Chapter 1

A study of the New Testament beatitude and the beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10: A new approach to 'Gattungsforschung'

1.1 Introductory remarks

In 1976 Markert said that in historical critical studies of form- and gattungskritische nature the dilemma of modern biblical scholarship comes to light. Although it is possible to describe the method of Form- and Gattungskritik, this method can not always be referred to the results of their application. Results still to come from the application of this method, could modify the Form- and Gattungskritik practiced up to now - in some instances even change it altogether (Markert 1976:86). The aim of this essay is to make a contribution in this regard.

Gattungsforschung is indicated by the terms Gattungskritik or Gattungsgeschichte in recent literature. This term has traditionally been used as an equivalent for the term Formgeschichte (the English Form Criticism), or one has been seen as an umbrella concept including the other. My preference for the choice of the term Gattungsforschung as an indication of the method for investigating literary types in biblical literature would hopefully be self-evident at the end of this contribution.

Formgeschichte is an element in the historical-critical method of exegesis and stemmed from the one-sidedness of the old literarkritische method as it was practiced by the Julius Wellhausen School in particular. Ever since the end of the Second World War the formgeschichtliche method has, at a surprisingly fast rate, gained a very prominent place amongst the investigative methods of biblical literature. Indeed, the point of departure was that a biblical pericope could only be interpreted correctly once a study of its specific literary form and its particular Sitz im Leben had been undertaken. The pronouncement in this respect made by Hermann Gunkel, in many ways the father of this investigative method, is known world wide, when he stated that one who studies an author, without knowing the Gattung the author uses, starts the building of the house with the roof.
For a period biblical literary theory did not take cognizance of the results of the new development in the area of general linguistics with the key word 'structure'. Today the situation has changed somewhat. Regarding Gattungsforschung, it was Wolfgang Richter (1970, 1971), an Old Testament scholar, in particular, who started looking at the traditional formgeschichtliche investigative method differently on the basis of more recent insights. Richter's exegetic approach consists of a plurality of methods. It is an exegetic approach in which different facets such as Literarkritik, textual criticism, structure, Gattung, semantics, historical perspectives, such as tradition criticism, and finally redaction criticism all have a place and fulfill a need. His literary theory (including his more modern approach to Gattungsforschung) essentially is an attempt to present a refinement of the existing literary investigative methods as well as an attempt to combine diachronic facets with synchronic facets with a view to establishing meaning. However, the sequence is always that the synchronic provides the material upon which the diachronic has to be built and never the reverse. This point of departure soon gave rise to a change in the situation regarding methodological consciousness. It is very noticeable in the book Exegese des Alten Testaments which was published in 1973 with Georg Fohrer (1973) and others as editors. Gunter Wanke (1973), for example, states in his book that the linguistic analysis forms the basis for all further exegetic steps, especially in Form- and Gattungkritik, and Motiv- and Traditionskritik, which both rely on the results of language analysis in their quest for set patterns. With reference to the New Testament Klaus Berger's 'multi-linear approach' (see Berger 1977) is known, although it is completely different from Richter's and is, in my own opinion, also unacceptable (see later). Regarding criticism of Richter, the works of Klaus Koch, and H Barth & O H Steck may be mentioned.

That which is applicable to Richter's motif in respect of his method of approach in general is also applicable to a single facet such as Gattungsforschung. He namely wishes to limit the trust the critic puts in emotions, fantasy and intuition by means of controllable criteria - something that is not really part of the traditional approach (see Richter 1970:219). Richter not only emphasized the well-known fact that there are different directions within the traditional formgeschichtliche approach but he also is of the opinion that ever since Gunkel not enough attention has been given to the criteria of this investigative method (see Richter 1971:126). And it is applicable to both the New and the Old Testament.

Like Wolfgang Richter - but not without criticism and changes in methodology - and on the basis of the authority of the insights gained through the more recent language and literary theories, I would like to indicate the flaws in the traditional Formgeschichte even more clearly. On the basis of these insights a new
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approach to *Gattungsforschung* is described and honed. There are three important insights that are applicable in this regard and all these may be attributed to the pioneer of modern linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure (1916). The three insights are firstly the difference between *la langue* and *la parole*, secondly the structural method in linguistics, and thirdly the difference between the synchronic and diachronic approach.

*Gattungsforschung* does not have the same objectives in the investigation of the Old Testament that it has in the New Testament, even though both literary corpora are of the same origin. I am convinced that the results of Richter's investigation in respect of the Old Testament may also be applied successfully to the New Testament, although I am not aware of any researcher who has done this.

The exposition that follows has been structured by means of four headings, namely 'Identification of the *Gattung*', 'The *Sitz im Leben* of the *Gattung*', 'Function of the *Gattung*' and '*Gattungsgeschichte*'.

1.2 Identification of the 'Gattung'

Richter queries the traditional approach of using the aspect of *Geschichtlichkeit* as criterion in order to identify *Gattungen*, and consequently he is not satisfied with the term *Formgeschichte*. He feels that the weakness of the traditional approach is, in fact, reflected in the composition of the term *Formgeschichte* (see Richter 1970:216). In view of the difference between synchronism and diachronism the aspect of *Geschichtlichkeit* still remains a facet of *Gattungsforschung* occupying its own specific methodological place. He wishes to distinguish between, what he calls, *Formenkritik* and *Formkritik*. He uses the term *Gattungskritik* to combine these two facets. *Gattungsgeschichte* is the last and, as such, a separate facet. The distinction will hopefully become clearer during the discussion which follows.

Pericopes and textual units are isolated by means of the *literarkritische* methodological facet. Such a pericope displays an 'ornamental', 'external', and 'internal' form. The 'ornamental' is the formal information in the pericope which is processed through an analysis of the rhyme, alliteration, assonance, rhythm, et cetera (Richter 1971:80-84). The 'external' is the *literarkritische* limitation mentioned above and is done by means of criteria such as lexeme uses, lexeme groups, sentence types and stylistic detail (see Richter 1970:22-23; 1971:50-62). It also includes criteria like repetition and tension. The determination of the 'external' form is controlled by an analysis of the 'internal' form. The latter is the structure of the pericope and an analysis is done by means of formal syntactic categories. This structured unit refers to what Richter indicates by means of the term *Form* and what I will refer to with the term *form* or *structure* henceforth.
In other words Richter means something else than the traditional ‘source criticism’ as practised by the Wellhausen School, in particular when he uses the term _Literarkritik_. However, this term is also used in Germany to indicate literary work in general (cf i a Sellin 1969:30). The structural approach of the so-called American ‘literary criticism’ in turn uses the term in a much narrower sense (cf i a Beardsly 1975). I prefer to talk about _pericope demarcation_ when indicating the analysis of the so-called ‘external form’. Within the _Gattungsforschung_ the pericope demarcation, essentially, is preliminary work which is done in respect of the analysis of the ‘internal form’. I have named the latter _structural analysis_. The technique I have applied is that which has been developed within the framework of the New Testament Society of South Africa under the leadership of J P Louw (cf i a Louw 1973:101-118; 1976:75-99). In contrast to Richter, however, I do not consider the analysis of the so-called ‘ornamental form’ to be a separate methodological step within the _Gattungsforschung_. The aspects Richter combines under this term are important but to my mind form part of the structural analysis.

Richter and Markert have named the demarcated textual units _Formen_ (see Richter 1971:132; Markert 1973:82). The comparison between the different _Formen_ is known to them as _Formenkritik_ to distinguish it from the term _Formkritik_. The latter is the study of the ‘ornamental’, the ‘external’, and the ‘internal’ form.

Each textual unit has a unique structure. But when various texts display certain similarities such related texts may be seen as a typical group and such a group may be indicated by means of the term _Gattung_ (cf Richter 1971:131). Once the form of a unit has been determined it is not always evident whether this form was structured in this way on a one-time and incidental basis or whether it is a manifestation of _Gattung_. From this it is evident that one can only speak of a _Gattung_ once one has proven the existence of at least two independent, similarly or relatively structured units. Only then does it become possible to discuss the question of the identification of the _Gattung_ in detail (Richter 1971:138). This does not mean that textual units need to be patterned along the same lines before they can be grouped together as a specific _Gattung_. The more similarities one needs to fulfil the requirements of a _Gattung_ the smaller the _Gattung_ is; the fewer similarities the bigger the _Gattung_ becomes (see Markert 1973:99). This implies that the term _Gattung_ can be used in respect of both small and extended units as was the case in the traditional _Formgeschichte_. Heinrich Zimmermann (1974:135), for example, regarded the term _Gattung_ as the general term and considered the Gospels, the Acta, the Epistle, and the Apocalypse, as being part thereof in respect of the New Testament. Smaller units like the apopthegm he called _Formen_, while he also distinguished short, fixed expressions and called them _Formeln_. Therefore a
Gattung need not always be a pericope. Literary types often consist of a fixed literary construction only. In these cases pericope demarcation and structural analysis as used in larger units, will be unnecessary. Identification should, however, still take cognizance of the difference between synchronism and diachronism. Imitating Loader (1975:19), I use the term Gattung in respect of both large and smaller units, and the term Makrogattung in respect of broader units such as the Gospels.

Where the form of a unit is established by means of formal syntactic categories (cola) the Gattung is identified by determining the communal ‘structural features’ of the structurally related and literary independent forms, and in this way describing the characteristics of the Gattung. This is why Richter queries the traditional method which uses the aspect of Geschichtlichkeit as criterion to isolate Gattungen. The communal structural characteristics cannot be recognized on the basis of a diachronic comparison. That may be the case, but the opposite has been proven by a large number of cases (see Richter 1981:129). A comparison between the forms of separate units is obviously necessary in order to identify Gattungen. Yet the principle that diachronism follows synchronism and not the reverse still applies (Richter 1971:131). Consequently Richter distinguishes between two synchronic facets in Gattungsforschung. The first he names Gattungskritik where structurally related forms are compared and Gattungen is isolated. (Naturally the series of texts that are relevant in the study are first demarcated, whereafter the structure of each unit is analysed separately.) The second is the question regarding the life setting (Sitz im Leben) of the Gattung including the question of its function. But before we progress to the discussion of this facet in Gattungsforschung I would like to say something about the most important methodological change I had made to Richter’s approach, namely the relationship between form and content in Gattungsforschung.

Richter (1971:136-138) carefully indicates that ‘provisionally’ he does not regard content to be constitutive to Gattung. Content can only be determined in respect of a concrete textual unit. And because he regards Gattung as a theoretical abstraction, that is only adequately outlined by its function, the ‘text type’ of a Gattung can indicate only the grouping of separate contents (in accordance with the different separate concrete textual units). Therefore the ‘unique’ content of an individual textual unit which is regarded as belonging to a typical group of units on the basis of objective syntactic rules is unusable as ‘Gattung characteristics’, because one must then accept as many Gattung sub-groups as there are unique contents in one group of Formen. That would render the concept Gattung pointless (see Richter 1971:133).
I find that, in the light of what was traditionally done, there is some sympathy for Richter’s point of view but feel that it definitely is too redactional. With the traditional approach uncontrollable criteria was often applied to Gattungsforschung. Since Gunkel’s time this has often been under discussion in spite of the commendable claim by Barth & Steck (1973:99) that, as exponents of the traditional approach, they agree with Richter that a distinction should be made between the aspects of content and form but that ‘performative function’ also cannot be determined without establishing the form. Dodd (1969:1-10) serves as an example of the Beatitudes in the Gospels. According to Dodd the Beatitudes in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke present different forms, each of which is a distinctive and characteristic literary product. These are related to various existing compositional forms and each is, in spite of the degree of communality, a product in its own right. The content of the form in the Luke pericope (beatitudes versus woe-cries) proclaims a reversal in the situation. Dodd calls this phenomenon the peripeteia – something which also appears in the other pericopes of the Gospels. The content of the Matthew pericope has an ethical meaning. His viewpoint thus is that there is a correlation between form and content. Although the form was not isolated in terms of fixed, defined criteria Dodd indicated some structural marking elements. Though he had a feeling for structural analysis he did not use it as a basis for the identification of Gattungen but eventually it was based fairly exclusively on the viewpoints derived from the content. This was also found with Gunkel (1933) at an earlier stage. His category, Klagelieder des Volkes (= laments of the people), is distinguished from the category, Danklieder des Volkes (= the people’s song of thanksgiving), on the basis of the content ‘thanksgiving’ and ‘lament’ while the forms did not really serve as diagnostic criteria.

Richter’s viewpoint is that he wants to disregard content in all aspects of Gattungsforschung. This is where Richter parts the way with many scholars who largely agree with him (myself included; cf Markert 1973:98). Content and form are not entities that have been accidentally combined; they may rather be seen as units which constitute meaning. In the semantic structure analysis technique which is applied by the New Testament Society of South Africa, and where the purely syntactic colon analysis of the text is written down with a semantic analysis based upon the Nida model of dynamic-equivalent Bible translation (cf Nida & Taber 1974; Louw 1976; Vorster 1979) the term ‘surface structure’ is used as equivalent of Richter’s form and the term ‘deep structure’ as equivalent of Richter’s content. Bearing this in mind it becomes clear why I do not wish to separate form and content. Barth & Steck’s (1973:100) remark in this regard remains applicable, when they ask the question whether überlieferungsgeschichtliche analysis is the same thing.
as "Gattung" classification. Furthermore, one can also ask what "gattungsgeschichtliche" work comprises of, when one should disregard the typical content and thematic scope of linguistic expressions, and stick solely to formalized phenomena. Klaus Berger (1977:134) even goes as far as, and I feel undeservedly, describing Richter as ‘hostile towards content’. Gattungsforschung may not be restricted to the formal only. However, Richter’s viewpoint presents the framework for the refinement of results.

I will use a schematic representation to explain my views in this regard. At the same time the sketch will serve as a summary of the new approach to Gattungsforschung that I put forward in this essay. The sketch was adopted from the work of Markert (1973:98) but was adapted to suit my aim.

From the above sketch it is clear that the aspects of form and content are taken into consideration in all the facets of Gattungsforschung. Notwithstanding my sympathetic attitude towards Richter’s point of view I feel that his approach is too one-sided.
Richter's method contains a contradiction. This is due to the fact that in the pericope demarcation a phenomenon such as 'tension' (one of his literarkritische criteria) is, in fact, nothing else than an aspect of content (cf Loader 1978:9). Content could also play a role in structural analysis.

With regard to the identification of the Gattung the comparison of not only units that are structurally related is required but these units should also be semantically related. What we are concerned with here is not that which is referred to above as 'content moments' but content in the sense of the meaning of a textual unit which is inextricably connected to its form. This basic, and very important viewpoint in respect of the Gattungsforschung is explained in the above schematic representation by means of the symbols S (surface structure = form) and D (deep structure = content). In the same way that there is a distinction between form and content in the semantic structure analysis of a specific textual unit although these cannot be separated at all because together they constitute meaning, the aspects form and content cannot be separated in the comparison of these units which belong to a typical group.

The benefit gained through the above explanation (which largely concurs with that of Markert) is that for the first time fixed demarcated criteria are applied where diachronism (comparison of units) follows synchronism (semantic structure analysis), and where Gattungen is not based on content (traditional Formgeschichte) alone, neither in arbitrary manner on first content and then form. This arbitrary nature is to be found in Klaus Berger's modern approach which aims to determine Gattungen or 'text types' on the basis of the roles played by the actants in the communication of the text (see Berger 1977: 128). According to Berger, who leans on the new reception and communication theory, we have to use as our point of departure - mainly because the primary aim of language is to communicate - the fact that all 'text types' display communication-directed characteristics and should therefore be distinguished according to the type of discourse situation. The distinction is consequently situated in the roles played by the speaker and the listener in the communication situation. The speaker, for example, announces his role explicitly by means of the so-called illocutive sentences such as question, allegation and admonition, and on the basis of this different 'text types' may be distinguished such as questions, instruction, salutation, admonition and narrative. Other 'text types' are determined on the basis of the relevant participants such as the prayer in which both God and man are participants, or on the basis of the type of discourse such as a dialogue or a monologue. Berger feels that in this manner he will be able to take thorough cognizance of what he calls 'a multi-linear approach to Gattungen'. Berger, however, shows that he does not deal with fixed criteria. He isolates some
text types' on grounds of the content. His definition of Gattung as well as the names
given to his various Gattungen display some major defects. He names the Emmaus
pericope (Lk 24:13-35) Wiedererkennungsgeschichte; the episode played out before
Pilate (Mk 15:1-5) is called a 'trial', and John 1:1-18 a 'prologue'. He shows very
little understanding about the problem regarding Wolfgang Richter and the
distinction between form and content, and consequently also about the structural
approach of modern linguistics. Berger furthermore takes little notice of the
principle regarding the comparison of additional related texts in order to isolate
Gattungen.

1.3 'Sitz im Leben' of the 'Gattung'
An exegete cannot study the form and content of a Gattung exclusively; he should
also look into the Sitz im Leben (life setting) of the Gattung. The Sitz im Leben is
the result of the customs that were prevalent during a certain period and which had
awarded such an important role to the orators and listeners or writers and readers
that specific literary types were regarded as necessary to act as vehicle of expression
in each specific case (Koch 1974:35-43; see also Annandale 1971:18-22). In the Old
Testament world and its environment we find, for example, the activities of the cult,
legal institutions, customs and institutions of the king's court. Victory songs were
sung when the conqueror returned, laments were sung at a funeral, instructions were
delivered by the priest at the temple, et cetera (see Muilenburg 1960:229). A
specific 'institution' usually is the exponent of more than one Gattung. Regarding
the Gospels, for example, the traditions about Jesus were first transmitted orally
before they were recorded in writing. During the stage of oral transmission these
traditions took on certain forms depending on the nature of the function it had in
the early Christian community (Travis 1977:154). Comprehensively, in New
Testament literature, we can speak of the proclamation of the good news, the
Christian worship gathering and the instruction in the faith as the Sitz im Leben of
the earliest church (see Zimmermann 1974:173). In the gospels we therefore need
to distinguish between the Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche and the Sitz im Leben Jesu
(see Aulen 1976).

I also feel that Richter's viewpoint regarding the recognizability of the Sitz im
Leben is too rigoristic. He claims that his viewpoint acts as corrective for the
traditional approach in this respect. Since Gunkel's time (and with inclusion of the
refinements and modifications that have been introduced over the years) the
description of the Sitz im Leben of a Gattung has been determined by two premises,
namely using as point of departure the literary form itself, and secondly the socio-
cultural details. The first-mentioned is introduced by means of questions like the following: Who is the author? Who are the readers? Regarding the second, knowledge of Israel and the ancient Eastern households, socio-cultic history and the history of religions is necessary (see Annandale 1971:22; Koch 1974:43). According to Richter the traditional *Formgeschichte* introduced criteria in this regard that was based upon ‘uncharacteristic data’. He does not wish to rely on extra-textual material of this nature, but on the data itself, which is possible through the recognition of the rules of its own structure and through its own intentionality (Richter 1971:145). To my mind Richter regards the danger of ‘diachronism’ against which James Barr (1961) warned during the sixties, far too seriously. We should therefore agree with Richter that the importance of synchronic analysis cannot be emphasized enough. This is also true in respect of the description of the *Sitz im Leben* of a *Gattung*. The latter, however, is an aspect in which diachronic considerations should also play a role. Questions regarding the author, readers, and socio-cultural details are necessary in order to observe the organized life setting the structure and content of a specific *Gattung* refers to. Diachronic considerations should thus always be controlled by the synchronic considerations. Synchronic investigation provides the framework for and protection against an arbitrary lapsing into ‘diachronism’ (see also Markert 1973:94 in this regard).

1.4 Function of the ‘Gattung’
Richter (1971:133) makes the following remark: *Gattung* is therefore an operational term that is only adequately outlined by its function. What is the ‘function’ of the *Gattung*? The question about the ‘function’ of the *Gattung* is, as formulated by Markert, also a question regarding the relationship between the literary setting of a concrete textual unit that is a manifestation of a specific *Gattung*, and the typical *Sitz im Leben* of that specific *Gattung* (Markert 1973:95). This very important distinction between the literary setting and the *Sitz im Leben* of a *Gattung* is the result of the distinction made between *la langue* and *la parole* by Ferdinand de Saussure (although Richter and the exponents of the new approach do not state this explicitly). De Saussure opened new perspectives through his statement that the phenomenon of *language* (= *le langage*) finds expression on a social and individual level. On a social level this is a system of signs which is applied by a specific community to communicate by means of certain sound forms. The technical term *la langue* (= *a language*) is used to indicate this. Utterances on an individual level is the actual application of *a language*. The latter is indicated by the term *la parole*. This is the actual language activity performed by a specific person at a specific...
moment (McKnight 1978:97-81). Like the term Gattung the term Sitz im Leben is an operational-hypothetic category dealing with the phenomenon of a language (la langue). The question regarding the literary setting is only addressed when the relevant Gattung is applied in actual language usage (la parole) on an individual level. It is against this background that Markert’s contribution in respect of his use of the term literary setting gains significance. The merit of the new approach in this regard is that in the Gattungsforschung the traditional idea of Gattung being an extra-literary quantity is dispensed with.

As mentioned previously the question regarding the ‘function’ of the Gattung is a question into the relationship between the Sitz im Leben and the literary setting of that specific Gattung. Hoffmann (1970:341-346) rephrases the question: Is the Gattung used ‘functionally typical’ (i.e. in accordance with the typical Sitz im Leben of the Gattung concerned) or is the Gattung used ‘functionally atypical’? Hoffmann (and Markert) uses Amos 5:1-3 to explain the above. Amos 5:2 is a manifestation of the Gattung ‘funeral oration’ which has the funeral of a person as its typical Sitz im Leben. Admittedly the reference here is to the destruction of a nation. The death of a person and the destruction of a nation do, however, indicate the same thing as the reference הַלּוֹלֶה shows. In this sense one may thus, in terms of Hoffmann’s terminology, refer to a ‘functionally typical’ use of the Gattung because there is no change in the Sitz im Leben, only a generalization. But if the context is taken into account as well as the fact that it is Amos who is speaking, the picture changes totally. In Amos’s time Israel was not on the verge of destruction but experiencing a period of political growth and glory. Against this background the Gattung of the ‘funeral oration’ has thus in fact been used ‘functionally atypical’. In this case the question regarding the ‘function’ of the Gattung is as follows: Why did Amos deem the specific Gattung of the ‘funeral oration’ to be suitable in this case, in other words functional within the context?

1.5 The ‘Gattungsgeschichte’

Another attribute of the new approach is the fact that the last facet, the gattungsgeschichtliche, is an aspect which is the logical result of the aforementioned, namely the question of the ‘function’ of the Gattung. As a whole the gattungsgeschichtliche question is a diachronic matter. The specific methodological position this facet occupies in the new approach should be seen against the background of the necessary distinction between the synchronic and diachronic methodological facets, the warning against intermingling these two facets, and the fact that diachronism is preceded by synchronism.
In essence Richter does not differ from the traditional Formgeschichte about the ‘what’ of Gattungsgeschichte. Gunkel did mention that when literary types are created they may, in the course of their usage, develop and consequently change, or intermingle with others and even form new types or eventually disappear. Like Tucker (1975:116), an exponent of the traditional approach, Richter mentions that the *Sitz im Leben* is not a historical entity in the sense that a narrow determinable historical date can be attributed to each *Sitz im Leben*. The *Sitz im Leben* is actually bound to a specific historical period. This is especially the case when an ‘institution’ of one kind or another forms part of the *Sitz im Leben*. Continuing along the line of the monarchy: its roots are in the 733, its origin lies with Saul, its individualistic character under David and Solomon, its independent realization in the Northern and Southern Kingdom, and finally its destruction in both kingdoms. The same cross sections may be made in respect of the Prophets. Each of these sections demarcate a certain period. From this it may be deduced that the actual manifestation of a *Gattung* is only applicable to a specific *Sitz im Leben* and that changes may take place in a *Gattung* during the course of a *Sitz im Leben*. It may therefore happen that a specific *Gattung* is used outside its original *Sitz im Leben* as is illustrated in the above example of the monarchy. Even though the original *Sitz im Leben* may have disappeared a *Gattung* that had originated in accordance with it may continue to exist. However, it may also happen that a *Sitz im Leben* develops to such an extent that new *Gattungen* become necessary. In addition to totally new *Gattungen* a specific *Gattung* may in such a case also adopt elements from another *Gattung* (= *GliedGattung*; a subordinate *Gattung*) in another *Sitz im Leben*. The newly formed *Gattung* is known by the name given by Gunkel, namely a *Rahmengattung* (= all-encompassing *Gattung*). A specific *Gattung* may also adopt a complete *Gattung* from another *Sitz im Leben*. This newly formed *Gattung* is known by Gunkel’s name *Gattungsmischung* (= *Gattung* mixture). This development in the *Gattung* essentially means that a new *Gattung* was formed because one can no longer speak of exactly the same *Gattung* (Barth & Steck 1973:59, 63). The study of these and similar phenomena is known as the *Gattungsgeschichtliche* investigation. It is done by comparing a specific *Gattung* with other samples of similar literary types. Individual modifications applied by the author once only are of no importance unless these modifications became active in a *Gattungsgeschichtliche* sense. In the new approach such *Gattungsgeschichtliche* phenomena are connected with the question into the ‘function’ of the *Gattung* (Markert 1973:97). However, one could rather say that, as was mentioned earlier, the *Gattungsgeschichtliche* question arises from the previous question regarding the ‘function’ of the *Gattung*. 
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This whole matter regarding the *gattungsgeschichtliche* is also related to the problem surrounding oral transmission that to this day receives a lot of attention in the traditional *formgeschichtliche* investigations, especially in respect of the research of the Pentateuch and Gospels. Klaus Koch wishes to add another two aspects as part of the *Gattungsforschung* in addition to the *gattungsgeschichtliche* investigation, namely the *Traditionsgeschichte* and the *Redaktionsgeschichte*. I feel that Barth & Steck (1973:56) and Markert (1973:85) are not convincing when they profess to not holding the same opinion. These two methodological facets each deserve to be dealt with separately (Loader 1978:5), although aspects of the *gattungsgeschichtliche* question may indeed display tangential points.

My preference for choosing the term *Gattungsforschung* as an indication of the investigation into literary types in biblical literature need not be explained any further in view of the terminological restrictions, weaknesses and confusion created by the use of terms like *Formgeschichte*, *Formkritik*, *Formenkritik*, *Gattungskritik* and *Gattungsgeschichte* as it has been described in the essay thus far.

2. THE NEW TESTAMENT BEATITUDE AND THE BEATITUDE SERIES IN MATTHEW 5:3-10

2.1 Introduction
The fact that the substantive ὁ μακαρισμός is used in Romans 4:6 and 9 as a name for the two sayings appearing between these two verses - sayings that have certain formal characteristics in common - leads us to believe that we are dealing with a fixed type of pronouncement. In their investigations into this type of pronouncement various scholars have announced that the beatitude is one of the most common formal pronouncements in the Greek language (see Votaw 1909:14b; Hauck 1942:369f). Many *formgeschichtliche* studies have been done on beatitudes as such. However, the traditional *formgeschichtliche* approach reveals some serious defects. There is no motivation, for example, to only talk about a *Gattung* when there appear to be certain formal similarities between sayings and passages. One can only speak of a *Gattung* when there are at least two independent literary units which show a characteristic relationship in respect of both structure and content (Richter 1971:138; Markert 1973:85). To the best of my knowledge a similar study has not been done in respect of New Testament beatitude.

In this section of this essay the New Testament beatitude and the beatitude series is investigated as a result of what may be called a 'new approach to *Gattungsforschung*’ (see again arguments in previous section). At the outset it will
be shown whether there is a *Gattung* like the beatitude in the New Testament, and if this is true whether the series in Matthew 5:3-10 is representative thereof or not. The investigation mainly consists of two parts, namely the identification of the *Gattung* and secondly the determination of the *Sitz im Leben* and its function. The question regarding the ‘function’ of the *Gattung* is, in contrast to the other facets of *Gattungsforschung*, not of a hypothetic-operational nature but refers to a case of actual usage. The beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10 is used as material to illustrate this. Much attention was given to the *gattungsgeschichtliche* question in the existing *formgeschichtliche* investigations into the beatitude. Consequently *gattungsgeschichtliche* matters will be discussed very briefly.

### 2.2 Identification of beatitude as *Gattung*

A *Gattung* can only be identified once a typical group of literary units or passages have been isolated. As mentioned above, this typical group consists of at least two independent literary units or passages that are related in respect of structure and content. Pericope demarcation and semantic structure analysis are essential in isolating such a typical group (see again section 1.2). Because the specific literary unit we are interested in always displays a short and fixed construction, a pericope demarcation and structural analysis is, unlike in the larger units, unnecessary. We only analyse the grammatical-syntactic construction and its semantics. With a view to a comparative investigation a table consisting of all the ways in which the word μακάριος, -ω, -ου and its other derivatives were formally (grammatically and syntactically) constructed in the New Testament is given. An outline of the semantics of the relevant word group is then given. By means of this method it will be possible to isolate a typical group.

When comparing the different forms we are able to make a broadly based division between the adjective, the substantive, and the verbal forms. The adjective construction is the dominant construction.

**A. Substantive form:**

- **Rm 4:6** καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
- **Rm 4:9** ὁ μακαρισμός οὗν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἡ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν;
- **Gl 4:15** ποῦ οὗν ὁ μακαρισμός ὑμῶν;
B. Verbal form:

Lk 1:48 Ἰδοῦ γὰρ ὁπο τοῦ νῦν μακαρίωσεν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεᾶ.
Ja 5:11 Ἰδοὺ μακαρίωσεν τοὺς ὑπομείναντας τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰωβ ἥκουστε, καὶ τὸ τέλος κυρίου εἶδετε, ὅτι πολύσπαρχος ἦστεν ὁ ἄγιος καὶ κύριος καὶ σικτίμων.

C. The adjective form is divided into a predicative and an attributive use.

With regard to the latter there are only four examples in the whole New Testament that also differ syntactically from one another.

a. Adjective used attributively:

Ac 26:2 Περὶ πάντων δὲν ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππα, ἦμημι εἰμαι τοῦ μακαρίου ἐπὶ σοὶ μέλλων σήμερον ἀπολογεῖσθαι,
Tm 1:11 κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ, ὁ ἐπιστεύθην εὖ.
Tm 6:15 ἦν καρποῖς ἰδίοις δείξει ὁ μακαρίος καὶ μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλεύσων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριεύσων,
Ts 2:13 προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

b. Adjective used predicatively:

In this grouping two types display a conspicuous difference. In the one group the μακαρίος, -α, -ον functions syntactically throughout as the logical objective in the saying, and in the other group as the starting point of the saying.

(i) Predicative adjective functioning as the logical objective in the saying:

Lk 12:38 καὶ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλάκῃ ἠλθεὶ καὶ εὑρηκαί ὅπως, μακάριοι εἰσὶν ἐκεῖνοι.
Jn 13:17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοι ἐστε ἐὰν ποιήτε αὐτά.
Ac 20:35(b) μημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Μακάριον ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδώναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.
Ja 1:25 ὁ δὲ παρακώψας εἰς νόμον τελείων τοῦ τῆς ἐλευθερίας και παραμείνας, σὺν ἀκροατῇ ἐπιληπτομονής γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ποιήσῃς ἑγγον, ὡς μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσῃ αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι, τὸν δὲ φόβου αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε,
1 Pt 3:14 εἰ ὑμεῖς ἔστε ἐν ὑμοίματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τῷ τῆς δόξης καὶ τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύμα ἐφ' ὕμως ἀναπαληταί.
(ii) In respect of this grouping (where the predicative adjective μακάριος, -ια, -ινι for macro.; -ια, -ινι for macro.; functions syntactically as the starting point of the saying act) the following additional grammatical and syntactical remarks may be made: The modes of the adjective inevitably always is the nominative. The gender and the number are determined in terms of the substantive (or the participial phrase functioning in place of a substantive) that is described predicatively by the adjective. Occasionally the subject the μακάριος, -ια, -ινι refers to is not disclosed. However, it can always be determined within the context. The subject is often expanded by means of a participial phrase and the copulative verb is often deleted. In most cases the matrix sentence is expanded by means of a motivating subordinate clause introduced by a subordinate clause of the δέ, γάρ or ίνα type, or a relative subordinate clause, or a temporal subordinate clause. To summarize the syntactic and grammatical description of this group: In this group we find a fixed syntactic construction in which the predicative μακάριος, -ια, -ινι always functions as the starting point of the saying but the rest that follows displays syntactic and grammatical variations. I subsequently provide a table to illustrate these variations. The sayings are first given without the motivating subordinate clauses and then with the motivating subordinate clauses.

Without the motivating subordinate clause:

Lk 11:27 Μακαρία η κοιλία η βάστισασά σε και μαστοι σους ἑθύλασας.
Lk 11:28 Μενοῦν μακάριοι οι ἀκούστες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες.
Lk 10:23 Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἄν ἐβλέπετε.
Jn 20:29 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁτι ἐώρακας με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἱδόντες καὶ πωτεύοντες.
Rv 14:13 Καὶ ἠκούσα φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης, Γράφων: Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθηκεύσοντες ἀπ' ἀρτι. ναι, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν· τὰ γάρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκαλούθει μετ' αὐτῶν.
Rv 19:9 Καὶ λέγει μοι, Γράφων: Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ αριστοῦ κεκλημένοι καὶ λέγει μοι, Οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν.
Rv 20:6 μακάριος καὶ ἄγιος ὁ ἐχὼν μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐσούται ἵπτες τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ {τά} χίλια ἐτα.
With the motivating lva subordinate clause:

Rv 16:15 'Iðou ἔρχομαι ὡς κλέπτης. μακάριος ὁ γρηγορῶν καὶ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ καὶ βλέπωσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ.

Rv 22:14 Μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἔσται ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῖς πυλώσιν εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

With a motivating relative subordinate clause:

Mt 11:6 καὶ μακάριος ἦστιν ὅς ἔδιν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

Mt 24:46 μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ὃς ἔλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει οὕτως ποιοῦτα.

Lk 7:23 μακάριος ἦστιν ὃς ἔδιν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

Lk 12:37 μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἔλθὼν ὁ κύριος εὑρήσει γρηγοροῦντας·

Lk 12:43 μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἔλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως·

Lk 14:15 Μακάριος ὥστε φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Lk 23:29 Μακάριαι αἱ στέφασι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἱ οὕκ ἐγένησασιν καὶ μαστοὶ οἱ οὕκ ἔθρεφαν.

Rm 4:7-8 Μακάριοι ὃν ἰδέθησασιν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὃν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἂν ὃς ὃν μὴ λόγισται κύριος ἀμαρτίας.

Rm 14:22 σὺ πίστιν ἢ ἦς κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ὑδάμαζε.

With a temporal subordinate clause or conditional ἐὰν sentence:

Mt 5:11 μακάριοι ἦστε ὅταν ὄνειδισσίν γέρον καὶ διώξεις καὶ ἐπιστν πάντα ποιητὰ καθ' ὑμῶν ἢ ἐν οὐκ ἐμοὶ· μακάριοι ἦστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι.

Lk 6:22 μακαριστέρα δὲ ἦστιν ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴ γνώμην, δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν.

I Cor 7:40 μακαριστέρα δὲ ἦστιν ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴ γνώμην, δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν.
With a motivating γράμμα subordinate clause:
Rv 1:3 μακάριος ο άναγινώσκων καὶ οι άκούοντες τους λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ προώντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς εἰγυγνος.

With a motivating ὅτι subordinate clause:
Mt 5:3 Μακάριοι οἱ πετωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βοσκεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (Compare Mt 5:4-10 and Lk 6:20-21.)
Mt 13:16 ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὅτα ὑμῶν ὅτι άκούουσιν.
Mt 16:17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶ, Μακάριος εἶ, Σῖμων Βαρωνᾶ, ὅτι σάρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκαλυφέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατὴρ μου ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
Lk 1:45 μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα ὅτι ἐσται τελείωσις τοῖς λελαμβανομένοις αὐτῆς παρὰ κυρίου.
Ja 1:12 Μακάριος ἄνατρ ὅς υπομένει πειρασμόν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος λήψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, διὸ ἐπηγεῖλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν.

In view of the above comparative table, the groupings under (b) (predicative adjective) may be regarded as a typical group in spite of the fact that there is a syntactic difference between groups (i) (predicative adjective functioning as a logical objective in the saying) and (ii) (predicative adjective functioning as starting point in the saying). The expressions containing the predicative adjective μακάριος, -ια, -ιου presents a fixed syntactic aphoristic form.

Once all the relevant contexts have been investigated in respect of content and attention is paid to both the lexical meaning and the use (for an explanation of these terms see Van Aarde 1980b:1-4) of the applicable words the semantics of the word group involved may be described as follows (see also Van Aarde 1980b:11). In all instances (fifty five times in thirty eight pericopes in the New Testament) the word μακάριος, -ια, -ιου and the cognate derivatives μακαρίζω and μακαρισμός serve as prophecies of blessing. Fifty two times it has the semantic function of psychological events and may thus be characterized as abstract-event words (or an explanation of terminology see Nida & Taber 1974:37). It namely expresses a qualitative condition, yet also refers to a process. If we check the 'use' in all fifty-two cases we find that with the exception of Acts 26:2 and Galatians 4:15, it refers to a religious prophecy of salvation regarding joy or blessing of some nature that implies some sort of eschatological participation. In Acts 26:2 and Galatians 4:15
the reference is to a non-religious type of joy. The last three cases (1 Tm 1:11; 6:15 and Tt 2:13) may be typified as a 'pure' abstract. Their 'uses' are different in that it refers to a predicate characteristic of God in the first two cases while the other refers to a predicate characteristic of an impersonal gift from God.

The predicative adjective μακάριος, -α, -ον in the sayings we have isolated above as a typical group displays the same tendency in content: It is an abstract-event word indicating a psychological process of a prophecy of joy referring to the joy eschatological participation brings about.

With this I have argued that the literary expression under discussion represents an identified Gattung. It may be labelled the Gattung 'beatitud'.

2.3 Identification of the beatitude series as Gattung

In Matthew 5:3-10 we find that the beatitude is collected as a series of eight sayings within a finely and artfully constructed pericope (see Van Aarde 1980b:5-7). Klaus Koch (1974:21-23) is of the opinion that a gattungsgechichtliche past lies hidden behind this beatitude series. He believes that the beatitude did not originate as a series but as single aphorisms. They were collected as a series at some later stage. When the development of a specific Gattung brings about a change of literary form one can no longer speak of the same literary form (see Van Aarde 1980a:69-71). Implicitly Koch's belief that the beatitude series is the result of a geschichtliche development also holds that there is a possibility that the series as such represents a Gattung in its own right. The aspect of Geschichtlichkeit cannot be introduced as criterion to identify Gattungen (Richter 1970:216). The gattungsgeschichtliche question which is essentially diachronic is a facet of Gattungsforschung with its own specific methodological place which it only gains towards the end. However, Koch's remarks force us to try to determine, on a synchronic basis, whether or not the beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10 represents a Gattung.

Keeping the above objective in mind it is necessary once more to check all cases in the New Testament that may possibly be combined in a typical group. Because I gave an explanation of the structure of the series in Matthew 5:3-10 in another article (see Van Aarde 1980b:4-7) it will not be repeated. The following cases subsequently deserve attention.
In this section we find a series of four beatitudes as opposed to four corresponding woe-cries. This section fills exactly the same position in Luke's Sermon on the Plain that it does in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. Regarding their content the four beatitudes of this section largely correspond with four of the series in the Gospel of Matthew. It should be accepted - and indeed is - that there is a common source behind these pronouncements. In the Lukan passage (the 'beatitude' accompanied by the corresponding 'woe-cry') we find a familiar and well-developed literary product of a specific nature (see Dodd 1968:3-4). In this the Gattung 'beatitude' and the Gattung 'woe-cry' serves as form elements (Gliedgattungen) of an expanded Gattung that can be labelled not only as a Rahmengattung but also as a Gattungsmischung (see again section 1.5 above for an explanation of these terms). Luke applies this Gattungsmischung in a series of four.

Whatever the original form of the beatitudes had been like in the common source, it is clear that in both the Matthean and Lukan pericopes the aphoristic beatitude was compiled in the form of a series. Although the two sections are not identical in terms of content and form their similarities are such that they may be typified as a typical group. Indeed, units need not be templates of one another in order to be grouped as a specific Gattung. In this regard Richter (1971:138) refers to units that are 'similar or related' in respect of each other. In view of the fact that one can only talk about a Gattung when at least two independent literary units are similar in respect of structure and content; the fact that the two passages concerned depend on a common source does not act as a disqualification for not calling the 'series' a Rahmengattung. In Luke 6:20ff and Matthew 5:3ff we find the totally independent work of two different authors who (although they relied on the same source) were not dependent on each other with regard to their literary work.
In Luke 11:27-28 two beatitudes are found in two consecutive cola. The second beatitude is opposed to the first in antithetical parallelism. Jesus shows that true ‘blessedness’ (= eschatological joy) does not lie in being his mother but in hearing and observing his teachings.

In this section three beatitudes are found within the same pericope (12:35-48). Although these do not appear consecutively there is a logical connection between them. The middle beatitude functions (in contrast to the other two) syntactically as the logical objective in the saying. We may indeed now refer to a balanced ‘series’. Significantly the beatitudes in this section time and again are a summary of the content of the scopus of the pericope.

It is a possibility that the word μακάριοι has to be seen as having a constituent connection with the object μακάριοι in the deep structure with the result that we find two separate subcola in the superstructure that are dependent on ἐρωτήσαν. This would then imply that we have two beatitudes in this section that follow directly on
each other but that the deletion of the latter has to be assumed. In my opinion deletion is not present in this case because στείραι καὶ αἱ κοιλαί and μαστοὶ have to be regarded as a semantic unit having exactly the same referential meaning. The same is true in respect of Matthew 13:16.

(e) Rm 4:7-8

Μακάριοι δὲν ἀφεθήσαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ δὲν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἀμαρτίαι. μακάριος ἀνήρ οὗ ὁ θεός ἀνεγέρσει αὐτὸν ἀπό τοὺς νεκροὺς κύριος ἀμαρτίαν.

This section is a citation of Psalm 32:1-2 which was taken over from the Septuagint word for word, with the exception of the last stichos of the Hebrew which were not quoted. If the hemystics are not taken into consideration there are two consecutive beatitudes in this section.

(f) Rv 1:3

μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ ὁ ἀκούοντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὅ γάρ καὶ ὁ ἐγγύς

In this case three beatitudes appear in the deep structure. The last two beatitudes were deleted in the surface structure. The question, however, is whether a case of this nature may be recorded as a series. It is also true in respect of Revelations 16:15 where the possibility of deletion exists.

The logical conclusion that may be drawn from the above information is that the Gattung 'beatitude' is frequently used in the New Testament in combinations of which the similarities are such that we may say that a 'beatitude series' was built up. It appears in a 'pure' form in two sections (Mt 5:3-10 and Lk 6:20ff). Syntactically Romans 4:7-8 is the closest to the series found in the above two passages. Although Luke 11:27-28 and 12:35-48 are not a series in the same sense as the above, there is a related comparison in that the beatitudes display a logical sequence in the relevant pericopes. The differences between the rest of the cases that were investigated are of such a nature that they cannot be regarded as belonging to this isolated typical group. Klaus Koch thus methodologically put the cart before the horse when he maintained that one should assume a gattungsgeschichtliche development from a single aphorism to a series. From our synchronic investigation it did, however, emerge that the Gattung 'beatitude' is applied as an element of form within the Rahmengattung 'beatitude series'.
Four other cases which fall outside the New Testament but are part of the Judaic literature, have come to my attention and strengthen the thesis that in Matthew 5:3-10 and Luke 6:20ff we are dealing with aGattung of own character:

In Sirach 25:7-11 theGattungsmischung is unmistakable. The author combines the aphoristic 'beatitude' with ten, the wisdom 'numerical saying'. This means that he is forced to structure the beatitude as a series in order to arrive at the number ten. In the introduction (verse 7) he announces the blessing (ευχάριστια) arising from ten types of human benediction and which at the same time imply a correct ethical life. Although the expression (μακάριος ὅ δείκνυ) is used twice only the effect is that of ten beatitudes which are constructed symmetrically around the two expressions.

In 2 Slavonic Enoch 42:6-14 (see Charles 1913:457) we find a series of nine beatitudes, and in chapter 52:1-16 (see Charles 1913:461-462) a series of seven where each is alternated with a corresponding 'woe-cry'. In both sections the term 'righteousness' functions prominently. See 42:11 ('Blessed is who sows the seeds of righteousness, for he shall reap sevenfold') and 52:16 ('And now, children, keep your hearts from unrighteousness, that you may inherit the weighing-scale of the light into eternity').

Thus both passages display similarities in content with both the Matthean and Lukan pericopes. If it is taken into account that the Slavonic Enoch book is dated around the time of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and that both manuscripts at our disposal are based upon an earlier Greek translation of, possibly, a Hebrew original (see Rost 1971:83-84), it serves to strengthen my thesis that we are dealing with the same literary product as in the 'beatitude series' of Matthew 5:3-10.

Lastly I refer to a hymn from the Geonic period which probably originated in the time of the Talmud (see Daube 1956:198). In this hymn there is a series of ten sayings in which God is addressed as נֶדֶבֶּל and נָבָא (the equivalent of the Greek μακάριος, -α, -ον) are semantically interchangeable. The first includes the additional supplementary component that God may be included as object of blessing while this is not the case with the latter (see the notes in Hatch & Redpath 1954:892). Keeping this in mind it is quite possible that this hymn may at least have some formal connection with the identified beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10. Daube (1956:198-200) also wants to prove this.

2.4 The Sitz im Leben of the New Testament beatitude
The term Sitz im Leben should not be recorded as a historical entity in the sense that a fixed historical date is determinable in respect of each Sitz im Leben. More than likely the Sitz im Leben is related to a specific historical period (see Tucker
This is one of the reasons why the question regarding the *Sitz im Leben* of a formula like the beatitude within the New Testament is not that simplistic. Indeed, if it could be determined that some of the beatitudes in the Gospels are *ipsissima verba* Jesu then the question regarding the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* could also be formulated. And should it be evident that there are beatitudes in the New Testament that should be recorded as *Gemeindebildung* (see Bultmann 1970:115; Koch 1974:53), then the question regarding the *Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche* should be asked again. We shall have to accept that the evangelist Matthew stood in the center of the early Christian congregation and that he most probably had written his Gospel with his congregation in mind (Klijn 1968:45). In respect of this matter in general the early Christian *kerugma*, the early Christian congregation, and the early Christian catechesis should in all probability be regarded as the *Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche* (Zimmermann 1974:173).

Koch (1974:36) points out that it is no longer known at which occasion in the early Christian congregation the beatitude was delivered. The Old Testament custom to use beatitudes as the introduction to a wisdom argument and the positioning of the beatitude series in Matthew 5 as the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount and in Luke as the introduction to the Sermon on the Plain leads him to believe that it appeared within the framework of the *Predigtgottesdienst*, and then as the *Ausgangstext* of the preaching to the congregation.

In this regard Joachim Jeremias (1963:21) has a very interesting theory. In view of the broad distinction made between *kerugma* and διδασκαλία in the early church where the *kerugma* is the preaching to the heathen of salvation in Christ, and the διδασκαλία is an instruction to the Christian congregation with the same content as the *kerugma*, Jeremias (1963:21) regards the whole Sermon on the Mount as a classic example of an early Christian διδασκαλία. To Jeremias the *Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche* of the Sermon on the Mount is to be found in the catechetic instruction to the post-baptismal Christians. The evangelist thus had a parenetical objective when collecting the various isolated logia which the Sermon on the Mount was supposed to have been constituted from originally. The logical conclusion is that if the Sermon on the Mount is a catechetic instruction given to baptised members or to postbaptismal Christians, it had to be preceded by something else. ‘It was preceded by the proclamation of the Gospel; and it was preceded by conversion, by being overpowered by the Good News’ (Jeremias 1963:24). The ‘Good News’ that precedes the collected sayings of the Sermon on the Mount is therefore the preaching of the Messiah. Jesus is the messiah-king, and as such, he speaks with authority in the Sermon on the Mount: ‘[I]t is as if to every saying of the Sermon on the Mount we must supply the protasis: “your sins are forgiven (Matt 9:2)”
(Jeremias 1963:29). This 'Good News', the 'protasis', is the *kerugma* and according to Jeremias the presumption should be that it precedes each logion throughout the Sermon on the Mount (διδαχή).

The *kerugma* is now followed by the *didache*. Moreover, the protasis is only ostensibly missing: *It is found in the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount in the form of the beatitudes* (5:3-12), and in the sayings on the glory of discipleship (5:13-16). These two sections concern the whole Sermon just as in a mathematical formula a number before a bracket. *They concern every saying in the Sermon on the Mount, they are simply not repeated every time.*

(Jeremias 1963:30; italics by Jeremias)

To Jeremias the implication is that the beatitude series played an important role in baptism in the early church. G Braumann (1960:259) also indicated that baptism was the *Sitz im Leben* of the beatitude series. According to him it is clear that the *Sitz im Leben* of the Sermon of the Mount should be seen as that of baptism.

Jeremias' finding in respect of the positional function of the beatitude series in Matthew 5 in certain instances bears a striking resemblance to my own results in this regard (see Van Aarde 1980b:10). However, the theories of Jeremias and Braumann in respect of the *Sitz im Leben* of the beatitude series remain hypotheses which cannot be proven beyond any doubt. It therefore does not seem possible to give a definite indication of the congregational *Sitz im Leben* of the New Testament beatitude. Even the fact that a large number of these figure syntactically as the departure point of a saying (see Klaus Koch) is not sufficient to record the congregational *Sitz im Leben* of the beatitude as the liturgical Ausgangstext of the Predigtgottesdienst (= sermon). According to Richter (1971:145) the *Sitz im Leben* should be inferred from the structure and content of the Gattung - if possible (see also Van Aarde 1980a:67). With regard to the New Testament beatitude its structure and content unfortunately are not sufficient to enable one to identify its specific congregational *Sitz im Leben*. The New Testament contexts in which the beatitude occurs differ in respect of content. On the one hand the beatitude is used on the basis of the suffering the addressed person has to endure as a result of 'enemies', and on the other it is used in terms of a correct ethical life. The content element that is, in fact, constantly present in the beatitudes of the New Testament is that the beatitude is a religious prophecy of blessing that bears relation to eschatological salvation. It appears as if we will have to be content with a vague indication in respect of the *Sitz im Leben* of the New Testament beatitude: *The early Christian eschatological salvation kerugma.*
2.5 The function of the beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10

The question regarding the 'function' of the Gattung is the question regarding the relationship between the literary setting of a concrete textual unit which is a manifestation of a specific Gattung, and the typical Sitz im Leben of that Gattung (Markert 1973:95). In other words, the question regarding the literary setting only comes up for discussion when we deal with the application of the specific Gattung in the actual use of the language. Thus the question regarding the 'function' of a Gattung is also the question whether the Gattung has been used 'functional typical' or 'functional atypical' in a concrete situation (Hoffman 1970:344). With this question the traditional view that a Gattung is an extra-literary entity is dispensed with in Gattungsforschung. We now focus our attention on the function of the beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10.

The pericope Matthew 5:3-10 fills a special position within its broader context, namely Matthew 4:23-9:35 (see Van Aarde 1980b:7-10). The latter section forms a circular composition. The identical introduction (4:23) and conclusion (9:35) give an indication of the dominant content of the passage by means of three participial phrases (διδάσκων, κρύσσων, θεραπεύων). This is a didactic motif, a kerygmatic motif and a healing motif. The healing motif comes to the fore mainly in the miracle stories of chapters 8 and 9. The didactic motif features prominently in the Sermon on the Mount (chapters 5-7). The miracle stories are also punctuated by stories of Jesus' instructions. The pericope under discussion (5:3-10) forms the exordium of the Sermon on the Mount. Within this particularly prominent structural-semantic positional unit Matthew makes use of a specific Gattung, namely the beatitude. Repetition changes it into a form element of a new Gattung - the beatitude series.

The typical Sitz im Leben of the beatitude is ideally suited to the evangelist. This typical Sitz im Leben was described above as a prophecy of blessing which should be seen as an eschatological salvation kerygma. The kerygmatic quality of the beatitude series (the exordium of the Sermon on the Mount) also provides kerygmatic quality to the rest of the didactical dimension in the Sermon on the Mount. And because the didactic passages are alternated with the miracle stories (especially healings) in a broader context (of which the Sermon on the Mount is the first section) these didactic passages should also be determined kerygmatically. Consequently this is also true in respect of the alternating miracle stories. Summarized it means that the kerygmatic motif finds its place in the broader context within the beatitude series.
It has now become obvious that in the context under discussion few other Gattungen would have been more functional and effective than the beatitude, and then in the form of a series. The literary setting of the beatitude series in Matthew 5:3-10 therefore indicates that this Gattung has been applied particularly 'functional typical'.

2.6 The Gattungsgeschichte of the New Testament beatitude

The beatitude as a specific fixed Greek literary formula is not only to be found in the New Testament. In addition to the numerous examples in classic Greek (see Hauck 1942:365-366) and in Hellenistic Greek outside the New Testament (see Kahler 1976:48-50, 52-53), there are forty-six examples in the Septuagint that meet the requirements we had set for those that had been classified as a typical group in the New Testament on the basis of a formal investigation. Thirty seven of the forty six cases are a reproduction of the equivalent Hebrew ḫôḥ formula. Twenty one examples are to be found in Psalms, six in Proverbs, three in Isaiah, and one each in Deuteronomy, 1 Kings, 2 Chronicles, Trito-Isaiah, Job, Ecclesiastes and Daniel. In Romans 4:7-8 we also find a quote from the Septuagint of Ps 32:1-2. These facts lead us to believe that the New Testament beatitude, in fact, has a history. But this history should not be searched for in the literature of classic Greece or that of the Hellenistic world (Koch 1974:23); it should be searched for in the Old Testament via the Septuagint, and in the Judaic literature. The investigations done by Walter Käser (1970:225-250) as well as Waldemar Janzen (1965:215-226) in respect of the form and content of the ḫôḥ pronouncements within the Old Testament serve as an illustration of this.

However, this does not mean that the Old Testament ḫôḥ formula has to correspond with the New Testament beatitude in all respects. Käser, in fact, indicated in no uncertain terms that there was no such grammatical similarity. Grammatically the word ḫôḥ, for example, is a status constructus plural and is independent from its following nomen in respect of number, gender and mode - in contrast to its New Testament equivalent (Käser 1970:230). With regard to syntax and content there are marked similarities although the ḫôḥ formula can only in a certain sense be regarded as the prototype of the New Testament beatitude.

Syntactically Käser indicated that the word ḫôḥ generally forms the climax of the saying that follows it and is consequently emphasized. In addition Klaus Koch (1974:8) indicated that there are examples in which the word ḫôḥ figures as the logical aim of the saying (see Pr 14:21; 16:20; 29:18). (Käser asks whether these three examples from Proverbs should not rather be regarded as a stylistic peculiarity of the redactor.)
These facts correspond very closely with the New Testament beatitude. Yet this is not all; there are other important syntactic similarities. The ἀλλά formula often appears only as a single saying without embedded extensions, as is the case with the New Testament beatitude (compare Ps 34:9b ἀλλά γεννημένος ἐστὶν ἔτι μὴ τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ with Lk 14:15 Μακάριος δότις φάγεται ὑπὸ τὸν ἐμοῖ). In other cases the matrix sentence is expanded by means of a relative subordinate clause (compare Ps 94:12a ἀλλά γεννημένος ἐστὶν δς ἐὰν μὴ σκοπήσῃ ἐν ἐμοῖ, or by means of a motivating subordinate clause (compare Is 3:10 ἀλλά γεννημένος ἐστὶν ἐν ἦλθεν ὁ θεὸν with Mt 5:2b-3 ἀλλὰ γεννημένος νῦν λέγων, Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί τῷ πνεύματι, οἱ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν). (The reading in the textual apparatus of Biblia Hebraica is accepted and thus we read ἀγαθὴν instead of ἐξοικείωσιν.) Sometimes the ἀλλά formula extends over two or three stichos. It should then be assumed that the word ἀλλά appears in each of these stichos (compare Pr 3:13 γεννημένος ἐστὶν γένει τῆς Σοφίας with Rv 1:3 ἀλλά γεννημένος ἐστιν ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἁκούσμες τοῦς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τα ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμένα, ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς ἡ γεγυναί). The content range of the ἀλλά formula often reaches further than the saying in which it appears (compare Ps 41:2-4 with Mt 16:17-19). The latter two examples of the ἀλλά formula form part of the group Käser (1970:225-229) called 'bound beatitudes'. He classified all the Old Testament examples in the Septuagint as 'bound beatitudes' and 'unbound beatitudes'. He included the Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach (in which four examples of the so-called 'bound beatitudes' appear) in this classification. The frequency of the latter group is also the highest. Because the range of the 'bound beatitudes' reaches across stichos and/or cola we may accept it as a fact that the majority of the Old Testament beatitudes (including the Septuagint and Judaic literature) contain the principle of expansion within themselves.

Regarding the content aspect of the Old Testament ἀλλά formula W Käser (1970:249) came to the following conclusion:

Sie ist Verkündigung der durch Gnade geschaffenen, durch Gnade aufrechterhaltenen, durch Gnade dem eschatologischen Ziel entgegengeführten Relation zwischen Gott und Mensch im Lebensbund der Gnade; dies gilt auch und gerade von den überaus zahlreichen thorabezogenen Makarismen. Im Blick auf den gestern, heute und morgen sich treu bleibenden Herrn des Bundes ist die makarismische Verkündigung wesenhaft eschatologisch. Dass das eschatologische Ziel oft auf eine innergeschichtliche Zukunft verkürzt
The roots of the New Testament beatitude are to be found in the Old Testament. The examples of the beatitude series in the New Testament (as well as those in Sirach 25:7-11, 2 Slav En 42:6-14 and 52:1-16) probably found tangential points in the 'bound beatitudes' of the Old Testament. In this way a section of Old Testament kerygma continued into the New Testament - even though it was filled with new content.