but walk away from his story with a sense of wonder. It is amazing to see the transformation in his life. It's amazing to see how far he fell and yet how his life was not defined by that failure, but ultimately by God's redemption. It is truly remarkable. I'm hard-pressed to think of any character in Scripture whose story gives me so much hope, especially when I fall into sin. When I pick up one of the Gospels and read about this impulsive and immature

man and then compare it with 1 Peter, a letter he wrote decades later, it's absolutely amazing to see what God did in his life. It is going to be real special to see some of these ways this unfolded throughout the course of this series of sermons.

Today we begin our formal journey through 1 Peter. This letter is a favorite for many Christians around the world, particularly in places where the Church is persecuted. The fact that the Church in America is, by comparison, relatively free from severe persecution probably best accounts for the neglect of 1 Peter in the preaching and teaching in Western churches. But it would be a mistake to conclude that this book is not relevant for our time and setting. A big mistake.

If you try to live the Gospel and its implications in our cultural environment you will experience persecution, as many of you can attest. That persecution may not be of the same sort or severity as Peter's original audience, but it will result in suffering nonetheless. Perhaps we will not ever have our lives endangered, but we, like Peter's audience, will be ostracized socially by some, slandered by others, and rejected by many. If you have never experienced these things for your faith, I would venture to say (and I believe Scripture would support this) that your faith is either not biblical faith or else not really being lived out in a biblical fashion. Peter will have some relevant things to say to us about that.

But 1 Peter is needed for us for a number of other reasons as well. Edmund Clowney described the book as "the most condensed New Testament resumé of the Christian faith and of the conduct that it inspires."¹ He went on to characterize the book as "a travellers' guide for the Christian pilgrims."² Martin Luther described it as "one of the noblest books in the New Testament", a "paragon of excellence", and a book that contained virtually everything necessary for a Christian to know.³ That's high praise.

The relevance of the book is also seen in the way it helps the Christian to discern his or her true identity and how this knowledge influences the Christian's relationship with the world. These two ideas, which are major themes of the book, are introduced in Peter's opening words and will be the fodder for our thought on the next few Sundays. In particular, I want us to see what God communicates to us, through Peter, about our relationship to God and to the world. But today I want us to simply introduce the book and remind ourselves of a thing or two about its author. To see this clearly, let's begin with the text.

Follow along as I read at the beginning of the 1 Peter. This is God's Word...

"Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, To those who are elect exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, ² according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in the sanctification of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ and for sprinkling with his blood: May grace and peace be multiplied to you." (1 Peter 1:1-2)

The first thing I would like us to note is what genre (or kind of literature) 1 Peter is because that will influence how we read and interpret it along the way...

THE GENRE: LETTER

If you are acquainted with first-century, Greek letters (and you could be if you are familiar enough with the New Testament since it contains several), then you will find in these opening verses the standard elements of the genre. Just like our letters today (or emails to a lesser extent) often abide by certain literary conventions, theirs did as well. Today, in most letters we would expect "Dear so-and-so...", followed by the letter's content, and some concluding pleasantries (e.g., "sincerely" or "affectionately yours") and the signature of the sender. We're used to that.

Well, in the first century letters tended to include four elements on the front end: name of the writer, name of the recipients, a greeting, and an introductory prayer (typically in that order).⁴ All of these things are present in 1 Peter. The writer identifies himself as Peter, the recipients as certain individuals from various regions in Asia Minor (i.e., modern-day Turkey),⁵ a greeting of “*May grace and peace be multiplied to you*” is found, and praise is offered to God in verses 3 and following. We will consider each of these features (and where they may be innovative) in due course, but let’s begin with the author, Peter.

THE AUTHOR: PETER

We know Peter as one of the first followers of Christ and one of the original twelve disciples. He was a fisherman by trade, prior to having followed Jesus. In fact, this is one of the reasons that some have doubted that Peter truly was the author of this letter. As a fisherman in Palestine, many skeptics have asked, could he really have written a letter like this? David Helm summarizes a common sentiment of “a veritable gaggle of scholars” who “feel that the Greek used in the letter is too elevated for Peter—the vocabulary too rich and uncommon—the engaging rhetorical flow too far above the intellectual capacity of an uneducated first-century fisherman like Peter.”⁶

Sometimes reference is made to Acts 4:13 as evidence for denying that Peter could have been the author. There we read,

“Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were uneducated, common men, they were astonished. And they recognized that they had been with Jesus.” (Acts 4:13)

The key words are “*uneducated*” and “*common*” (ESV), “unschooled” and “ordinary” (NIV). People use this admission to cast doubt on Peter’s ability to write sophisticated Greek prose.

Yet this strikes me as a very weak argument on a number of levels. To begin with, what is good Greek? That seems somewhat subjective? And how would we know what Peter’s writing abilities were at the time this letter was written (decades after we first encountered him on a boat fishing)? Even if at one point he was inarticulate in Greek, are we really to believe he could not have acquired the skill with some training? Furthermore, in the context of Acts 4, why are the religious leaders pointing out that Peter is “*uneducated*” and “ordinary”? It’s because they are astonished at how the power of God was so evident in his ministry and how persuasive he had been among the people. “In other words, these men were amazed that one so ordinary could also be one so well-spoken.” They didn’t come across as the babbling idiots they expected. And, as Helm adds, “if we are honest, all of us should be willing to admit that someone who is so well-spoken might also have the capability of becoming so well-written.”⁷

Finally, it is very possible that what these religious leaders in Acts meant by “*uneducated*” referred to the fact that Peter lacked training in rabbinic traditions and practices, not that he was incapable of putting together good Greek sentences. So I think it’s clear the skepticism that is applied to cast doubt on Peter’s authorship of this letter is often based more on an agenda to undermine the reliability of the Bible than it is on any concrete literary or historical evidence. The same could be said of other attempts to deny that Peter was the author as the text here claims.⁸

Plus, we should add, even if Peter had help writing, that would not undermine the claim that he is the author and source of the letter. Paul admits to having help in his letters at certain points and co-senders at others. At the end of this letter Peter acknowledges that he had written these things “by/through Silvanus” (5:12), which could mean either that Silvanus was the one who delivered the letter to the various regions mentioned at the beginning and/or that he was the secretary Peter used to put his thoughts into writing (a common practice in that day). So

even if Peter needed some help in Greek, the mention of Silvanus could explain the final form of the letter, which Peter obviously endorsed. That theory makes the most sense to me.

By the way, some of your translations read “Silas” in 5:12 (e.g., NIV). That’s because “Silvanus” is in all likelihood the Latinized form of the Greek name for “Silas” (which itself was probably the Greek form of his Aramaic name). Silas was the companion to Paul referred to on several occasions in the New Testament (Acts 16:19, 25, 29; 17:4-15; 18:5), a Roman citizen (16:37), and a prominent leader in the Jerusalem church (15:22).⁹ This, by the way, debunks another objection, namely, the claim that Peter could not have written the letter because it sounds too much like Paul’s style. If Silas was a companion and co-laborer with Paul first (which he was) and Silas in fact had a hand in helping Peter write this letter (which he seems to have), then the Pauline flavor should surprise no one. And, of course, there is no real tension between Peter and Paul’s theology, as some have alleged. So the theological compatibility of their writings is a good thing and precisely what we should expect. So let’s take the text at face value. Peter is the author.

His Name

“Peter” was the name Jesus gave to him. His Jewish birth-name was “Simon.” But one day, in that famous passage where Jesus says to him “on this rock I will build my church,” Jesus calls him “Petros,” which is a Greek word that means “rock.”¹⁰ The Aramaic word for “rock” is “kepha,” which lies behind the English name “Cephas.” All of those designations are used for Peter in the Bible. But he seems to have preferred his nickname, “Peter” (wouldn’t you, if Jesus gave you a cool nickname like “the Rock”?). It is quite possible that he was the first person to ever have this as a name.¹¹

His Title

You probably know a lot about Peter and some of his history we will bring out throughout the course of this series.¹² But, for now, let’s focus on what Peter says about himself here. His self-description is as short as it is significant, which is to say that it’s very short and very significant. “*Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ*” (1:1). As an “*apostle*” he has a distinct and unique authority. You’ll notice none of our church’s leaders have the title “*apostle*.” There is a reason for that. That’s because we don’t see it as an office that continues into the present day. Wayne Grudem explains it this way:

“New Testament *apostles* had a unique kind of authority in the early church: authority to speak and write words that were ‘words of God’ in an absolute sense. To disbelieve or disobey them was to disbelieve or disobey God. The apostles, therefore, had the authority to write words which became words of Scripture. This fact in itself should suggest to us that there was something unique about the office of apostle, and that we would not expect it to continue today, for no one today can add words to the Bible and have them be counted as God’s very words or as part of Scripture. In addition, the New Testament information on the qualifications of an apostle and the identity of the apostles also leads us to conclude that the office was unique and limited to the first century, and that we are to expect no more apostles today...The two qualifications for being an apostle were (1) having seen Jesus after the resurrection with one’s own eyes (thus, being an ‘eyewitness of the resurrection’), and (2) having been specifically commissioned by Christ as an apostle.”¹³

The word “*apostle*” literally means “sent one” and it was a common term for a “messenger.” And on at least a few occasions, it is used in this broad sense in the New Testament (Phil. 2:25; 2 Cor. 8:23; John 13:16). But the normal use of the term in the Scriptures is for the official title of “*apostle*,” which I see no evidence to support that this office continues into the present day. I recognize that there are many churches with leaders who are referred to as “apostles,” but I think it is misguided and misleading. If they mean simply that their modern “apostles” are “sent” by God into the world for some purpose, then I suppose that may be technically true (and

it would be true for *all* Christians). But it should at least be admitted that this is not the way the term is used in the Bible. For that reason, it is misleading.

“Though some may use the word *apostle* in English today to refer to very effective church planters or evangelists, it seems inappropriate and unhelpful to do so, for it simply confuses people who read the New Testament and see the high authority that is attributed to the office of ‘apostle’ there.”¹⁴

But here, in 1 Peter 1:1, Peter is not just called an “*apostle*,” but specifically an apostle “*of Jesus Christ*.” Did you know that this phrase “*of Jesus Christ*” is never attached to any other New Testament church office? You never read of “teachers of Jesus Christ.” You never find reference made to “evangelists of Jesus Christ” or “prophets of Jesus Christ” or “pastors of Jesus Christ” or “deacons of Jesus Christ.” Not once. But you do find “Apostles of Jesus Christ” (or “apostles of Christ Jesus”).¹⁵ This is further evidence that this is a unique and supremely important position in church history. No one today has this sort of authority. Peter can simply assert that fact about himself and his audience will take seriously what he is going to say as though Peter was sent by God to say it. We too ought to listen with the same humility and submission.

But remember where I began the sermon. Peter was not always this man. A lot had happened in Peter’s heart in the thirty years leading up to this letter. There was quite the turnaround. Let me show you a glimpse of what I mean. Turn with me to Luke 22. Luke tells the story of the final meal that Jesus shares with his disciples, the meal that is imitated as the basis for the Lord’s Supper ordinance. At some point after the meal (or perhaps during) a fight breaks out among the disciples. This is what Luke tells us about that scuffle...

“A dispute also arose among them, as to which of them was to be regarded as the greatest. ²⁵ And he said to them, ‘The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and those in authority over them are called benefactors. ²⁶ But not so with you. Rather, let the greatest among you become as the youngest, and the leader as one who serves. ²⁷ For who is the greater, one who reclines at table or one who serves? Is it not the one who reclines at table? But I am among you as the one who serves. ²⁸ ‘You are those who have stayed with me in my trials, ²⁹ and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, ³⁰ that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’” (Luke 22:24-30)

Then in the next verse (22:31), Jesus singles Peter out. Imagine that. This fight breaks out. Jesus offers a corrective. And then among the group he singles Peter out. Imagine if you were Peter. Listen to what Jesus tells him.

“‘Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, ³² but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned again, strengthen your brothers.’ ³³ Peter said to him, ‘Lord, I am ready to go with you both to prison and to death.’ ³⁴ Jesus said, ‘I tell you, Peter, the rooster will not crow this day, until you deny three times that you know me.’” (Luke 22:31-34)

Then, in this very chapter, Peter denies having any knowledge of knowing Jesus three times, just like Jesus predicted. To help you understand how low of a moment that was for Peter, look at the last occasion where Peter denies Christ. Look at verse 60 and following. This happens after Jesus’ arrest, when he is brought to the religious leaders and several people are around to watch the commotion. Peter has followed in the shadows to see what is happening. Some people recognize him and ask if he was one of Jesus’ followers. He denies even knowing Jesus twice. Now here is the third time. Verse 60....

“But Peter said, ‘Man, I do not know what you are talking about.’ And immediately, while he was still speaking, the rooster crowed. ⁶¹ And the Lord turned and looked at Peter. And Peter remembered the saying of the Lord, how he had said to him, ‘Before the rooster crows today, you will deny me three times.’ ⁶² And he went out and wept bitterly.” (Luke 22:60-62)

Can you imagine the agony of that moment for Peter? Can you imagine a lower and darker moment than that, save Christ's own slaughter? That was Peter's lowest moment. A moment when all the rottenness of Peter's heart gushed to the surface. A moment when Peter must have thought, "I'm done. God is through with me. It's over."

But remember, the prophecy about this denial that Jesus gave Peter at their last Passover meal was attached to another one. "*Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned again, strengthen your brothers.*" Built into Jesus' prediction that Peter would deny Him three times is a reassurance that Jesus has prayed for Peter's faith in that moment and that, therefore, it would not fail and that his life would turn around. But that "turning back" was for a purpose. Jesus says, "*when you have turned again, strengthen your brothers.*"

This has been such an impactful text in my life. It gives me a lot of hope when I remember those dark moments in my soul where I have fallen further into sin than I ever thought I could. And it reminds me that Christ redeems people and situations. That none of those experiences are lost. That He can take even the tragedies of our lives, like this dark night for Peter, and use them to open the door to help other people's faith. Peter has something to say to people who go through extreme adversity and sin, because he has been there. And what he has to say, God uses to strengthen them. God will not waste your history, if you, like Peter, turn around to Him in repentance.

The letter of 1 Peter is itself an example of this. Written approximately thirty years later, this letter is an example of how God was using Peter to strengthen his brothers. And as we work through it, we will see examples of Peter's transformation and how, after his fall, God used his past history and past encounters with Jesus to help others. Let me give you just one example as we close.

One of the most heartfelt conversations between Peter and Jesus happens after Peter's denial and after Christ's resurrection. In fact John ends his Gospel with that encounter. It's found in John 21, beginning in verse 15. Let me read it to you.

"When they had finished breakfast, Jesus said to Simon Peter, 'Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these?' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord; you know that I love you.' He said to him, 'Feed my lambs.' ¹⁶*He said to him a second time, 'Simon, son of John, do you love me?' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord; you know that I love you.' He said to him, 'Tend my sheep.'* ¹⁷*He said to him the third time, 'Simon, son of John, do you love me?' Peter was grieved because he said to him the third time, 'Do you love me?' and he said to him, 'Lord, you know everything; you know that I love you.' Jesus said to him, 'Feed my sheep.'* ¹⁸*Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were young, you used to dress yourself and walk wherever you wanted, but when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and another will dress you and carry you where you do not want to go.'* ¹⁹*(This he said to show by what kind of death he was to glorify God.) And after saying this he said to him, 'Follow me.'"* (John 21:15-19)

Now, with this in mind, look at 1 Peter 5 and tell me if you don't hear the words of Jesus ("*feed my sheep*") echoing in the background. Listen to his instruction to elders in the church (people like me, the pastors) and tell me that it doesn't sound like Peter took to heart that conversation with Christ and is now passing it down to a new generation of Christ followers. Start in verse 1.

"So I exhort the elders among you, as a fellow elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, as well as a partaker in the glory that is going to be revealed: ² shepherd the flock of God that is among you, exercising oversight, not under compulsion, but willingly, as God would have you; not for shameful gain, but eagerly; ³ not domineering over those in your charge, but being examples to the flock. ⁴ And when the chief Shepherd appears, you will receive the unfading crown of glory." (1 Peter 5:1-4)

This is an appropriate passage to look at this morning since we are talking about the author because, as Karen Jobes points out, “First Peter 5:1 is the most extensive self-description given by the author in this epistle.”¹⁶ And here, Peter commands the elders to “*shepherd the flock of God that is among you.*” The command there is striking for at least two reasons. First, this is not the only place in the New Testament where “*elders*” are described as “shepherding” (e.g. Acts 20:17, 28, where the term ἐπισκόπους [overseers] is also used). If you ever see “pastor” in an English translation, it is the word “shepherd” in Greek. When you study the use of the words, you find that “pastor/shepherd” and “elders” (or even “overseers”) are all terms used for the same church office. This text is a good example, because the elders are told to shepherd the flock, to pastor the flock.

Second, when you recall the memorable instructions of Jesus to Peter (“shepherd my sheep”) in John 21:15-19, you hear the solidarity he has with these elders as he wrote these words (cf. “fellow-elder”). As Peter has been instructed, so he now instructs. And he tells them that their shepherding role is really that of an under-shepherd, because as Peter reminds them, those being led are “*God’s flock.*” God is their Shepherd. Elders, then, are to shepherd “*as God would have*” them,¹⁷ following the example of Jesus, “*the good shepherd,*” who “*lays down his life for his sheep*” (John 10:11).¹⁸

Isn’t it amazing to see this side of Peter? To read about the old man juxtaposed to new man that God had made him? What changed him? The Good Shepherd. And what makes Jesus the Good Shepherd *par excellence*? The fact that He laid down His life for His sheep.

It strikes me as a such a mercy that the prediction of Peter’s betrayal of Jesus occurs in the context of that meal that births the Lord’s Supper ordinance. What a mercy that every time Peter thought back on that moment of his predicted failure, he would remember it in the context of the bread and the wine. What a mercy that he could find in that memory hope. What a grace that the memory of his greatest failure would so naturally connect to Christ death. “*This is my body, given for you...this cup is the New Covenant in my blood which is poured out for you.*” That New Covenant was the one promised by the prophets of the Old Testament, one that was to be characterized by the forgiveness of sins. There was enough blood spilled on that cross to atone for Peter’s sins. So Jesus says, “when you turn back, strengthen your brothers.”

And listen, there was enough blood shed on the cross to take away your sins too. But you have to trust Jesus. That’s what faith is. And biblical, saving faith always involves turning from our sins and turning to God. As long as you run from God, you’ll know nothing of this salvation. As long as you try to work to atone for your own sins, you’ll know nothing of this salvation. As long as you allow the guilt and shame to keep you from the cross, you’ll know nothing of this salvation. But if you remember that your sin is the reason Jesus came, then, perhaps for the first time, you will renounce your own efforts, look up from the muck and mire of your dark heart and see a cross and a resurrected Savior with an arm extended saying “come...look at the wounds...look at these scars...turn away from your sins and trust in me. I will save you. I died to set you free.”

What a Savior!

Peter knew Him well. And there is no reason you could not as well...Trust in Him.

Next time we will consider who Peter is writing to. He addresses them as “the elect.” What does that mean? We will give some thought to this question next Sunday.

Let’s pray...

¹ Edmund Clowney, *The Message of 1 Peter*, BST (Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 15.

² *Ibid.*, 36.

³ Quoted from Karen Jobes, *1 Peter*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 1. Cf. Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996), 64.

⁴ J. S. Duvall and J. D. Hays, *Grasping God's Word: A Hands-on Approach to Reading, Interpreting, and Applying the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005), 233.

⁵ Clearly this was intended as a “circular letter,” that is, one that would be read in one place, copied, and taken to another place, until the whole region accessed its content. Duane F. Watson and Terrance, *First and Second Peter* (PCNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 19.

⁶ David R. Helm, *1 & 2 Peter and Jude: Sharing Christ's Sufferings* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008), 22.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

⁸ Most of the best Evangelical commentaries address the main counterarguments, but most will find Grant Osborne's work to be the most accessible. He succinctly and intelligently defends against the five most common arguments against Petrine authorship: (1, 2) “The Greek of 1 Peter is too good for a Galilean fisherman, and the author utilizes the Septuagint [i.e., the Greek translation of the Old Testament] throughout”; (3) “The epistle is addressed to remote provinces in the north part of Asia Minor, and these were not likely reached until long after Peter had passed from the scene”; (4) “The developed church situation in 1 Peter 5 and the level of persecution described in the epistle fit the situation at the end of the century, not that of the 60s”; and (5) “The language of the epistle is too Pauline and shows too little cognizance of Jesus to have been written by Peter.” Grant Osborne, “1 Peter” in *James, 1-2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation* (CBC 18; Ed. Philip W. Comfort; Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.), 131-133. All of these can be defended against sufficiently (see Osborne, Jobes, Schreiner, et. al.). The burden of proof still lies on those who seek to deny the claim of the text, but not clear evidence has been proffered to date to warrant such a conclusion. One may also find Scot McKnight's insights helpful on this subject (Scot McKnight, *1 Peter*, NIVAC [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 26-29). For more on the historical attestation for Petrine authorship, see Jobes, 59-60.

⁹ Jobes, 321; R. C. Sproul wrote, “If Silvanus was Silas, he would have been capable of writing at a high level of Greek language, and if he wrote the epistle under the supervision and even the dictation of the Apostle Peter, that would account for the eloquence of the Greek without denying Petrine authorship.” R. C. Sproul, *1-2 Peter*, St. Andrew's Expository Commentary (Good News Publisher, 2011), 20.

¹⁰ Technically, the word is *petra*, but that is feminine. Since it is referring to a man, a masculine Greek ending is given to yield *petros*. Osborne remarks, “It was a virtual prophecy, for Peter never became ‘the rock’ until after Pentecost; before then, he was shifting sand!” Osborne, 147.

¹¹ I. Howard Marshall, *1 Peter*, IVPNTC (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1991), 29.

¹² See McKnight, 44-45.

¹³ Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 906. He gives further explanation and support in the following pages and cites the classic essay on the matter, by J. B. Lightfoot, “The Name and Office of an Apostle,” in his commentary, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians* (first published in 1865; reprinted by Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957), 92-101.

¹⁴ Grudem, 911. He continues, “It is noteworthy that no major leader in the history of the church—not Athanasius or Augustine, not Luther or Calvin, not Wesley or Whitefield—has taken to himself the title ‘apostle’ or let himself be called an apostle.” Karen Jobes makes a similar point, stretching back to some of the earliest church fathers. “Peter writes with the confidence that he is presenting the ‘true grace of God’ (5:12) and that his words come with apostolic authority. In the first century of the Christian church, the primary characteristic of an apostle was his authority to bear authentic testimony to the life and significance of Jesus Christ. An apostle was recognized to have an authority distinct from even the great early church leaders such as Ignatius, Polycarp, and Clement of Rome. Ignatius (Ign. *Rom.* 4.3) writes in his letter to the Romans, ‘I do not enjoin you as Peter and Paul did. They were Apostles; I am a convict’ (Lightfoot 1893). And again he writes (Ign. *Trall.* 3.3), ‘But I did not think myself competent for this, that being a convict I should order you as though I were an Apostle’ (Lightfoot 1893; similarly also Ign. *Eph.* 3.1; Ign. *Magn.* 6.1). Furthermore, the apostles were recognized as equal in authority to the prophets of the OT era. Polycarp (Pol. *Phil.* 6.3) wrote, ‘Let us then serve him in fear, and with all reverence, even as he himself has commanded us, and as the apostles who preached the gospel unto us, and the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of the Lord [have alike taught us]’ (Lightfoot 1893). It is with such apostolic authority that the author of the letter of 1 Peter wishes to be understood.” Jobes, 59-60.

¹⁵ Wayne Grudem, *1 Peter*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 47.

¹⁶ Jobes, 300.

¹⁷ The phrase *κατὰ θεόν* could be understood as (1) that the oversight in the church should be done God's way (as above); or (2) that God wills there to be oversight in the church. Either option would fit the context here. A choice is not necessary, as Peter could have had both in mind when he wrote. But, at the very least, the first should be conveyed in translation, as the second is implicit.

¹⁸ Cf. John H. Elliott, “Ministry and Church Order in the NT: A Traditio-Historical Analysis (1 Pt 5:1-5 and Parallels),” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (July 1970): 367-391.