

- CHAPTER III: SECTION B -

THE INTER- AND EXTRATEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE THRUST, PERSPECTIVE
AND STRATEGY OF 1 PETER

We are now about to proceed with the implementation of my historical tools in order to analyse the interrelated semiotic modes from a historical dimension and in terms of the heuristic criteria of extension, coherence and delimitation as outlined in section A.

The reader is once again advised to keep the schematizations of the relevant pericopes in appendix A open in order to follow my argumentation.

The thematic demarcation of the historical analysis has been argued in the concluding remarks of the intratextual analysis (cf II C). It should be obvious, furthermore, that the limitations of the scope of this dissertation also imposed certain restrictions. The reader should therefore not expect a complete analysis of the historical thrust, perspective and strategy of 1 Peter. My main aim is to illustrate how a historical analysis of the semiotic modes with the aid of a heuristically defined methodology is able to uncover the dynamic thrust, perspective and strategy of a text. As mentioned in the introductory remarks to chapter III, the historical analysis will therefore be limited to the oxymoron #êklektôis parepidêmois# in 1:1 as the dominant master symbol symbolizing the text thrust; to a selection of the Christological tradition material as a reflection of the text perspective; and to the text type as the culmination of the text strategy. This analysis will also be restricted to the theological basis of 1 Peter (i.e. pericopes I-V) with only cursory remarks to the rest of the text.

Let us now take our seats in order to experience the dynamic historical interlude of the wonderful "Petrine" symphony.

*

1. THE INTER- AND EXTRATEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE THRUST AS SYMBOLIZED BY THE OXYMORON #ĒKLEKTOÏS PAREPIDĒMOIS# IN 1:1

1.1 TEXT-SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS

1.1.1 Text-syntactic extension: minimum and maximum traditio-historical extension - textual and literary criticism

.1 Obviously the minimum text-syntactic extension in the historical dimension could comprise a traditio-historical word or even only a recognizable morpheme. We have already established the importance of the combination #ēklektoï̄s parepidēmois# in 1:1 of 1 Peter. There were a number of reasons why this contrapuntal tandem of words was highlighted within the intratextual dimension (cf II B 1 and II C). Although the phrase #ēklektoï̄s parepidēmois# is a hapax legomenon in 1 Peter it is syntactically a combination of two structural markers which are strategically important in the rest of the writing - compare the lexeme #ēklektós# as part of the theological foundation of the writing in 2:4, 6 and 9; and the lexeme #parepidēmos# in 2:11 as part of pericope V which dominates the greater part of the writing (i.e. 2:11-4:19 according to my analysis or 2:11-4:11 according to Goppelt 1978:79). I argued that this contra-sogetto represents the text thrust of 1 Peter gathering so many contrasting themes (viz vertical-horizontal, positive-negative and insider-outsider relationships) as well as the text function (e.g. assertive-appellative) of 1 Peter. This exposes the fact that the lexemes #ēklektós & #parepidēmos# constitute the two dominant master symbols which represent the thrust of the Christological perspective on the identity and existence of the addressees in 1 Peter.

All these considerations suggest that the description of the addressees as "elect strangers" reflects a traditio-historical distillation. This is confirmed by a literary critical analysis. #Ēklektoï̄s parepidēmois# is clearly an aporia reflecting a semantic tension which probably presupposes an extratextual reality making the combination of the two words possible. This phrase occurs in a style-rhetorically highly structured discourse which is often a telltale in the identification of tradition material (cf the triadic and dualistic expansions as well as the rhythm and rhyme of 1:1-2 as discussed in II B 1.3.1). Another important argument for the identification of this phrase as tradition material is found in the fact that it is used as a status description of the receptor-readers (cf 1:1 and 2:11) which implies that the real readers must identify themselves with these master symbols suggesting that they are already known or at least acceptable within the addressees' frame of reference. This will be

confirmed by the traditio-historical analysis in 2:4-10 where the master symbol #ékлектós# is exposed as an intertextual reference to Old Testament-Jewish tradition material.

Therefore, #éklektoís parepidēmois# has text-syntactically been identified as a possible tradition unit within a bigger tradition stream within 1 Peter.

.2 I have already argued that I will leave my discussion of the most important text-variant readings of 1 Peter till after the analysis of the historical pragmatics of the text (cf III B 3.3.3). This is due to my conviction that text-variant readings are the result of different copyists' reception of 1 Peter which is a pragmatic issue (cf III A 2.1.1).

1.1.2 Text-syntactic coherence: coherence of tradition units - literary and form criticism

The coherence of the word pair #éklektoís parepidēmois# is a "fait accompli" by virtue of the fact that the two words stand text-syntactically in apposition to each other. The form-critical criteria applicable to this phrase, namely its formal characteristic (i.e. a word pair); its ornamental form (i.e. the rhyme of #-ois#); and the semantic contrast define its text coherent profile. This profile enables us to identify this phrase as an "oxymoron".

This style-rhetorical form is imbedded within the macro form of the letter and the micro forms of the prescript and the triadic formula in verses 1-2 as we will see shortly.

1.1.3 Text-syntactic delimitation: alternation of tradition units and forms

As a result of the style-rhetorical coherence this tradition unit is clearly demarcated - especially in the light of #éklektoís# (a!) and #parepidēmois# (b_) as the binary constituents of a chiasmus in the first pericope. With the identification and preliminary demarcation of the tradition unit completed, I will now proceed to analyse the semantic reference of the tradition unit.

*

1.2 TEXT-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

1.2.1 Text-semantic extension: inter- and extratextual semantic reference - tradition history

In the historical text-semantic extension of the phrase

#ēklektoīs parepidēmois# in 1:1 we have to determine the probable inter- and extratextual frames of reference with the aid of a traditio-historical analysis. One of the problems facing the analysis of the text-semantic extension of a tradition unit is the fact that semantic unity could be symbolized with different lexemes. The reference of #parepidēmos#, for example, coincides to a large extent with that of #pároikos#, #xénos# and also #diasporá# and their derivatives. Likewise #ēklektós# as a reference to God's people is related to group-identificative symbols such as #ēkklēsia, ἔθνος, laós & hágioi# (cf Elliott 1982:422). The reader will find that the criteria for the analysis of the tradition history (cf III A 2.2.1) will be applied in the following excursion without explicitly mentioning the relevant criterium under discussion each time.

.1 In tracing this oxymoron within canonical Christian literature it is significant that this combination is unknown in the Pauline writings. Acts 13:17 is actually the closest parallel within the New Testament. This parallel is obviously not verbatim as it is constituted by the derivatives of #eklégomai# and #paroikía# referring to the "election" and "rejection" (i.e. living as aliens) of Israel during their stay in Egypt. Acts 7:6 refers to Israel's stay in Egypt and 7:29 to Moses' stay in Midian (both using the lexeme #pároikos#). Hebrews 11:9 uses the lexeme #paroikéō# with regard to the patriarchs. The hendiadys #paroikous kai parepidēmous# in 1 Peter 2:11 has a close parallel in Hebrews 11:13: #xénoi kai parepidēmoi#. In contrast to 1 Peter one finds that Hebrews links a Hellenistic aspect with the eschatological election and rejection, namely the inheritance of the heavenly city. #Pároikos# also occurs in Ephesians 2:19 but there designating non-Christians in contrast to 1 Peter whereas #ēklektós# on its own very seldom refers to Christians in Paul's letters. Therefore, in spite of these parallels 1 Peter remains unique in that it applies these concepts directly to Christians in contrast to the other New Testament references which keep it within its Old Testament context or at the most indirectly linking it with the Christian community. First Peter "...bereitet auf diese Weise vor, dass das griech. Wort #pároikos# in der Kirche des 2. Jh.s gelaufene Selbstkennzeichnung wird" (Goppelt 1978:82).

It was mentioned in a previous paragraph that the lexemes #diasporá# and #paroikéō# are semantically related to the oxymoron #ēklektoīs parepidēmois# in 1 Peter 1:1. It is therefore probably no coincidence that we find analogies with the references in 1 Peter in the prescripts of James (cf #ēn tē diasporá;) and 1 Clement, the Epistle of Polycarp to the church in Philippi and the Martyrdom of Polycarp (cf #tē ēkklēsia tou theou tē paroikouēsē;)#). Even though the parallels are not

verbatim they presuppose a common conceptual world expressed by a tradition complex. The point at stake is obviously to determine the interdependence between these writings. The relationship with 1 Clement and James is not clear. The dependency of Polycarp on 1 Peter is rather certain and reflects a situation in which the church was designated by the status of "strangers and aliens" in the world. Didache 9:4 confirms this: "Das Selbstverstaendnis als Diaspora ist hier 'in Did 9:4' [my addition] liturgische Tradition geworden. Es bleibt in der Christenheit bis ins 4.Jh. lebendig. Dann verschwindet das Selbstverstaendnis wie der Terminus. Er tritt erst im 19.Jh. wieder auf, zunaechst fuer konfessionelle Minderheiten, in der neuen Weltsituation nach dem 2. Weltkrieg aber, um die Situation der Christenheit in der Weltgesellschaft zu kennzeichnen, noch mehr um auszusagen, dass die Christenheit immer Diaspora bleibt, auch im christlichen Abendland, weil sie es ihrem Wesen nach ist" (Goppelt 1978:79).

Research has established that #diasporá# is a terminus technicus in the LXX (e.g. Dt 28:25, 30:4; Jr 13:14, 15:7, 34(41):17; Neh 1:9; Is 49:6) for describing the Jews outside Palestine (cf Goppelt 1978:78). From these references we gather that the Jews understood the diaspora "... als Gericht, das durch die Sammlung in der Heilszeit behoben werden soll" (Goppelt 1978:78). They gathered as a religious-exclusive community in synagogues which kept their bond with the temple in Jerusalem intact. 1 Peter alludes to this frame of reference but differs in some respects: "Aber die Zerstreung ist hier nicht durch Gericht entstanden, sondern durch eine sie aus der Voelkerwelt aussondernde und entfremdende Erwaehlung. Die Diasporasituation ist Ausdruck des eschatologischen Schon und Noch-nicht, Ausdruck der Erwaehlung und des Fremdseins" (Goppelt 1978:79). In addition to Goppelt's remarks I would like to emphasize that the crucial difference (as we will see under III B 1.2.2) is that the orientation point of the diaspora shifted from Jerusalem to Christ.

The combination #paroíkous kai parepidēmous# in 2:11 has parallels in the LXX: Genesis 23:4 (i.e. Abraham as #pároikos kai parepidēmos# in a promised land) and Psalm 38(39):13 (i.e. Israel as #pároikos égo eimí pará soi kai parepidēmos kathōs pántes hoi patéres mou# who are dependent on God). Leviticus 25:23 and Psalm 118(119):19 are similar to Psalm 38(39):13 although #parepidēmos# is substituted by #prosēlutos# (in Leviticus 25) and #pároikos# (in Psalm 118). Goppelt (1978:79-80) distinguishes between #pároikos# and #parepidēmos# on biblical and extrabiblical usage in the following way: "#parepidēmos# ist der 'Fremde' (= #xénos#), der sich ohne Buergerrecht, aber auch ohne Gastrecht voruebergehend unter einem anderen Volk aufhaelt; #pároikos# ist der Fremde, der minderberechtigt auf Dauer neben der Buergern des Landes lebt, der sogenannte 'Beisasse'." This election-rejection

frame of reference is also found in the writings of the Essenic sect with some remarkable parallels to 1 Peter. "Eine Aussage ueber ihre Entstehung in CD 3,21-4,6 verbindet nicht nur Erwaehlung (1 Petr 1,1; 2,9) und Aufenthalt in der Fremde (1 Petr 1,1.17; 2,11), sondern fuegt auch weitere den ersten Hauptteil des 1 Petr konstituierende Elemente ein: den Exodus (1 Petr 1,13), das Exil (dafuer in 1,1 Diaspora), die Drangsal (1,6), das wahre Israel (vgl. 1,9f), die totale Umkehr (dafuer in 1,3.23 die Wiedergeburt)" (Goppelt 1978:82; cf also Schelkle 1976:19 and the following references: CD 6:4f, 1 QM 1:3, 1 QS 8:6, 11:16 and 1 QpHab 10:13 in this regard). It is, however, important to note that although one finds striking parallel frames of reference between 1 Peter and CD, 1 Peter is terminologically nearer to the LXX and consequently to Hellenistic Judaism.

.2 The designation of Christians as #eklektói# is attested in the New Testament (cf Mk 13:20, 22, 27 and parallels; Rm 8:33; 16:13; Col 3:12; 2 Tm 2:10; Tt 1:1; and Eph 1:4). Once again the Jewish matrix of this metaphor is likewise found in the Old Testament (cf Dt 4:27; 7:6; 14:2; Am 3:1f; Is 43:20; 45:5) as well as "... in den Schriften des Spaetjudentums ..." (Goldstein 1973:140). As I have mentioned earlier in this section, this designation of Christians is related to a number of other group-identificative metaphors. Our interest with regard to 1 Peter is obviously the theological and Christologico-soteriological redescription and reinterpretation of this ecclesiological metaphor. In the light of the fact that this will be analysed in detail in III B 2 we will suffice to conclude that the traditio-historical extension of the metaphor #eklektós# is defined within the parameters of its Old Testament-Jewish matrix.

This excursion showed amongst other things the traditio-historical development that ran parallel to or followed the "Petrine" tradition. To trace the traditio-historical background or reality referred to by these metaphors we will have to take our cue from the intertextual references in 1 Peter to its Old Testament and Jewish matrix (cf Brox 1979:57-58). In conclusion, therefore, the split reference of the above-discussed election-rejection metaphors is to the world and reality of Hellenistic Judaism - that is the era in which Judaism was in interaction and confrontation with the Graeco-Roman world. In this context the metaphors of "election and rejection" were a cosmologic interpretation of their "Sitz im Leben". It is crucial, however, to take note of the early church's Christological perspective which redescribed these election-rejection master symbols and their sociological implications (cf Brox 1979:56). This logically leads us to the historical text-semantic coherence underlying this metaphoric oxymoron.

1.2.2 Text-semantic coherence: extratextual world, cosmologic perspective and the relationship text-reality - socio-cultural analysis

.1 It has become clear in the light of the traditio-historical analysis that the paradoxical semantic reference to the addressees of 1 Peter as #*èkлекτοῖς παρεπίδημοῖς*# in 1:1 had a traditio-historical extension before and after its own "Sitz im Leben". It is especially in establishing 1 Peter as a converging and diverging point of certain traditions that we will try to pinpoint its "Sitz im Leben". Obviously the parameters in pinpointing the real world of 1 Peter are determined first and foremost by the results of my intratextual analysis of the socio-cultural world, perspective and ideal interlocutors reflected in the text (cf II C 4.2 & 4.3) as well as by the results of my historical analysis of the traditio-historical extension of 1 Peter (cf III B 1.2.1).

* The traditio-historical analysis has established an Old Testament matrix symbolized by the patriarchs sojourn, the exodus and the diaspora (i.e. referring to the exile) as the intertextual frames of reference in 1 Peter. Furthermore, the parallels with the Essenic selfconception places 1 Peter within the postexilic Old Testament and Judaistic matrices. The Christological orientation of 1 Peter narrows it further down to early Christian literature which has a terminus a quo between 30-50 A.D. The unique combination of Christological tradition favors a Palestinian matrix for 1 Peter (cf Goppelt 1978:56).

* In my reconstruction of the socio-cultural matrices (cf II B 4.2) and referential sequence of events (cf II C 4.3) in 1 Peter, it has become clear that the addressees were a resocialized group in Asia Minor. Irrespective whether this group was primarily Jews in the diaspora (cf Dijkman 1984) or Gentiles (which seems more probable - cf Brox 1979:56) the question to be answered is when this resocialization (i.e. Christianization) of the region referred to in 1:1 could be presupposed in terms of a terminus a quo. Scholars differ in this regard (cf my discussion in I A 2). Most scholars date the Christianization of Asia Minor to the first missionary journey of Paul, but differ as to whether it included the northern regions. Others feel that the spontaneous development of Christianity since Pentecost needn't presuppose the work of an apostle prior to the establishment of Christian communities in these regions. Therefore, we will have to look further for other indications in pinpointing the time of writing.

* In trying to date the persecution in 1 Peter we are also at a loss when comparing the different opinions of scholars. Brox (1979:32) pretty much sums it up when he concludes that it was a

"... zeitlose Realitaet oder Moeglichkeit" in the second half of the first and early part of the second century. This is confirmed by my intratextual analysis (cf II C 4.3). If my reconstruction of a probable alternative "Sitz im Leben" in which the addressees are viewed as self-assured but lukewarm Christians who are admonished to live up to their status as strangers and aliens in this world is plausible, it opens an even wider range to date 1 Peter (cf II C 4.3). One would then also have to consider a date prior to any Christian persecution - probably as early as 50 A.D. Another possibility which could also be reckoned with is that the addressees are in an identity crisis with regard to the Zealot movement (which was in confrontation with the Romans) and are therefore admonished to submit to the authorities by doing good even if it means that they should suffer. This last possibility, although less probable, also opens the possibility of dating 1 Peter as early as 50-60 A.D.

In determining a terminus ante quem references from 2 Peter (110 A D) as well as the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians (112 A D) are conclusive.

* In this search to reconstruct the extratextual reality of 1 Peter the question of authorship has traditionally been decisive. Once again scholars differ in identifying the real author. Depending on one's presuppositions one's conclusions are predetermined. If #Pétros# is taken as a direct reference to Peter, the apostle, it implies that 1 Peter must have been written prior to his death and consequently presupposes the Neronian persecution as the stimulus for writing to the Christians in Asia Minor. On the other hand, if pseudepigraphy or deuteroigraphy is accepted as customary in the early church it opens the boundaries for the dating of 1 Peter and consequently for the "Sitz im Leben" referred to (cf Brox 1979:55-56).

* It has become clear that one should be extremely careful not to force an extratextual "Sitz im Leben" into a text. This confirms the criticism which exposed the "referential fallacy" of the historical paradigm (cf III A 1 & 2.2.2; cf IV A 2.1 and 2.2). In fact the "Sitz im Leben" is often ambiguous and seduces scholars to an illegitimate socio-cultural transfer. Although this inevitably leads to the questioning of much of the detailed extratextual reconstructions, certain minimum parameters still structure the communication act. In this regard Elliott's sociological exegesis of 1 Peter made some valuable contributions. Elliott (1981) reconstructed a social profile of Asia Minor from the first to the third centuries which is therefore applicable to 1 Peter irrespective of whether it is dated in the first or second century. Some outstanding features of Asia Minor were its "... enormous diversity of the land,

peoples and cultures" (Elliott 1981:61); and its predominant rural communities with their closed social structures and demands for conformity (Elliott 1981:65). These features would obviously account for the conflicting interests of the many different and often competing groups within the general population. "In general, furthermore, such distinctions inevitably involved political, legal, economic and social restrictions and disadvantages for those so identified as 'strangers' and 'foreigners'" (Elliott 1981:67). It is within this sociological frame of reference that the addressees were predominantly aliens permanently residing in (#paroikía, pároikoi;) or strangers temporarily visiting or passing through (#parepidēmoi;) Asia Minor (Elliott 1981:48). However, when communities are divided on religious grounds an element of fanaticism is added to the insider-outsider relationships. Therefore it is not strange at all that the Christian community as described in 1 Peter reflects most features of sectarian communities resulting in and profiting from conflict and polarization (cf Elliott 1981:73-78): "The vision of universal salvation which it embraced and attempted to actualize in its communal life had been found attractive particularly by those estranged from the sources of political power, economic security and social mobility" (Elliott 1981:79). It seems, however, that the opposition from the outsiders created tension and discord which undermined the community's distinctiveness, group cohesion as well as the maintenance of its faith and hope in salvation (against Brox 1979:87).

This reconstructed extratextual sociological world is probably the background against which 1 Peter should be understood. Although it is not to be compared to the minutely precise description of 1 Peter's "Sitz im Leben" as found in traditional studies on 1 Peter, the advantage of reconstructing a comprehensive social profile which does justice to both the intra- and extratextual evidence is obvious. In this respect Elliott has made a valuable contribution towards a solution for the impasse in historico-critical research. In contrast, however, to Elliott's (1981:84-87) location of 1 Peter between 73 and 92 A.D., I personally judge the possibility of dating 1 Peter before 73 A.D. a viable probability especially in the light of Elliott's social profile which dominated Asia Minor in the first three centuries.

In my opinion, therefore, the contribution of a historical analysis is rather found in the possible interaction and estrangement between intra- and extratextual worlds as a means of receptor persuasion (cf Elliott 1981:10-11 & 49). This relativizes the necessity for the reconstruction of an exactly defined "Sitz im Leben", but still honours the basic extratextual parameters which constitute a meaningful context for the textual communication of a particular text. This confirms the importance

of the cosmologic perspective as an orientation point in the communication process. Especially with persuasive communication one finds that the communicator utilizes the dynamics of intra- and extratextual reference (even if it has more than one probable "Sitz im Leben") as his *modus operandi* in order to persuade his receptors. With regard to ancient texts we are in the dilemma that we don't share their extratextual world and therefore it must be reconstructed to understand the primary estrangement which is obviously paradigmatic for a secondary reception. With regard to the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις#, Brox (1979:57) remarks: "Die Begriffe der Erwaehlung, des Fremdlings und der Zerstreung kommen dabei aus biblisch-juedischer Ueberlieferung, die hier (wie in einer Reihe von anderen fruehchristlichen Schriften) einerseits in Affinitaet, andererseits in Konkurrenz zum juedischen Selbstverstaendnis auf die christliche Situation in der 'Welt' appliziert wird." This "Konkurrenz" is especially important with regard to the reinterpretation of "God's elect" in terms of the Christian community (cf Kelly 1969:40). The estrangement between intra- and extratextual worlds is blatantly explicit in 1 Peter with regard to the insider-outsider relationship.

.2 This brings us to the identification of the alternative cosmologic perspectives referred to in 1 Peter. The cosmologic perspective of 1 Peter has already been described as "Christological" with all that it implies (cf II C 4.2). Petersen's distinctions between primary world, secondary world and resocialization is important for our discerning of the alternative or conflicting cosmologic perspectives in 1 Peter. On the one hand, the communicator clearly identified the primary world of the addressees (i.e. the world they were born into) as comparable to the heathen world (cf 4:4) and that of their ancestors (1:18) (which is probably the same because the macro text gives us no indication that they are to be distinguished). The analysis of the actantial roles in 1 Peter confirms that their opponents are primarily heathens and their cosmologic perspective is described as "desire orientated" (cf the derivatives of #ἐπιθυμία# in 1:14; 2:11 and 4:2). The addressees experienced a resocialization in which they became "Christ orientated". Therefore, the conflict in 1 Peter is explicitly between a Christological and Hellenistic perspective. This explains the thrust of 1 Peter in which the addressees are designated as strangers and aliens with a unique horizontal conduct towards outsiders, namely the heathens who inflict suffering on them (cf blocks B and C). On the other hand, the Christological perspective redefines the Old Testament-Jewish traditions (especially in block A). It is, therefore, possible that 1:18 and 2:4-10 reflect a controversy between believers, on the one hand, and non-believers identified as Jews, on the other

hand. This mixed composition of the outsiders is in line with the observation that the addressees themselves are also a mixture of resocialized (i.e. converted) Jews and Gentiles - although the latter are probably in the majority (cf Elliott 1981:67).

As a result of the analysis of the alternative cosmologic perspectives we could at least deduce that the addressees were resocialized from both a heathen and Jewish life-and-world view irrespective of whether they were predominantly a Jewish (who became Hellenized) or Gentile (who as Christians came to know the Old Testament - some probably also as previous proselytes) community. Therefore for both these possible reconstructed addressees the Christological reinterpretation of the Old Testament-Jewish master symbols were relevant. In this regard Helmut Millauer (1976:58-60) made a contribution by giving a profile of the Old Testament-Jewish tradition complex presupposed in 1 Peter as the concept of a one-sided vertical election of the addressees as God's eschatological heirs from whom obedience, witness and righteousness is demanded even if it implies suffering. Obviously the bottom line will be to outline the implications of the Christological redescription and relativization of this tradition complex. This will be the point of interest in the next section (cf III B 2).

.3 Obviously the extratextual reference of this Christological perspective is of crucial importance in the reconstruction of the extratextual conceptual world of the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπίδημοις#. In the light of the fact that this issue is related to the text-reality issue in the analysis of the Christological perspective of 1 Peter (cf III B 2), we will not pay any attention to it at this stage. This is also the case with the identification of the stage of theological development reflected in the proclamation of 1 Peter which will only be dealt with in section C 2 of this chapter. It seems, nevertheless, obvious that the extratextual reality of the oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπίδημοις# at least presupposes a resocialized community. This implies that the real readers had an experience of resocialization or conversion which makes the message of 1 Peter relevant for them. Without this extratextual reality the communication of 1 Peter is unthinkable. In the light of these considerations it is of limited interest whether the receivers were newly baptized Christians (cf Brooks 1974:290-305) or an already established community (cf Danker 1967:93-102).

To conclude then I would like to remark that, in my opinion, my sociological analysis of the historical text semantics has proved to be capable of opening new possibilities in evaluating and reconstructing the extratextual reality of a text. I believe it is one way to overcome the "referential fallacy" of historico-critical research.

1.2.3 Text-semantic delimitation: change in "worlds" and perspectives

Text-semantically 1 Peter can be demarcated as a semantic unit determined by a Christological perspective which is in contrast to other semantic coherent units, namely the "worlds" of Hellenism and Judaism. This confrontation between "worlds" demarcates the semantic unity of 1 Peter in terms of its specific Christological perspective. In section C 2 of this chapter a profile will be given of the contrasting cosmologic perspectives of the different worlds reflected in 1 Peter.

*

1.3 TEXT-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

1.3.1 Text-pragmatic extension: inter- and extratextual text-functional and style-rhetorical references - literary and form history

I have already remarked that #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπίδημοις# in 1:1 is an oxymoron. The profile established in the syntactic and semantic analyses enabled us to identify this phrase as an "oxymoron": "If the paradoxical utterance combines two terms that in ordinary usage are contraries, it is called an oxymoron;" (Abrams 1981:127). It should be noted that this is rather a style-rhetorical form than a "form" within the traditional boundaries of "Formgeschichte". Nevertheless, according to Abrams (1981:127) it is frequently used in devotional prose and religious poetry as we will see shortly (cf III B 1.3.1).

Now, if we accept that the oxymoron is a style-rhetorical convention, the ultimate question is what does it want to signal? Plett (1975:254) describes the function of oxymora as "... die Widersprüchlichkeit im menschlichen Dasein aufzudecken." With regard to religious poetry Abrams (1981:127) views oxymora "... as a way of expressing the Christian mysteries, which transcend human sense and logic." That this is indeed the case in 1 Peter has already been illustrated in the intratextual analysis where we have concluded that the paradoxical thrust of 1 Peter (viz an incompatibility between having a relationship with a transcendent, almighty God in paradoxical contrast to experiencing suffering and hostility within the world) is symbolized by the combination of two master symbols - #ἐκλεκτός# and #παρεπίδημος# (cf II B 4.2).

Therefore, the historical analysis confirms the intratextual results. The oxymoron #ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπίδημοις# in 1:1

programmatically introduces the paradox of the Christian existence which determines the thrust of 1 Peter. One could deduce from this that the communicator-author deliberately or inevitably used an oxymoron as the ultrakernel condensation of the text thrust symbolizing the issue he wanted to deal with - that is to give meaning to the paradox of Christian existence. Therefore, the blessing in colon 2 is not only a traditional style-rhetorical device to create goodwill from the readers it also reinforces the text thrust by blessing the addressees with a life of grace and peace (i e a meaningful life).

1.3.2 Text-pragmatic coherence: the communicator-redactor and style-rhetorical conventions - redaction criticism

It is important to note that a paradoxical existence is not only the fate of Christians, but of mankind as a whole. This is implied in the fact that the oxymoron is a style-rhetorical convention in general literature. We have established, furthermore, that the paradoxical combination (election-rejection) is traditio-historically also found in the Old Testament and Jewish matrix of 1 Peter. What is ultimately important, however, is the explanation of man's paradoxical existence - that is to give meaning to this existence. Therefore, the bottom line is ultimately what difference is there between 1 Peter's interpretation of the paradox "election-rejection" in contrast to its traditio-historical matrices. This manipulation and redescription of the paradoxical, inter- and extratextual reality is a matter of text-pragmatic coherence, namely a global strategical attack of the communicator-redactor on the receptor. In this analysis of the global strategical attack of the communicator-author's implementation of the election-rejection paradox we are dependent on redaction-critical criteria.

The election-rejection tradition is redactionally linked to the introduction of the text in which the interlocutors are defined with imbedded traditional phrases such as an identification, triadic and salutation formulas which define the interlocutors and especially the addressees in terms of a Christological and theological perspective. This redactional perspective represents the crossroad between the different election-rejection traditions. The Old Testament and Qumran traditions have been reinterpreted from a Christological perspective. This is the way in which the communicator-redactor wanted to give meaning to the paradoxical tension with regard to the addressees' existence in their reality.

1.3.3 Text-pragmatic delimitation: change in strategy and pragmatic conventions

The Christological perspective has been identified as

determinative not only for the semantic inter- and extratextual reference (cf III.B 1.2) but also for the text-pragmatic strategy of the communicator-author (cf III B 1.3). The author applied the election-rejection tradition to suit his Christological perspective. It now remains to be seen if this historical strategy demarcates 1 Peter as a whole. So let us turn our attention now to the symphonic heart-throb of 1 Peter - its Christological perspective.

* *

2. THE INTER- AND EXTRATEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE CHRISTOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE IN 1 PETER

2.1 PERICOPE I (1:1-2)

2.1.1 TEXT-SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS

2.1.1.1 Text-syntactic extension: minimum traditio-historical extension - literary criticism

The frequent recurrence of #Iēsoûs Christós# (9x) and #Christós# alone (12x) is in itself enough reason to confirm the importance of references to Jesus Christ within the intratextual dimension of 1 Peter. Obviously this implies that it is equally important from a historical dimension which I hope to illustrate in due course.

.1 In the first pericope we find some additional clues pointing to the fact that the twice occurring Christological reference to #Iēsoûs Christós# (in 1:1 & 1:2) is part of bigger tradition units. The syntactic highly-structured discourse in 1:1-2 gives us a rather clear signal. The redundant description of the communicator-author with two imbedments (i e #āpóstolos# and #Iēsoû Christoû#) which is not essential for the sentence or colon matrix (i e reflecting a syntactic deviation) gives itself away (cf II B 1.1.2 & 1.3.1).

.2 Likewise the Christological reference in 1:2 is part of a triadic expansion of #ēkletoîs parepidēmois# which is highlighted by three prepositional clauses and the omission of the articles of the nouns. In addition to this, style-rhetorical features such as rhythm and rhyme (cf II B 1.1.2 & 1.3.1) leave little doubt that we are dealing with a tradition unit. Colon 1 is elliptic which is an aporia or syntactic deviation which often signals some historical convention. Although some of the words and phrases in 1:1-2 are #hápax legomena# in 1 Peter, it is problematic to use this criterium when we have so little left of an author's literary work as is the case with "Peter".

Now that we have identified tradition material in pericope I our next step is to determine whether there is some coherence with regard to these traditions. In this endeavour we are crossing the boundaries of literary criticism to enter into the world of form criticism.

2.1.1.2 Text-syntactic coherence: coherence of tradition units - literary and form criticism

.1 Based on the literary criticism of this pericope we have established the probability of tradition units and extratextual

conventions. With regard to the first Christological reference, #Iēsoû Christou# in 1:1, we find that it is coherent with #āpóstolos# and #Pétros#. Therefore, this tradition unit rather reflects a short "formularly" character according to Zimmermann's (1978:140) recommendation "... unter 'Formel' die kurze, fest gepraeigte Wendung zu verstehen."

.2 Secondly, the second expansion of #ēklektois parepidēmois# - that is #katà ... Christou# - has a triadic and rhyme-rhythmical text-coherent profile which constitutes a triadic formula. It is important to re-emphasize the significant change in actants in the different units of the triad (viz #theos#, #pneúma# and #Iēsoûs Christós#).

We have therefore identified two separate Christological tradition units. We will return to them separately in the next section. It should be noted, however, that the overall coherence of pericope I is constituted by its introductory form: from-whom:to-whom:greetings. This is confirmed by the fact that it is indeed the very first pericope of the text of 1 Peter. Therefore, we have identified an introductory form which will be confirmed in the traditio-historical comparison and be dealt with in greater detail in the analysis of the text type of 1 Peter (cf III B 3).

2.1.1.3 Text-syntactic delimitation: alternation of tradition units and forms

Obviously the delimitation of the tradition material can only be done preliminarily in the text-syntactic analysis and will therefore only be finalized after the semantic and pragmatic analysis of the historical dimension has been taken into account. Nevertheless, we have identified two units of Christological tradition material which have been incorporated within a conventional introduction unit. In the light of this demarcation we will now proceed to analyse the text-semantic extension, coherence and delimitation thereof.

*

2.1.2 TEXT-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

2.1.2.1 Text-semantic extension: inter- and extratextual semantic reference - tradition history

.1 The phrases #āpóstolos Iēsoû Christou# and #āpóstolos Christou Iēsoû# occur frequently in the New Testament and only (except for 1 Th 2:7 where the phrase is different viz #hōs Christou āpóstoloi;) in the introductory formulas or "prescript" of the

letters (cf 1 & 2 Cor 1:1; Eph 1:1; Col 1:1; 1, 2 Tm & Tt 1:1; 1 & 2 Pt 1:1). It has therefore clearly been used as a traditional formula in the early church. The occurrence of the phrase in the introduction to the letters confirm that this formula has been an "identification formula" for the apostles.

The Pauline usage of this formula probably precedes that of the Petrine usage if the traditional dating of the New Testament writings is accepted. As it is absent in the Gospels and Acts it seems that this formula originated within the interaction of the apostles and the Christian communities. To define the "Sitz im Leben" of origin more precisely (e.g. the Palestinian or Hellenistic church) would be speculation. Nevertheless, it is especially in the contact between an apostle and the believing communities that such an identification would have been functional. In literary correspondence addressed to believing communities such an identification would likewise be functional. It is clear, at least, that the introduction of this textual correspondence follows an already known custom.

There are enough differences in the letter introduction as well as the usage of this formula to distinguish 1 Peter from the Pauline letter introductions (cf Goppelt 1978:76). Compare for example the absence of the Pauline terminology such as #ἀγαπητός, κλητός, ἅγιος, πίστος & ἐκκλησία# and the presence of #παρεπίδημος, ἐκλεκτός & διάσπορά# which represent a non-Pauline tradition (cf Ja 1:1; 1 Clem; PolPhil; MartPol).

.2 Some constituents within the triadic formula have parallels in the rest of the New Testament - for example the liturgical #θεὸς πατήρ#; #κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ# (cf Ac 2:23 as the only other occurrence and, interestingly enough, in the speech of Peter); #ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος# (cf 2 Th 2:13 as the only other verbatim parallel); as well as #εἰς ἄντισμὸν ἁίματος# (cf Heb 12:24 as the only other parallel). As a tradition unit 1 Peter 1:2a is one of the triadic formulas (cf Mt 28:19 and 2 Th 2:13) of the early church (cf Goppelt 1978:83; Brox 1979:58).

There are, furthermore, some very obvious similarities between this triadic formula and the Essenic soteriological tradition (1 QS 3:6-8). In the Qumran community this schema not only represented a soteriology but was also a "Aufnahmerritual". Therefore the question is whether this formula refers to the Christian baptism. This seems to be confirmed by Hebrews 10:22 as well as the old-Syriac baptismal ritual (cf Did 7:1). Goppelt (1978:84) concludes, however, that this formula does not refer to the "acts" of a baptismal ritual. It is rather an Essenic inspired Palestinian-Syriac baptismal catechesis which was taken over by the congregation in Rome (cf the letter to the Hebrews). Therefore the unity of this formula isn't constituted by a

baptismal act, but by the kerugma of God's acts. Goppelt regards the Christological formula as referring to the incorporation into the death of Jesus Christ. In addition to the baptismal catechesis as background for this tradition unit, we are also able to trace the combination of "obedience" and "sprinkling of blood" to the Old Testament covenant sealing tradition as described in Exodus 24:3-8 (cf Brox 1979:57; Goppelt 1978:86-87).

2.1.2.2 Text-semantic coherence: extratextual world, reality and "Sitz im Leben" - socio-cultural analysis

.1 The extratextual reality referred to by the identification formula #Pétros ápostolos 'Iēsoû Christoû# is subjected to multiple interpretation. This illustrates once again that historical criticism operates within semantic parameters (i.e. a question of reference). It seems to me a senseless endeavour to try to prove or to disprove the "real apostle Peter" as the author of 1 Peter. In fact there is more than one plausible option (e.g. the "real" Peter, Silvanus or an elder in the early church). It all depends on the plausibility of different presuppositions in the argumentation. What is, to my mind, more important is the function of this reference to "Peter" linked with a reference to "Jesus Christ".

.2 The triadic formula is clearly part of the Christological tradition material. Obviously this formula presupposes a Christian community which formulated it for some purpose whether it be catechetical, liturgical or ritual. The precise "Sitz im Leben" is difficult to reconstruct although it seems if Goppelt is correct in assuming that it is not the acts of a baptismal ritual but rather baptismal tradition which could be used in catechesis or even, to my mind, probably in a baptismal liturgy. Nevertheless, the overwhelming evidence leads us to conclude that the extratextual world referred to is that of a Palestinian baptismal tradition complex.

.3 It should be obvious that the Christological perspective in the above-discussed formula forces us to determine what the reference "Jesus Christ" really implies. I will leave the conclusions in this regard to the synthesis in III C 2. I first want to get a comprehensive outline of the parameters of the Christological perspective in pericopes I-V. A few parameters can be deduced from the first pericope, namely that Jesus Christ does not only authenticate the communicator-author but is also superior to the receptor-addressees. This presupposes some sort of extratextual superiority over the interlocutors as well as an extratextual commitment to Jesus Christ. These observations, to my mind, pinpoint the issues at stake which will determine my analysis of the extratextual reality referred to, namely the

extratextual basis and presuppositions dominating the authority of Jesus Christ as well as the addressees' commitment to Him.

It is important to note that the Christological perspective reflected in the triadic formula is probably an alternative to the Essenic tradition. The significance of these alternative cosmologic perspectives is of the utmost relevance because it is expressed in terms of initiation and commitment tradition material which usually reflects the crucial-kernel beliefs of different communities and institutions. The issue of alternative cosmologic perspectives is, however, an issue for text-semantic delimitation.

2.1.2.3 Text-semantic delimitation: change in "worlds" and perspectives

We have already seen that the communicator-author used his introductory pericope to establish a Christological perspective right from the start. Intratextually we have already determined that this perspective binds the whole of 1 Peter together and demarcates inevitably a historical semantic text-coherence. Therefore, a Christological commitment constitutes the coherent "world" of 1 Peter. This demarcated historical semantic unit is, however, to be distinguished from other semantic units with their own cosmologic perspectives and worlds. This conflict and interaction of "worlds" will be dealt with in section C of this chapter after the Christological perspective has been outlined comprehensively.

*

2.1.3 TEXT-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

2.1.3.1 Text-pragmatic extension: inter- and extratextual text-functional and style-rhetorical references - literary and form history

.1 The function of an identification formula is obviously self-identification and authorization. The description of the author as an apostle of Jesus Christ creates a certain expectation for the readers and determines their relationship towards this letter.

.2 The triadic formula reflects something of the origin of (as it became known at a later stage in the history of Christianity) a trinitarian theology. This triadic formula in 1 Peter could be classified as a "Glaubensformel" which is a formulation and condensation of "das vergangene Heilsergebnis" (Zimmermann 1978:176). Interestingly enough Zimmermann (1978:177) states: "Da die Glaubensformel den Inhalt des Glaubens prägnant

zusammenfasst, ist ihr 'Sitz im Leben' aber auch dort zu suchen, wo der Glaube ausgesprochen und bestaetigt wird. Das geschieht bei der Taufe: Der Täufling bekennt sich zu dem Glauben, dessen Inhalt ihm waehrend seines Katechumenates dargelegt und erklart worden ist." Therefore, the triadic formula in 1 Peter signals a credal commitment which probably contains emotive connotations reflecting a reflexive-persuasive function of the tradition material in the text. This requires our attention for the coherence that the communicator-redactor wanted to create in using tradition material in his discourse.

2.1.3.2 Text-pragmatic coherence: the communicator-redactor and style-rhetorical conventions - redaction criticism

.1 The incorporation of the identification formula in this letter is more than just convention. It is clearly an authorization of the letter. Whether the actual author is Peter himself or a pseudonymous author is an open matter and part of the multiple meaning and interpretation of the text. It takes, however, nothing from the fact that the symbol #Pétros# refers to the apostle claiming his authority (cf Brox 1979:55-56). "Der Name soll dem Brief - unabhaengig davon, wieweit der Apostel an seiner Abfassung beteiligt war - bei den Christen in Kleinasien Gehoer verschaffen" (Goppelt 1978:76). "Peter" was a very important symbol in the early church right from the start. He was known as the first disciple of Jesus (Mk 3:16 par); the bearer of the Easter-kerygma (1 Cor 15:5) and the Gospel tradition; and ultimately the representative of the early church (Gl 1:18 & 2:9). This background clearly reveals the redactional intention with the identification formula irrespective of the real communicator-author.

.2 The Christological tradition within the triadic formula is explicitly linked to the origin (cf #éklectós & prógnōsis#) and ultimate commitment (cf #hagiasmós & hupakoē#) of the interlocutors. Therefore this Christological interpretation of the interlocutor's existence reflects the communicator's "perspective" on reality. This leads us to conclude that the redactor wanted to establish the basis of this dialogue on the communicator-author's (cf #ápóstolos 'Iēsoû Christou#) and the receptor-reader's (#eís hupakoēn kai řantismòn haímatos 'Iēsoû Christou#) common Christological commitment and perspective on reality. The redactor did this by using tradition material reminding them of their baptism. The communicator-redactor, therefore, did not only make an appeal to the addressees based on their formal commitments, but he also made an emotional appeal based on their public experience of this commitment during their baptism.

If this formula reminded the readers of the Old Testament covenant sealing as Brox (1979:57) believes, it would be highlighted by the Christological reinterpretation thereof (cf Goppelt 1978:87). The effect, however, would be the same - that is to emphasize the Christological perspective on the receptor's existence: "Also soll im Bild von der Besprengung mit dem Blut Christi (vgl. Hebr 12,24) von einem neuen Bund die Rede sein, bei dem Jesu Tod die Rolle des Opfers spielt und der als biblische Chiffre den adressaten ihr jetzt gewonnenes Verhaeltnis zu Gott als neue Verbindlichkeit auslegt, die durch die Intervention Jesu Christi begruendet wurde" (Brox 1979:57). Ultimately the redactor used this Christological perspective to serve as the basis for the dialogue with his receptor-readers.

In conclusion then it has become clear that the Christological tradition material in this pericope functions as an inter- and extratextual orientation with regard to the receptor-readers' cosmologic perspective. In this sense the historical dimension of 1 Peter is vitally important for the primary as well as the secondary communication of the text. First Peter will obviously fail to communicate with receptor-readers who are without a historical Christological frame of reference or data basis.

It is important to note, however, that simultaneously with this identification of the receptors with the text perspective an estrangement is also bound to take place. In my methodological considerations on historical text semantics (cf my discussion of metaphors and perspectives in III A 2.2.1) we have seen that this is essential in any communication event. This will become evident when we consider the communicator-author's strategy in pericope II (cf III B 2.2.3). We will return to this issue in chapter IV where it will be the focal point of our attention. For the moment, however, we will turn our attention for a brief moment to the historical text-pragmatic delimitation which is related to this phenomenon of estrangement in the communication event, namely the demarcation of the communicator's strategy in this regard.

2.1.3.3 Text-pragmatic delimitation: change in strategy and pragmatic conventions

The application of tradition material obviously reflects the Christological perspective of the author. His strategy in this pericope is to establish a basis for communication with his addressees by emphasizing their common Christological commitment. He does this with the aid of inter- and extratextual emotive and reflexive-persuasive tradition material. Whether the communicator-author will proceed with his historical strategy to create a perspectival identification from his readers, or whether he will change his strategy to create an estrangement or even a

The thrust, perspective & strategy of 1 Peter: Historical analysis

break with his readers remains to be seen in the following pericopes. In the light of my communication-theory, we could anticipate, however, that if the communicator-author has something to convey to his receptor-readers he will have to combine the processes of "identification" and "estrangement". In this regard we will find that the author of 1 Peter was a master of strategies. Let us see for ourselves.

*

*

2.2 PERICOPE II (1:3-12)

2.2.1 TEXT-SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS

2.2.1.1 Text-syntactic extension: minimum traditio-historical extension - literary criticism

I have identified six phrases in which the reference to Jesus Christ were explicit. I will limit my Christological analysis to these phrases within their co-text. This does not mean that there is no other Christological material in this pericope, but this selection will help me to keep my analysis within bounds.

.1 The Christological phrase #toû kuriou hēmōn 'Iēsoû Christou# in 1:3 is a hapax legomenon in 1 Peter and could possibly suggest tradition material. One should be cautious, however, in the application of this criterium when one analyses a relatively small and undefined corpus such as the Petrine corpus. Together with the redundancy in the description of the actant #Iēsoûs# the evidence for identifying tradition material is much stronger and will be confirmed by the intertextual references (cf III B 2.2.2). The compact and highly structured nature of verses 3-5 also confirms this fact - compare the high frequency of adjectival descriptors, the threefold prepositional clauses, and the redundant repetitions. Lastly, the unit of tradition material is also betrayed by the change from first person plural in verse 3 to second person plural in verses 4ff (cf Shimada 1966:146-147).

.2 The phrase #di' anastaseōs 'Iēsoû Christou êk nekrōn# in 1:3 has two variants in 1 Peter: verbatim but without #êk nekrōn# in 3:21 (although #êk nekrōn# functions in the co-text of 3:18-4:6); and also 1:21 in a semantically related reference #theōn tôn êgeiranta autōn êk nekrōn#. The fact that this combination of motives occurs three times in 1 Peter obviously suggests a tradition complex.

.3 The phrase #ên âpokalûpsei 'Iēsoû Christou# in 1:7 occurs verbatim in 1:13 within the co-text of a positive vertical (!) relationship. In 4:13 we encounter a variant #ên tē âpokalûpsei tēs dóxēs autoû# also with reference to Jesus Christ. Therefore, the combination of Jesus Christ, his revelation and a positive vertical relationship reflects a Christological tradition.

.4 #hōn ouk idóntes âgapâte# in 1:8 is a hapax legomenon in 1 Peter which could (but with less certainty as compared to the three above-discussed phrases) imply a traditional phrase. It should be mentioned, however, that there are manuscripts which have a text-variant reading with regard to this Christological phrase, namely the substitution of #idóntes# with #eidótes#. We

will return to this in the text-pragmatic delimitation of the strategy of 1 Peter (cf III B 3.3.3).

.5 Likewise #pneûma Christoû promarturómenon# in 1:11 is a hapax legomenon in 1 Peter which makes it impossible for us to deduce any literary critical conclusions as to whether it is a traditional phrase or not. It is interesting to note that a text-critical note is also found in this phrase (i.e. the omission of #Christoû# by certain manuscripts). This could have important implications for the evaluation of the traditional character of this phrase.

.6 The combination of #pathema# and #Christos# in the phrase #tà eîs Christòn pathēmata# in 1:11 recurs (although not verbatim) in 4:13 (cf #toîs toû Christoû pathēmasin#) and 5:1 (cf #tōn toû Christoû pathēmátōn#) which most probably reflects tradition material.

The highly structured discourse of pericope II suggests that the above-discussed phrases could be part of bigger tradition units (cf .1 above). This is confirmed by the style-rhetorical analysis of the intratextual dimension of this pericope (cf II B 2.3.1). Especially the redundant occurrences of relative particles, word couples, dualistic and triadic imbedments as well as rhyme-rhythmic features. As my analysis focusses on the Christological tradition material I will only occasionally refer to the bigger tradition units within which it occurs. Let us therefore continue to analyse the text-syntactic coherence of the different Christological tradition units.

2.2.1.2 Text-syntactic coherence: coherence of tradition units - literary and form criticism

The syntactic coherence of the six phrases referred to above is based on the fact that an immediate-constituent analysis exposed that they are phrase units. Therefore, they are probably part of the formulary tradition material. The fact that Jesus Christ is the common denominator in all six phrases leads us to define the phrases more precisely as "Christological formulae." This is less certain, however, with regard to phrases 4 and 5.

2.2.1.3 Text-syntactic delimitation: alternation of tradition units and forms

It seems as if phrases 1 & 2; 3 & 4; and 5 & 6 are part of different and bigger tradition units. In any case this is how they are imbedded in the discourse of 1 Peter. Phrases 1 & 2 are part of colon 1 which as a whole complies with almost all the criteria for identifying a tradition unit. The thrust of colon 1

is "praise". In contrast to this, phrases 3 & 4 are part of the cluster comprising cola 2-4 in which the thrust is a semantic contrast between the positive vertical relationship and negative and embarrassing situation of the addressees. Phrases 5 & 6, on the other hand, are part of cola 5-8 which constitutes a context of a dated forward-looking to salvation. Therefore at least three tradition complexes have been identified. Let us continue to determine their inter- and extratextual reference.

*

2.2.2 TEXT-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

2.2.2.1 Text-semantic extension: inter- and extratextual semantic reference - tradition history

I will proceed by discussing each of the six phrases in the exact order which I followed above.

.1 In 2 Corinthians 1:3 and Ephesians 1:3 the verbatim parallel to 1 Peter 1:3 is found: #eúlogētòs ho theòs kai patēr tou kuríou hēmōn 'Iēsoú Christou# which clearly confirms the traditional character thereof (cf Goppelt 1978:90). This implies that this phrase is common to both the Pauline and Petrine traditions. This helps us to define the syntactic extension of this formula more precisely. The dating of 2 Corinthians is widely accepted as within the parameters of 53-57 A.D. and is therefore a terminus ad quem for this tradition. It is possible to distinguish the creed #kúrios 'Iēsoús Christós# within this phrase and trace its tradition history back to the Aramaic #maránatha# (cf 1 Cor 16:22) which is coincidentally one of the oldest Christian creeds (cf Kelly 1969:47). In the light of the fact that it occurs in 1 Peter in a bigger tradition complex (cf above), I have treated it as such. The next paragraph will confirm my *modus operandi*

This Christological phrase has been classified as an eulogy form (cf Goppelt 1978:90; Zimmermann 1978:177-178). The form is primarily constituted by a benediction with a motivation which is usually followed by participle, relative and causal sentences. The form of the eulogy is found in the Old Testament "berakāh" (cf Goldstein 1973:155-158; Shimada 1966:141) or prayer style (cf Gn 14:20; 1 Ki 1:48 & 8:15 and especially the Psalms 40:13 (= 41:14), 71(72):18, 88(89):53, etc) as well as in the Essenic prayers (1 QM 14:4, 8; 1 QH 5:20, 10:14 & 11:27). The verbal adjective #eúlogētós# is unknown in extrabiblical Greek which confirms the Old Testament background thereof (cf Goppelt 1978:91; Kelly 1969:47). In the early church the "Sitz im Leben" of the eulogy is most probably the liturgical prayer. In 1 Peter this formula is applied within the customary eulogy of a

Christian letter. Therefore Brox (1979:59) concludes: "Der Text 1,3-12 ist eine Eulogie (Lobrede)." This is confirmed by Goppelt (1978:90-91) who rejects Windisch's theory that 1:3-12 is a hymn with five strophes although he acknowledges the rhythmical and highly structured composition of the pericope into four parts. The reference to "rebirth" in 1:3 most probably reflects an extension of the semantic parameters of the first two Christological phrases within the realm of Christian baptism (cf Kelly 1969:46). Therefore it could well be that this combination of the eulogy form with Christological and baptismal master symbols represents a cultic-liturgical tradition unit (cf Tt 3:5-7; Rm 8:14-24; Col 3:1-4; 1 Jn 2:29-3:2). In his endeavour to reconstruct the tradition history of the baptismal concept of "rebirth", Shimada (1966:159-198) exposes the semantic extension thereof within the circles of the Old Testament, Judaism, New Testament and the Mystery cults. He concludes, however, that it is difficult to assume any direct history-of-tradition or literary relationship between 1 Peter and these circles.

In contradiction to the above-discussed view of a baptismal frame of reference for #ánagennáō#, Hiebert (1980b:88) mentions that certain scholars deny this and rather accepts the resurrection as the appropriate conceptual frame of reference. It seems, however, that the latter view is outdated and that it disregards the possibility of multiple meaning and interpretation. Selwyn (1947:123) shows that although we cannot be conclusive on what the author had in mind when he wrote these words, the reference to the new life of early Christians would in any case activate the memories of their baptismal experiences.

.2 The Christological phrase #di' ánastáseōs Ἰησοῦ Christoῦ# appears only in 1 Peter (cf also 3:21). Although the #ék nekron# isn't directly linked in 3:21 it is relevant in the context of 3:18-4:6. Elsewhere in the New Testament certain phrases come close to the phrase used in 1 Peter (cf especially Ac 2:31 where the context of death (hades) also functions in Peter's speech; cf also Ac 4:33, 17:18, 32, 26:23; Rm 1:4, 6:5; Phlp 3:10). One should therefore rather speak of a loosely formulated tradition unit. In 1 Peter itself it seems to have become more formalized as a credal formula. Although there is no one-to-one linkage between the Petrine usage and the rest of the New Testament writings, there is some continuation between Paul's reference to the causal effect (creating a new life) of the resurrection and 1 Peter's formulation of #di' ... #.

.3 The combination of #ápokálupsis# with #Ἰησοῦς Christós# occurs also (although not verbatim) in 1 Corinthians 1:7; 2 Thessalonians 1:7; 1 Peter 1:13 (verbatim in this case) & 4:13 with reference to the parousia. In Galatians 1:12 this phrase

refers to the revelation of Christ to Paul on the road to Damascus. The verb #ἀποκαλύπτω# alone also refers to the parousia in Luke 17:30; Romans 8:18 and 1 Peter 1:5. This phrase is therefore probably also a credal formula ("Glaubensformel") of the early church in the light of the fact that it is attested by both the Pauline and Petrine tradition. It is difficult, however, to reconstruct a tradition history with such scanty evidence. It is clear, nevertheless, that this formula in 1 Peter links with the Pauline usage.

.4 There is no verbatim parallel of the phrase #ὅτι οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπήτε# to be found in the New Testament. We find our closest parallel in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians (cf 1:3) which is almost certainly dependent on 1 Peter. There are in the New Testament, however, a few allusions where either the absence of or the love for Christ is implied (e.g. Ja 1:12 also in the context of trials; 2 Cor 4:17f; 1 Cor 2:9; 16:22; Rm 8:24 & 28; 10:14; Eph 6:24; Heb 11:27; Jn 8:42; 14:15, 21, 24; 21:15-17). None of these references are able, however, to confirm that we are dealing with the tradition history of a Christological form or formula in 1:8. This phrase rather reflects some kind of a statement tradition which probably had its "Sitz im Leben" in the worship services of the early church (cf Goppelt 1978:103).

.5 The phrase #πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ# is found verbatim only in Romans 8:9. Different combinations of #πνεῦμα# and #Ἰησοῦς Χριστός# in apposition is also found in Acts 16:7 (although text-variant readings are found in this case) and Philippians 1:19. We could hardly describe it as a traditional formula with such little attestation in the New Testament. Once again the Pauline usage probably outdates that of 1 Peter. Whether there is any dependence on Paul or not cannot be deduced from this phrase. Influences from Jewish apocalyptic expectations (cf Dan 9:2, 22-27; 12:6-13) as well as from the Qumran tradition (which interpreted the prophecy of the Teacher of Righteousness as the revelation of the end - cf 1 Q pHab 7:1-8) could probably be detected in the Petrine linkage of Christ's Spirit and the witnesses of the endtimes (cf Goppelt 1978:108; Kelly 1969:60). In the Johannine tradition we find that #πνεῦμα# (i.e. the #παράκλητος#) and #ἀλήθεια# as metaphors for Jesus Christ become more central (cf Jn 14-16). Scholars differ in their interpretation of this phrase with regard to the issue whether the "Spirit of Christ" in verse 11 is to be identified with the "Holy Spirit" in verse 12.

.6 Except for the linkages of #πάθημα# and #Χριστός# in 1 Peter (viz 1:11, 4:13 and 5:1) this combination is found only in 2 Corinthians 1:5 (with #πάθημα# preceding #Χριστός# in contrast to the usage in 1 Peter). Once again I would hesitate to describe this phrase as a formula of the early church.

Nevertheless it would seem that in the Petrine usage it has become a credal formula. The scanty attestation of this phrase in Paul's letters makes any conclusion on dependency very difficult. The similarities between 2 Corinthians 1:5-7 (cf also Phlp 3:10) and 1 Peter 1:11, 4:13 and 5:9 are, however, remarkable - compare Christ's suffering as foundation for the corporate suffering of believers. This is especially true of the letter to the Hebrews in which Christ's death is held up as a model and inspiration for its readers (cf Kelly 1969:61). In Hebrews 2:9 the combination of suffering (#páthēma#) and glory is found as in 1 Peter 1:11 and 4:13-14. The verb #páschō# is also linked with glorification in Romans 8:17; 2 Timothy 3:12 and 2 Corinthians 4:10. Therefore, we can at least conclude that the suffering and death of Christ as a master symbol for Christians is well attested in the New Testament although it is impossible to reconstruct a form and tradition history for the particular phrase in 1 Peter.

The contextualizing of this phrase within eschatological and apocalyptic tradition in 1:10-12 reflects an interaction between the Christological perspective and an extratextual tradition complex. The analysis and reconstruction of this interrelationship is a matter of text-semantic coherence. This is to be distinguished from the analysis of the text-semantic extension which attempts to identify the semantic parameters of the tradition material. Obviously the difference between the criteria of extension and coherence is only a shift in analytical focus whereas both analyse basically the same material. This will explain the overlapping between the previous and the following sections.

2.2.2.2 Text-semantic coherence: extratextual world, cosmologic perspective and the relationship text-reality - socio-cultural analysis

.1 The reconstruction of the tradition history of the Christological phrases in pericope II implied an extratextual world comprising the following: early Christian liturgical material (e g eulogy, creeds, sermon material, baptismal material) with a predominantly Old Testament-Jewish matrix which includes possible allusions to Hellenistic concepts. This reconstruction of the Christological tradition material reflects two facets of the extratextual world. Firstly, it obviously reflects the historical dimension of written correspondence, namely its inter- and extratextual conventions and world. In the light of the fact that we are going to deal with this in section B 3 of this chapter, I would just like to emphasize that all of the Christological tradition material in pericope II functions as part of an epistolary eulogy which inevitably sets the parameters

of the co-text. This will prove itself to be important when we consider the text-pragmatical strategy reflected in this pericope (cf III B 2.2.3). Secondly, this reconstruction at least sets the parameters for the real interlocutors as a community familiar with Old Testament-Jewish traditions which lives in a Hellenistic environment. The intertextual references in 1 Peter therefore clearly correlate with Elliott's reconstruction of the social profile of Asia Minor in the first three centuries (cf III B 1.2.2). This does not necessarily lead to a conclusive and precise reconstruction of the interlocutors' "Sitz im Leben" in terms of an exact date and location, but provides us with certain minimum parameters for a meaningful communication of 1 Peter. What is of the utmost importance for the successful (i.e. primary and secondary) communication of an ancient text is, however, to identify or determine the inter- and extratextual reference of the text perspective.

.2 It is interesting that my historical analysis exposed that the intertextual reference in 1 Peter presupposes an extratextual community which upholds a certain perspective and master symbols. We have seen that the liturgical tradition units in this pericope are time and again interpreted from a Christological perspective. In the light of the fact that liturgical material is usually the treasure of a resocialized community it obviously reflects the expressions of their crucial-kernel beliefs. This is clearly expressed by the resocialized community's emotive evaluation (i.e. praising God) of their ultimate meaning in life or "neue Lebenswirklichkeit" (Manke 1975:55-56) which is ultimately based on the "Christ events" and symbolized by their baptism (cf 1:3-5). The addressees' negative "Sitz im Leben" is also Christologically reinterpreted and relativized in terms of their relationship (i.e. faith and love) towards Jesus Christ (cf 1:6-9). Their "Sitz im Leben" is further relativized in terms of the coming revelation of Jesus Christ and their salvation (cf 1:6-9). The third cluster (i.e. cola 5-8 or 1:10-12) is actually a further explanation of the Christological reinterpretation of the Old Testament eulogy by showing that God's grace is inextricably intertwined with the "Christ events" of suffering and glorification which relativizes Jewish eschatological and apocalyptic expectations. This implies that the addressees' inter- (i.e. their Old Testament background) and extratextual reality (i.e. their "Sitz im Leben" at the time of writing as well as their future) are evaluated from an explicit Christological perspective (cf Manke 1975:55-60). This inevitably raises two issues.

Firstly, the question with regard to the relationship of the cosmologic perspective of 1 Peter with that of other New Testament writings forces itself on us. We will deal with this in section C 2 of this chapter. Secondly, the relevance of the

extratextual reality of this Christological perspective will have to be determined. We have seen that the intertextual reference of the Christological tradition material is inseparably bound to the ultimate extratextual referent, Jesus of Nazareth. The importance and relevance of this extratextual reference will only be discussed in the synthesis of the historical perspective (cf III C 2). It is especially the reference to the "Christ events" of "resurrection, revelation, suffering and glorification" that will have to be discussed.

The effect of this Christological orientation of the receptor-readers' inter- and extratextual worlds will be discussed in the text-pragmatic analysis. In order to reconstruct the pragmatic implications of the historical dimension of the Christological material, we once again have to demarcate the text-semantic world of 1 Peter.

2.2.2.3 Text-semantic delimitation: change in "worlds" and perspectives

It is clear that the communicator-author himself demarcated the possible inter- and extratextual worlds of the addressees in terms of a Christological perspective which he contrasted against a Palestinian matrix and a Hellenistic "Sitz im Leben". We will return to this issue in section C.

*

2.2.3 TEXT-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

2.2.3.1 Text-pragmatic extension: inter- and extratextual text-functional and style-rhetorical references - literary and form history

Although the text-pragmatic extension within pericopes is determined in the light of the function of the tradition material as micro genres, we will have to keep in mind that the macro genre and text type overcodes 1 Peter with metatextual conventions (cf III B 3.3.1). Tradition material is, nevertheless, an identification symbol which has qualitative and emotive values attached to it, which is important in setting the parameters for the text-pragmatic extension.

The function of the first two Christological phrases in this pericope (cf verse 1) have been identified as formulae which have polemic, liturgical and baptismal functions. The Christological phrases in verses 7 and 8 are probably a formula and a statement respectively which had an apologetic-consolatory function with regard to the "absence" of Christ (cf Brox 1979:66). The last two

Christological phrases in verse 11 both refer to Christological events which qualify eschatological and apocalyptic expectations (cf Brox 1979:68-72).

It has become clear that the Christological tradition material extends text-pragmatically as master symbols which function within existential, religious and cosmologic parameters of human experience. This confirms the fact that the Christology in 1 Peter reflects the cosmologic perspective of the communicator-author and his ideal readers. Therefore, each of these master symbols have an emotive, reflexive-persuasive and authoritative function. The million-dollar question which confronts us at this stage, however, is to determine what the communicator-redactor had in mind by incorporating these different Christological traditions with their different functions? This is an issue to which we will find an answer within the parameters of the text-pragmatic coherence.

2.2.3.2 Text-pragmatic coherence: the communicator-redactor and style-rhetorical conventions - redaction criticism

In the introductory pericope we have seen that the communicator-redactor created a basis for the receptor-readers to identify with him. He did this by incorporating tradition material which reflected a Christological perspective within the conventional structure of ancient epistles (cf III B 3). In this pericope the communicator-redactor utilizes the conventional eulogy to incorporate Christological tradition material. This time, however, we encounter an implicit and explicit appeal to his addressees as the intratextual analysis of the text pragmatics illustrated (cf II B 2.3). Interestingly enough, we have seen in our analysis of the historical text-pragmatic extension in the previous section (III B 2.2.3.1) that this appellative nature of pericope II was also reflected in the existential, religious and cosmologic parameters of the Christological tradition material. The communicator-redactor's unique incorporation of these traditions within his intratextual discourse will expose the text-pragmatic coherence and ultimately his strategy and intention with this pericope.

Obviously, the frame within which the redactor organizes his tradition material is important to determine his strategy (cf III A 2.3.2). Therefore, the fact that this pericope is framed by the eulogy form creates a thanksgiving parameter for the discourse and the tradition material incorporated. In this regard a preliminary remark with regard to the function of poetic material is necessary. Grosse argues that group songs (e.g. hymns) have a function as identification symbols and are therefore essentially appellative (cf III B 3.3). Consequently this will also apply to liturgical prayers and thanksgivings which confirm the

appellative nature of 1:3-13.

This thanksgiving is defined in terms of the interlocutor's positive vertical relationship with God which is described in the introductory phrase of the eulogy as a Christologically interpreted "salvation". Therefore, the first Christological phrase in this pericope establishes the primary parameter of thanksgiving which sets the tone for the whole pericope. This emotive function of the Christological phrase is, however, intensified by an estrangement created by the Christological reinterpretation of the Old Testament-Jewish eulogy tradition which viewed the election of Israel as the foundation of their relationship with God. In contrast with the Jewish perspective, the addressees' vertical relationship is made meaningful by a Christological reinterpretation of their reality. The endeavour to demarcate the exact words added to Christologize the Jewish "berakāh" (cf Shimada 1966:155-157) is, in my opinion, not only presumptuous but also does not contribute anything more to our understanding of this pericope. Of greater importance is the fact that the communicator-redactor went even further than this indirect appeal to the addressees to identify with this spirit of thanksgiving. He vividly recalled the emotive event of the addressees baptism which signified their ultimate commitment and new status (cf Shimada 1966:196). Brox (1979:60) emphasizes that this reference to baptism is not nearly sufficient evidence to conclude that 1 Peter is a baptismal homily as scholars believed in the past. It does contribute, however, to the festive and text-aesthetic atmosphere (cf the rhyme, rhythm, metaphors and contrasts) the author wanted to create with his hymnic eulogy. Shimada (1966:173-174) argues that the Christological reinterpretation of the baptismal concept of "rebirth" could probably reflect a polemic intention of the redactor against the Mystery cults and their conception thereof.

This emotional appeal to the addressees to give thanks, is deepened by the second Christological phrase which refers to the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This Christological phrase is a creed that the new life, existence and hope of the community committed to Jesus Christ are effected by the resurrection of Christ. Here reference is made to the ultimate master symbol or root metaphor of Christianity because the resurrection was not only an authentication of Jesus Christ, it was also the main stimulus for their meaningful existence in this reality. Together with the text-aesthetic devices of rhyme and rhythm, the communicator-redactor has proved himself as a master in textual strategies (cf Brox 1979:60). He pulled out all the stops in his conducting of this textual symphony. He made an indirect but irresistibly persuasive appeal to his addressees by activating and relativizing their Jewish matrix in terms of

different emotive, cultic, liturgical and existential Christological master symbols.

This context is therefore decisive for the text-pragmatic coherence of the other Christological phrases. Within this jubilant and festive frame of reference the communicator-redactor relativizes the paradoxical extratextual predicament of the addressees (cf the #ên hō# linkage between verses 3-5 and 6-8). Brox (1979:68) sums it up magnificently: "Die Gewissheit des Heils wird ihnen in den grossen Lettern tradiert Bilder und Vorstellungen vor Augen gestellt. Das Heil, die Realitaet, auf die der Glaube sich einlaesst und verlaesst, wird ueberbietend, auch begeisternd dimensioniert, waehrend das faktisch empfundene Bedrueckende dagegen ganz klein proportioniert ist" It is in this light that the Christological phrases in verses 7 and 8 function apologetically, consolingly and also paraenetically. This is seen in the author's interpretation that the eschatological revelation of Christ signals the addressees' salvation which not only relativizes his absence and their existential predicament, but also encourages and deepens their commitment to him (cf Thomas 1968:188). Therefore, the addressees are admonished to rejoice in spite of their suffering. This privilege of the addressees is underlined in verses 10-12.

The communicator-redactor used the Christological phrases in verse 11 to reveal the cosmologic and time-historical implications of the "Christ events". This Christological reinterpretation of the eschatological-apocalyptic traditions reinforces, intensifies and concludes the jubilant and thanksgiving atmosphere which the communicator-redactor wanted to create with his eulogy. The supreme advantages of the addressees are highlighted by the fact that even the prophets and the angels did not share their privilege of experiencing the revelation of Christ. It is surely no coincidence that the suffering of Christ is highlighted in verses 10-12. It is most probably to explain the addressees' own suffering as the inevitable result of their commitment to him (cf Manke 1975:57-58). Therefore, this Christological interpretation of eschatological and apocalyptic expectations also serves the communicator-redactor in alienating his addressees from their contemporaries' apocalyptic speculation and despair with regard to the endtimes. In contrast to this, he reassures his addressees of the already decisive revelation in Christ Jesus (cf Brox 1979:70; Goppelt 1978:106).

It has become clear that the communicator-redactor wanted to reinforce the receptor-readers' Christological commitment by interpreting their total reality - it is their past (viz their Palestinian-Hellenistic matrix), present (i.e. their suffering in their Hellenistic-Jewish environment), as well as their natural and supranatural (cosmologic) future - from a "Spirit-inspired"

(cf Manke 1975:60) Christological perspective. We have seen that the communicator-redactor pulled out all the stops in his strategic orchestration of the "Petrine" symphony. The next question is, therefore, whether there has been a change in strategy in the discourse development in 1 Peter.

2.2.3.3 Text-pragmatic delimitation: change in strategy and pragmatic conventions

In comparison with the analysis of the historical text pragmatics of the first pericope we have found that it is indeed the case that the author changed or rather broadened his strategy. The strategic emphasis of the communicator in pericope I was to create an identification between the interlocutors' cosmologic perspective with the aid of Christological tradition material. In pericope II we found that the communicator pursued an estrangement (i.e. appellative-persuasive) strategy in addition to his identificative strategy. This became evident in the way he implemented the Christological tradition units (cf III B 2.2.3). This alternation between identification with and estrangement from inter- and extratextual tradition material as the communicator-redactor's strategy, confirms the oscillation between the evaluative and appellative text functions of the intratextual text pragmatics.

* *