

Revisiting the Sermon on the Mount: Some Major Issues

Andrie B. du Toit
Research Fellow, University of Pretoria

Abstract

Without disregarding the value of a diachronic approach, priority is given to a synchronic understanding of the Sermon on the Mount in its present form. Emphasis on diachronics, or even a shuttling between the diachronic and the synchronic, tends to cloud the holistic message that the Sermon was intended to convey to its real-world Syriac audience. The situation of that audience and its bearing on the content of the Sermon on the Mount are discussed. Compositional and thematic aspects of the Sermon are highlighted, such as its position within the macro-structure of Matthew, the author's predilection for triads, the inner structure and theme of the Sermon. It is proposed that the basic theme of the Sermon on the Mount is the very special identity of Jesus's end-time community and that its main purpose is the shaping and affirming of that identity. Contrary to the normal view that there are presently nine beatitudes, stylistic as well as contentual considerations indicate that the so-called ninth beatitude is in reality an actualising and personalising amplification of the eighth. Aspects of the antitheses such as their significance, the Jesus of the antitheses, and, finally, the Lord's Prayer also receive attention.¹

Key Terms

Sermon on the Mount; Gospel of Matthew; synchronic; diachronic; audience; macro-structure; inner structure; theme; identity; identity shaping; beatitudes; antitheses; Lord's Prayer

¹ In honour of my much appreciated former student, fellow colleague and abiding friend, Prof. Jan van der Watt, presently professor at the Special Faculty of Theology, Radboud University, Nijmegen.

1 Introduction

The Sermon on the Mount is undoubtedly the most well-known, celebrated and provocative speech in human history. No other famous oration posed a more thoroughgoing challenge to every generation, its religious life, its politics, its everyday ethos. It is a direct onslaught on the selfishness, the self-indulgence, the hypocrisy of people, societies and nations; it challenges our lethargy, our timid hesitancy to break out of our comfort zones and to fully accept the cost of discipleship. Many attempts have been made to whittle down its challenge, but it will invariably re-emerge, expose and inspire. The editors of a volume on the history of the Sermon on the Mount describe it as “a majestic river giving life to new crops everywhere it goes” (Larsen 2007, 13). However, this does not by any means imply that all interpretational problems and differences have been solved. This article² will address a few of these.³

“Sermon on the Mount” (henceforth SM) is in two respects a misnomer. In the first place, the verb διδάσκειν is used to introduce Jesus’s words, and the scene pictured is that of a teacher instructing his pupils (5:1–2). In his conclusion, the evangelist repeats the same verb (7:29) and depicts Jesus’s discourse as διδασχῆ (7:28), thereby categorising it, not as a sermon, but as a means of teaching or instruction. In the second place, “sermon” suggests that we have before us a cohesive unit that was *in toto* delivered at a single historical situation, which was evidently not the case. A comparison with the two other Synoptic Gospels Mark and Luke, but predominantly with the latter, indicates that Matthew brought together sayings of Jesus from different contexts. Already Calvin observed this, stating that instead of aiming at historical preciseness, Matthew wanted to present his readers with “a brief summary of the doctrine of Christ . . . collected out of his many and various discourses” (Calvin [1845] 1993, 259; my italics). This basic insight has proven to be correct. A significant

² The term “revisiting” includes also a personal note; cf. Du Toit (1966, 1967, 1977). Since these articles, more recent methodological approaches such as redaction criticism and reception criticism became well established and many publications raising new questions, offering new solutions or re-addressing old problems came to the fore. “Revisiting” therefore implied that these developments had to be addressed. At the same time, a long period of busying myself with the SM brought new insights.

³ Already in 1987 Guelich spoke of the “sea of literature on the Sermon” (1987, 117). I shall not even try to skim that “sea” here—but see the still valuable first orientations of Guelich (1987) and Carter (1994). In his magisterial commentary on Matthew, Luz provides us with a mass of relevant literature (2002 vol. 1).

part of the material in the SM has parallels in various contexts in Luke and to a much lesser extent in Mark (cf., e.g., Guelich 1982, 33–36). Therefore, the SM is neither a sermon and nor were its contents delivered at a single occasion. However, it may contain a historical kernel, augmented by traditional material from other contexts such as Q.

Particularly in the latter half of the previous century, diachronic studies such as source, tradition and redaction criticism, aided by composition criticism, attempted to retrace the developmental history of the SM. Ulrich Luz, for example, gave constant attention to this exercise (2002, 251–553). The results of these diachronic investigations served mainly to provide us with important insights into the genesis of the SM, the redactional tendencies of Matthew and a better understanding of some details of the SM. As to the larger picture, the yield is unfortunately in many respects tentative and open to conjecture.⁴ Our available sources and scientific tools are simply inadequate to perform a satisfactory and convincing historical reconstruction. From a heuristic perspective, in the sense of assisting us to determine and understand Matthew's message, the diachronic approach certainly has some value, for example, in instances where Matthean redaction is clearly evident. However, in my opinion, for the understanding of Matthew's mind and his message for his late first century audience/readers, a synchronic analysis of the Matthean text, as presented to us in its present (text-critically scrutinised) form, deserves priority. A primary diachronic approach, or even a shuttling between the diachronic and the synchronic, all too easily obscures and distorts the coherence, the holistic message and the overall impact of the SM—Jesus reassuring and calling, through the agency of Matthew, his new, end-time community to exemplify, through their lives, what true discipleship entails.

In this article, I will first give attention to the *Sitz im Leben* of the real-world first audience of the SM and its bearing on the content of the Sermon as we have it before us. Secondly, compositional and thematic considerations with regard to the SM will receive attention, focusing mainly on the position of the SM within the macro-structure of Matthew and the inner structure and theme of the SM. Thereupon the beatitudes follow with observations regarding their number and the highly disputed issue of the indicative versus the imperative. Following that, I shall discuss

⁴ See, e.g., the criticism of aspects of the reconstruction of Betz (1995) by David Catchpole (1998, 219–225).

the structure and significance of the antitheses, as well as the Jesus of the antitheses. Finally, attention will be given to the position of the prayer section within Matt 6:1–18 and the number of the so-called “we” prayers.

2 The Audience of the Sermon on the Mount and Its Bearing on the Sermon’s Content

The intra-textual audience of the SM can be envisaged as two concentric circles: The disciples in the inner circle, sitting as pupils at the feet of their teacher (5:1–2) and the crowds (οἱ ὄχλοι) in the outer one (5:1; 7:28–29). For Guelich, the latter are, in Matthew, a “neutral chorus with little or no theological significance” (1982, 59). Luz, on the other hand, depicts them as the potential church (2002, 247 n. 15). What we can say with confidence is that they function throughout as interested, sympathetic⁵ but still uncommitted role-players (7:28–29; 9:33; 12:23 etc.). These two groups constitute, as it were, the two audiences “inside” the text. There was, however, a third one, the real-world audience “outside” the text, those for whom Matthew wrote his gospel in the first place.⁶ Indications are that this real-world audience or readership consisted primarily of Christians living in Galilee, or, more probably, in Syria,⁷ particularly in and around Antioch, its famous and populous capital (e.g., Kümmel 1973, 90; Gundry 1982, 609; Luz 2002, 100–103; Ehrman 2000, 102). According to Kraeling, the total population of Antioch probably approached 500 000 in the period of the empire and “a figure approximating 65 000 of Jewish residents will need to be kept in view” (1932, 136). This figure may be too high (Meeks and Wilken 1974, 8; Meier 1983, 31). Meeks and Wilken (*ibid.*) reckon with a figure of 22 000 in the time of Augustus; if we apply Kraeling’s growth factor for the period of the empire, the number of

⁵ Matt 27:20–26 is the only exception; but there they are prevailed upon by Jewish leaders.

⁶ In a sense the differentiation between those “inside” and those “outside” the text is relative, since the disciples represent the real-world church and the crowds real-world outsiders.

⁷ It is significant that Syria is specifically mentioned in Matt 4:24, the only instance in the gospels. For other arguments in favour of Syria and Antioch, see esp. Luz (2002, 101–103). In view of Matt 28:19–20, Matthew may even have had a wider audience in mind, which in fact fairly soon became a reality.

Jewish residents in Antioch would have increased to close to 32 000, which is still an impressive number.⁸

The book of Acts tells us of a young and energetic community of first generation Christ-believers in that city (Acts 11:19–30; 13:1–4; 14:26–28). Was this youthful vibrancy still characteristic of the Christians in Syria when Matthew wrote his gospel? In the light of our knowledge of the tensions between church and synagogue in the late first century, as well as certain indications that we can extrapolate from the Gospel of Matthew itself, the situation seems to have changed considerably. These Syrian Christians, a substantial part of whom would have been Jewish Christ-believers,⁹ found themselves in a difficult transitional period. The final separation between synagogue and church was imminent or, more probably, already a reality.¹⁰ In the heated animosity between Jews, and particularly Jewish Christians, certain critical issues came to the fore, some of which would have had a bearing on the message of the SM. The following may have been the most prominent:

(1) The Christian belief in the unique position of Jesus, *inter alia* as the Messiah and the Son of God, would have been in the centre of the conflict.¹¹ Under Jewish pressure some Jewish Christians may have

⁸ In his fascinating study of the history of the Jews in Antioch, Kraeling (1932, 153–154) refers to the lively interaction between the Jews of Antioch and kindred groups in Palestine. It is not inconceivable that Matthew also had some Palestinian Christians in mind.

⁹ It is uncertain whether the Ἑλληνισταί of Acts 11:20 were Greek-speaking Jews or non-Jewish Greeks. Acts 6:1 and 9:29 point towards the former, but even the latter possibility would not militate against a strong Jewish-Christian presence in Antioch. Of those from a gentile background a substantial number would have been former God-fearers. As such Matthew's focus on the OT roots of the Christian message would have appealed to them as well.

¹⁰ This would be the obvious understanding of the references to “their” or “your” synagogues (4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54 and 23:34). The synagogue is depicted as already an alien institution; cf. esp. Stanton (1992, 113–131). Also Matthew's severe denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees as ὑποκριταί (23:15–29; cf. also 5:20; 6:2, 5, 16; 15:7; 22:18) fits in better within this period and the specific *Sitz im Leben* of Matthew, because this was the stage in Jewish history when these two closely associated groups, “the proponents of that form of Judaism which became normative in Jewry” (Hare 1967, 94), became dominant. As is well-known, Davies even regarded Matthew as a Christian response to Jamnia (1964, 304–315); but this direct linking is improbable; see, e.g., Talbert (2004, 23).

¹¹ Hare (1967, 18) claimed that in most instances the christological factor was only *one* of several which caused Jewish antagonism. However, it cannot be doubted that the christological claim of the early Christians was the *root* cause of the conflict. All other

wavered, particularly in the period after the Birkat ha-Minim which effectively excluded them from taking part in synagogical activities. Was Jesus indeed the fulfilment of the messianic expectations of Israel? In response to this Matthew set out to confirm to these Christians the trustworthiness of their faith in the exalted position of Jesus. In his opening chapters he confirmed that Jesus was the Messiah, the God-with-us, the fulfilment of the OT prophecies (Matt 1–2).¹² In Jesus's baptism and temptation his Sonship comes to the fore (3:17; 4:3, 6). This high Christology is affirmed throughout Matthew.¹³ In the SM these and other christological titles are less prominent; nevertheless, Jesus is portrayed as the Second Moses, as the Lord of the incipient church whose authority absolutely transcends that of the great and venerated lawgiver of Israel (cf. esp. the antitheses, Matt 5:21–48).

(2) Concomitant with the conflict about the identity of Jesus was the need for affirmation of the religious identity of these Christians, particularly vis-à-vis their non-Christian Jewish contemporaries. As long as they were still tolerated within the synagogue and could therefore still regard themselves as being part of the multi-faceted Jewish family, their specific identity was less critically questioned. Now it was under the full spotlight. Christians, particularly those in a strong Jewish environment as in Antioch, were forced to rethink their own position vis-à-vis the historical Israel. What constituted their different identity; what were their decisive identity markers; what was their mission in the world; what *ethos* was expected of them? I would contend that the SM was intended to provide at least some answers in this regard.

(3) A strong bone of contention in Jewish-oriented minds would have been whether the OT law was still normative for Christians and, if so, in what sense? Already in the early period of the Jesus movement there were questions about issues so central to Jewish orthopraxis as observance of the Sabbath, purity laws, circumcision and the importance of the temple. However, obedience to the law was the most critical point. There can be little doubt that the strong affirmations of Matt 5:17–20 presuppose

factors, whether theological, sociological or ethnic (Israel-centrism) that contributed towards the eventual parting of the ways, emanated from this fundamental claim. Hare in fact seems to contradict himself when he states elsewhere (1967, 5) that it was “the insistent emphasis upon the *centrality* of Jesus that excited intolerance.”

¹² It stands to reason that his report about the miraculous conception of Jesus (1:18–25) was intended to counter defamation from Jewish side.

¹³ See the well-balanced overview of Combrink (1983b, 79–87).

Jewish criticism in this regard and that the Matthean Jesus responds to it in the strongest terms. He did not come to abolish the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them. Till heaven and earth pass away, every iota and dot of the law will stand (5:17–18). Instead of relaxing the commandments, Jesus expects of his followers a righteousness that exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees (5:20) and then spells out, in the rest of the SM, the life ethos which he expects of them.

However there may be more to it: We get from Matthew the impression that his audience had to be strongly reminded of the necessity to *live* their faith. Their problem was typical of Christian groups of the late first century, that is second and third generation Christians, namely uncertainty about certain aspects of their faith (e.g., the parousia)¹⁴ and particularly spiritual fatigue and lethargy (cf. Luz 2002, 99–100).¹⁵ Hence, Matthew's strong emphasis on practising righteousness (3:15; 5:6, 10, 19–20; 6:33) and bearing fruit (3:8, 10; 7:16–20; 12:33 etc.).

(4) It is difficult to extract from our NT documents the exact historical details about Jewish persecution of Christians in the period around the insertion of the Birkat ha-Minim in the Shemoneh 'Esreh. The rabbinic sources are even less helpful, but the insertion as such was already an indication of increased tension. As is to be expected from the heated climate at that stage, it was only natural that Matthew's audience had to reckon with the possibility of persecution and defamation by Jewish antagonists. It is significant that Matthew particularly singles out the Pharisees and the scribes (who were mostly associated with them) that are the two groups who gained the upper hand in the post Birkat ha-Minim period and were the ardent adversaries of Jewish Christians. Hare (1967, 80–96) has shown convincingly how, in Matt 23, the Matthean redaction intensifies the anti-Pharisaism already present in Q and associates the Pharisees and scribes with the persecution of Christians in the synagogues. Also in Matt 10:16–33 the references and allusions to the persecution of Christians by members of the synagogue are prominent (Hare 1967, 96–114). The persecution theme receives special attention in the beatitudes (Matt 5:10–12). Matthew disrupts the stylistic scheme of the foregoing beatitudes, enhances the persecution theme significantly and changes the third person address of the previous beatitudes to a personal “you.” There would have been an important reason for this: the reality of various forms

¹⁴ 2 Pet 3:8–13.

¹⁵ The writer of Hebrews speaks of the “drooping hands” and the “weak knees” (12:12).

of persecution or, at least, the expectancy of imminent reprisals. The audience of Matthew was in need of pastoral encouragement¹⁶ and that is exactly what Matt 5:10–12 had in view. The nascent church of the SM, consisting of Jesus’s first followers, served as a window through which those later Christians could see themselves.

3 Compositional and Thematic Considerations

3.1 *The Sermon on the Mount within the macro-structure of Matthew*

No one less than W. D. Davies (1964, 14) spoke of the “architectonic grandeur” of Matthew. After studying the composition of Matthew, Peter Ellis declared “one gets the feeling the author put together his gospel with the precision of a Swiss watch” (1974, 27). That would be somewhat of an overstatement,¹⁷ but we cannot but admire Matthew’s compositional style, be it in typical Semitic fashion.

Bacon’s well-known division of Matthew in five “books” (1930, 81–82), counterparting the five books of Moses, as well as the threefold division by Kingsbury (1973) did not receive substantial support. More widely accepted is the macro-structural view, first proposed by Lohr, that Matthew was arranged as a ring-composition.¹⁸ Its subdivisions revolve in symmetrical pairs around chapter 13, narratives regularly alternating with discourses. It can be illustrated as follows:

¹⁶ Hare (1967, 106) was of opinion that Matthew viewed Jewish persecution of Jesus followers as a past experience, but in view of the religious climate before and particularly in the period after the Birkat ha-Minim, the evangelist’s prominent attention to the persecution theme, and particularly 5:10–12, that was hardly the case. Hare also insists (1967, *passim*) that persecution was almost invariably directed at Christian missionaries. This may primarily have been the case, but to differentiate so clinically between the persecution of Christian missionaries and rank and file Christians is questionable. Matt 5:10–12, at any rate, does not make such a distinction. Defamation would have affected Christian communities as a whole.

¹⁷ See n. 51 below.

¹⁸ Lohr (1961, 427); Fenton (1963, 15–17); also Ellis (1974, 12–13); Combrink (1982, 2–3; 1983b, 75–78). In favour of this chiasmic structuring, VanderWeele (2008, 671–673) points out that three structural triads are present in chs. 8–9 as well as in chs. 21–22, thus strengthening the case for chiasmic correspondence. He concludes: “Perhaps Lohr was right” (2008, 673). However, for a modified concentric pattern based on the development of the narrative, see Combrink (1982, 11–19; 1983a, 69–72).

<u>Chapters</u>	<u>Contents</u>	
1–4	Narrative	
5–7	Discourse	
8–9	Narrative	
10	Discourse	
11–12	Narrative	
13	Discourse	
14–17	Narrative	
18	Discourse	
19–22	Narrative	
23–25	Discourse	
26–28	Narrative	

Particularly important to us are the five major discourses. With the discourse in Matt 13 in the centre, the first two (5–7 and 10) balance the last two (18 and 23–25). Remarkably, even the content of these symmetrically arranged discourses more than once balance each other. For instance, the beatitudes at the beginning of the first discourse (Matt 5–7), are counter-balanced by the woes at the start of the final discourse (Matt 23–25).¹⁹ Matthew’s compositional acumen is still further illustrated by the deft way in which he marks the end of each of these five discourses with a similar wording. Matthew 7:28, for instance, concludes the SM with the formulation: “When Jesus had finished these words.” Almost identical wordings occur at the conclusion of each of the other four speeches (11:1; 13:53; 19:1 and 26:1).

The crucial importance of the SM, being, as it were, the inaugural address of the Matthean Jesus, is not only reflected by its primary position, but also by the very special way in which the evangelist framed it within the broader context of his gospel. In Matt 4:23 he characterised Jesus’s public ministry as consisting of *teaching, proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom and healing*. However, proclaiming the gospel is not a separate item alongside teaching and healing; it most probably is intended as embracing and summarising these. Put differently, Jesus’s proclamation of the kingdom consisted of two facets: teaching and healing.

¹⁹ The task of the disciples towards those *outside* their community (ch. 10) balances with their task towards those *within* (ch. 18). Typical of this ring-like technique is how the Immanuel quotation in 1:22–23 is counterbalanced by Jesus’s parting assurance, “I am with you always” (28:20); see Fenton (1963, 16).

Julius Schniewind (1968, 8, 36) identified this arrangement as programmatic: Matt 5–7 presents us with the *teaching* of Jesus and Matt 8–9 reflects primarily his *healings*. The Jesus of Matthew is the messianic King, the Son of God, in *word* (5–7) and in *deed* (8–9). And then, in 9:35, in a perfect ring composition, and a wording which is almost identical to that of 4:23, Matthew neatly concludes his portrayal of Jesus as the great Teacher and Healer.²⁰

3.2 *The beginning and ending of the Sermon on the Mount*

Dale Allison (1987, 429–430) strongly advocates the view that Matt 4:23–5:2 is in fact the introduction to the SM and 7:28–8:1 its conclusion—the Sermon as such being “sandwiched” between these two passages. To prove his point he identifies several commonalities between them which, in his view, would indicate a *conclusio*:

<u>4:23–5:2</u>	<u>7:28–8:1</u>
“great crowds followed him” (4:25)	“great crowds followed him” (8:1)
the crowds (5:1)	the crowds (7:28)
the mountain (5:1)	the mountain (8:1)
“going up” (5:1)	“going down” (8:1)
“teaching” (5:2)	“teaching” (7:28)

These correspondences are indeed striking, but Allison reads too much into them. Mere surface correspondence does not necessarily constitute a meaningful stylistic creation. In addition, the contents of 4:23–25 and of 8:1 clearly demarcate them from the SM as such. Contrary to Allison,²¹ 4:23–25 should be seen as a background setting to the SM, preparing for the actual introduction in 5:1–2. Regarding the conclusion of the SM, it has often been pointed out that Matthew distinctly marks the ending of each of his five major speeches with a *τελεῖν* formula, as is the case in 7:28–29. At the same time, 7:28–29 concludes the SM on a high note, while 8:1 forms a fitting prelude to the following healing narrative (8:2–4).

²⁰ See also Kürzinger (1959, 583); Du Toit (1977, 35–36); Luz (2002, 244).

²¹ Likewise also Grundmann (1968, 111).

3.3 *Matthew's predilection for triads*

Matthew's predilection for triads, highlighted *inter alia* by Kürzinger (1959, 572–574), is quite obvious. Even when one resists the temptation to find triads everywhere, it is clear that they abound, from the threefold arrangement of Jesus's genealogy at the outset of his gospel (1:1–17) to the triadic Great Commission at its conclusion (28:19–20). This is also the case in the SM.

Stassen (2003) comes to the ambitious conclusion that Matt 5:21–7:12 contains fourteen carefully composed triads. However, apart from some important observations, which may be further explored, his overall scheme is too belaboured to be convincing. A stylistic pattern should not need so much explanation. In scrutinising Stassen's procedure, Thom rightly concludes that Stassen not only artificially tries to put the SM "into a straightjacket formed by an ethical schema" but also ignores the dyadic and tetradic patterns occurring in it (2006, 291, 293–300). I shall limit myself to Stassen's analysis of the six so-called antitheses (Matt 5:21–48) each of which, according to him, contains a piece of "traditional piety," a "vicious cycle" and a "transforming initiative" (Stassen 2003, 270–282). In order to understand Stassen's argument it would be helpful to use his division of the first antithesis (5:21–26) as an example. Matthew 5:21 contains the so-called "traditional piety." Then follow three "vicious cycles," namely, being angry, uttering ῥακά and μωπέ (5:22), and finally the "transforming initiatives that deliver from the vicious cycles" (5:23–26; see Stassen 2003, 272–273). I cannot discuss Stassen's proposal in detail here. Three observations must suffice:

(1) His identification of three such elements in each of these six passages is extremely difficult to follow and much too artificial. The almost universally accepted dyadic division of these logia in a "thesis," citing a command derived from the OT, and an "antithesis"²² which contains Jesus's reaction, is much more self-evident.

(2) Stassen takes great pains explaining the absence of a "transforming initiative" in the section on divorce (5:31–32) without providing a really convincing explanation.

(3) In the final passage (5:43–48), he is forced to suggest that the second and third elements have been switched, but that does not really

²² These two terms are not really apposite, but they have become part of our exegetical jargon.

solve the problem since 5:48 would fit in better with his “transforming initiative.”²³

Although we cannot agree with Stassen’s complex overall pattern, the SM contains many obvious examples of Matthew’s tendency to arrange his material triadically. It should, however, be kept in mind that findings will differ due to divergent interpretations of the Matthean material.²⁴ Obvious triads would be such as the 2x3 grouping of the six antitheses in 5:21–48,²⁵ including the triad of being angry with a brother, calling him “*raka*,” or addressing him as a “fool” in the first antithesis (5:22). In Matt 6:5–18 we have a triad consisting of three forms of religious activity: almsgiving (6:2–4), prayer (6:5–15) and fasting (6:16–18). It is not difficult to identify a minor triad in 6:5 (praying to be seen), 6:6 (praying in private) and 6:7–8 (praying soberly). These sections are bound together by parallel combinations around προσεύχεσθαι. In 6:5, a circumstantial ὅταν is followed by προσεύχησθε, upon which follows a prohibition and a negative comparison (with the “hypocrites”). In 6:6, we once again find a circumstantial ὅταν followed this time by the singular προσεύχη and a positive injunction. In 6:7, ὅταν προσεύχησθε is replaced by προσευχόμενοι which denotes semantically exactly the same²⁶—as confirmed by all English translations (cf. also Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf 1975, §418 5b). As in 6:5, a prohibition and a negative comparison (this time with the “heathen”) follow. Without doubt we have here a carefully composed triad.²⁷

Coming to the inner space of the Lord’s Prayer, the triadic arrangement of the “you” petitions is obvious. Later on I shall argue that Matt 6:11–13 also contains three “we” petitions. If this is correct, we have within the prayer section, which forms the centre of the already triadic Matt 6:2–18, three smaller triads, one in 6:5–8 and two within the Our Father!²⁸

²³ For a more detailed critique of Stassen’s position, see Thom (2006, 293–300).

²⁴ Since subjectivity is an imminent danger, I limit myself deliberately to the more obvious examples. The literature on the SM teems with often ambitious and very subjective attempts to find more and more complex examples of triadic arrangements.

²⁵ *Vide infra*.

²⁶ This change may be due to the need for stylistic variation.

²⁷ The introduction to the Lord’s Prayer (οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς [6:9]), although repeating προσεύχεσθαι, differs structurally from those in the previous triad, thereby not forming a quartet. However, contentually it could illustrate the flip side to the wordy prayers of the heathen (6:7–8).

²⁸ See also 6:31: Eating, drinking, wearing.

In chapter 7, the triadic scheme is less prominent but not absent, as indicated by the asking, seeking, knocking triad in 7:7–8, the double triadic descriptions of the two gates/roads in 7:13–14 and that of the floods, wind and rain in 7:25, 27.

3.4 *The inner structure and theme of the Sermon on the Mount*

The SM starts with a solemn introduction in 5:1–2 that pictures Jesus as the Second Moses ascending the mountain, thereupon sitting down to deliver his “inauguration” speech and concluding in 7:28–29 with the profound impression it made on the audience.

With reference to the contents of the Sermon as such (5:3–7:27) or some major parts of it, I shall single out a few of the more prominent positions.

3.4.1 The proposal of W. D. Davies

In his well-known work on the (Jewish oriented) setting of the SM, Davies endeavoured to show that the SM is to be regarded as “a kind of Christian, mishnaic counterpart” to the formulations of Jamnia (1964, 315). Within this context he proposed that Matt 5:17–7:12 should be subdivided into three blocks, namely, 5:17–48; 6:1–18 and 6:19–7:12—these three roughly corresponding to the Jamnian re-interpretation of the three “pillars” sustaining the world: Matt 5:17–48 dealing with the Torah of Jesus, 6:1–16 with the true worship and 6:19–7:12 with the true piety (1964, 307).²⁹ Ingenious and impressive as this proposal is, Davies had to perform too much logical footwork³⁰ to make the correspondence between 5:17–7:12 and the “three pillars” fully convincing.

3.4.2 Proposals favouring the Lord’s Prayer as a structural determiner

Walter Grundmann proposed the interesting thesis that the Lord’s Prayer constitutes the theological centre of the SM and provides the key towards its understanding (1968, 204–206). According to him, the part of the SM preceding the Our Father leads towards its three “you” petitions and the part of the SM following on it unfolds the “we” petitions. Eduard Schweizer (1973, 130)—although somewhat cautiously—expressed the

²⁹ Basically Ellis (1974, 37) agrees with this.

³⁰ As indicated by the assumptions and arduous explanations he is forced to make (Davies 1964, 305–315). Noteworthy enough, as a scholar of great integrity he states that his venture was, although “not a leap in the dark,” nevertheless one “into the twilight of available sources” (ibid., 315).

same conviction. However, as Günther Bornkamm correctly pointed out (1978, 430–431), this proposition is without solid support from the relevant texts.

Bornkamm in turn (1978, 424–431), endorsed by Guelich (1982, 324–325), visualised a much more limited structural role for the Lord’s Prayer within the SM. He sought to identify the Lord’s Prayer as providing the organising principle for the basic ordering of 6:19–7:12,³¹ but his position is also open to criticism. Allison (1987, 426) shows, for instance, that the correlation that Bornkamm found between the three “you petitions” of the Lord’s Prayer and 6:19–24, dealing with the treasure in heaven, the sound eye and God and Mammon, is too general to be persuasive.³² And Lambrecht (1985, 164) rightly complains that 7:6, which deals with how Jesus’s disciples should handle what is holy and precious, could hardly be a comment on “lead us not into temptation.”

In his impressive commentary on Matthew, Ulrich Luz also proposes that the Lord’s Prayer is in fact the central text of the SM (2002, 253–255, 416). In his impressive presentation of the structure of the SM (2002, 254) the Sermon as a whole revolves around the prayer section. His argument is appealing. It would indeed be appreciated by Christians of every conviction if Matthew wanted to indicate, by means of his composition, that the SM revolves around the prayer motif, more specifically around the Lord’s Prayer. They would also gladly agree that the maxims of the SM can only be fulfilled when based on prayer. However, there are serious questions around the specific *structural ordering* of the SM around the prayer section. In Luz’s structuring of the SM (2002, 254), the obvious breaks between certain sections of the SM and the natural cohesion between others are more than once sacrificed at the cost of his proposition. The beatitudes are, for example, grouped together with Matt 5:13–16,³³ and the unit thus created is itemised as “the introduction” to the SM. In this way the contentual break between the beatitudes and the important section regarding the mission of the Jesus followers (5:13–16) is blurred. Worse, the importantly foregrounded beatitudes, depicting the eschatological blessedness of the poor in spirit etcetera, are downgraded as belonging merely to an introduction, while the

³¹ He divides the SM into three parts, the second of which (= B) consisting of 6:1–7:12. However, it is not clear how he saw the position of the logia preceding the Lord’s Prayer within section B.

³² Cf. further Allison (1987, 425–428).

³³ Being balanced by the “conclusion” in 7:13–27.

real main section of the SM begins with 5:17. To give another example: In order to create a balance between 6:1–6 and 6:16–18, Matt 6:5–6, which deals with the practice of prayer, is illogically severed from its broader prayer context and added to 6:1–4 which deals with almsgiving.

3.4.3 Righteousness as the decisive structural determiner

It is widely accepted that the SM can be subsumed under the theme of righteousness, more specifically the “surpassing righteousness,” and that the SM revolves structurally around this theme. According to Matthew’s composition, Jesus precedes his actual ethical instructions, which begin at 5:21, with the solemn statement: “For I tell you, unless your *righteousness surpasses* that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven” (Matt 5:20). Not only does the righteousness theme occur five times in the SM, it almost invariably occupies an important, if not prominent, position (5:6, 10, but particularly 5:20; 6:1, 33). Especially noteworthy and indicative of the importance of righteousness for Matthew is his somewhat awkward addition of the phrase “and its righteousness” to “the kingdom of God” in 6:33.³⁴ Many are therefore rightly of the opinion that righteousness, and more specifically the “surpassing/greater righteousness,” as expressed in 5:20, is the heart and dominant theme of the SM. Two of its strong champions are Robert Guelich (1982, 38–39) and Jack Kingsbury (1987, 136–137).³⁵ Taking the greater righteousness as cue, Kingsbury subdivides the SM as follows:

- 5:3–16: Introduction: On those who practise the greater righteousness
- 5:17–48: On practising the greater righteousness toward the neighbour
- 6:1–18: On practising the greater righteousness before God
- 6:19–7:12: On practising the greater righteousness in other areas of life
- 7:13–27: Injunctions on practising the greater righteousness.

Many variations of this basic theme are offered. I have no hesitation to agree that this approach presents a comparatively fair formulation of the theme and the structure of the *major* part of the SM. However, would that be the most acceptable formulation? Three considerations come to the fore:

³⁴ This is clearly a Matthean addition to Q (Luz 2002, 473 n. 3). For Matthew the kingdom of God and righteousness belong intrinsically together.

³⁵ See further i.a. Strecker (1970, 264–273); Betz (1995, 130); Viljoen (2013).

- Firstly, there is a clear tendency in the δικαιοσύνη approach to downgrade Matt 5:3–16, in the interest of this scheme, to a mere introduction, in contrast to the so-called “main section” which revolves around righteousness as is evident, for example, in the case of Kingsbury. Betz (1995, 48–49) aptly remarks that “any compositional proposal, even if focusing on an individual passage, must explain the composition of the whole of the SM.” He could have added that any proposal that assigns a secondary place to prominent individual passages in favour of a preconceived scheme has certain definite weaknesses. Why did Matthew foreground both 5:3–12 and 5:13–16 in the first place? Were they really so inconsequential to him?
- Secondly, whereas Matt 5:13–16 could, although with some difficulty, be understood as having an introductory function, it is never explained in what sense the beatitudes could be seen as merely an introduction to the “main section” of the SM.
- Thirdly, is it legitimate to simply ignore the clear break between 5:12 and 5:13?

The obvious answer to all these questions is that the beatitudes, as well as the metaphoric statements in 5:13–16, which so strikingly depict the mission of the Christ followers within the world, are not merely introductory to the “real” substance of the SM; they are so important within the overall structure of the SM that they should be reflected accordingly. Without denying the aptness of the righteousness theme for the major part of the SM,³⁶ it could therefore be asked whether we could not approach the SM from an even more fundamental, inclusive and functional dimension that would also include the δικαιοσύνη aspect.

3.4.4 Identity shaping and affirmation as thematic and structural key

The notion of identity formation could help us to find a thematic and structural key towards understanding the SM.³⁷ This theme is not always

³⁶ It is true that “righteousness” also occurs in the beatitudes, viz. in 5:6, 10, but there it does not function in the sense of an ethical requirement, but as an eschatological *desideratum* or *bonum*. Betz (1995, 131) rightly describes it in 5:6 as a divine “gift.”

³⁷ Matthew does this by reminding his audience of who they *are* and what they *should be* as Christians. This is not the first endeavour to approach the SM from this angle. In this regard two pioneering publications deserve mentioning: Already in 2004 Charles Talbert focused on what he called character formation and decision making in the SM (his accent fell mainly on the first). Nine years later Francois Viljoen (2013) dealt with the SM in terms of identity formation, focusing on it through the lens of righteousness.

equally apparent on the surface of the SM, but it functions throughout in its deep structure. Whereas the first four chapters of Matthew highlight the identity of Jesus as the messianic King (1:1–17; 2:1–12), the Immanuel (1:23), the Saviour (2:21), the Son of God (2:15; 3:17; 4:3, 6), in the SM the spotlight focuses on the very special identity of the Jesus community, shaping and affirming it.³⁸

Identity issues are quite obvious in the beatitudes where the character and attitude of the Jesus people are spelled out. They are the “poor in spirit” (5:3) of the final chapters of Isaiah (Guelich 1976, 427), the heirs of the eschatological kingdom of God that is dawning in the presence of Jesus (5:3). Their special qualities are further outlined in the remaining beatitudes. They are the mourning ones (5:4). Like Jesus, they are the meek (5:5; cf. 11:29). They are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness (5:6), etcetera. The focus on their identity is further endorsed by the switch to the second person of the verbs and the pronominal forms (“you/your”) in 5:10–12 (seven in total) which, at the same time, prove that Jesus’s disciple audience are part of the blessed ones. This personal directedness and identity demarcation³⁹ is continued by the two accentuated “you are” formulations in 5:13, 14 (ὁμεῖς being added for emphasis) that introduce the striking metaphoric description of the position and task of the Jesus followers in the world (5:13–16). They *are* (the indicative of identity) and they *are called to be* (the imperative inherent in that indicative) the salt and the light of the world, a city situated on a hill. They should make their light shine (5:15–16). Their exemplary lifestyle should be evident to the outsiders and persuade them to praise God (5:16).

At the conclusion of this passage (5:16), the notion of God’s fatherhood surfaces as a self-evident, present reality, not needing further substantiation.⁴⁰ Although it is mentioned here for the first time, and indeed not broadly spotlighted in the rest of the SM, it occurs no less than

In this context “identity formation” should not be confused with Erikson’s psychoanalytic theory of stage-like human development, although there may be analogies.

³⁸ Cf. my remarks above on the need of Matthew’s Syrian audience in the post Birkat ha-Minim period to be reassured of who Jesus really was and of their own identity vis-à-vis a hostile synagogical environment.

³⁹ Betz aptly defined the contents of 5:3–16 as “definitions that establish the identity of the community addressed in the SM” (1995, 165). However, also the remainder of the SM contributes to the correct understanding of their identity.

⁴⁰ However, its eschatological dimension appears already in 5:9.

seventeen times⁴¹ and in such a matter of fact way that we may accept that it functions subconsciously throughout the SM. Having God as their Father (and therefore being his children) is in fact one of the most essential identity markers of the Jesus followers in the SM. It gives them—the disciple audience inside the text and the real-life Christian audience outside—a new and special status; it makes them the highly privileged and at the same time the greatly obliged. On the paternal side it calls forth reassuring associations such as caring, guiding, monitoring and even rewarding and, on the filial side, trust, closeness, obedience, security and openness. Sober but regular reminders such as those in the SM serve to affirm and inculcate these.

This cementing of the special identity of the Jesus people vis-à-vis the “others,” is continued throughout the SM. Talbert (2004, 100) aptly declares of Jesus’s teachings in 5:21–48 that they function as “verbal icons of the divine will” and as such are “a catalyst for the formation of the character of the disciples around the higher righteousness of radical obedience.” They should distinguish themselves from the scribes and Pharisees as persons who practise the “greater righteousness” (5:20). This “greater” does not simply mean performing *more* righteous acts; within the context of the SM it denotes a different *quality* of behaviour (cf. Luz 2002, 322–323). The six antitheses (5:21–48) expound this further. Each of the antitheses shows what special kind of person a Jesus follower, through his lifestyle, should prove to be.⁴² In contrast to those who would slavishly obey the Torah, the disciples have Jesus as their new and final authority. This eschatologically new Jesus demand is particularly evident in the final and climactic antithesis (5:43–48) where the demeanour of the disciples is contrasted to that of the tax collectors and the gentiles. The τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε question (5:47a), recalling περισσεύση in 5:20, is usually translated in a quantitative sense, that is as “what *more* do you do?” whereas both our standard present-day NT dictionaries correctly indicate that τί περισσὸν should be understood in a *qualitative* sense: BDAG (2000, s.v. περισσός) translates the Greek as: “What are you doing *that is remarkable?*”, while L&N (vol. 1 §58.57 s.v. περισσός) renders it as: “What *exceptional thing* have you done?” The conduct of the disciples should be remarkable, exceptional, extraordinary. This understanding is corroborated by Jesus’s

⁴¹ 5:16, 45, 48; 6:1, 4, 6 (*bis*), 8, 9, 14, 15, 18 (*bis*), 26, 32; 7:11 [21]; cf. 5:9. In 16 instances God is referred to as the Father of the disciples. 7:21 is an exception, God being called the Father of Jesus.

⁴² Cf. Talbert’s formulation of this (2004, 147–148).

immediately following question: “Do not even the gentiles do the same?” (5:47b), indicating that the behaviour of his followers should not be qualified by sameness (τὸ αὐτό cf. also 5:46b) but by extraordinariness. Unlike popular sentiment that construed the OT love commandment as a limitation to love *only* one’s neighbour and in fact as a concession or even an encouragement to hate one’s enemies, and unlike the tax collectors who restricted their love to those who loved them, the Jesus followers should love everybody, even their enemies (5:43–46). Some isolated Jewish texts propagated a lenient, even helpful, attitude towards one’s foes (cf. Exod 23:4–5; Prov 24:17–18; 25:21–22). However, no OT or early Jewish text required that the faithful should love their enemies.⁴³ To love one’s enemies was practically unheard of, even shocking; but in doing so, Jesus’s followers would emulate their heavenly Father whose loving-kindness is boundless. Unlike the gentiles, they should not only greet their brothers and sisters but all who cross their path (5:47). Their behaviour should be conspicuously different because they *are* different. They have a new identity. They are God’s children. They should be perfect (= boundless) in their love because their Father is perfect in his love (5:45, 48).

Bonhoeffer (1989) saw this extraordinariness which Jesus expected of his followers sharper than anybody else:

Worin unterscheidet sich der Jünger vom Heiden? Worin besteht “das Christliche”? Hier fällt nun das Wort, auf das hin das ganze 5. Kapitel ausgerichtet ist, in dem alles Vorige zusammengefasst ist: das Christliche ist das “*Sonderliche*,” das περισσόv, das Ausserordentliche, das Nichtreguläre, Nichtselbstverständliche. . . . Das Natürliche ist τὸ αὐτό (ein und dasselbe) für Heiden und Christen, das Christliche fängt an bei dem περισσόv. (p. 147; cf. 120)

He even chose as title for Matt 5: “Vom ‘Ausserordentlichen’ des christlichen Lebens” (“About the extraordinariness of the Christian life”) (1989, 55; cf. also 147 n. 152).

This otherness/qualitative difference continues through chapter 6. The Jesus community should distinguish themselves by not practising their righteousness in order to be noticed (6:1). Their almsgiving should differ from that of the “hypocrites.” They should do it inconspicuously by not

⁴³ Nissen (1974, esp. 303, 316–317).

blowing a trumpet to win human praise (6:2–4). Unlike the “hypocrites” who display their piety by praying in public, their personal prayers should take place in private (6:5–6). Unlike the gentiles they should not babble repetitiously (6:7–8); they have their own, sober common prayer (6:9–13). Likewise, their fasting should differ from that of the “hypocrites” (6:16–18), etcetera. All these statements undergird the identity of the Jesus community by formulating the kind of behaviour that should characterise them.⁴⁴ At the same time, vilifying the opponents (the “hypocrites”) strengthens the Jesus followers against the hostility of the post Birkat ha-Minim period.⁴⁵

In Matt 7, the contrast between the Jesus followers and the outsiders is more subtle, but their distinctive lifestyle is still in view. They should refrain from judging since they realise their own shortcomings (7:1–5). They should be discerning about how they deal with what is holy (7:6).⁴⁶ They should persevere in asking, seeking, knocking (7:7–11). They should exemplify the golden rule by doing to others what they would want those to do to them (7:12). They should go through the narrow gate in contrast to the many going on the wide and easy road (7:13–14). They should beware of the false prophets and recognise them according to the fruit they bear (7:15–20). They should also beware of deceiving themselves by outward tokens of loyalty to Jesus. The real test is whether they obey the will of the Father (7:21–23).⁴⁷ They should be those who not only hear the words of

⁴⁴ This difference in lifestyle of course opens up the danger of a renewed Pharisaism—excelling others and thereby inflating one’s own self-esteem (“God, I thank you that I am not like other people” [Luke 18:11]). Bonhoeffer succinctly laid his finger on this: “Der Ruf zum Ausserordentlichen ist die grosse, unvermeidliche Gefahr der Nachfolge” (1989, 153). The righteousness of the SM is exactly the opposite, as is clear from the warnings in Matt 6. Like a stream springing from a natural source, it emanates, not from any inherent quality of the Jesus followers, but from their relationship to Jesus and their heavenly Father, revolving around their prayer life (6:5–15).

⁴⁵ As in 6:7, Matt 6:31–32 demarcates the Jesus followers from the gentiles.

⁴⁶ This is about the maximum we could say about this extremely problematic saying; see i.a. Luz (2002, 494–498); Betz (1995, 493–494); Stassen (2003, 289–290). It has had as many interpretations as commentators. Luz (*ibid.*) surmises that Matthew, as a conservative redactor, preserved this logion unchanged from Q. A stylistic feature which is often overlooked is its chiasmic nature (a-b-b¹-a¹); see Turner (1963, 346–347). Dogs (a) would rather maul people (a¹) than swine, while swine (b) would rather trample things underfoot (b¹) than dogs. Heuristically that does not help us further.

⁴⁷ The relation between 7:15–20 and 21–23 is unclear. Luz (2002, 520–534) treats 7:15–23 as a single unit, but Betz (1995, 538–539) is probably right in viewing 7:21–23 as a new one. 7:20 is a strong conclusion, and 7:21 gives the impression of a new

Jesus but also act on them, thus building on the rock (7:24–25), in contrast to those who hear these words without putting them into practice (7:26–27).

In view of the above, the theme of the SM can be formulated as: The unique identity of Jesus's new, end-time community. And its purpose: Shaping and affirming the unique identity of Jesus's new, end-time community.

The SM as a whole could then be subdivided as follows:

- 5:1–2: Introduction: The inaugural speech of Jesus, the Second Moses and messianic King
- 5:3–12: The identity markers of the blessed Jesus community
- 5:13–16: The unique mission of the Jesus community
- 5:17–7:27: The exemplary ethos of the Jesus community
- 7:28–29: Conclusion: The reaction of the audience.

Matt 5:17–7:27 could still further be subdivided into:

- 5:17–20: The exemplary ethos of the Jesus community: Practising the surpassing righteousness
- 5:21–48: The exemplary ethos of the Jesus community: Practising the surpassing righteousness in interpersonal relationships
- 6:1–18: The exemplary ethos of the Jesus community: Practising the surpassing righteousness in religious activities
- 6:19–34: The exemplary ethos of the Jesus community: Practising the surpassing righteousness in everyday issues
- 7:1–12: The exemplary ethos of the Jesus community: Practising the surpassing righteousness in some remaining life-areas
- 7:13–27: The radical choices Jesus's followers are confronted with.

4 The Beatitudes—Two Observations

4.1 *The number of the beatitudes from Matthew's perspective*

Since this is a synchronic study, it is not necessary here to dwell on the divergent views regarding the number of beatitudes as seen from a diachronic perspective. Contrary to the almost universally accepted view that Matthew wanted to present us with nine beatitudes, I wish to contend that we have in fact to reckon with only eight. There are important stylistic

beginning. If that is correct, 7:15–20 would deal with the threat of false prophets, and 5:21–23 with internal self-deception (cf. Betz, *ibid.*) or false claims.

and contentual considerations for accepting Matt 5:11–12, not as an additional beatitude, but as an amplification of the eighth. I shall first focus on *stylistic* features.

The eight beatitudes in Matt 5:3–10 form a strongly poetic unit which, particularly when read aloud, has a charming rhythm and cadence. It subdivides into two neat groups of four (5:3–6 and 7–10),⁴⁸ each counting precisely 36 Greek words.⁴⁹ It is rounded off as a closed unit by the promise of the kingdom in the first beatitude (5:3) and its repetition at the end of the eighth (5:10), creating in typical Semitic fashion a beautiful ring composition. This circular formation is further endorsed by the fact that only in the first and the eighth beatitude the motivation for the blessedness of those in question contains a verb in the present tense (ἔστιν), while in the remaining six the motivations are consistently in the future tense. It is also noticeable that the first and the eighth beatitudes contain an identical number of words (12). Furthermore the verbal passives (= p) and actives (= a) inbetween the first and the eighth beatitude show a double p-a-p pattern (5:4–6 and 7–9). Noteworthy is also that the first quadruplet contains no less than six instances of p-alliteration.⁵⁰ Critically, it may be questioned whether all these features were intentional, but the unity and meticulously shaped poetic character of the eight beatitudes in Matt 5:3–10 cannot be denied. In contrast to this, the so-called ninth beatitude in 5:11–12 is in plain prose, without any literary adornment, falling outside the ring composition of 5:3–10, and, contrary to the open-ended address of the previous beatitudes, it directly addresses the audience. From the *contentual* perspective, 5:11–12 does not present a new theme. It elaborates further on and personalises the theme of persecution which was already in focus in the eighth beatitude. Reminding us somewhat of the peshar tradition, the content of the eighth beatitude is applied to suffering and persecution in the early church, including the situation of Matthew's Syrian audience in the period around the Birkat ha-

⁴⁸ Cf. Michaelis (1968, 149–161); Du Toit (1977, 38–39). For two unlikely Matthean alternatives (one consisting of only 7 beatitudes and another of 3x3), see Michaelis (*ibid.*)

⁴⁹ Note also the repetition of righteousness at the conclusion of each quadruplet.

⁵⁰ See Michaelis (1968); Du Toit (1977, 38). Within the individual beatitudes there are also several instances of dual alliteration and assonance: double π in the first beatitude, double π in the second, double δ in the fourth, double ε in the fifth, double κ in the sixth and double δ in the eighth. Was this incidental? Hardly.

Minim.⁵¹ The main adaptations are that the disciples are now directly addressed, that other forms of suffering are added, that being persecuted for righteousness is replaced by suffering on account of Jesus, and that the assurance of inheriting the kingdom is replaced by the call to rejoice in view of the future reward waiting in heaven. All this does not indicate a new beatitude but an actualisation, a concretisation and a personally applied amplification of the eighth. To conclude: It seems indeed extremely doubtful that Matthew would have regarded 5:11–12 as a ninth beatitude.⁵²

4.2 *The beatitudes between the indicative and imperative*

It is a moot point whether the beatitudes are actually proclaiming the good news of God's gracious blessings on the poor in spirit, the mourners, the meek, those who hunger and thirst for righteousness and so forth, or are in fact conditions or injunctions to *be* or to *become* the poor in spirit etcetera, in order to enjoy the bliss of the kingdom. Somewhat simplifying the issue, we may formulate it as the difference between the indicative and the imperative understanding of the beatitudes. Particularly in Protestant circles the indicative understanding has been prevalent. A prominent proponent of the imperatival understanding was Hans Windisch who described the beatitudes as "entrance conditions" (1937, 63 n. 1). In his wake, George Strecker saw the beatitudes primarily as "entering precepts" (1970, 262–263; 1984, 34).⁵³ In the imperative approach,⁵⁴ the whole of the SM should be understood in an ethical sense while, according to the indicative understanding, the SM is introduced by a gospel proclamation (5:3–12), followed in 5:13–16 by a mission statement and in 5:17–7:27 by an extended ethical demand.

⁵¹ If Matt 5:11–12 is a Matthean addition, which seems probable, it would indicate that although the evangelist was predisposed to attractive textual arrangements, he was not a slave of them. Cf. also his redactional activity in the prayer section of ch. 6.

⁵² At the same time, 5:11–12 has a hinge function: It also prepares for the second person presentation of the mission of the Jesus community in the world.

⁵³ Strecker was strongly criticised by Guelich (1976; 1982, 109–111). In his commentary on the beatitudes (1984) Strecker made substantially more of the gift character of the beatitudes, although he still called them "entrance conditions." He accepts that the indicative and the imperative do not oppose one another; but for him the latter is still primary, while it includes the indicative (1984, 35–36).

⁵⁴ Cf. also Luz (1985, 189 n. 11).

However, things are somewhat more complicated. We ask again: Should the beatitudes be understood simply as reflecting God’s gracious initiative or also (or rather) as a call, even a challenge, to become the poor in spirit, etcetera? Generally speaking, it would be short-circuiting to approach the biblical beatitudes *in toto* from a mere either-or presupposition. Typically, they are all laudatory in nature—a characteristic that is sometimes overlooked. At the same time they may be exclusively in the indicative, as when Mary is called blessed because of her pregnancy (Luke 1:45). The majority of biblical beatitudes are obviously used in this sense, the blessing being based on an already existing or imminent positive reality. On the other hand, some beatitudes are imperatival, as when a slave is called blessed if he faithfully carries out his duties in the absence of his master (Matt 24:46 // Luke 12:43). However, the indicative and the imperative may not necessarily exclude one another. Reception criticism has taught us that authentic understanding may vary according to the situation of the receptor. Most readers would, for instance, agree that Ps 1:1–3 pronounces a blessing on the one who avoids the advice of the wicked and delights in the law of the Lord (1:1–3). However, it could also be read as a call to *become* such a person. Likewise the Matthean beatitudes would generally be understood in the indicative, as pronouncing God’s gracious initiative towards the poor, etcetera. That would be confirmed by the fact that some beatitudes link up so closely with the final chapters of Isaiah, particularly Isa 61, which can be called the “gospel chapter” of the OT. However, the Matthean beatitudes may *also* be understood in the imperative, as an appeal to the audience to *become* those blessed ones. But the laudatory nature of these “imperatives” should not be forgotten. They should therefore be understood as “soft” imperatives, that is, more hortative than prescriptive. Rather than strict entrance conditions or precepts, they are urging, calling, inviting; thus, in their own way, as being part of God’s gracious initiative.

To summarise: A natural first reception of the beatitudes would indicate that the SM begins with God’s gracious initiative and not with stringent conditions or demands for entering the kingdom. They confirm that God has once again taken the initiative. He reaches out to his people. Enjoying the blessings of the kingdom is not due to the efforts of the disciples; it is a result of divine love embracing and accepting them. However, they can also be experienced as a call, even a gracious challenge to associate with those blessed by Jesus.

5 The Antitheses

5.1 *The nature and composition of the antitheses and the significance of the latter*

Matthew 5:21–48 consists of six units, usually called the antitheses. The name “antithesis” is somewhat misleading. In the first instance, each of these units begins, not by an antithesis, but with what we may call a thesis. Jesus begins with a short quotation of what was said to Israel of old. Only thereafter does he start with his own “but I say to you”—the antithesis. Nevertheless, the heading “antitheses” is correct in the sense that these striking contrasting pronouncements contain the really important truths that Jesus wanted to bring home to his audience. Secondly, the term “antithesis” gives the impression of an absolute contrast between what was said to the ancients and what Jesus is saying. But that would contradict what had been stated before, namely that Jesus came, not to nullify the law, but to fulfil it (5:17–20).⁵⁵ The “but I say to you” does signify a contrast, sometimes even a drastic one, but Jesus does not contradict the law in the absolute sense; he reinterprets and radicalises it. Even in the climactic sixth antithesis Jesus radicalises the love commandment by drastically widening its scope. The disciples should do what was previously unheard of:⁵⁶ they should not only not hate their enemies; they should include even them in their love.

We saw how meticulously the beatitudes were composed.⁵⁷ This applies also to the six antitheses. Whereas the beatitudes were arranged in two groups of four, the antitheses divide into two groups of three. Each of the first three (5:21–32) starts with basically the same formula, but they become increasingly shorter: “You have heard that it was said to those of ancient times . . .” (5:21); “You have heard that it was said . . .” (5:27); “It was said . . .” (5:31). On each of these statements follows Jesus’s “but I say to you . . .” The “again” of 5:33 signals the beginning of the second triplet. Here the three introductory formulae are: “Again, you have heard that it was said to those of ancient times . . .” (5:33); “You have heard that it was said . . .” (5:38); “You have heard that it was said . . .” (5:43). It is only in the last instance that the parallelism is slightly interrupted, perhaps

⁵⁵ Certainly Matthew did not view it as a contradiction; otherwise he would have formulated it differently.

⁵⁶ Cf. Nissen (1974, esp. 303, 316–317).

⁵⁷ *Vide supra.*

due to the climactic nature of the sixth antithesis. It is noteworthy that the content of what Jesus is saying in the first triplet consistently begins with a *whoever*, while the first two of the second triplet contain a *do not*. However, here also the third member falls somewhat out of line.

There is more to Matthew's composition. His stylistic technique includes even word counts. Whereas the two clusters of the beatitudes contain exactly the same number of words,⁵⁸ the word count of the two triplets of the antitheses is very close, namely 259 compared to 246.⁵⁹ Their letter counts are even closer, namely 1138 to 1131!⁶⁰ This is certainly not incidental. As with the beatitudes, the evident care in the composition of the antitheses reflects their utmost importance.

5.2 *The Jesus of the antitheses*

We should not underestimate the impact Jesus's antithetical statements would have had on a Jewish-oriented audience or readership, whether in Palestine, Syria or elsewhere. We know that ever since the Babylonian exile, and particularly following the reforms under Ezra and Nehemiah, the law grew in stature and importance. The bloody Maccabean Revolt was incited by an attack on the law by the Syrian king Antioch IV (cf. 1 Macc 1:41–2:22). According to the book of Jubilees, which came into being in approximately the middle of the second century BCE,⁶¹ the tenets of the Torah were originally written on tablets in heaven, the law of Moses merely being a copy of these (cf., e.g., *Jub.* 15:25). A few decades later the Epistle of Aristeas emphasised the divine origin, flawlessness and sanctity of the law (see §§31, 171, 240, 313). It increasingly came to be regarded and defended as holy and unassailable. In the first century, Josephus stated that its statutes were respected to such an extent that during previous ages no one had been "so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them" (*C. Ap.* 1.42).⁶² Although not everybody would have shared these sentiments to the same degree, we have to accept that, in the time of Jesus, no devout Jew would

⁵⁸ *Vide supra.*

⁵⁹ The word count of Luz (2002, 325 n. 1) differs slightly, namely 258 to 244. This may be due to a variety of textual and related factors. The difference is negligible.

⁶⁰ The letter count of Luz (*ibid.*) is 1131 to 1130, a difference of only one letter!

⁶¹ VanderKam (2001, 21) dates it between 150 and 160 BCE.

⁶² As is well-known, in the period following on the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, it became the absolute centre of and supreme authority in Judaism.

have dared to challenge the authority and inviolability of the Mosaic law or the iconic status of Moses. Jesus's "but I say to you" would have created exactly such an impression. His antitheses presented an unequalled radicalisation, to some extent even an emendation, of the precepts of the Mosaic law. What is more, Jesus undergirds his statements, not by appealing to some other great authority, but by his own. He speaks these words with the self-awareness of someone greater than Moses, of one challenging what were commonly held as unassailable divine commandments. Even Ulrich Luz, who is very careful in this regard, draws attention to the importance of at least some of the antitheses for understanding the self-consciousness of Jesus. Referring to the first two antitheses, which he regards as going back to the historical Jesus, he aligns himself (Luz 2002, 331) with the statement of Dalman that Jesus is here making a claim which for Jewish ears would have amounted to "ein Eingriff in göttliche Prerogative" ("an intrusion into divine prerogative").⁶³ In plain words: Pious Jews would have experienced these words as blasphemous. It stands on a par with other claims of Jesus such as that he can forgive sins (Matt 9:2) and that he will judge the world at the end of time (Matt 24:30; 26:64). This is high Christology. Reading the antitheses within the broader Matthean context, these are not only the words of one greater than Moses, but those of the messianic Son of David (Matt 1:1–17), the God-with-us (1:23; cf. 28:20), the Son of God (2:15; 3:17 [cf. 4:3, 6]; 16:16–17), etcetera.

6 The Prayer Section of Matthew 6 with Special Reference to the Lord's Prayer

I shall restrict myself to some compositional remarks concerning the prayer section in Matt 6:5–15 and particularly the Lord's Prayer. As we have already seen, Matt 6:2–18 consists of a triad dealing with three forms of religious activity: almsgiving (6:2–4), prayer (6:5–15) and fasting (6:16–18). That puts the prayer section in the centre, with 6:2–4 and 6:16–18 on either side of it, balancing each other, not only structurally, but even in the number of their words! According to the Greek texts of both the UBS and Aland, 6:2–4 counts 64 words, whereas 6:16–18 contains 63! Again that would be hardly incidental. Coming to 6:5–15, it strikes one

⁶³ Luz (2002, 332) nevertheless warns against putting too much weight on what he calls a "formal or quantitative determining of Jesus's authority." His authority lies rather in what he himself says.

that its length is entirely disproportionate to that of 6:2–4 and 16–18. Already Kürzinger regarded 6:7–15 as an interpolation (1959, 574–576). In his view, the prayer section originally consisted only of 6:5–6. In that case, the prayer section would have been entirely proportionate in length (65 words) to those about almsgiving (64 words) and fasting (63 words). As far as structure is concerned, all three sections start with a reference to the hypocrites, their actions, their motivation and their present reward. Then, in antithetical fashion, Jesus indicates the sober and non-ostentatious behaviour he expects of his followers and concludes with their heavenly reward. In light of the above, it could be reasonably argued that Matt 6:7–15 has been inserted into an earlier well-composed triad (consisting of 6:2–4, 5–6 and 16–18).

Kürzinger regarded Matt 6:7–15 as a *post-Matthean* insertion (1959, 575–576). Since 6:5–6 already dealt with Christian prayer praxis it would have seemed, from a liturgical perspective, in order to add the prayer instructions of 5:7–15 to it. He nevertheless held the contents of 6:7–15, and particularly that of the Our Father, as deriving from the primary tradition of dominical sayings (1959, 575).

Ulrich Luz also regards 6:7–15 as an insertion and, like Kürzinger, he accepts the Lord's Prayer as deriving from the historical Jesus (2002, 438); but he differs from him⁶⁴ in viewing 6:7–15 as a *Matthean* insertion (2002, 416). It is understandable that he prefers to dissect 6:7–15 from the preceding part of the prayer section (6:5–6) and comments on it separately (*ibid.*).⁶⁵ However, there are caveats regarding this procedure. If we accept 6:7–15 as being inserted by Matthew, it would mean that he regarded it as vital to the Christian understanding of prayer and that to him, as a careful redactor, the insertion made good sense in spite of the disproportionate bulkiness it created. He certainly loved neat arrangements, but he was not addicted to them.⁶⁶ The message conveyed was more important. Our task, on the synchronic level, would then be to understand the sense he made of it within its present context, particularly as Luz himself concedes that 6:5–15 is “sehr einheitlich” in spite of its compound character (2002, 416).

⁶⁴ In my view more convincingly when one takes cohesive thematic markers such as προσεύχομαι and πατήρ into account.

⁶⁵ Also Talbert (2004, 109–119) prefers to treat 6:7–15 on its own; see esp. p. 109.

⁶⁶ Cf. my remarks in n. 51 above.

Isolating 6:7–15 from its present context runs the risk of missing certain intratextual dynamics created by its insertion.⁶⁷

Coming to the inner space of the Lord's Prayer, the triadic arrangement of the "you" petitions is obvious. But do we have three or four "we" petitions? Historically this has long been a bone of contention (cf. Luz 2002, 435; Betz 1995, 376). With most of the Eastern fathers, most of the Reformers and some modern commentators,⁶⁸ I agree that we have only three "we" petitions. My reason for this is not only the balance between the two sections of the Lord's Prayer, but, more importantly, the evident back to back relationship between the requests that we should not be led into temptation, but be delivered from evil. Both deal with our entanglement in sin and our existential need to be freed from evil (cf. Betz 1985, 351).

7 Conclusions

The most important conclusions of this study would be the following: The life situation of Matthew's Syrian, real-world receptors influenced his redaction and presentation of the SM to a noticeable degree. The crucial importance that the evangelist attached to the SM is reflected not only by its primary position as the first of Jesus's five speeches, but also by the artful way in which he inserted it within the context of Matt 4:23–9:35. After discussing various prominent proposals regarding the structural determiner and theme of the SM, that of the special identity of Jesus's new, end-time community has been presented as a viable proposition. The purpose of the SM would then be the shaping and affirming of the identity of Jesus's new, end-time community. Regarding the beatitudes, stylistic and contentual considerations make it practically certain that the so-called ninth beatitude in Matt 5:11–12 should be understood as an actualising and personally applied amplification of the eighth, rather than as an additional beatitude. Further, the either-or contrast between understanding the beatitudes in the indicative or the imperative should be replaced by a both-and, although the indicative remains primary. Matthew's great care in composing the antitheses indicates their importance. Jesus's "but I say to

⁶⁷ For example, the vital symbiosis between private (6:6) and communal prayer (6:9–13) and the further development of the motif of sober, childlike trust in the goodness of the heavenly Father.

⁶⁸ Among others, Luz (2002, 435, 454); Betz (1995, 375, 381); Talbert (2004, 117–118).

you” reflects a self-awareness that can be categorised with such high christological claims as in Matt 1:23 (cf. 28:20), 2:15, 3:17 (cf. 4:3, 6), 16:16–17, etcetera. I hope to have shown that Matt 6:7–15, which includes the Lord’s Prayer, is a Matthean insertion, even though I accept, as is almost universally agreed, that the latter goes back to Jesus himself. The number of the “you” prayers in the second half of the Lord’s Prayer has long been a bone of contention, but there is evidently a back to back relationship between the requests that we should not be led into temptation (6:13a), but be delivered from evil (6:13b). Since both deal with our existential need to be freed from sin and evil, they integrally belong together.

In this article, I have mainly concentrated on the framework within which, in my opinion, the more detailed exegesis of the SM should take place. The latter also presents us with numerous issues. Of these probably the most awkward would be our interpretation of the six antitheses. Firstly, they confront us with the as yet not fully solved hermeneutical question of how to interpret their intended challenge.⁶⁹ The second vexing question would be the typical practical forms which obeying that challenge would require of Jesus’s present-day disciples and church. These questions require a fresh, in-depth rethinking.

Bibliography

- Allison, Dale C. 1987. The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount. *JBL* 106:423–445.
- Bacon, B. W. 1930. *Studies in Matthew*. London: Constable.
- Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. 2000. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press (BDAG).
- Betz, Hans Dieter. 1995. *The Sermon on the Mount including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3–7:27 and Luke 6:20–49)*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins. Minneapolis: Fortress; London: SCM [Hermeneia].
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf. 1976. *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 14. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. 1989. *Nachfolge*. Herausgegeben von Martin Kuske und Ilse Tödt. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag [Dietrich Bonhoeffer Werke Vierter Band].
- Bornkamm, Günther. 1978. Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt. *NTS* 24: 419–432.
- Broer, Ingo. 2012. Die Weisung der Bergpredigt und die Verantwortung der Christen. Pages 11–24 in *Er stieg auf den Berg . . . und lehrte Sie: Exegetische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Bergpredigt*. Edited by Hans-Ulrich Weidemann. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk [SBS 226].

⁶⁹ See, e.g., the valuable remarks of Tannehill (1970) about what he called “focal instances”; also Broer (2012).

- Calvin, J. [1845] 1993. *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists: Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Carter, Warren. 1994. *What are They Saying about Matthew's Sermon on the Mount?* New York: Paulist Press.
- Catchpole, David. 1998. Review of Betz, Hans Dieter 1995. *JTS* 49:219–225.
- Combrink, H. J. Bernard. 1982. The Macrostructure of the Gospel of Matthew. *Neot* 16:1–20.
- _____. 1983a. The Structure of the Gospel of Matthew as Narrative. *TynBul* 34:61–90.
- _____. 1983b. The Gospel according to Matthew. Pages 57–101 in *Guide to the New Testament IV. The Synoptic Gospels and Acts: Introduction and Theology*. Edited by A(ndrie) B. du Toit. Translated by Roy Briggs. Halfway House: NG Boekhandel.
- Davies, W. D. 1964. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Toit, A(ndrie) B. 1966. The Nature of the Witness of the Church in the World according to Mt 5:13–16. Pages 200–218 in *Biblical Essays 1966*. Edited by A. H. van Zyl. Potchefstroom: Pro Rege.
- _____. 1967. The Self-Revelation of Jesus in Mt 5–7. *Neot* 1:66–72.
- _____. 1977. Analysis of the Structure of Mt 4:23–5:48. *Neot* 11:32–47.
- Ehrman, Bart D. 2000. *The New Testament. A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Peter F. 1974. *Matthew, his Mind and his Message*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Fenton, J. C. 1963. *The Gospel of St. Matthew*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. London: Cox & Wyman.
- Grundmann, Walter. 1968. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Berlin: Evangelisches Verlaganstalt [THKNT 1].
- Guelich, Robert A. 1976. The Matthean Beatitudes: “Entrance-Requirements” or “Eschatological Blessings”? *JBL* 95:415–434.
- _____. 1982. *The Sermon on the Mount. A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco: Word.
- _____. 1987. Interpreting the Sermon on the Mount. *IBC* 41:117–130.
- Gundry, R. H. 1982. *Matthew. A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. 1967. *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [SNTSMS 6].
- Kingsbury, J. D. 1973. The Structure of Matthew's Gospel and his Concept of Salvation-History. *CBQ* 35:451–474.
- Kraeling, Carl H. 1932. The Jewish Community at Antioch. *JBL* 51:130–160.
- Kümmel, W. G. 1973. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 17. Aufl. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Kürzinger, Josef. 1959. Zur Komposition der Bergpredigt. *Bib* 40:569–589.
- Lambrecht, Jan. 1985. *The Sermon on the Mount. Proclamation and Exhortation*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier [GNS 14].

- Larsen, Timothy. 2007. Introduction. Pages 13–18 in *The Sermon on the Mount through the Centuries*. Edited by Jeffrey P. Greenman, Timothy Larsen, and Stephen R. Spencer. Grand Rapids: Brazos.
- Lohr, C. H. 1961. Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew. *CBQ* 23:403–435.
- Nissen, Andreas. 1974. *Gott und der Nächste im Antiken Judentum*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck) [WUNT 15].
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida. 1988. *Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament, Based on Semantic Domains*. Vol. 1. New York: UBS (L&N).
- Luz, Ulrich. 1985. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (1. Teilband Mt 1–7)*. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag [EKK 1/1].
- _____. 2002. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (1. Teilband Mt 1–7)*. 5., völlig neubearbeitete Aufl. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener [EKK 1/1].
- Meier, John P. 1983. Antioch. Pages 12–86 in *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Christianity*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier. Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak & Van Gennep.
- Meeks, Wayne A., and Robert L. Wilken. 1974. *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*. Missoula: Scholars Press [SBL SBS 13].
- Michaelis, Christine. 1968. Die Π-Alliteration der Subjektsworte der ersten 4 Seligpreisungen in MT. v 3–6 und ihre Bedeutung für den Aufbau der Seligpreisungen bei MT., LK. und in Q. *NovT* 10:148–161.
- Nissen, Andreas. 1974. *Gott und der Nächste im Antiken Judentum*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck) [WUNT 15].
- Schniewind, J. 1968. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. 12. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [NTD 2].
- Schweizer, Eduard. 1973. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. 13. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [NTD 2].
- Stanton, Graham N. 1992. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Stassen, Glen H. 2003. The Fourteen Triads of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:21–7:12). *JBL* 122:267–308.
- Strecker, Georg. 1970. Die Makarismen der Bergpredigt. *NTS* 17:255–275.
- _____. 1984. *Die Bergpredigt: Ein exegetischer Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Talbert, Charles H. 2004. *Reading the Sermon on the Mount: Character Formation and Ethical Decision Making in Matthew 5–7*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Tannehill, R. 1970. The “Focal Instance” as a Form of New Testament Speech: A Study of Matthew 5:39b–42. *JR* 50:372–385.
- Thom, Johan C. 2006. Dyads, Triads and Other Compositional Beasts in the Sermon on the Mount. Pages 291–308 in *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach, Johan C. Thom, and Jeremy Punt. Leiden: Brill [NovTSup 124].
- Turner, Nigel. 1963. *Syntax*. Vol. III of James H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

- VanderKam, James C. 2001. *The Book of Jubilees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- VanderWeele, Tyler J. 2008. Some Observations concerning the Chiastic Structure of the Gospel of Matthew. *JTS (New Series)* 59:669–673.
- Viljoen, Francois P. 2013. Righteousness and Identity Formation in the Sermon on the Mount. *HTS Theological Studies* 69:1–10.
- Windisch, Hans. 1937. *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der richtigen Exegese*. Leipzig: Hinrich [UNT 16].

andriedt@icon.co.za

Unit A4 Ruimtesig, P. O. Box 73501, Lynnwood Ridge 0040, Pretoria, South Africa