

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 Gattungskritik*, 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

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 Acts, the Epistle, and the Apocalypse, as being part thereof in respect of the New Testament. Smaller units like the apothegm 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 reductional. 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.

P₁		P₂		P₃		P₄	pericope demarcation
S	D	S	D	S	D	S	semantic structural analysis
							pericope comparison
		P₁ S D		S D P₄			typical group
							group comparison
		S	D				<i>Gattung</i> identification

Sitz im Leben

Function → *Gattungsgeschichte*

P = Pericope

S = Surface structure = form

D = Deep structure = content

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 *Sitze 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 Aulén 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 *בְּחִרְלָת* 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 11th, 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*.

νῆτες. 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 μακάριος 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, -ια, -ιον 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 μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Rm 4:9 ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν;

Gl 4:15 ποῦ οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν;

B. Verbal form:

Lk 1:48 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί·

Ja 5:11 ἰδοὺ μακαρίζομεν τοὺς ὑπομείναντας· τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἴωβ ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος κυρίου εἶδετε, ὅτι πολὺσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ
 ὁ θεὸς ὁ κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων.

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 ὧν ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ἡγῆμαι ἑμαυτὸν μακάριον ἐπὶ σοῦ μέλλων σήμερον ἀπολογεῖσθαι,

1 Tm 1:11 κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ, ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ.

1 Tm 6:15 ἦν καιροῖς ἰδίους δείξει ὁ μακάριος καὶ μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευνόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων,

Ti 2:13 προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,

b. Adjective used predicatively:

In this grouping two types display a conspicuous difference. In the one group the μακάριος, -ια, -ιον 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 κἂν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ κἂν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὔρῃ οὕτως, μακάριοί εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι.

Jn 13:17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῇτε αὐτά.

Ac 20:35(b) μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.

Ja 1:25 ὁ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ παραμείνας, οὐκ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς ἔργου, οὗτος μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται.

1 Pt 3:14 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχετε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι, τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῇτε μηδὲ ταραχθῇτε,

1 Pt 4:14 εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.

- (ii) In respect of this grouping (where the predicative adjective μακάριος, -ια, -ιον 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, -ιον 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 *ὅτι, γάρ* or *ἵνα* 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, -ιον 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 ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας.
 Lk 11:28 Μενοῦν μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες.
 Lk 10:23 Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε.
 Jn 20:29 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι ἐώρακάς με πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες
 Rv 14:13 Καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης, Γράψον· Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἀπ' ἄρτι. ναί, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν· τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν.
 Rv 19:9 Καὶ λέγει μοι, Γράψον· Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖναι τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι καὶ λέγει μοι, Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν.
 Rv 20:6 μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ· ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἔσονται ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ {τὰ} χίλια ἔτη.

Rv 22:7 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ. μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου.

With the motivating *ἵνα* subordinate clause:

Rv 16:15 Ἴδου 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 ᾖσιν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῖς πυλῶσιν εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

With a motivating relative subordinate clause:

Mt 11:6 καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

Mt 24:46 μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἔλθων ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὕρησιν οὕτως ποιοῦντα·

Lk 7:23 μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.

Lk 12:37 μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἔλθων ὁ κύριος εὕρησιν γρηγοροῦντας·

Lk 12:43 μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἔλθων ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὕρησιν ποιοῦντα οὕτως·

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

Lk 23:29 Μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἱ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἱ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν.

Rm 4:7-8 Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογιῆται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

Rm 14:22 σὺ πίστιν {ἦν} ἔχεις κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει·

With a temporal subordinate clause or conditional *ἐάν* sentence:

Mt 5:11 μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἰπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν {ψευδόμενοι} ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ·

Lk 6:22 μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι

1 Cor 7:40 μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην, δοκῶ δὲ καγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν.

With a motivating γάρ subordinate clause:

Rv 1:3 μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς.

With a motivating ὅτι subordinate clause:

Mt 5:3 Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (Compare Mt 5:4-10 and Lk 6:20-21.)

Mt 13:16 ὕμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὅρα ὕμῶν ὅτι ἀκούουσιν.

Mt 16:17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Lk 1:45 μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα ὅτι ἔσται τελεώσις τοῖς λελαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ κυρίου.

Ja 1:12 Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πεφασμὸν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

ΣΥΜΠΕΡΑΣΜΑΤΑ

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, -ιον 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, -ιον 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, -ια, -ιον 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* 'beatitude'.

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 *gattungsgeschichtliche* 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.

(a) Lk 6:20-22; 24-26

Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
 μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν, ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε.
 μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελάσετε.
 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν
 ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς
 πονηρὸν ἔνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
 Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.
 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι πεινάσετε.
 οὐαὶ, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.
 οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ
 γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

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.

(b) Lk 11:27-28

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα ἐπάρασά τις φωνὴν γυνὴ
ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε καὶ
μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας.
αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπεν, Μενούν μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ φυλάσσοντες.

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.

(c) Lk 12:37, 38, 43

μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος εὐρήσει
γρηγοροῦντας·
κἂν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ κἂν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὖρῃ οὕτως,
μακάριοι εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι
μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει
ποιῶντα οὕτως·

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.

(d) Lk 23:29

ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσιν, Μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ
κοιλίαι αἱ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἱ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν.

It is a possibility that the word μακάριοι has to be seen as having a constituent connection with the object μαστοὶ in the deep structure with the result that we find two separate subcola in the superstructure that are dependent on ἐροῦσιν. 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 στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι 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 ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσσεται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

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 hemistichs are not taken into consideration there are two consecutive beatitudes in this section.

(f) Rv 1:3

μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς 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 a *Gattung* of own character:

In *Sirach* 25:7-11 the *Gattungsmischung* 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 (ἐμακάριζα) arising from ten types of human benediction and which at the same time imply a correct ethical life. Although the expression (μακάριος ὁ δεῖνα) 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 אֱלֹהֵינוּ and בָּרוּךְ (the equivalent of the Greek μακάριος, -ια, -ισ) 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

1975:116). 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 *Sitze 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 διδασχῆ in the early church where the *kerugma* is the preaching to the heathen of salvation in Christ, and the διδασχῆ 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 διδασχῆ. To Jeremias the *Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche* of the Sermon on the Mount is to be found in the catechetical 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 catechetical 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, κηρύσσων, 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 Kähler 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 אֲשֶׁר־ 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 אֲשֶׁר־ pronouncements within the Old Testament serve as an illustration of this.

However, this does not mean that the Old Testament אֲשֶׁר־ 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 אֲשֶׁר־, 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 אֲשֶׁר־ formula can only in a certain sense be regarded as the prototype of the New Testament beatitude.

Syntactically Käser indicated that the word אֲשֶׁר־ 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 אֲשֶׁר־ 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 **אֲשֶׁר** formula often appears only as a single saying without embedded extensions, as is the case with the New Testament beatitude (compare Ps 34:9b **אֲשֶׁר הִגְבִּיר יְיָ יִסְתַּחֲבֹד** with Lk 14:15 Μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ). In other cases the matrix sentence is expanded by means of a relative subordinate clause (compare Ps 94:12a **אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּנּוּ אֲשֶׁר הִגְבִּיר יְיָ יִסְתַּחֲבֹד** with Mt 11:6 μακάριος ἐστὶν ὃς ἐάν μὴ σκαυδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί), or by means of a motivating subordinate clause (compare Is 3:10 **אֲמָרוּ צְדִיק בִּישָׁעִי כִּיפְרִי טַעֲלִיחִם יֵאָכְלוּ** with Mt 5:2b-3 ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων, Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν). (The reading in the textual apparatus of *Biblia Hebraica* is accepted and thus we read **בִּישָׁעִי** instead of **כִּיטֹב**.) Sometimes the **אֲשֶׁר** formula extends over two or three stichos. It should then be assumed that the word **אֲשֶׁר** appears in each of these stichos (compare Pr 3:13 **אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי חָצָא וְיָפִיק חֲבוּנָה** with Rv 1:3 μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς). The content range of the **אֲשֶׁר** 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 **אֲשֶׁר** 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 **אֲשֶׁר** 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 treubleibenden Herrn des Bundes ist die makarismische Verkündigung wesentlich eschatologisch. Dass das eschatologische Ziel oft auf eine innergeschichtliche Zukunft verkürzt

erscheint - eine Beobachtung, die der ntl. Seligpreisung fremd ist - spricht noch einmal dafür dass der Gott dieses Bundes (und also dieser Relation) der Herr aller Geschichte ist. Im Blick auf ihn ist die Existenz des Menschen in dieser Relation (der ntl. Seligpreisung wiederum so gut wie unbekannt) als die des vom Gesetz Jahwes umhегten Lebens beschrieben. Die drei für den alt. Makarismus wesentlichen Momente der Relation, der eschatologischen Orientierung und der Verknüpfung des Heilszuspruches in die Thora als der Form des Lebens aus Jahwe lassen sich mehr oder minder ausgeprägt. Darin aber klingen die makarismischen Zeugnisse des AT und NT in eins zusammen: *Seligpreisung ist Lobpreis der heilschaffenden Gnade Gottes am erwählten Menschen.*

(Käser 1970:249; his emphasis)

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.