- CHAPTER I -

INTRODUCTION: "CARDS ON THE TABLE!"

- CHAPTER I -

INTRODUCTION: "CARDS ON THE TABLE!"

An introductory chapter is a custom in scholarly work. The introductory chapter, however, is utilized for a variety of purposes. It is often used merely to describe the contents or chapter division of the work or to pay tribute and give thanks to persons who influenced them. Some use it to give an overview of the problems regarding their subject matter, while others utilize the introductory chapter to give account of the methodology applied in their research. The last approach is a step in the right direction and, in my opinion, the proper use for an introductory chapter. I would like to argue that this methodological account should be broadened to accommodate an account of the philosophical presuppositions of the scholar. This is necessary because of the diverging and often untenable contradictions in the results of scientific research. This is true of every scientific discipline and subdiscipline. The root of the problem has everything to do with the opposing "presuppositions" of scholars which lead to different approaches and consequently to different results. Although different (even opposing) approaches and results are initially stimulating and in the interest of development in scientific research, it is in the long run highly counterproductive for the development of science and inevitably results in a deadlock position between fanatical scholars.

I proceed in my introductory chapter to illustrate this very problem in section A by outlining the cacophony echoing from scholarly work in theology as a whole as well as the deadlock concerning the exposition of biblical texts (taking 1 Peter as an example). Through this brief sketch of the dilemma confronting theology, I am arguing that the whole crisis in theology boils down to a hermeneutical-exegetical crisis. In section B my theoretical-methodological considerations are put on the table by first setting the boundaries for a hermeneutical-exegetical model whereafter I define it in terms of the communication process as my paradigm for a solution to the communication crisis in biblical scholarship. The analytical processes and aids (based on the theoretical-methodological considerations) which I am implementing in this dissertation are discussed in the A sections of chapters II, III and IV respectively. As a penultimate part of my introduction, section C deals with my epistemological and paradigmatic presuppositions in order to comply with my demand to put one's cards on the table. This section exposes my covert

presuppositions and commitments in addition to the already discussed theoretical-methodological considerations. It is especially done within the parameters of the philosophy of science as a crosscheck on my hermeneutical-exegetical basis.

With these cards on the table I trust that the reader will have a detailed outline in order to evaluate the possibilities and limitations of this dissertation.

*

THE COMMUNICATION CRISIS: A CACOPHONY

1 .THE COMMUNICATION CRISIS WITHIN CHRISTIANITY AND THEOLOGY: A MORAL ISSUE

The New Testament is the compilation of the primary documents of the Christian community . Although what is to be said is, to a large extent, also applicable to the Old Testament, this study focusses on the New Testament as such . These primary documents of the Christian community (henceforth the "New Testament") are part and parcel of human communication . It is very important, however, to note that from the very beginning the church used the New Testament, to a large extent, as an instrument for mass communication. This is evident when we consider Budd & Ruben´s (1979:118) definition of a mass communication institution as " ...a structural-functional unit, operating in a one-to-many mode, which has as its goal the purposeful diffusion of information into and with the intent of exerting control over the communicational environment, and thus controlling the behavior of individuals vis-a-vis that environment toward some end." In fact, this "intent of exerting control on others in a one-to-many mode" is part and parcel of the very nature of Christianity. Therefore, most of the New Testament writings were written with the intention of exerting control over its own community or of converting others . Even the personal letters in the New Testament soon functioned as mass communication instruments.

However, when Christianity uses the New Testament for the purpose of "exerting control over the communicational environment" (i e using the New Testament as a normative or canonized text), a moral issue is at stake. Barnlund (1973:49) maintains " ... the aim of communication is to transform chaotic sense impressions into some sort of coherent, intelligible and useful relationship . When men do this privately, either in confronting nature or in assessing their own impulses, they are free to invent whatever meaning they can . But when men encounter each other, a moral issue invades every exchange because the manipulation of symbols always involves a purpose that is external to, and in some degree manipulative of, the interpreter of the message ."

It is this moral issue that has become critical within Christianity and theology today . The church and its officials

(including biblical scholars) are trying to exert control over society with the Bible as a normative conscience-binding instrument. They often contradict each other on crucial moral and ethical issues such as evaluating political initiatives, artificial conception, marriage and euthanasia; on theological issues such as baptism, the eucharist, trinity and redemption; on ecclesiological issues such as church unity and the church´s role in society; and on the exposition of biblical literature such as Genesis, Jona, Daniel, the Gospels and Revelations. When the church (supported by theological research) binds the consciences of society and its own members in such a conflicting way the question arises whether it has not become an irrelevant and meaningless instrument creating disorder and confusion. This problem is aggravated by the fact that people are inspired to fanaticism when their particular views are apparently sanctioned by "God´s Word".

This one-sidedness and the ruthless promoting of one viewpoint, is also found amongst biblical scholars (as it is also found in other sciences). Let us see for ourselves!

*   *

2 THE COMMUNICATION CRISIS: CACOPHONY IN THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH ON 1 PETER

Although the church tradition on biblical writings was already in dispute in the first centuries A.D., it was only after the reformation and especially the enlightenment that a full-pledged war raged between historico-critical scholarship and church tradition. This created a communication crisis between the church and theology as well as among biblical scholars as such. Their evaluation and interpretation of introductory issues (such as authorship, date, addressees, situation, etc) differs to such a degree that one tends to loose faith in scholarly work. This situation prevails even today when one compares the most recent commentaries and introductions on the New Testament. Although one could agree with Elliott (1976:253) that our understanding of 1 Peter and its historical context has grown in the last decades - even that we have gained more clarity on some issues - there is no consensus whatsoever amongst scholars. As an illustration of the cacophony of different and often contradictory views which are often ruthlessly promoted by scholars, I am now going to give an outline of the different views in the Introduction to 1 Peter. Obviously it will not be possible to discuss and evaluate all the arguments for and against the different views in detail for that could develop into a dissertation on its own. I will have to limit the discussion by only stipulating the different views and their main arguments. An overall evaluation, however, will be given in section A 3 of this chapter.

2.1 AUTHORSHIP

On the authorship issue German scholarship, to a large extent, agrees that Peter the apostle could not have been the author in spite of the internal witness of the letter (cf Kuemmel 1975:421-424; Goppelt 1978:66-70; Brox 1979:43-47). The most important objections are: that the excellent Greek used in the letter is not to be reconciled with that of an uneducated fisherman; that Peter had no previous contact with the addressees; that the letter reflects no direct or eyewitness contact with Jesus but is dependent on church tradition; that the Pauline influence on 1 Peter is too strong to be identified with Peter; that Silvanus was Palestinian and could therefore not serve as a scapegoat to salvage the Petrine authorship by means of an amanuensis; and that the general character of the letter and the persecution reflects the "Sitz im Leben" of the second or third generation of Christians rather than that of Peter as part of the first generation (cf Best 1969/70:95-113; Blevins 1982:401-413). With these considerations in mind Brox (1979:41, 46 & 228) concludes that the author was a presbyter of the second or third generation Christians in Rome. Therefore 1 Peter is according to Brox (1979:226-230) a pseudonymous letter claiming

I A

the authority and example or image of Peter, the apostle, to instruct and comfort the addressees. Goppelt, however, is reluctant to describe 1 Peter as pseudonymous. He concludes "Die Namen Petrus und Silvanus sind, misst man sie an der traditions-geschichtlichen Struktur des Briefes, alle Wahrscheinlichkeit nach kein Postulat pseudonymer Schriftstellerei, das lediglich eine formale Autoritaet vorweisen wollte. Der Brief wendet auf alle Faelle tradition an, fuer die diese beiden Namen als Sigel stehen koennen. Moeglicherweise hat man in Rom gewusst, dass diese Tradition massgeblich durch diese beiden Lehrer (Petrus und Silvanus) gepraegt war, und sie deshalb unter ihrem Namen weitergegeben" (Goppelt 1978:69).

A view that shares Goppelt´s assumption that this letter is based on Petrine tradition is the postulation of a Petrine school which was responsible for this letter (cf Best 1977:60-63; followed by Blevins 1982:401-413). Therefore, these scholars confirm the above-mentioned objections to Petrine authorship in order to serve their theory of a Petrine school (cf Blevins 1982:401-403). Blevins (1982:402) argues that there are "... at least four reasons for positing the existence of a Petrine community. First, the similarities and dissimilarities in 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude could best be explained by community authorship. Second, the liturgical elements in these three letters would point to a worshiping community. Third, the unique use of Old Testament, dominical logia, early church traditions, and pseudepigraphical literature involves a community design. Fourth, evidence within the New Testament and church fathers gives that indication." He continues: "Thus we envision a school or community which traced its origin to Simon Peter the apostle. By using the name of Peter, they preserved his memory and brought esteem to their founder. They seem to have addressed each other as `beloved´ (1 Pet. 2:11; 4:12; 2 Pet. 3:8, 17; Jude 3, 17, 20). The traditions of Peter are valued (1 Pet. 5:12-13; 2 Pet. 1:13-14). Peter is set forth as author and one who is a figure of authority (2 Pet. 3:15-17). The use of the Septuagint points to a group which was involved in teaching, learning and studying. Members of the group seem to have withdrawn from society and to have seen themselves as a priesthood (1 Pet. 2:11; 2:5)" (Blevins 1982:403).

Although conservative and evangelical scholars are often prepared to accept the possibility of pseudepigrapha in the canon (cf Metzger 1972:1-24) it is often with great reserve (cf Guthrie 1970:671-684) taking great pains to prove that it is in any case not true with regard to the writings included in the New Testament canon (cf Guthrie 1970; Carrington 1951; and Winbery 1982 with regard to 1 Peter). Predictably enough, conservative scholars are much more positive towards the external evidence upholding the church tradition that Simon Peter, the apostle, was

the author of 1 Peter (cf Winbery 1982:14). Their arguments concerning the internal evidence include the following: the persecution reflected fits that of Rome in the latter half of Nero´s rule (i e in the sixties) which according to Winbery (1982:9) would explain 1 Peter 4:12-16 irrespective of whether it refers to an official persecution or not, as well as the relatively positive attitude towards the authorities which was still possible at this stage; the Pauline traits as well as the excellent Greek in 1 Peter could easily be explained if Silvanus was indeed Peter´s amanuensis (cf 5:12) who had relative freedom in the writing of the letter (cf Rolston 1977:3,4 & 8; Schweizer 1973:12; Selwyn 1947:9-17; Winbery 1982:9 & 12-14); the primitive character of the Christian beliefs in 1 Peter "... suggest a date nearer the middle of the first Christian century rather than at the end or even in the second century" (Winbery 1982:10; cf Holmer 1976:14-15; Schweizer 1973:11; Selwyn 1947:56-63); the absence of reference to the life of Jesus is to be explained in the light of the fact that 1 Peter is not a "... first-time proclamation to the people addressed" (Winbery 1982:13) - in any case there are ample echoes of the sayings of Jesus which would confirm a first-hand witness as the author (cf Gundry 1966/67:345). The interesting hypothesis of W C van Unnik (1942) which identifies the addressees of 1 Peter as Jewish proselytes provides additional arguments for the Petrine authorship, for instance that Peter as the apostle for the circumsized (cf Gal 2:7), had the authority to address these Christians.

A radically different hypothesis is proposed by K M Fischer (1978:203): "Wir sind also der Ueberzeugung, dass der urspruengliche Verfasser den Namen Paulus geschrieben hat und er erst von einem Spaeteren wohl unabsichtlich in Petrus geaendert wurde. Der Brief wird darum innerhalb unseres Buches unter die Deuteropaulinen eingereiht, wohin er nach dem Willen seines urspruenglichen Verfassers auch gehoeren duerfte." Fischer´s (1978:199-203) main arguments for this conjecture comprise of the following: 1 Peter is addressed to the centre of Pauline territory; Silvanus and Mark are linked to Paul in the New Testament and not to Peter; the form of the letter is clearly Pauline; the persecution reflected in the letter is different from that of Peter´s time; and the theology of the letter is markedly Pauline. This then leads Fischer (1976:203) to juggle with the names #Pétros# and #Paûlos# conjecturing that the name of the author was abbreviated #PS# (as was often done with well known names) and that a copyist misinterpreted it as #Petros# in stead of #Paûlos#.

*

I A

2.2 ORIGIN

The letter´s reference to "Babylon" as the place from where it was sent, is almost unanimously interpreted as Rome by twentieth century scholars (cf Goppelt 1978:65-66; Brox 1979:41-43; Filson 1955:403; Fischer 1978:207; Moule 1956/7:8-9). Brox, however, suggests that Babylon could have been used as a metaphor for the general existence of Christians in exile.

One has to go back to the previous centuries to find supporters for the view that Babylon referred to Babylon on the Euphrates, for instance Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, Lightfoot and Alford (cf Manley 1944:142) or to Babylon in Egypt, for instance Leclerc, Mill, Pearson, Calovius, Pott, Burton and Gresswell (cf Manley 1944:142). Manley (1944:146) sides with the latter theory concluding modestly: "The writer of these notes makes no pretensions to theological knowledge. An interest in the subject was aroused by two visits to Egypt ...."

One could conclude, therefore, that the issue of the origin of 1 Peter is one of the few Introduction issues that has gained widespread consensus in the twentieth century.

*

2.3 DESTINATION, ADDRESSEES AND THEIR SITUATION

.1 There is a general consensus amongst scholars that the destination of the letter - that is Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia - refers to the Roman provinces and not to the districts as some of the older scholars believed (cf Goppelt 1978:27 footnote 2). In the Good News Bible the description "provinces" is actually added to the text although it is absent in the Greek text.

.2 Brox (1979:24-34), Gopppelt (1978:27-30) and others (e g Danker 1967:99; Van Unnik 1969:129; Winbery 1982:6) agree that 1 Peter is addressed to predominantly gentile Christians. Van Unnik´s (1942) identification of the addressees as predominantly proselytes is not in contradiction to this, but rather a specification. These scholars therefore reject the hypothesis that the addressees in Asia Minor were predominantly Jewish Christians - a hypothesis recently revitalized by J H L Dijkman (1984). Dijkman (1984:24) believes that the addressees were Jewish converts of the Jerusalem mission to the circumcised who lived in Asia Minor as #pároikoi#. Kelly (as quoted by Blevins 1982:405) probably represents the state of research on the addressees with his assertion that it is doubtful whether there were many churches in the first century outside Palestine, at any rate in the larger centres of population, of which the members

were wholly Jewish or wholly Gentile. There is no consensus whether the addressees were mainly recently baptized Christians (cf Brooks 1974:290-305) or whether they represented an already established community (cf Danker 1967:93-102). To complicate it even more some believe that 1:3-4:11 was addressed to the new converts whereas 4:12-5:11 was addressed to the established community (cf the literary theories of Preisker and Blevins amongst others as discussed under section A 2.5 of this chapter). F W Danker (1967:101) represents the opposite view which is mainly supported by scholars accepting the literary unity of the letter (e g Brox and Goppelt): "First of all, if the addressees in both portions of the epistle have a history of suffering for the faith behind them, it is improbable that we are dealing with new converts as candidates for baptism in 1:3-4:11, unless a probationary period of some length, impossible to document, is assumed." Some believe that the addressees belonged to the poorer classes of society, but others have indicated that this is not the whole truth because 3:6 refers to well-to-do women whereas 2:13-17 was probably addressed to free men.

.3 Opinions differ on the situation of the persecution reflected in 1 Peter. Some believe that two totally different eras of persecution are represented. Brox (1979:24-35) and Goppelt (1978:56-64) judge the "Sitz im Leben" of the addressees very much the same. They agree that we are not dealing with a state persecution, but primarily with a conflict between Christians and non-Christians in everyday life (thus also Moule 1956/7:8). Their suffering included the experience of distrust, hate, slander, discrimination (social ostracism), aggression and probably (cf Goppelt) but not necessarily (cf Brox) a summoning before court because of the "grundsaetzliche Anderssein der Christen" (Goppelt 1978:60) in their following of Christ which led to a polarization between Christians and non-Christians (including Jews and Gentiles). This conflict seems to have been fairly widespread in the Roman Imperium (over against the Neroine era in which the conflict was localized). Brox (1979:32) conludes that this suffering doesn´t help us in dating the letter because it was a "zeitlose Realitaet oder Moeglichkeit" in the second half of the first and early part of the second century whereas Goppelt believes it reflects the era 65-80 A.D. Brox and Goppelt (cf Sylva 1980:161; Winbery 1982:4-5) are also of the opinion that there is not enough evidence to deduce two different eras of persecution in 1 Peter (cf the traditional distinction between 1:1-4:11 and 4:12-5:11). Brox (1979:33-34) explains this difference as literary dramatizing and creativity on the author´s side.

In sharp contradiction to the above-mentioned, Francis Wright Beare (1945:284) overassuredly states: "In my own opinion, the references to persecution in the closing verses of the fourth

chapter correspond so exactly to the description of Pliny´s
methods as they are set forth in his Letter to Trajan (Book 10,
Epistle 96), that we are entirely justified in concluding that it
was written at that very time, i.e, 111-112 A.D., and it was
quite likely that it had its origin in one of the cities of the
province of Bithynia and Pontus." Winbery (1982:7) contests this
hypothesis: "However, when 1 Peter is compared with the whole
section in Pliny, the actual similarity boils down to the mention
of `the name´ and the use of the term `Christian.´ Any actual
dependence on the statement of Pliny is very questionable."
Blevins (1982:404), on the other hand, assumes that events
similar to those in Bithynia (111 A.D.) described by Pliny with
regard to Trajan´s reign, occurred in Domitian´s time. He accepts
the different persecution situations before and after 4:12. With
regard to the latter he states: "In this section persecution is
no longer a future possibility but a harsh reality, a `fiery
ordeal´ which has broken out against the church" (Blevins
1982:404).

K M Fischer (1978:204), who categorized 1 Peter as a deutero-
Pauline writing, also envisages the end of the Domitian reign
(93-96 A.D.) as the historical background of the persecution
reflected in the letter.

*

2.4 THEME AND STRUCTURE

.1 Norbert Brox (1979:16-24) proposes the theme "hope" for this
letter (cf Danker 1967:93-102). This hope is based on Christ´s
resurrection (cf 1:1-12) and has important implications for the
lives of the addressees (cf 1:13-3:12) even in suffering (cf
3:13-5:11). Goppelt suggests that the theme is related to the
designation of the addressees as "strangers" in the society (cf
1:1 & 2:11) which implies suffering (Goppelt 1978:40-42; followed
by Blevins 1982:410-411). Brox (1979:17-18) rejects Goppelt´s
formulation of the theme (i e "Die Verantwortung der Christen in
der Gesellschaft") as anachronistic. This reflects two different
presuppositions on the origin and theme of this letter: Brox
proposes that the "Sitz im Leben" of the addressees necessitated
the theme of "hope" for the author whereas Goppelt asserts that
the author had something to say on the theme of Christians and
society.

In addition to the different interpretations of the theme by
Goppelt and Brox, we also find the following interpretations.
Brooks (1974:294; cf Martin 1962:40) argue that the whole letter
is to be understood in the light of the author´s concern for
"baptism": "Rather the entire writing becomes more understandable
if it is read with the idea that the author"s concern for baptism

has permeated its entire fabric ." This was contested by David Hill (1976:189): "To say that the letter, or most of it, is a baptismal homily or liturgy is to treat as explicit, direct and prominent what is only implicit, presuppposed and subsidiary. I Peter is paraenetical, not catechetical: and its mains [sic] theme is the conduct of Christians in a situation of testing and adversity" (cf the similarities with Goppelt´s theme above as well as McCaughey´s 1969:40). Closely related to the baptismal theme is the interpretation of 1 Peter as a Christologized paschal liturgy in which Passover themes dominate (cf Leaney 1963/4:238-251 who extended Cross´s theory). Fischer (1978:204), on the other hand, argues: "Das Zentralthema des ersten Petrusbriefs ist das Leiden der Christen. E. Lohse (Paraenese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief) hat gezeigt, dass diesem Thema alle christologischen und paraenetischen Traditionen untergeordnet sind." Winbery (1982:16) views 1 Peter as a challenge towards the church to accept her identity as the people of God and to live accordingly.

Still others view the theme of the letter in a more comprehensive way, for instance Selwyn (1947:1): "The purpose of the letter is to exhort and encourage them in a time of trial; and this he does by unfolding to them the ways of God as revealed in the Gospel, by recalling to them the example of Christ, and by expounding the principles of conduct, negative as well as positive, which were inherent in their calling and their baptism ."

.2 Goppelt´s (1978:42) division of 1 Peter differs from Brox´s (cf above under .1). His division is as follows: 1:3-2:10 (i e the foundation of the Christian existence as God´s people in society: marked by faith, hope & love); 2:11-4:11 (i e the implications of their existence as strangers in society: submission to institutions and suffering); 4:12-5:14 (i e application and elaboration of the previous discourse concerning "dem Verhaeltnis der Christen zur Gesellschaft und der Leidensnachfolge").

As the whole issue with regard to the structure of 1 Peter is closely related to the literary unity and character of the letter, more possible and probable structures will be discussed in the following section.

*

I A

2.5 <u>LITERARY</u> <u>UNITY</u>, <u>CHARACTER</u> <u>AND</u> <u>DEPENDENCY</u>

.1 Although 1 Peter is composed of a variety of themes, images and associations often with an alternation in tone, style and themes, Goppelt (1978:40-44) and Brox (1979:35-38) accept the unity of 1 Peter on the grounds of its argumentative style, themes, subthemes, situation and pastoral intent throughout the letter. To this may be added that features such as the author's preference for compound words, concrete imagery and negative-positive contrasts are found in both 1:1-4:11 and 4:12-5-14. This refutes the traditional two part division of 1 Peter on the grounds of style and "Sitz im Leben" (Sylva 1980:160). Both Goppelt (1978:44-45) and Brox (1979:23-4) assert 1 Peter to be a real letter or rather a "circular letter" (i e "Rundbriefs" or "Rundschreiben"). Brox (1979:24), however, remarks "Ein solches "Rundschreiben" bleibt ein Schreiben, also ein Brief. Aber der literarischen Form nach bleibt der Uebergang zur Rede fliessend." Goppelt (1978:45-47) also emphasizes the excellent Greek which is reflected in the rhetorical expertise and the poetic and rhythmic style in 1 Peter.

On the other hand, scholars argue that there is a definite break between 1:3-4:11 and 4:12-end due to a difference in style (i e the first part is in a formal, structured and rhythmical style and the latter part in a direct and simple style) and "Sitz im Leben" (i e the first part reflecting hypothetical persecution as against actual persecution in the latter part). This hypothesis of disunity in 1 Peter became the linchpin for the reconstructions of the form-critical character of the writing as we shall see shortly.

In addition to the above-discussed issue of the unity of 1 Peter as a whole, the results of the form-critical reconstructions have to be added. Martin (1962:31-34) discusses the form-critical contributions of Selwyn, Windisch and especially Bultmann with his analysis of the three Christological hymns - that is 1:18-21, 2:21-25 and 3:18-22. In a certain sense Preisker's reconstruction of 1 Peter as a baptismal liturgy in which he distinguishes the minutest detail, wording and participants of the liturgical order, is the extreme limit of the form-critical approach (cf the next paragraph). It is clear that the danger of textual manipulation in the interests of a theory with regard to form-critical analysis is a real threat and, indeed, the major criticism against it (cf Martin 1962:34).

.2 The literary and theological character of 1 Peter has been one of the major issues in the history of the research (especially since the beginning of the twentieth century. My outline of this development follows that of Goppelt (1978:37-40) and Martin (1962:29-42) amongst others. Therefore, the reader will find

that reference is made to a number of outdated classics which I
have not read and are consequently not taken up in my
bibliography. The research of the twentieth century was
initiated by Adolf Juelicher´s "Einleitung in das Neue Testament"
in 1906 in which he judged that 1 Peter lacked a unifying theme
and coherent structure. This was confirmed by the
literary-critical hypotheses of Richard Perdelwitz in 1911
proposing that a copyist combined two different texts (i e a
short letter consisting of 1:1-2 and 4:12-5:14 with a baptismal
sermon consisting of 1:3-4:11). This hypotheses was followed by
Hans Windisch in 1930 and Francis Wright Beare in 1947. O S
Brooks (1974:290-305) who agrees that 1 Peter is a "baptismal
instructional sermon", on the contrary emphasizes the unity of
the letter which he found to be held together by 3:21.

The liturgical interpretation of 1 Peter which was initiated by
Perdelwitz in 1911 and Bornemann in 1919 was to be developed into
greater detail by Herbert Preisker. Preisker (in his revision of
Windisch´s commentary in 1951) complemented the literary-critical
evaluation with a form-critical analysis showing 1 Peter 1:3-5:11
as an eyewitness account (probably put together by Silvanus) of a
worship service mainly composed of a Roman baptismal liturgy (cf
Moule 1956/7:3 where he gives a neat outline of the liturgy and
the service as a whole). The first part of the service (i e
1:3-4:11) was directed to the baptizands containing a
"Gebetspsalm" (1:3-12); a "belehrende Rede" with the baptism act
between 1:21 and 22; a baptismal dedication (1:22-25) and a
baptismal festive hymn (2:1-10). The rest of the service contains
paraenetical material (2:11-3:12) and a "Offenbarungsrede"
(3:13-4:7) with hymns in between (viz 2:21-24, 3:18-22). The
baptismal service as the major part in this worship service was
concluded by a closing prayer in 4:7-11. The latter part of the
letter (i e 4:12-5:11) is then the conclusion of the worship
service as such in which the whole congregation is addressed with
a "eschatologische Offenbarungsrede" (4:12-19), admonition to the
elders (5:1-9), "Segenspruch" (5:10) and a closing doxology
(5:11). Martin (1962:37) remarks (tongue in cheek?) that in this
minute eyewitness reconstruction characters responsible for
different parts of the liturgy flit across the stage in a
bewildering array.

In 1954 F L Cross followed this theory of Preisker, to a large
extent, but improved it in one important respect - that is the
postulation of a more precise date for the baptism. He concluded
that 1 Peter was the liturgy of a passover-baptism-eucharist
service because of the references to the Exodus and Easter (cf
the joy-suffering contrast and the paranomasia #páschō-páscha# as
the background for the frequent occurring #páschō# in 1 Peter) as
well as to the eucharist (cf #égeúsasthe# in 2:3). In contrast to
Preisker, Cross viewed 1 Peter rather as the bishop´s running

commentary on the baptismal liturgy than the liturgy itself. Cross´s hypothesis, however, was contested by C F D Moule (1956/57:3-11) and T C G Thornton amongst others. Especially Cross´s embarrassment with the remainder of the letter (viz 4:12-5:11) clouds his hypothesis with suspicion (Martin 1962:39). M E Boismard (to a lesser extent) and A R C Leaney (to a greater extent) followed the suggestions of F L Cross. Leaney (1963/4:238-251) argued that there is enough evidence to confirm that 1 Peter is to be linked with a Passover liturgy which was current in the early stages when the early church still upheld Jewish forms of worship.

In an article in which Moule (1956/7:1-11) criticized Cross´s hypothesis he suggested that 1 Peter was actually two different forms of the same letter. Letter A (1:1-4:11 & 5:12-14) was written to a community in which persecution was only a possibility whereas letter B (1:1-2:10; 4:12-5:11) was written to Christians undergoing persecution. It is especially the parallel and recurring themes in letters A and B which lead Moule (1956/7:10) to this hypothesis. Moule based his distinction of the persecution envisaged in the two letters by comparing New Testament parallel persecution-phrases (especially the Apocalypse) with that of 1 Peter. Blevins (1982:411) tries to solve the discrepancy with regard to the persecution in the letter by asserting that the Petrine school directed 1:3-4:11 as a baptismal sermon towards the new converts amongst the addressees and 4:12-5:11 as a sermon towards the larger congregation already involved in the persecution. A last hypothesis that crossed the imaginative (and overactive?) mind of B H Streeter (cf his "The Primitive Church" published in 1929) was to solve the break between 4:11 and 12 by conjecturing that the epistle was compiled, probably at Sinope in Pliny´s time, by combining a sermon to a group of baptized persons (1:3-4:11) with a letter of encouragement in time of persecution (4:12-5:11) which were both probably written by Elder Ariston who may have been Bishop of Smyrna (cf Moule 1956/7:2 for a discussion of Streeter´s theory).

Brox (1979:16-24) and Goppelt (1978:40) rejected the above-mentioned hypotheses (cf also Martin 1962:29-42; Winbery 1982:4-5). Goppelt´s (1978:40) criticism seems to sum it up: "Beide (die formgeschichtlichen und literarkritischen Hypothesen) gehen von der Voraussetzung aus, dass eine sinnvolle Gedankenfuehrung in dem Brief nicht zu finden sei. Gelingt es, diese Voraussetzung zu widerlegen, dann sind diese Hypothesen nicht mehr noetig, um den Aufbau zu erklaeren; sie werden zu Vorarbeiten fuer eine sachgemaesse formgeschichtliche und traditionsgeschictliche Analyse des Briefes." Sylva´s (1980:159) comment with regard to this issue is also appropriate: "However, I note that just because baptism is alluded to does not mean that

the document is some type of baptismal document. To determine what type of document it is one must determine its focal point." In this regard a number of scholars emphasize that 1 Peter remains an epistle with the references to baptism subordinated and in the service thereof (cf Martin 1962:35 where he lists Selwyn, Lohse, Moule and Bieder to his support).

.3 The relationship between 1 Peter and the other New Testament writings has also been disputed. Goppelt and Brox argue that 1 Peter wasn't literary dependent on any New Testament writing. The similarities should rather be explained by a common oral tradition in the early church (cf Goppelt 1978:47-57; Brox 1979:22-24; Elliott 1976:246-247; Dijkman 1984:24). The relationship with Pauline theology is of special interest. Some would argue, especially Fischer (1978:199-216), that 1 Peter is "deutero-Pauline". Therefore, it is not surprising that a number of studies were undertaken to analyse the relationship between 1 Peter and the Pauline letters (e g Couts 1956/7:115-127; Mitton 1950:67-73). Others (e g Brox and Goppelt) acknowledge the similarities with Paul, but emphasize the differences as well. Elliott (1976:247) discerns aptly between Pauline dependency and honouring of Pauline tradition in his discussion of the relationship between Romans and 1 Peter: "In the case of Romans the question must be asked whether the author of 1 Peter was dependent less on a letter of `Paul´ than on a cherished document of the `Roman community´ from which he wrote. The influence then, would be more Roman than Pauline."

Goppelt (1978:47-56) also compares the relationship between 1 Peter, the Pastoral letters, James, Hebrews, the Gospels and extrabiblical literature. Two main streams of tradition are traced in 1 Peter: the Pauline (Hellenistic) and the Palestinian tradition (which includes Old Testament, Qumran, Wisdom, Apocalyptic and Gospel traditions). Brox (1979:22-24) tends to divide the influences in terms of catechetical, liturgical, paraenetical and homiletical traditions which already had fixed applications in the early church and were likewise applied by the author of 1 Peter. Dijkman (1984:24) specifies that 1 Peter represents early Jerusalem catechism. The broad representation of New Testament tradition material in 1 Peter is an argument used by Blevins (1982:407-408) to relate this letter to a Petrine school at the end of the first century when most of the New Testament writings already existed, although literary dependency is not postulated.

In the end the crucial question will be if there is something of a "Petrine" theology represented in 1 Peter. In this regard Brox is more hestitant than Goppelt who accepts a "Petrine" influence in 1 Peter. The hypothesis of a Petrine tradition is obviously rejected by Fischer (1978:198-216) who interprets 1 Peter as a

deutero-Pauline writing. One of the most important criteria in
discerning a Petrine theology is whether 1 Peter reflects the
so-called Palestinian or Primitive theology distinct from the
Pauline and more developed theology of the New Testament. Goppelt
concludes that this is indeed the case.   He is supported by Paul
E Davies (1972:115-122) who regards the Christology in 1 Peter as
primitive and John H Elliott (1976:247-248; followed by Sylva
1980:162) who distinguishes a distinct Petrine theology or
trajectory.   In this regard Elliott (1976:248), therefore, also
supports the probability of a Petrine circle which is to be
located geographically (whether it be Antioch, Asia Minor or
Rome).

Robert H Gundry (1966/7:336-350) bases his arguments for a
primitive theology in 1 Peter on the frequency of dominical
sayings in   1 Peter which ultimately also prove apostolic
authorship in his opinion.   Ernest Best (1969/70:95-113) reacted
to this by showing that the relationship between 1 Peter and the
gospels is minimal and that apostolic authorship is not at all
certain. To this article Gundry (1974:232) once again reacted
confirming his initial stance: "We may conclude, then, that good
reasons remain for our seeing 1 Pt as dictated by the Apostle
Peter in Rome, and for our seeing his dictation as peppered with
frequent allusions to dominical sayings and incidents which were
both authentic and possessive of special interest to him."

                                *

2.6 DATE

Obviously the question of authorship determines the dating of
this letter.   Once again the opinions differ considerably.
Goppelt (1978:64-65) argues that the nature of the conflict
reflected in the letter; the lack of reference to church
episcopacy; as well as the earliest probable date of the
expansion of church to the whole of Asia Minor suggests a date
between 65-80 A.D. Brox (1979:38-41), on the other hand, suggests
a terminus ante quem of 100 A.D. (cf the literary reference to 1
Peter in 2 Peter and Polycarp´s Philippian letter) and a terminus
post quem of 70 A.D. (because Rome was only designated as
"Babylon" after 70). Brox´s dating is (with minor differences)
also shared by Elliott (1976:254) who is followed by Sylva
1980:156-157 & 162). At the beginning of this century Ora Delmer
Foster (1913) used the interrelationship between 1 Peter and the
other New Testament writings to date this letter between 87-90
A.D. The weakness of this theory is obviously that if one tampers
with the assumed datings of the other New Testament writings the
whole hypothesis falls to pieces.

Scholars accepting Petrine authorship (cf I A 2.1) are bound to

I A   17

date the letter by Peter´s possible stay in Rome shortly before his crucifixion under Nero in the sixties. Some scholars, however, are not convinced of this tradition linking Peter with Rome. Nevertheless, scholars who propose this early date for 1 Peter find no trouble in relating the persecution reflected in the letter with that of the early sixties in Rome when the clouds of Nero´s aggression gathered and were already visible. Therefore Winbery (1982:3-16) maintains that this date explains some features in 1 Peter such as the tension between the hypothetical and actual persecution; the still positive attitude towards authorities in contrast to the much later situation reflected in the book of Revelation; the cryptogram "Babylon" for Rome (irrespective of whether it was used for secrecy or merely for homiletic purposes) which designated Christians in exile. In addition to this, it could also be argued that the primitive character of the tradition material as well as the church order supports an early date.

Best´s and Blevins´ theory of a Petrine school limits their dating of the letter to a time when the development of such a school is probable. Blevins (1982:403) postulates that a Petrine school could have been established already at the end of the first Christian century. His interpretation of the persecution reflected in 1 Peter as "cruel treatment and harsh persecution" (Blevins 1982:401 & 403-404) leads him to conclude that 1 Peter originated during the reign of Domitian - that is 81-96 A.D. (cf Blevins 1982:411). Fischer (1978:204-206) supports this and even dates it more precisely at the end of Domitian´s reign (93-96 A.D.), but then as a creation of the Pauline circle and not the Petrine circle. J D McCaughey (1969:27 & 37) and F W Beare (1945:284) date 1 Peter during the reign of Trajan (98-117 A D) without being able to identify the author.

*

It should be more than obvious that the results of the research on 1 Peter echo a cacophony of opposing sounds. The question is whether we are able to identify the dissonant instruments responsible for this cacophony and whether we are able to orchestrate the different instruments into a symphony. Let us first identify the dissonant instruments.

*   *

3. THE COMMUNICATION CRISIS: IDENTIFYING THE DISSONANT INSTRUMENTS IN THE CACOPHONY

The above-discussed Introduction issues with regard to 1 Peter clearly illustrate the babelic confusion and lack of agreement amongst scholars. This confusion is also found with regard to other New Testament writings (cf Rousseau 1985). Although many of these differences needn´t be a problem (cf my conclusions in chapters II C, III C & IV), one has to acknowledge the cacophony echoing from biblical scholarship. This crisis with regard to the communication and interpretation of the New Testament texts is to a large extent the result of the lack of a comprehensive hermeneutical and exegetical theory. This is not only responsible for the overinterpretation and one-dimensional approach to the New Testament (i e a lack in methodology), but also for an uncritical awareness of the problems that science faces (i e a lack in theory).

3.1 A DISSONANT EXEGETICAL METHODOLOGY: OVER- AND UNDEREXPOSURE OF TEXTS

The lack in exegetical methodology is clearly reflected by the one-dimensional approaches in the history of research on 1 Peter. The inevitable result of a one-dimensional approach is an illegitimate overinterpretation which implies both the over- and underexposure of texts. This "over-" and "underexposure" manifests itself in the three basic modes or aspects of texts - that is the theological-philosophical, the historical and the linguistic-literary (cf my article in Scriptura 1984:50-78 where these distinctions were illustrated). Let me first explain what I mean by the over- and underexposure of the basic modes of texts before we evaluate the results of the research on 1 Peter.

The overexposure of texts distorts the communication act through the overemphasizing of a certain mode. Theologically this is to abuse the New Testament as a source of "general truths and imperatives" as if the Bible were a scientific, ethical and cultic-liturgical textbook (cf Barr 1973:13; Best 1983:181-82; Cain 1972:35). The historical overexposure degrades the New Testament to a historical textbook. This is reflected in New Testament Introduction where a hypothetic and speculative reconstruction of "who, when, why and where" is often found (cf Barr 1973:19-20; Best 1983). Another way of overexposing the historical aspect is to subject the linguistic analysis to the historico-critical method as part of the latter as H Zimmermann (1978:20) does: "Eine linguisticsh geformte Exegese ... fuegt dem oben beschriebenen methodischen Weg der historisch-kritischen Forschung keineswegs eine neue Etappe hinzu ...". The overexposure of the linguistic-literary aspect considers the New Testament as a mere literary phenomenon while the main aim,

perspective and historical remoteness of these writings are neglected.

The underexposure of texts constitutes the neglect of the basic modes of the New Testament. Theologically this means that the true nature, message and intention of the New Testament are ignored. This links up with the overexposure of the historical and literary modes of the text. Historically an underexposure of texts would imply that the historical background of the text is ignored. With canonized texts this easily leads to a verbal inspiration theory believing that the writings fell from heaven containing timeless truths which are directly applicable for men of all ages. The underexposure of the linguistic-literary mode of normative texts also tends to a verbal inspiration theory. This links up with the theological overexposure of texts as oracles spoken by God himself. Therefore the combination of certain modes can be as dangerous as a one-mode approach. One could, for example, emphasize the theological approach, neglect or reject the historical approach only to take up the linguistic-literary approach (in a positivistic way) which inevitably ends in a fundamentalistic overinterpretation of the New Testament.

It is fascinating to note how Heinrich F Plett (1975:52-56 & 99-102) in his "Textwissenschaft un Textanalyse" confirms the above-mentioned observations concerning the deficiencies which result from the overemphasis of a certain textual mode. It is especially fascinating that Plett, professor in Anglistik, comes to the same conclusions regarding texts in general. His emphasis on the inextricable interrelationship between syntactics, semantics and pragmatics confirms my concern for the over- and underexposure of the different modes of a text (cf I B 3 .2.2). Sandra M Schneiders (1982:68) also emphasizes the multi-dimensionality of biblical texts by warning against the overexposure of certain approaches. The interpretation of the New Testament has gone astray because of this very issue, namely the lack of a comprehensive and integrating approach. Although Plett (1975) and Schneiders (1981 & 1982) acknowledge the interrelation and multidimensionality of texts, an outline and model which accomodates the different dimensions is still to be found for biblical exegesis. This will be my main concern in this dissertation. First, let us continue by exposing different one-dimensional approaches to 1 Peter.

It is interesting to notice how the scientific focus shifted in the different eras of the research history dominating and predetermining the research and results with regard to 1 Peter. As an illustration let us briefly reflect on the developments in this century (cf Lategan 1982 for an overview of the cultural influences on methodology since the enscripturing of the New

Testament). At the turn of the century (i e from the nineteenth to the twentieth) New Testament science was in the grips of the history of religions school as part and parcel of the historical paradigm which dominated biblical scholarship in an ever increasing manner since the reformation and the Copernican revolution (cf Furnish 1974:338-339). In terms of the constituents of the communication model (viz source - message - receptor) Lategan (1984:3) describes this historical interest as biblical scholarship´s predominant occupation with the "source". As a result of this emphasis on the source, scholars were interested in the historical reconstruction of the authorial, redactional and socio-cultural background of the New Testament documents. This interest of the historical paradigm was exploited with the exegetical methods of literary, form and redaction criticism. Form and redaction criticism developed in the first half of this century as aids in order to analyse and reconstruct the developments in the early church and its influence on the New Testament. These methodological developments were in many respects the zenith of the historical paradigm. Martin (1962:29) concludes that historical critical ". . . works have claimed that the reader is also able to enter into the public worship of the Primitive Church, and to hear echoes of the catechetical instruction given to its converts, in the forms in which liturgy and baptismal catechesis were becoming standardized in the Hellenistic Christian communities." Therefore, it is not surprising that the different literary theories with regard to 1 Peter as a baptismal sermon, baptismal liturgy and its different variations came to the fore. These discoveries of the "voice of the early church" in its catechesis, liturgy and missionary work were found and reconstructed from almost every New Testament writing (cf Martin 1962:29-30). It is important to note the close relationship and interdependence of the different historical methods in this regard. Take for example the development in the research with regard to 1 Peter. The literary critical interest of scholars were predominantly directed towards literary problems within 1 Peter (cf Juelicher´s judgement that 1 Peter lacks a unifying theme and coherent structure) which they tried to solve with historical answers in terms of kerygmatic forms (cf the theories of a baptismal sermon and liturgy), formulas and redactional work of compilers (cf the two letters theory). Obviously, such a one-sided, one-dimensional overexposure of a text predetermines the answers of the research. This interest in reconstructing the historical background of 1 Peter (and for that matter the New Testament as a whole) ended in speculation, unproven phantasies and a cacophony of voices as was clearly illustrated (cf I A 2).

In the expositon of biblical writings scholars started to question the historical critical approach and to emphasize the synchronic dimension of texts and its related methods of

analyses. This "... first real "paradigm switch" occurred with the advent of structuralism and its emphasis on the autosemantic nature of texts" (Lategan 1984:3). It was especially during the sixties that the influence of this paradigm switch was seen amongst others in the literary theories of the "New Criticism" in America, the "Merlinisten" in Netherlands and the "Nouvelle Critique" in France (Van Luxemburg, Bal & Weststeijn 1982:65-68). In terms of the communication model the interest of scholars shifted from the source to the medium (i e the text and its message) in order to avoid the "genetic" and "referential fallacies" which dominated the historical analysis of texts - especially in biblical scholarship (Lategan 1984:3; cf J G Davies 1983; Keifert 1981:154-158). This shift in emphasis also determined the research on 1 Peter. "In contrast, analyses of sections of 1 Peter and their relation to the whole, supported by attention to the compositional devices employed, have led to a growing conviction that `in its final form 1 Peter is a piece of genuine correspondence.´ A thoroughgoing investigation of the literary style, structure and redactional techniques of 1 Peter has yet to be made. The ground work, however, has been laid. Further observations of such composition-analysis now provide a valuable literary control for the determination and interpretation of the document´s theology" (Elliott 1976:249). This text-immanent orientated interest in the New Testament was also welcomed and advanced by conservative and evangelical circles which were utterly frustrated by the devaluation of Scriptural authority within the historical critical paradigm. An extreme text-immanent reaction to the historical critical approach has therefore been found in the fundamentalistic and theological overexposure of the text of 1 Peter. Examples of this "fundamentalistic fallacy" would be to use 1 Peter (erroneously according to Elliott 1976:249-250) for prooftexting the "Descencus Christi ad inferos" from 1 Peter 3:19; or the universal priesthood of believers from 2:4-10. Such a fundamentalistic approach would utilize this letter in order to settle denominational disputes with regard to baptism, election, church-state relationships, race ideologies, et cetera with an appeal to "God´s Word as it stands in the text" - obviously ignoring the historical remoteness of 1 Peter as an ancient canonized text.

Recently the emphasis in textual analyses has shifted from the medium to the receptor in terms of the communication model (Lategan 1984:4). This obviously had its influence amongst biblical scholars as well (e g J G Davies 1983; Keifert 1981). The suggestion is that communication is incomplete without its "destination" - that is the reception of the text. Therefore, the emphasis is on the relationship text-reader (Lategan 1984:4) and the performance of the text. Keifert (1981:167) voices his discontent with previous exegetical procedures rather bitterly by

accusing one of his "... exegetical teachers who said at the
conclusion of a strenuous textual, source, form and redactional
analysis of a text, `The rest is homiletics,´ as if to say the
rest is either easy, or worse, less significant." The exegetical
analysis of 1 Peter has predictably also become more
receptor-orientated. The pragmatic dimension of this new
paradigm obviously interrelates with contextual theology which
includes materialistic and sociological exegesis. In this regard
some scholars have already started to exploit 1 Peter, for
instance J H Elliott (1981) and his sociological analysis of 1
Peter. The receptor-orientated movement, however, has already had
to recognize its "achilles heel", namely the "indeterminable
fallacy" in the evaluation of different or, even worse,
contradicting and mutually exclusive receptions.

In reading my dissertation, the reader would notice that I am
indeed part of this last paradigm switch which strives to take
the communication process to its completion. It will also become
clear that, in contrast to some overreacting synchronists and
diachronists, my pursuit is not primarily a defiance of the
synchronic and diachronic paradigms (although I realize their
limitations), but the accommodation thereof in a communication
model which endeavours to do justice to all three constituents in
the communication process: source, medium and receptor (cf I B).

Let us draw a few conclusions from this section. The dominance
of the different methods in their respective eras resulted in the
downplay of other important aspects and facets of 1 Peter as an
ancient canonized text. Biblical scholars in general were
seduced by positivism (Schneiders 1982:52-59) and a method monism
(cf Loader 1978:3-6) which reduced the interpretation of the New
Testament to one "universal" (whether it be linguistic,
historical or theological). These "universals" and their
corresponding methods which were philosophically absolutized,
tyrannically reduced and ultimately distorted the complex
phenomenon of textual communication to one mode or dimension.
Take for example the tyrannical rule of the historical paradigm
blowing the authorship and literary unity issues with regard to 1
Peter out of all proportion whatsoever. As we will see later (cf
II C 4.3; III C 2.5) these two issues are rather irrelevant for
the communication and understanding of the letter. We have also
seen how structuralism reduced the dynamics of textual
communication to a static phenomenon. Ultimately one will have
to admit with Weideman (1981:232) "... that no single theory can
supply a complete systematic explanation for the phenomena
invesitgated by linguistic theory."

Therefore, a lack in method often reveals itself in a one-mode
approach which leads to a one-sided over- or underexposure of
texts. It has become clear, however, that the dissonant

methodology is only the reflection of the philosophical and cultural trends of different eras. Therefore, the lack in methodology is only the symptom of the disease, namely the lack of a comprehensive theory. This is then the second dissonant instrument responsible for the cacophony echoing from biblical scholarship.

*

3.2 A DISSONANT HERMENEUTICAL THEORY: IGNORANCE OF PRESUPPOSITIONS AND COMMITMENTS

Scholars often ignore that their methods and approaches to their object of analysis are philosophically based or should I say "biased" (cf Weideman 1981). It is important to note that the historical paradigm, its procedures and results were especially predetermined by the post renaissance, reformation and enlightenment philosophies of Lessing, Kant and Hegel (to name a few) which influenced prominant theologians such as Baur, Strauss, Ritschl, Schleiermacher and Troeltsch. Michel (1979:207) remarks that Kant´s emphasis on the reason, empirical experience and the anthropologization of religion makes "... ein durchgaengiger roter Faden sichtbar: eine tiefsitzende Skepsis angesichts der Zuverlaessigkeit geschichtlicher Ueberlieferung" (cf Lategan 1982:57-60). This absolutizing of the reason and the critical orientation towards history explicitly marked biblical scholarship (cf the debate on 1 Peter as discussed above). This became explicitly evident in Troeltsch´s criteria of criticism, analogy and correlation for the historical paradigm (Michel 1979:206-207).

Ultimately the rise of radical historical criticism in biblical scholarship at the turn of the century, inevitably made the pendulum swing to the other side. The grip of the "objective" historical positivism and its relativizing of history was shattered by the first world war (1914-1918). This led to existentialism which emphasized man´s responsibility to create meaning for himself in this world as it is not to be found in his past (cf philosophers such as Heidegger, Sartre and Camus). In biblical scholarship Barth, Bultmann, Ebeling and Fuchs, indeed with different paradigms, represented this existentialistic quest for meaning from Scriptures which resulted in the theological interpretation thereof (cf the theological commentaries on 1 Peter by Bigg, Schlatter, Schweizer, Selwyn, Cranfield, Schelkle, Leaney and Kelly).

As a reaction to the emphasis on the "source" (via historical criticism) and the subject / receptor (via existentialism), structuralism tried to eliminate "... subject, geschiedenis en wil (intentionaliteit) als factoren bij het verstaan van de tekst

..." (Lategan 1982:65). Overagainst the freedom, uniqueness and relativism of the historical and existential approaches, structuralism maintained that reality is part of a formal system of recurring patterns. It was especially Russian formalism, the Pragian school and French structuralism which influenced a variety of text-immanent approaches (e g linguistics, narratology and generative poetics) within biblical scholarship (cf Lategan 1982:66-67).

This overemphasized concern for "... die universele en die negering van die kontingente" (Combrink 1983:9) amongst structuralists made the pendulum swing once again to the dynamics and extratextual pragmatics of texts. In a certain sense this was a revival of existentialism and historicism. Once again this echoed in the philosophical arena (cf Popper and Kuhn) as well as in the philosophy of language which became pragmatically, semantically, and sociologically orientated. Together with these developments texts were seen as part of the complex phenomenon of human communication. This resulted in multidimensional, integrative and comprehensive communication models as we will see shortly.

This superficial survey to illustrate the influence of philosophical-theoretical movements in science in general and biblical scholarship in particular, will have to suffice. The conclusion is obvious, namely that a lack in the theory or philosophy of science is as dangerous as a lack in methodology for text analyses. Schneiders (1982:52) observes "... that all interpretation, no matter what its methodology, operates out of hermeneutical presuppositions that are philosophical, that is, ontological, epistemological, and aesthetic in nature. To be unaware of these presuppositions does not make them inoperative; it simply makes them ideologically tyrannical."

In the discussion of the Introduction to 1 Peter this lack in theory became evident in the phenomenon of method monism. I would now like to discuss additional factors which should also be included in the theoretical considerations of biblical exposition such as the scholar´s commitments and presuppositions; inconsistencies; lack in validating criteria; inappropriate questions posed; the possibilities and limitations of methods, science and human knowledge in general.

Let us first illustrate how a scholar´s view of the authorship, date and situation of 1 Peter can be traced back to the scholar´s commitments and presuppositions. Take for example a conservative scholar such as Carlton L Winbery (Professor at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary) and his attempt to defend the apostolic authorship of 1 Peter. Interestingly enough, Winbery (1982:8) was quick to recognize the bias of scholars defending an

opposing view with regard to the origin of the letter (which is obviously related to the authorship debate): "The efforts to associate "Babylon" with the literal city in Mesopotamia have behind them the desire to deny Peter´s ministry in Rome for anti-Catholic reasons. Church tradition is totally against such a position". Unfortunately he failed to articulate his own presuppositions which forced him to a paradoxical exposition of #Pétros# in 1:1 and #ĕn Babulōni# in 5:13. Winbery (1982:8) rejects scholars taking "Babylon" on face value and argues that it is a cryptogram for Rome in contrast to his acceptance of the face value of "Peter" as referring to the apostle (1982:13). Therefore, he rejects scholars who argue that "Peter" is symbolic and a pseudepigraphical device (1982:11). This example reveals how scholars inconsistently change their methodological approaches (i e realism exchanged for symbolism and vice versa) according to their commitments and presuppositions. Their covert commitments causes them to make these type of switches unconsciously and, therefore, prevents them from giving account of it. Ultimately the end justifies the means. Examples of this kind of inconsistencies can be multiplied infinitely.

Another case in point is the way in which scholars turn their opponents´ point of view upside down by exchanging their opponents´ presuppositions (whether critical or conservative) for other presuppositions establishing a foundation for their arguments which ultimately confirm their own point of view. This can be illustrated for example by the main argument for or against Petrine authorship. Scholars are unanimous with regard to the excellent Greek used in 1 Peter. Critical scholars conclude from this fact that Peter, the apostle, is ruled out as the author presupposing that a Galilean fisherman is illiterate (cf Acts 4:13) and stays that way throughout his life. Conservative scholars are prepared to uphold Petrine authorship by presupposing either that Peter had a good knowledge of Greek due to the influence of Hellenism in Galilee or that Peter used Silvanus as an amanuensis. The same holds true for the dispute on the origin of the cryptogram "Babylon" for Rome. Some argue that it could have originated as early as 70 A.D. (as a result of the Neronian persecution) whereas others argue that Rome only became the archenemy in the latter half of the Domitian period (i e 90 A D). In J H Elliott´s (1976:246) article this same phenomenon is exposed where the parallels between 1 Peter and 1-2 Thessalonians are interpreted either as literary affinities or literary dependency in order to prove apostolic and pseudonymous authorship respectively. It is disturbing that scholars give way to this kind of juggler´s trick by means of twisting arguments to justify their ends. The fact is that both critical and conservative scholars are unable to prove the different presuppositions that underlie their explanations of the excellent Greek of 1 Peter or the origin of the cryptogram "Babylon" for Rome.

Scholars would have served science better by acknowledging that the phenomena of the excellent Greek or the situation of the persecution reflected in 1 Peter are neutral facts which are multi-interpretable. In this regard the distinctions of J M Ross (1976:214-221) which classify information or "facts" into juridicial categories of conclusive, persuasive, suggestive, neutral and irrelevant evidence are noteworthy. In the Introduction issues one find that biblical scholars very often use neutral and suggestive evidence as conclusive arguments. Elliott (1976:248) confirms this malpractice when he argues for the liberation of 1 Peter from "Pauline bondage": "Literary affinities and the use of tradition cannot provide the main proof for either apostolic, Silvanine, or pseudonymous authorship." Interestingly enough, like Ross, Ricoeur proposes "juridicial reasoning" as the basis for the validation of differing interpretations, although Ricoeur concedes that the procedures of validation "... are closer to a logic of probability than to a logic of verification" (Michell 1984:45). This lack in the application of validation criteria in the theological debate is certainly one of the major causes for the deadlock situation we find ourselves in.

In addition to the necessity of the validation of evidence scholars will also have to acknowledge the limitations of certain questions posed. Take for example Elliott´s (1976:248) conclusion that the authorship issue is secondary in the light of the compelling evidence of a Petrine circle. One could even take this further and relativize the authorship issue in terms of this writing as an autonomous literary creation as such or as part of the New Testament canon in which authorship is subjected to the canonical perspective and master symbols (cf my view on this in chapter III B 3.3.1; III C 2.5 & IV B 3).

It is therefore, in the light of the previous paragraph, important to acknowledge the limitations of certain evidence and questions posed. This has the implication that scholars should acknowledge the limitations in the application of their methods. With regard to different methods we have seen that the overexposure of the historical critical method entangles one in a vicious circle in which the answers to the problems identified, were predetermined. Take for example the literary-critical identification of a break between 4:11 and 12 in 1 Peter. The identification of this problem inevitably leads to the historical explanation thereof in terms of form, "Sitz im Leben" and authorship. To this Elliott (1976:249) comments: "Observations about sources have too quickly become conclusions about genre; supposed indications of disunity (especially the "break" between 4:11 and 12) have been exaggerated; ...." Therefore, it is not surprising that a linguistic-structural approach could come to a

UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

different (and most certainly more balanced) view acknowledging the unity of the letter. W S Vorster´s (1977a:34-35) plea on this issue of methods and their limitations is appropriate: "Again I wish to underline the importance of determining the objectives of the researcher. This is not a plea for a monism of method. On the contrary, it is a plea for sound methodology" (cf also Cain 1972:29-43).

The point I want to make is that unless scholars reflect on their theoretical and methodological presuppositions and commitments the scientific debate will remain in an impasse. Compare in this regard my article "Woord, Waarheid en (Nuwe Testamentiese) Weten- skap" (1985:1-16) in which I illustrated how the differences with regard to Introduction issues between distinguished scholars such as Werner Georg Kuemmel and Donald Guthrie can be explained by their theological and denominational commitments and background.

Ultimately, scholars will also have to reflect on the possibilities and limitations of human and scientific knowledge. Karl-Heinz Michel (1979:210) suggested in his article "Die Bibel im spannungsfeld der Wissenschaften": "Eine Dogmatisierung sogenannter wissenschaftlicher Ergebnisse ist alles andere als angebracht, weil noch die beste Wissenschaft menschliche, und das heisst unvollkommene irrtumsfaehige und revisionsbeduerftige Wissenschaft bleibt." This requires modesty and patience: "A. Einstein soll einmal Kardinal Faulhaber im Spass gefragt haben, wie er sich verhielte, falls die Wissenschaft die Nichtexistenz Gottes beweisen wuerde. Faulhaber habe ruhig geantwortet: `Dann warte ich geduldig, bis sie ihren Rechenfehler gefunden haben.´ Solche der erkannten Wahrheit gewisse Gelassenheit steht uns Christen in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion unserer Tage gut an" (Michel 1979:210).

In dealing with the two major dissonant instruments responsible for this scholarly cacophony in biblical science - that is a lack in theory and methodology - we will have to find a solution. In New Testament science the two relevant disciplines are hermeneutics and exegesis which both deal with theoretical and methodological issues. I shall now proceed in section B to give an outline of the hermeneutical-exegetical boundaries to which I would like to adhere in this dissertation in the light of the discussion up till now. The extremely important umbrella issue related to the theoretical-methodological considerations - that is the possibilities and limitations of human knowledge (as identified above) - will be dealt with in section C and will serve as a crosscheck on my hermeneutical-exegetical boundaries and the construction of a problem-solving communication model.

*   *   *