Below are pages 4 and 5 of Pastor Mark Driscoll's 2009 book, "Trial: 8 Witnesses From 1&2 Peter," published by Mars Hill Church. Under the section called "Peter the Author," Pastor Driscoll again directly lifts and publishes, without attribution or proper footnotes, content from page 1369 of "1 Peter," New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition, Ed. D. A. Carson, et al., 4th ed. (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994).

Peter the Author

While some critics argue that Peter is not the author of the letters bearing his name, the evidence against such critics is more than sufficient. They are prone to argue that he could not have written the letter based on Acts 4:13, which says that Peter was not formally educated. However, this charge is not credible for five reasons.

First, Peter is described in Acts 4:13 as "uneducated," and the style of Greek in which the letter is written is said to be too good for a Galilean fisherman to have used. Also, quotations in 1 and 2 Peter are taken from the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Old Testament, rather than the Hebrew version. The style is, however, not so "educated" as some would like to make out and in places it is much more the language of ordinary people. There is evidence that in Peter's time, Greek, as well as Aramaic, was spoken in Galilee, and as a fisherman living in Capernaum on one of the great trade routes, he would have had to speak Greek regularly. The fact that his own brother's name, Andrew, is a Greek one suggests that from boyhood Peter grew up with this language. Some thirty years' work of evangelism and teaching in a church that contained an increasing proportion of Gentiles would have made him more fluent in Greek and prepared to quote the Septuagint. Furthermore, the

~4~

As well as this direct evidence that Peter the apostle was the author, the letter frequently alludes to the life and teaching of Jesus, which Peter was present to witness. Subsequently, the verdict of F. H. Chase is that "no Epistle has caught so much of the spirit of Jesus." ⁴

Fourth, from the language of 1 Peter 4:14–16, some have built a case to suggest that the letter was written at a time when the very fact of being a Christian was a crime, and this is known not to have been the case until long after Peter's death. Peter's argument in 1 Peter 2–4, however, is that Christians must take care to live an innocent life so that if they are falsely accused, such slander will be without foundation. The book of Acts reveals that from the earliest days, misunderstanding, personal prejudices, and rejection of the gospel could lead to persecution because of the name of Christ (e.g., 13:50; 14:5, 19; 16:19–24; 17:5, 13; 18:12–13; 19:23–29). In fact, Peter's own words suggest that he was speaking only about individual and not state-sponsored persecution of Christians (1 Pet. 2:13–14). The relationship between the church and the authorities indicated in the letter is basically the same as in Acts,

On page 6 of his book, Pastor Driscoll does credit David H. Wheaton and D. A. Carson in footnotes 5 and 6 from citations in *New Bible Commentary*. However, as you can observe in the book, those footnotes apply further down in his text, to two direct quotes from those men. The plagiarized sections themselves contain no footnotes, quotes or attribution.

which also precedes the horrendous and murderous persecution that was inflicted upon Christians in the time of Nero some years later.

Fifth, 2 Peter 3:1 reveals that the author of 2 Peter is in fact the same person who wrote 1 Peter: "This is now the second letter that I am writing to you, beloved." Despite some scholarly doubt concerning the authorship of 2 Peter, David H. Wheaton writes:

The writer leaves us in no doubt on the matter. He says he is "Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1). He was on the mount of Transfiguration with Jesus (1:16–18) where only Peter, James and John were with him (Mk. 9:2–12). He had written on a previous occasion to the recipients of this letter (3:1) and is on familiar terms with them (3:1, 8, 14, 17). Furthermore, he calls Paul "our dear brother" (3:15), and at the time of writing he was expecting to die quite soon (1:14). ⁵

Furthermore, the early church consistently recognized Peter as the author of the two letters bearing his name. This includes Polycarp, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, among others. Simply, 1 and 2 Peter were penned by Peter. D. A. Carson calls Paul Achtemeier's commentary on 1 Peter "the fullest commentary in English at the exegetical level" and "a masterpiece of careful scholarship." ⁶ Thus, the greatest technical commentator on 1 and 2 Peter concludes, "The majority of the evidence, both external and internal, would appear to support the traditional view that Peter the apostle wrote this letter."

NOTES

- Wiersbe, W. W., The Bible Exposition Commentary (1 Pe 1:1) (Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1996, c1989).
- D. R. W. Wood, "Peter" in New Bible Dictionary, ed. I. Howard Marshall et al., 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 905.
- Karen H. Jobes, 1 Peter (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 8.
- Quoted in David H. Wheaton, "1 Peter" in New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition, ed. D. A. Carson, electronic version, (Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1994).
- David H. Wheaton, "2 Peter" in New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition, ed. D. A. Carson, electronic version, (Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1994).
- D. A. Carson, New Testament Commentary Survey (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986/2007), 136.
- 7. Peter Achtemeier, 1 Peter (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 35–36.

Please see the following excerpt to compare with the previous excerpts from Pastor Mark Driscoll's book, "Trial: 8 Witnesses From 1&2 Peter." The following is from page 1369 of 1 Peter," New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition, Ed. D. A. Carson, et al., 4th ed. (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994).

PETER

Introduction

Who wrote 1 Peter? The writer says he is 'Peter, an apostle of Jesus The writer says it is a vector, air aposite of Jesus Christ' (1:1), and was a 'witness of Christ's suf-fering' (5:1). He is writing with the help of Silas (Silvanus) from a place he calls 'Babylon', where (Silvanus) As with him (5:12–13). As well as his direct evidence that Peter the apostle was this uncer the letter frequently alludes to the life and teaching of Jesus (see below). The verdict of F. H. Chase is that 'No Epistle has caught so much of the spirit of Jesus' (Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings, vol. III, p. 780).

Many early authors referred to the letter and quoted from it, but in recent years five main reasons have been put forward for suggesting that the apostle Peter was not in fact the author.

First, Peter is described in Acts 4:13 as 'unschooled', and the style of Greek in which the letter is written is said to be too good for a Galilean fisherman to have used. Also, quotations are taken from the Septuagint (LXX), the Greek rather than the Hebrew version of the

The style is, however, not so 'educated' as some would like to make out and in places it is much more the language of ordinary people. There is evidence that in Peter's time Greek, as well as Aramaic, was spoken in Galilee, and as a fisherman living in Capernaum on one of the great trade routes he would have had to speak Greek regularly. The fact that his own brother's name, Andrew, is a Greek one suggests that from boyhood Peter would have grown up with this language. Some thirty years' work of evangelism and teaching in a church which contained an increasing proportion of Gentiles would have made him more fluent in Greek and prepared to quote the LXX as his 'Authorized Version'. It is not certain, but Silvanus (5:12 may have acted as Peter's amanuensis (i.e. composing the letter from thoughts Peter shared with him). If he did, then his background as a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37) of some breeding could well have affected the style and language.

Secondly, from the language of 4:14-16 some have built a case to suggest that the letter was written at a time when the very fact of being a Christian was a crime, and this is known not to have been the case until long after Peter's death.

Peter's argument in chs. 2 - 4 is, however,

that Christians must take care to live an innocent life, so that, if they are falsely accused, such slanders will be without foundation. The book of Acts (e.g. 13:50; 14:5, 19; 16:19-24; 17:5, 13; 18:12-13; 19:23-29) shows that from the earliest days misunderstanding, personal prejudices and rejection of the gospel could lead to persecution 'because of the name of Christ'. 4:14-16 need have no further legal implications than similar phrases in Mt. 10:22 and Acts 5:41. In fact, what Peter says about the role of the state in 2:13-14 suggests that he did not expect persecution from that quarter. The relationship between the church and the authorities indicated in the letter is basically the same as in

Thirdly, some object because the letter contains ideas found in Paul's writings especially in his letter to the Ephesians.

This argument is only valid if the theory is accepted that the two apostles disagreed and were never finally reconciled. The basic teaching in the early church was fairly standard, and it would have been strange had there been no similarities. If we accept that Peter and Paul may have been together in Rome (see below on where the letter was written) just before the letter was written they would doubtless have talked over many of the issues considered in it (see also Gal. 1:18).

Fourthly, according to Gal. 2:9 Peter and Paul agreed to work in different spheres, and yet the destination of 1 Peter is thought to be an area evangelized by Paul.

The arrangement referred to in Galatians was made at least ten years before the letter was written and in the interval the distinction between Jewish and Gentile churches would have become less clear. 1:12 suggests that Peter had not brought the gospel to his readers, but Acts 16:6-7 suggests that Paul had not visited all of them either.

Finally, some say that this letter does not contain the sort of personal references to Jesus one would expect from a writer who knew him as well as Peter did.

See, however, e.g. 1:8, 13; 2:21-25; 3:14; 4:14; 5:1-2 and other references in the commentary below. Let the readers make up their own minds as they read the letter for themselves.