

- CHAPTER III: SECTION C -

THE INTER- AND EXTRATEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE THRUST, PERSPECTIVE  
AND STRATEGY OF 1 PETER AS A TEXT UNIT: SYNTHESIS

Having done a historical analysis of 1 Peter 1:1-2:12, we are now in a position to draw some conclusions with regard to the inter- and extratextual dimension of the thrust, perspective and strategy of 1 Peter. This synthesis will enable us to identify a few parameters for the dynamic reference in textual communication. It should be clear that we have reached a crucial point in our endeavour to expose the dynamics underlying the communication process of 1 Peter. If we are able to outline this dynamic interrelationship, we shall take a giant leap towards the understanding of how the emission and reception of an ancient text was inter- and extratextually determined. This will enable us to draw some conclusions with regard to the metatextual communication of ancient texts. In the end this will serve as the basis to outline the parameters for a secondary reception of ancient texts.

\*

1. TEXT THRUST: COMPOSITION AND INTERRELATIONSHIP OF TRADITION MATERIAL

Although, I have limited my inter- and extratextual analysis of the thrust to the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις#, it should be clear that the composition and interrelationship of other tradition material are also constitutive for the static thrust of 1 Peter. Nevertheless, I believe that we are able to draw a fairly representative picture of the composition, structure and interrelationship of the historical dimension of 1 Peter's static thrust:

.1 With regard to our analysis of the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις# in 1:1 we have identified Old Testament-Jewish and Hellenistic-Jewish tradition material imbedded within the static structure of 1 Peter. These traditions were interrelated in such a way that a semantic paradox (viz election versus rejection) was created. This was symbolized by the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις# in 1:1 which was strategically incorporated in the "presignal" of the whole text.

.2 If one scans the rest of 1 Peter one finds that this composition of tradition material prevails throughout the text. From start to finish the election-rejection thrust is tradition-historically emphasized against the background music of the Old Testament-Jewish and Hellenistic worlds (cf 1:1-2; 1:3-5; 1:10-12; 1:13; 1:14-16; 1:17-21; 1:22-25; 2:1-3; 2:4-8; 2:9-10 and 2:11-12).

.3 A third corpus of tradition material, however, runs like a golden thread throughout 1 Peter - that is the Christological traditions. In our analysis of the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις# in 1:1 we recognized the Christological reinterpretation of the Old Testament-Jewish matrix of these metaphors (cf III B 1.2.2). This syntactic interrelating of the Old Testament-Jewish and Hellenistic-Jewish traditions, on the one hand, with Christological traditions, on the other hand, was found throughout 1 Peter. This was especially illustrated in my analysis of the Christological tradition material of 1:1-2:12 which included early Christian creeds, formulae as well as liturgical, catechetical and sacramental tradition material (cf III B 2). Time and again the Christological tradition was interrelated within Old Testament-Jewish and Hellenistic-Jewish tradition complexes or metaphors.

A last important observation with regard to the Christological tradition material should be stressed. In our analysis of the text type of 1 Peter, we have identified a few narrative structures imbedded within 1 Peter (i.e. 1:10-12; 1:18-21; 2:4-8; 2:21-25; 3:18-22). Therefore, we can conclude that the syntactic



imbedment of narrative structures highlights the otherwise argumentative structure of 1 Peter. It is extraordinarily conspicuous, however, that each and every one of these narratives refers to Christological events.

.4 Thus the profile of the static composition of tradition complexes which constitutes the thrust of 1 Peter can be illustrated in the following way:

OLD TESTAMENT	JEWISH	HELLENISTIC	CHRISTIAN
<p>*****</p> <p>THRUST:                      ELECTION        -        REJECTION</p> <p>*****</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PERSPECTIVE</p>			

In our analysis of the historical thrust it became evident, however, that the static structure and composition of tradition material were not only linearly composed but also perspectively and argumentatively. In this regard the oxymoron #ēklektōis parepidēmois# represented the paradoxical thrust of 1 Peter as applied to the addressees. We have seen that an oxymoron is an existential master symbol which gives meaning to the paradoxical existence of man. This explains why the tradition material with its numerous socio-cultural, religious and existential metaphors were used to contrast and highlight the paradoxical reality of the addressees. In this paradoxical and chiastic structure a converging dynamic force was identified - that is the Christological-cosmologic perspective of 1 Peter.

\*                      \*

2. TEXT PERSPECTIVE: ULTIMATE SEMANTIC REFERENT

The analysis of the inter- and extratextual thrust has revealed that the tradition material in 1 Peter is perspectively orientated. This insight is extremely important for our understanding of the the dynamics of textual communication. In our historical analysis of 1 Peter's cosmologic perspective in section B of this chapter, we have experienced the dynamics of the inter- and extratextual reference of textual communication. The following dynamic parameters have been identified as constitutive for the communication of 1 Peter:

- 1) The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter determines the dynamics of the static text thrust decisively;
- 2) The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter reflects a battle between perspectives which explains the dynamics of pretextual and metatextual communication;
- 3) The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter is a redescription of the extratextual reality;
- 4) The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter has a historical "ultimate referent";
- 5) The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter reflects a resocialized community, its master symbols and canonical traditions.

It is obvious that these dynamic parameters are crucial for the metatextual communication of ancient canonized texts. In the light of the fact that these parameters will therefore have to be dealt with in chapter IV in more detail, a basic outline and synthesis of these parameters will suffice.

.1 The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter determines the dynamics of the static text thrust decisively. This was illustrated in the analysis of the oxymoron in 1:1 as well as in the analysis of the Christological tradition material in 1:1-2:12 (cf III B 1 & 2).

\* The analysis of the oxymoron in 1:1 led us to identify its Christological split reference. This split reference to Christ has proved to be the basis for the paradoxical status of the addressees. Therefore, Christ's election and rejection (cf 1:10-12; 2:4-8; 2:21-25; 3:18-22) were identified as the master symbols which the communicator-author emphasized in order to give meaning to the existence and reality of the Christ-committed addressees. These Christological parameters were already explicitly highlighted in the introductory pericope where the



oxymoron was interrelated to the Christological qualification of both the author and the addressees (cf III B 1.3.2). This Christological definition of the addressees as #ēkletois parepidēmois# is also confirmed throughout the text in the explicit references to their presupposed resocialization. In the intratextual analysis this was elaborately illustrated (cf II C 4.2). From a historical dimension the fact that the addressees were resocialized was also deduced from the esoteric Christological metaphors and tradition complexes extensively used by the communicator-author to communicate with his readers (cf III B 1.2.1; 2.4.1.1; 3.2.1; 4.2.2).

\* In our analysis of the Christological tradition material in 1:1-2:12, we found that the Christological perspective of 1 Peter dominated each and every tradition, semantic domain and actantial relationship referred to in 1 Peter. The Christological perspective of the semantic domains and actantial structures have been dealt with in the synthesis of the intratextual text (cf II C 4.2; appendix C). With regard to the tradition complexes we find, for example, that the Old Testament-Jewish eulogy is qualified by #diā 'Iēsoû Christou# (cf 1:3); the Jewish apocalyptic expectations are Christologically interpreted (cf 1:10-12); the Old Testament-Jewish (especially the Essenic - cf Goppelt 1976:494-495) interpretation of the eschatological exodus community is Christologized (cf 2:4-10).

.2 We can infer from this perspectival orientation of 1 Peter that a battle between different traditio-historical worlds took place. In the text of 1 Peter, however, we only find the remains of the struggle between these worlds and their respective cosmologic perspectives - that is Old Testament-Jewish, Hellenistic-Jewish, Hellenistic and Christian perspectives (cf Goppelt 1978:55). We have already identified the ultimate referent of the Christological perspective as the person Jesus Christ and the cosmologic perspective and master symbols which He represented. In order to get a clearer picture of the cosmologic perspectives that the communicator-author of 1 Peter contested, let us identify their ultimate referents briefly.

\* The Old Testament-Jewish matrix in the New Testament era had the Law as their ultimate referent. "For Judaism to speak of 'God' means to speak of his Law, through which God's will and commandment are made manifest" (Lohse 1976:178). It is precisely the possession of the law that constituted Israel as God's elect people. The Essenic community at Qumran likewise trusted in the Law and their belief that they were the eschatological exodus community: "In Qumran besteht diese Wurzel im radikalisierten Gesetz, dessen kontrollierbare Realisierung durch Gnadenkrafte ermöglicht wird. Im 1. Petrusbrief entspringt dagegen alles aus dem Evangelium von der Erloesung, die verborgen durch Kreuz und



Auferstehung geschehen ist und schaubar erst in naher Zukunft hervortritt" (Goppelt 1976:495). In 1 Peter we only find remains of this confrontation with the elect status of Israel and the Essenic community in the communicator-author's redescription of these "election" traditions in terms of the election of Christ and his followers. In contrast to the Jewish trust in their elect status and the Law as the ultimate meaning for their lives, the Christ followers found their ultimate meaning in the crucified and exalted Christ and his ultimate referent - that is "God the Father". "Where the relationship of man to God is determined entirely by the Law, where people seek after righteousness under the Law and know no other way to salvation outside the Law, there can be no place for a suffering Messiah who takes upon himself the guilt of others" (Lohse 1976:192).

\* The religious matrix of Hellenism during the New Testament era, was rather varied including the belief in the gods, popular belief, popular philosophy, mystery religions and Gnosticism (cf Lohse 1976:222-277). In 1 Peter the encounter with Hellenism is reflected in the description of the life-style and ethics of the Gentiles. Their licentious conduct reflected an ultimate referent of self-centredness, preoccupation with bodily pleasures and prosperity (cf 1:14; 2:11-12; 4:1-6). In contrast to this the addressees were admonished to follow Christ as their ultimate referent. In our analysis of the "rebirth" metaphor in 1:3 (cf III B 2.2.2.1) we have noticed possible Hellenistic undertones of the mystery cults' initiation concept (cf Goppelt 1978:91-94). However, the difference with the Christological perspective is evident: "While for the myste the initiation into the mysteries joins him to the fate of a nature-deity and imparts to him a divine vital power, through baptism the Christian is related to the historically unique event of the death and resurrection of Christ" (Lohse 1976:242). The same holds true for the possible gnostic interpretation of the #lógos# metaphor in 1:22-25. "The Greeks, too, posed the question regarding salvation. The variety of intellectual and religious ideas and movements exhibited by Hellenistic-Roman world indicates how intensely the people of the ancient world searched for the ultimate meaning of their lives. The way they hoped to find it was through wisdom. The philosophers, for example, sought to fathom wisdom by rational thought, in order to mold life in accordance with its norms. But in the mystery fellowships and in gnostically-minded groups, wisdom was understood as a mystical-ecstatic experience which seized man by means of divine revelation and transformed him into a new being which is lifted above corruption and decay into the heights of celestial beings. Knowledge and insight which teach one to comprehend God and the world, man and his destiny would open the door to deliverance and salvation" (Lohse 1976:278-279). For the author of 1 Peter, however, the #lógos# split refers to Jesus Christ in order to redescrbe the ultimate reality of the



Christ-committed interlocutors (cf II B 3.2.2).

\* In the cosmologic battle between these different worlds the cosmologic perspective of 1 Peter was quite distinct. We have seen the remains of this "battle between the different cosmologic perspectives" in our analysis of 1 Peter's dynamic reference to its inter- and extratextual world. It is ultimately against the background of this cosmologic battle that the relevance of Jesus Christ was highlighted in 1 Peter but also in the New Testament as a whole. "For Jews demand signs and Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1 Cor 1:22-25; cf Lohse 1976:279). The paradoxical identity of the addressees of 1 Peter is therefore Christologically based on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The "cross paradox" is therefore the cornerstone of the paradoxical master symbol, #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις#, which had to give ultimate meaning to the reality of the addressees.

Obviously this battle between cosmologic perspectives certainly reveals one of the most important dynamic parameters underlying pretextual and metatextual communication. This implies that the processes of identification and estrangement are extremely relevant for both the text creation and reception of texts. This is in my opinion one of the most exciting insights for our understanding of ancient canonized texts. The metatextual implications of this insight will be spelled out in chapter IV (cf IV A 2.2 & 2.4). Therefore, let us continue with the discussion of the third dynamic parameter of the cosmologic perspective of 1 Peter.

.3 The Christological perspective refers to an extratextual reality which has decisive significance for 1 Peter. This was in more than one way clearly illustrated in our historical analysis of 1 Peter.

\* We have seen with regard to the addressees that it is impossible to determine their "Sitz im Leben" with certainty. A few social profiles will suit the intratextual world of 1 Peter to a greater or lesser extent (cf II C 4.3). Therefore, the communication of 1 Peter would have been relatively successful in more than one "Sitz im Leben". What is vital, however, is the inter- and extratextual reality of the addressees' commitment to and knowledge of Jesus Christ (cf III B 1.2.2; 2.1.2.2). We have seen that the Christological-cosmologic perspective and its esoteric master symbols and metaphors in 1 Peter presuppose insiders as the receptor-readers.



\* The extratextual reality of the author is likewise important in 1 Peter, but then in a different sense from the traditional authorship issue (cf III B 2.1.3.2). The extratextual reality at stake for the successful communication of the text perspective is the "authority" of the "author".

Obviously the relevance of this extratextual reality (as redefined above) is crucial for the communication of 1 Peter. Without the extratextual reality of the addressees' commitment to Christ, the "authority" behind this letter and the reality experience of the interlocutors, communication would have been impossible. The implications of this parameter for a secondary reception are obvious.

.4 The extratextual reality of Jesus Christ has likewise proved to be crucial in the inter- and extratextual reference of 1 Peter. Jesus Christ has been identified as the ultimate referent.

\* Like the authorship issue the relevance of the extratextual reality and relevance of the Christological perspective is bound to the question of "authenticity". The reader should therefore note that I interpret this extratextual reality referred to by Jesus Christ in 1 Peter not as the reference to historical events in the first place, but as an authentication of the communicator-author's Christological perspective. This suggests that some extratextual criterium was operative in the worlds of the interlocutors. This explains the relevancy of the historical dimension in order to outline the canonized traditio-historical frame of reference of the communicator-author and receptor-readers. This has important implications for the metatextual communication of ancient canonized texts. Not only does it determine the presuppositions without which communication would have been impossible, but it also reveals the relief that a particular New Testament writing has within this tradition (cf .5 of this section).

\* The relevance of the extratextual "Christ events" in 1 Peter is related to the pragmatic function of the narrative material in 1 Peter. This will be dealt with in the next section (i e III C 3).

\* It is also important to note that the different extratextual events as well as the master symbols in 1 Peter are interrelated to the ultimate referent Jesus Christ. This confirms my theory that the "cosmologic perspective" is the cornerston of all communication. With regard to 1 Peter, we found that the references to the extratextual reality (even the Jesus events) as well as the theological, ecclesiological and sociological master symbols were Christ orientated. The reality of the commitment to the Christological perspective therefore relativizes or



redescribes the total reality.

Without any doubt the extratextual reality of the "ultimate referent" in 1 Peter is decisive for the communication thereof. This implies that the intertextual and extratextual dimension of texts provides important parameters for the successful communication of ancient texts. The reader should note that my interpretation of the historical issues relevant for this communication is totally different than that of the traditional historical paradigm (cf IV A 2.2).

.5 The cosmologic-Christological perspective of 1 Peter reflects a resocialized community, its master symbols and canonical traditions;

Traditio-historically 1 Peter reflects a unique combination of tradition material within the New Testament as part of the corpus of Christianity's canonized traditions. It has a distinct Palestinian overtone (cf the Old Testament, Qumran and Synoptic influences in 1 Peter - cf Goppelt 1978:51) with a Lucan (especially the parallels with the "suffering Christ" in Luke and Acts - cf Manke 1975:250-251), Marcan (cf Mark's plot which finds its climax in the cross as the revelation of the son of God), Pauline (e.g. common tradition material, soteriology, passion theology, etc), general (cf parallels with James and Hebrews) and even Johannine (cf the Christological interpretation of # $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$  &  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ # in 1:22-25 as well as the emphasis on brotherly love) undertones. In a certain sense 1 Peter is representative reflection of the proclamation during the first Christian century. Goppelt (1978:106) remarks with regard to 1 Peter's eschatological interpretation of the salvation in Christ: "Mit dieser Auffassung steht der 1 Petr in der entscheidenden soteriologischen Grundlinie des NT, die von Jesus ueber Paulus bis Johannes vertreten wird." This phenomenon is multi interpretable. It could either suggest that the proclamation of 1 Peter precedes the other New Testament writings, or developed simultaneously, or reflects a late compositum mixtum. Each of these interpretations could explain the traditio-historical composition of 1 Peter. This could also explain either Peter (as the rock on which the church is built), Silvanus (who had contact with Paul and Peter), and even a pseudonymous author (who wanted to consolidate as much authority as possible in his letter). Not only do these issues seem unresolvable, but also unnecessary unless we want to fall for the genetic fallacy once again. What is important in this historical excursion on the origin of 1 Peter is the fact that 1 Peter represents a wide spectrum of early Christian tradition which, together with the fact that it was a circular letter, is important in outlining the relationship with the other New Testament writings. On the one hand, this representative and public character of 1 Peter transcends the



specific, personal and addressees' orientated character of certain writings (viz a number of letters) in the New Testament. On the other hand, we will see in the analysis of the strategy of 1 Peter, that due to its Christological perspective it is dependent on the Synoptic tradition and its narration of the "Christ events".

This reveals a relief of the tradition material in the New Testament. This will have important consequences for the metatextual communication of the different canonized texts in the New Testament. The unique role that 1 Peter plays in this interrelationship is probably the reason why Luther had such high esteem for 1 Peter. The essence of the Christological perspective (i.e. the paradox of election-rejection in which ultimate meaning is found) is uniquely portrayed in 1 Peter. Helmut Millauer (1976:186-187) traced the tradition history to the Old Testament-Jewish matrix (especially Wisdom and intertestamental literature) which interpreted the suffering of the elect as "Pruefung" (testing). Another Old Testament-Jewish tradition (especially found in Qumran) interpreted suffering as "Gericht" (judgement) - that is as a purification of the elect and therefore regarded as "ein heilvolles Handeln Gottes" (Millauer 1976:186; cf Goppelt 1976:504). This tradition complex is, however, overcoded by the "Nachfolgetradition" (i.e. the imitation of Christ - cf 2:21-25) as well as the beatification of the persecuted (cf the joy in suffering in 1:6 & 4:13) of the Synoptic Gospels (cf Millauer 1976:186 against Nauck, 1955:68-80, who identifies the Maccabean tradition as the background). "Aufgrund dieser verschiedenen Traditionen kommt der 1. Petrus brief zu einer eigenen Leidensdeutung: das Leiden des Erwählten in der Gemeinschaft mit Christus ist als Berufung in die Nachfolge Gnade (2,19f.). Diese Tiefe des Leidensverstaendnis ist ohne Analogie" (Millauer 1976:187; cf Manke 1975:219).

In conclusion therefore, the Christological redescription of the inter- and extratextual reality represented in 1 Peter reflects the ultimate commitment of the communicator-redactor. His cosmologic perspective is the cornerstone which orientated his intra-, inter- and extratextual constructed text thrust. On the other hand, his cosmologic perspective also determines his text strategy. This brings us to the synthesis of the dynamic parameters of the text strategy of 1 Peter.

\*                      \*



### 3. TEXT STRATEGY: LITERARY CONVENTIONS

Our analysis of the inter- and extratextual dimension of the strategy has exposed the literary conventions underlying the text type of 1 Peter. These conventions gave us some insight in the strategy which communicator-redactor utilized for the communication of his text. The important question to be answered is "why" he chose the argumentative-pluripersonal strategy. I have suggested that it was determined by the Christological perspective of the author. Let me explain:

.1 We have seen that the argumentative-pluripersonal strategy of 1 Peter is based on the elementary binary structure which was described as "identification" and "estrangement". The process of identification in 1 Peter is directed at the addressees as an insider group. In order to accomplish this the communicator used Christological group-identificative symbols, metaphors and tradition complexes (cf Elliott 1981:228-229). The process of estrangement was brought about by contrasting the Christological perspective and master symbols with those of other religious and ideological traditions. This implies that the argumentative strategy of 1 Peter which comprises group-identificative and perspectival-persuasive text functions, was determined by the Christological perspective of the author. The author wanted to encourage and persuade his addressees that their Christ commitment provides the cosmologic perspective which gives ultimate meaning for their total existence. The letter form and its conventions were used as a vehicle for this communication act. Van Luxemburg et al (1982:107) refers to persuasive texts which aim at directing the readers lives as "directieven teksten" in contrast to "evaluerende teksten" which aim to influence the attitude of the reader. Therefore, 1 Peter is a "directive" text type which attempts a strategical and existential (total) onslaught on the receptor's commitments (cf III B 2.1.3; 2.2.3; 2.3.3 & 2.4.3). It is especially the use of redundant and emotional, mutual socio-cultural and religious-cultic metaphors which presuppose insiders as readers. Obviously the author expects to persuade them through a religious and emotional experience of the text. It is important to note the movement in the textual persuasion by a redescription and reinterpretation (i.e. split reference) of metaphors and subcodes (cf the Christological and theological remoulding of Old Testament, socio-cultural and -political concepts). The author's redefining of the socio-political (e.g. race, nation, kingship and people) and religious (e.g. priests, election and sacrifices) status of the implied readers from an alternative perspective, alienates and challenges the master symbols or subcodes of the real readers risking a break in communication. In this regard the text of 1 Peter is creating an alternative interpretation of the real readers primary world. This overcoding of the primary



socio-cultural conventions and values is primarily achieved through contrasting (as we will see in the next paragraph) with the aim to reinforce the implied (and ultimately the real) reader's resocialized world. "In traditional theological terminology, this means that the language of the New Testament, viewed from the onlook of its symbolic function, either reinforces our faith vision of reality or challenges our vision of things. Considered under the dimension of its symbolic function, the text of the New Testament - that is a given linguistic sign - has a power to confirm or challenge one's radical 'Weltanschauung'" (Collins, R F 1983:259).

.2 This perspectival determined strategy, however, is in turn decisive for the text thrust. Therefore, it is not surprising that the text thrust as symbolized in the "election-rejection" paradox of the oxymoron in 1:1, reflects the identification and estrangement processes of the argumentative strategy. On the one hand, these strategic processes are identified in the contrast between election and rejection. The "election" master symbol of the text thrust represents the indicative, identity and presuppositions (i e identification) of the addressees' existence. In contrast to this, the "rejection" master symbol represents the imperative and implications (i e estrangement) of the addressees' existence. On the other hand, however, the "election and rejection" master symbols are each interpreted in terms of identification (i e their paradoxical status as #ἐκλεκτοί# and #παρεπίδημοι#) and estrangement (i e the Christological interpretation and relativization or redescription thereof).

J H Elliott (1981:101-164) emphasizes that the argumentative strategy of 1 Peter is expressed by the socio-religious metaphor of the "household". In this regard the contrast #οἶκος# - #παροίκος# is significant and of great importance in 1 Peter. "The household served as the paradigm for delineating respective roles, relationships and responsibilities within the religious community. The οἶκος suggested familiar as well as familial imagery for depicting both the religious and the social dimensions of life in the kingdom of God. With its wide field of associated terms and images such as fatherhood, childhood, birth, adoption, brotherhood, fraternal love and domestic service, the household supplied powerful social, psychological and theological symbols for depicting the radical and comprehensive nature of the Christian conversion and cohesion, the commonality of Christian values and goals, and the distinctive character of communal Christian identity" (Elliott 1981:222-223). This outline of Elliott makes it sufficiently clear that the #οἶκος# metaphor integrates many themes and subthemes in 1 Peter by contrasting the primary and resocialized worlds of the addressees. The household suggested a home for the homeless.



In my opinion Elliott overinterprets this metaphor when he describes it as the strategy, the heart of the evangelical message (Elliott 1981:227 & 233) and the ideology (Elliott 1981:267-295) - that is in the sense of my cosmologic perspective - of 1 Peter. This is clear in the light of the fact that even the household metaphor is Christologically founded in 1 Peter - compare God's fatherhood (1:17-21), the addressees' brotherhood (1:22-25) and the insiders as #oikos tou theou# (2:4-10). Within my reconstruction the household is indeed important, but then as one of the dominant master symbols of the Christological perspective - similar to the oxymoron #eklektōis parepidēmois#. The latter is in my opinion, however, highlighted by the communicator-author himself (cf the structurally important pericopes I and V) as the dominant master symbol designating the addressees' identity. The household master symbol which is indeed envisaged as the alternative "home" for the addressees within their social, legal, political and religious alienation in society, is indeed a dynamic equivalent illustration of the addressees' status as #eklektōis parepidēmois#. Ultimately, however, both these master symbols are Christologically orientated which means that the basic strategy of 1 Peter is the Christological redescription of reality. Therefore, Elliott neglects the Christological "ideological strategy" of 1 Peter at the cost of his reconstruction of the #oikos tou theou# as the primary strategy which encourages the addressees (and ultimately the outsiders) to identify with this alternative home for the homeless (i.e. as #paroikoi#). It is nevertheless to the credit of Elliott that he highlighted the sociological, psychological and theological relevance of the #oikos# master symbol in the Christological-orientated strategy of 1 Peter.

.3 The Christological perspective also explains why the communicator-redactor included narrative tradition material (i.e. part of the cultic liturgic tradition) within his argumentative strategy. The fact that this narrative material refers to Christological events makes the explanation self-evident - that is to provide the Christological basis for his argumentation. Goppelt (1976:505) confirms the strategic importance of the narrative material: "Dreimal, und zwar jeweils an den Höhepunkten der Ausführungen ueber die Existenz der Christen in der Gesellschaft, bringt der Brief bekenntnisartige Aussagen ueber Christi Weg und Werk in hymnischer Form." This probably served as a confirmation and authorization of his Christological perspective. We have seen that the primary function of the Christological traditions in 1:1-2:10 was to emphasize the mediatory role of Jesus Christ in the resocialization of the addressees (cf 1:3; 1:17-25; 2:1-8). In addition to this it served as a basis for the exhortation to the addressees - especially with regard to their conduct and suffering as



followers of Christ's example (cf Goppelt 1976:506-507). This strategical function of the imbedded narrative material has important implications for the metatextual communication of 1 Peter.

David Hill (1982:61) holds the view that the the incorporation of tradition material in a discourse is not a goal in itself, but is functional. We have seen that this is indeed the case with regard to the Christological narrative material in 1 Peter. The narrative material served as an authorization and orientation of the cosmologic perspective which constituted the basis for the communication between the communicator-author and the receptor-readers. Therefore the use of this narrative material as authorization of 1 Peter implies that the historical quest for Jesus is not to be pursued from a writing such as 1 Peter, but from its inter- and extratextual sources, on the one hand, and the Christological commitment of the interlocutors, on the other hand. In the traditio-historical context of the New Testament this implies that it is to be pursued from the analysis of the Gospels and the "apostolic tradition" and not primarily from the letters. This has the further implication that the Gospels are the matrix of the remaining New Testament literature. This will help us to reconstruct the relief of the tradition history of the New Testament. However, it is important to note that the Jesus narrative in 1 Peter is the ultimate reality which determines the interlocutors total existence.

.4 The literary form which served as an ideal vehicle for the strategy of the communicator-author was the "circular letter". It was a means of long distance, authoritative-perspectival, argumentative and group-identificative communication in a one to many mode (cf III B 3.2.2 & 3.3.1). In this regard the poetic function played a supportive role in escalating and intensifying the strategical processes of identification and estrangement. The communicator-author's style-rhetorical implementation of redundant group-identificative-emotive-cultic-liturgical metaphors and traditions as well as shock-effective-paradoxical-emotive-religious-sociological-political contrasts revealed a total onslaught of a master strategist (cf III B 1.3.2; 2.1.3.2; 2.2.3.2; 2.4.3.2). This is especially true of 1 Peter 1:2-2:12. Although the reader will find that the style-rhetorical intensity is toned down in certain pericopes of 2:13-5:14, the expertise of the master conductor of 1 Peter is indeed reflected in his text symphony as a whole.

.5 Finally, it seems that we are able to reconstruct a metatextual pragmatic procedure with regard to text creations. It has become clear in our analysis of 1 Peter that the cosmologic-Christological perspective of the communicator-author ultimately determines his text strategy and thrust. This



perspectival and hierarchial procedure has important implications for the metatextual communication of a text. Not only does it explain the creation of a text, it also sets the parameters for the actual communication and reception of a text by the receptor-readers. This means that communication is essentially a "strategical battle between perspectives." In this battle the basic binary process of identification and estrangement is decisive.

With these conclusions with regard to the possibilities and limitations of the analysis of the inter- and extratextual dimension of texts, we are now in a position to conclude this dissertation by outlining the parameters for the metatextual communication of ancient canonized texts.

\* \*