

Apart from the sources indicated, there are scattered references of interest from Anatolia and Mesopotamia. However, these references are omitted here as of marginal importance.

In a basic sense, the relevant literature is much more extensive. The Near Eastern materials offer a wealth of information about the setting and role of the persons who appear as prophets or oracular speakers and thus make it possible to interweave the texts with the life situations in a way that cannot often be done with the Biblical material. The Near Eastern texts cannot be studied apart from the extensive information that is available about the context of the activities reported. In that sense the scope of the sources is immense.

THE UNDERSTANDING OF "SITZ IM LEBEN" IN FORM CRITICISM

Douglas A. Knight
Vanderbilt University Divinity School

I. INTRODUCTION

With the extensive attention given in recent years to the method and application of Old Testament form criticism, it is somewhat surprising that the concept of Sitz im Leben has not been submitted to a similar amount of scrutiny.¹ Indeed, as has been recently observed,² it holds an enviable, almost unassailable position among all contemporary exegetical tools, its success being certainly due to the results which can be obtained if one will only avail himself of this aspect. Actually, when one considers the extensive developments in Old Testament research since Hermann Gunkel secured a legitimate place for form criticism among the exegetical methods,³ it is not so difficult to realize why scholars have been reluctant to tamper with the foundation of this method. Some, in fact, do not even hesitate to make this sociological dimension into a hermeneutical conditio sine qua non, at least for texts that went through a preliterate stage.⁴ As important as the Sitz im Leben may be for an adequate understanding of the text, there is no doubt about its centrality to the form-critical method. It can in fact be appropriately regarded as the Achilles' heel of form criticism⁵ -- which is not to say that it is an inherently vulnerable spot, but rather that it is so crucial that a successful attack on it could be sufficient to bring the entire structure down. Because this sociological orientation is so central to form criticism as a whole and to individual text analyses as well, it is incumbent upon us to reexamine this principle and to consider ways in which other scholarly disciplines may be able to give additional clarification and strength.

A. Definition

There are two "classical" statements that have had wide influence as virtual definitions of Sitz im Leben, and it may be helpful to reproduce them in their entirety here. The first is from Gunkel:

Jede alte literarische Gattung hat ursprünglich ihren Sitz im Volksleben Israels an ganz bestimmter Stelle. Wie noch heute die Predigt auf die Kanzel gehört, das Märchen aber den Kindern erzählt wird, so singen im alten Israel die Mädchen das Siegeslied dem einziehenden Heere entgegen; das Leichenlied stimmt das Klageweib an der Bahre des Toten an; der Priester verkündet die Tora dem Laien am Heiligtum; den Rechtspruch (Mišpat) führt der Richter vor Gericht zur Begründung seiner Entscheidung an; der Prophet erhebt seinen Spruch etwa im Vorhof des Tempels; am Weisheitspruch erfreuen sich die Alten im Tore; usw. Wer die Gattung verstehen will, muss sich jedesmal die ganze Situation deutlich machen und fragen: wer ist es, der redet? wer sind die Zuhörer? welche Stimmung beherrscht die Situation? welche Wirkung wird erstrebt? Oft wird die Gattung je durch einen Stand

vertreten, für den sie bezeichnend ist: wie heutzutage die Predigt durch den Geistlichen, so damals die Tora durch den Priester, der Weisheitsspruch durch die "Weisen", die Lieder durch den Sänger usw. So mag es auch einen Stand der wandernden Volkserzähler gegeben haben.⁶

The second, from Albrecht Alt, is actually a statement about the form/content relationship, but it expresses clearly that this, and thus also the form-critical method, is dependent wholly on the Sitz im Leben. According to him, Gattungs- or Formgeschichte depends on the observation that in each individual literary form, as long as it remains in use in its own context, the ideas it contains are always connected with certain fixed forms of expression. This characteristic connection is not imposed arbitrarily on the material by the literary redactors of a later period. The inseparable connection between form and content goes back behind the written records to the period of popular oral composition and tradition, where each form of expression was appropriate to each particular circumstance amongst the regularly recurring events and necessities of life.⁷

One thing that becomes especially clear from both of these statements is that the element Leben in the phrase Sitz im Leben is being emphasized, i.e. that the primary setting with which the early form critics were concerned was a social or communal setting, one which consists of real people coping with real life, and that this setting is all important for the Gattungsgeschichte. It follows from this that the Sitz im Leben for ancient Israel was conceived to be exclusively at the oral plane; at least Gunkel and his followers tended to reserve the term for the oldest, simple genres prior to the stage of literary fixation.⁸ Furthermore, the Sitz im Leben was considered to cohere, by definition, to form and content of the genre; in Mowinckel's words: "each situation creates its own formal language around a definite subject-content" and can therefore be reached by induction.⁹ Von Rad's insistence upon analyzing the form and determining the Sitz im Leben of much more complex entities (viz. the Sinai-tradition and even the Hexateuch as a whole¹⁰), which especially in light of the work of an author could not so easily be derived genetically from its Sitz, amounted to a rebuke of this previous restrictive view and underscored the need to consider the effect of the environment on any genre, also literary ones.

In recent years there has been an increasing dissatisfaction with the limitations of the traditional understanding of Sitz im Leben.¹¹ Before we attempt to deal with the terminological problem, it might be best to specify in general terms the total phenomenon, of which Sitz im Leben is only one part -- albeit a very significant one. Every piece of literary expression, whether in oral or written form, emerges out of a configuration of social and/or intellectual influences which affect to a greater or lesser degree its formation and maintenance and which combine to produce the meanings that constitute this literary entity. This configuration of influences is characterized, as a rule, by locus (both spatial and temporal) and

intent, and the given literary expression respects these through its conjunction of form and content. This package of influences, locus, and intent is what has been generally understood as the Sitz im Leben, though its actual scope and applicability to genres have varied among form critics. For example, does a Sitz im Leben describe only a situation or relationship that is typical,¹² or can it also apply to an unusual, particular occasion which may give rise to a literary piece? Or again, is Sitz im Leben restricted only to actual occurrences (e.g., a funeral) and is thus not to be identified with institutional groups (e.g., the mourners)?¹³

For all of the disputes over which specific Sitz im Leben may be most appropriate in individual cases (and problems of definition may in a few cases account for some of these disagreements), one thing is clear: Appeal is made to this external reference, with its socio-cultural and intellectual data, under the assumption that the given literary unit (which in the case of the Old Testament is culturally foreign to us) can thereby be better understood. This is the postulate emphasized by Gunkel, and its significance has in no way diminished in the intervening period. In fact its importance has increased with the present linguistic thesis that meanings are pre-given and transmitted through the linguistic structure of the language. Yet given an agreement on this assumption, can we remain satisfied with the traditional term employed so widely since Gunkel's time?

B. Terminology

A terminological battle is being waged on two fronts. First, although Sitz im Leben has long been a terminus technicus among German, English, French and other biblical scholars, there has been some effort to employ in non-Germanic languages alternative expressions -- whether the motive be linguistic purity, stylistic variation, or whatever. Thus in French one finds,¹⁴ often in tandem with "Sitz im Leben", such terms as "milieu vital", "milieu de vie", "milieu d'origine", "situation concrète". And in English the substitutes tend to be "life-situation", "setting in life", or just "setting".¹⁵ These are considered equivalents of the term "Sitz im Leben"; no discernible attempt is made to define them any differently than what the German expression means at present. It could in fact be argued that "Sitz im Leben" seems to imply more -- sociologically, linguistically, dynamically -- than does, e.g., "setting". Stylistic variety is a commendable enough aim, but the desire to preserve language purity is hardly in order: A language can and does adopt foreign terms directly, especially to designate a technical subject; thus "Sitz im Leben" deserves as warm a reception in English as that given the word "genre".

The second terminological dissatisfaction is, however, much more substantive and crucial. The question is raised whether "Sitz im Leben", "milieu vital", "setting",¹⁶ or any of the other current terms are sufficient to describe the total, general phenomenon defined above: the environment from which any literary entity might derive its meaning and in which it might be designed to fulfill some purpose. To complement "Sitz im Leben" other categories have been suggested: Lapointe,¹⁷ seeking to avoid the confusion of the literary Sitz with its

concretizations (both of origin and of usage), distinguishes between the "milieu d'origine", which he equates with the Sitz im Leben and which considers both the formal origin and the material or historical setting in which a literary entity arose; the "milieu usager", which is the context in which the entity (e.g., a prayer of thanksgiving for recovery from illness) is used;¹⁸ and the "milieu culturel", which designates the general environment -- with its customs, traditions, literature, ideas -- in which a given author works. This latter milieu he identifies with Alonso Schökel's¹⁹ "Sitz in der Literatur", which refers to the setting (e.g., prophetic "schools") in which older pieces received their final redactional form. Lapointe's categories are somewhat similar to those suggested by Richter, though there are differences as well. Richter distinguishes between institutions, the literature itself, and (here he is more tentative) the style of an epoch.²⁰ The institutions (e.g., kingship, the prophets, the priests, state officers, tribes, the elders) would seem to constitute both the milieu d'origine and the milieu usager. The style of an epoch would be relevant in both the milieu d'origine and the milieu culturel, while the Sitz in der Literatur has a more specific horizon than does Lapointe's milieu culturel. In addition to these categories, one also meets the expression "Sitz in der Rede", which is to designate the function that a genre can have in other than its original setting (e.g., the use of the lament as a prophetic warning or taunt).²¹

It is obviously most significant that what was once a simple category (Sitz im Leben) has now become differentiated and expanded into several distinct levels, but the plethora of existing designations and the inadequacy of Sitz im Leben or "setting" to do duty for all present us with a terminological problem which must be resolved. We should exercise real restraint, however, in introducing new terms that would only add to the confusion. Nonetheless, it may be worth this risk if a nomenclature can be developed which can with clarity and precision designate the diverse aspects of the external environment from which the literary entity is given birth.

One term that has received limited application already²² may be ideally suited for this purpose: "matrix". A derivative of the Latin "mater" (= mother), the word "matrix" originally meant "the womb" or "parent stem" and later came to refer generally to any "place or enveloping element within which something originates, takes form, or develops" (Webster's). Causality can be implied (e.g., in its anatomical use for a formative part) but is not intrinsic to it (e.g., it can designate any natural material in which crystals, gems, metal, etc., are embedded). Thus as a general term for any kind of environment in which a literary entity may originate, develop, and be maintained, "matrix" is much more appropriate than are "Sitz im Leben" or "setting". And to this general term can be affixed a variety of adjectives that will designate with precision the specific environment most applicable: e.g., institutional matrix; societal matrix ("Sitz im Leben" traditionally refers to either of these two, especially with respect to the oral phase of genres); cultural or epochal or historical matrix (Richter's "style of an epoch"; an example is von Rad's postulated "Solomonic enlightenment" as the matrix for J, the

succession narrative, and early wisdom sayings²³); intellectual or ideological or theological matrix (referring to a specific heritage under whose influence one stands²⁴); literary matrix (equivalent to Alonso Schökel's and Richter's Sitz in der Literatur); linguistic or mental matrix (the preconceptual mental structures that may alone be responsible for the formation of some genres²⁵). The list can be expanded as the exegete finds different levels at which a genre, formula, tradition, or text received new impulses of meaning. It remains only to point out that with this terminology we can respect fully the phenomenologists' emphasis on the "life-world" and the "multiple realities" of human experience, i.e., the complex of meanings to which the human being (and thus also his verbal expressions) is oriented.²⁶

II. LINGUISTICS AND THE COMMUNICATION OF MEANINGS

One would expect that other disciplines within the humanities would be concerned to determine the contextual matrices within which all thinking and communicating occur. To be sure, sciences dealing with ancient or primitive societies do address these questions; notable here are folkloristic, mythology, and anthropology.²⁷ Similarly, it is a concern also of phenomenologists, as just mentioned. On the other hand, it is surprising that contemporary literary sciences and sociology devote only negligible attention to these matters. The former engages in extensive genre criticism, but to the extent that it omits the field of folk literature (which is the domain of the folklorists) it is primarily concerned with the individuality and intent of the given author or poet. Böckmann's careful study of the influence of the cultural matrices on German literature since the Middle Ages constitutes an important exception to this rule, but also he is less concerned with the societal or institutional matrices.²⁸ Sociology, from which we might especially expect help, has largely turned these questions over to anthropology. There is a well-developed field of sociology of literature,²⁹ but its object of inquiry is the phenomenon of literature in modern mass society: the role and status of the author, his influence on society, institutional intermediaries (critics, publishers, book stores, libraries), the sociology of the readership, mass media, society and societal problems as literary material, and the political (especially Marxist) use of literature. Again these can be subsumed to some degree under the rubric of the cultural matrix, but this contributes only in a limited way to our concerns. There is, however, another field of study which promises to bring us more direct dividends.

It takes little astuteness to recognize the increased importance gained by the discipline of linguistics during this century³⁰ -- or the impact that it can have (and many³¹ would say: must have) on the biblical exegetical method. Linguists posit a basic link between society and language, and the foundational work on this was carried out by the structural linguist F. de Saussure, the comparative linguist A. Meillet, and the neo-linguists B. Croce and K. Vossler.³² Making no pretensions of doing justice to their work, we might summarize a few relevant theses: Language is seen to be not a living organism but a social phenomenon understood only in terms of its functions in the community. It is the bearer and medium of understanding and thus intimately connected with and dependent upon

the social and cultural structure of the community. Language is created by man in order to carry out the function of maintaining contact and communication among people. As basic as language thus is to the human consciousness and also to the hermeneutical enterprise (Gadamer), there still remain non-linguistic or extra-linguistic (de Saussure: external linguistic) factors and properties (e.g., physical, historical, geographical; note de Saussure's comparison with the game of chess, distinguishing accidental from essential elements of the game). And not to be forgotten is de Saussure's celebrated distinction between the two aspects of the phenomenon of human speech (langage): language (langue), which is a social (i.e. a function of the people, not the individual), psychological, abstract system of specific signs that correspond to prelinguistic ideas; and speaking (parole), which is an individual, psychophysical, momentary act executed not by the mass but by the individual, in accordance with the rules and structure of his language (langue). It is the first aspect, language = langue, that is the object of linguistic studies.³³

Lapointe has made a significant attempt to reformulate the category of the Sitz im Leben in terms of contemporary linguistics.³⁴ Just as we have noted above in Section I, the reason that such a restructuring of this category is necessary is that Sitz im Leben has traditionally been associated with only oral literature, whereas linguists assert that actually no human discourse can avoid the necessity of being related to a "milieu vital".³⁵ Lapointe suggests three linguistic concepts that converge on this category -- reference, situation, and context.³⁶ We will want to determine to what extent these coincide with the matrices we have delimited.

Reference, at least within the Saussurean tradition, is first of all to be understood as a counterpart of "signification". The latter is the psychological association of a concept (= signifié, signified; e.g., a tree) and an auditory image (= signifiant, signifier; e.g., the word "tree").³⁷ If this association signifié--signifiant is applied to its surrounding reality (e.g., where the tree is located, whether the wind is blowing it), we uncover concrete data that can add to the sense of what otherwise is a general, abstract signification. These referential data are extralinguistic, exterior to the domain of language circumscribed by signification. For example, it makes a difference whether the sound /p/ is pronounced by a masculine or feminine voice, whether "temple" in a given text refers to the Solomonic or Zerubbabel construction, whether "disciples" are those of Isaiah or of Jesus. Such specificity is often lacking in the linguistic structure (perhaps especially of a folk-literature?), yet is highly significant in capturing the designated concrete, individual experience. In Lapointe's words, "le message linguistique a essentiellement besoin d'un commentaire extralinguistique pour mordre sur l'expérience concrète et individuelle. La langue réfère à l'individuel sans le signifier proprement."³⁸ In his understanding, the Sitz im Leben in biblical studies is essentially an extralinguistic commentary on the given text in that it seeks to provide concrete information (e.g., on the actual liturgical use of a psalm, or the referents of the "tu" and "vous" in Deut.) not directly signified by the language of the text. We may add at this point that this concept of "reference" is in effect

embraced by our general term "matrix" and could be applicable for any of the specific matrices (e.g., institutional, societal, historical/cultural, literary).

In addition to the concrete referential, the Sitz im Leben comprises the situation, which is best understood as "l'ensemble des faits connus par le récepteur au moment de l'acte sémique et indépendamment de celui-ci."³⁹ It thus embraces the concrete circumstances surrounding the communication act as well as the language itself that is employed; only the discourse (i.e., the verbalized content of the communication) is excluded, for which it provides the situational locus. In a word: whereas the referent completes the meaning of the language of the discourse, the situation includes the language as the prerequisite for the interpretation of the discourse. The question is whether or not a given statement needs to be related to its situation in order for the meaning to be understood; i.e., must one be aware of some situational action if he is to understand a statement? For the vast majority of biblical discourse, Lapointe postulates that we are faced with communication "apart from situation rather than in situation" ("hors situation plutôt qu'en situation")⁴⁰ and this has an important implication for exegesis: We must avoid the common temptation to hasten to match a given text with some situation, for this will then automatically limit the text to this specific meaning; a good example of this is the tendency to consider the psalms "in situation" and to interpret them as such (e.g., royal psalms; psalms for the New Year festival). The problem becomes especially obvious when one considers that the situation of oral delivery can include a rich assortment of gestures, changes of voice-tone, and attitudes -- whereas it is impossible for these to be present in written communication except perhaps through verbal description. Narratives tend to include more details about the situation than do lyrical pieces, which present more of a passionate subjectivity; drama, on the other hand, does not verbalize the situation.⁴¹ In the cases where we are provided with "statements in situation", we must remember that these are often variable and can be accommodated to different situations and thus take on varying meanings; this is, of course, a common form-critical principle.⁴² The sum of this linguistic analysis of situation is that, as important as it is for the correct interpretation of discourse, biblical statements now tend to lack this information and should only with great caution be inserted into situation.

But while the recovery of the situation is often frustrated, new vistas of meaning are opened when we consider the context. Whereas exegetes tend to understand context only as a literary framework, the linguist T. Slama-Cazacu defines it much more broadly as embracing everything that can contribute to the production of meaning -- thus including extralinguistic factors (referents), the linguistic system itself (the situation), and the discourse itself and the interrelationship of its parts.⁴³ A discourse, removed from its situation and its referential data, takes on a new series of situations during its later literary development. While its postulated individual parts (e.g., the Jahwist, the Abrahamic cycle, the succession narrative) are not identified as such in our text, when one considers all aspects of the context these parts and their possible earlier situations emerge. "Ce qui en effet est hors situation n'est pas hors contexte."⁴⁴ This, however, is not to

say that the Sitz im Leben thus uncovered in the text becomes anything more than hypothetical. The biblical text does not affirm explicitly the presence of the Sitz im Leben, but it does indicate it; it can be "divined" from the text.⁴⁵

What is to be learned from the application of linguistic sciences to the concept of the Sitz im Leben? It is fairly obvious that meaning-communication is complex, that forces from many matrices impinge upon the communication and that not all of these can be classified as "linguistic". As much as we need to determine these forces, they are not always recoverable; and where they are accessible, it is only through the indicative power of language. In Lapointe's words: "le Sitz vise les choses en tant qu'elles constituent pour leur part le sens du langage; ces choses ne sont elles-mêmes accessibles qu'à travers le fonctionnement indiciel du langage."⁴⁶ It is another question, however, whether for our form-critical purposes the "linguistic matrix" ought to have a meaning more restrictive than this all-embracing sense.

III. PROBLEMS FACING THE CRITICISM OF MATRICES

The purpose of the discussions that follow is to direct attention to a number of problematic areas touching on the analysis of matrices. Their significance is not restricted to the task of reconstructing and analyzing these matrices; rather, these problems also have direct implications for form criticism as a whole. Our treatment of each question makes no attempt to be exhaustive, but rather to pinpoint the dilemmas and to make some suggestions about their resolution.

A. What Actually Do We Know?

Let us not deceive ourselves: The recovery of an ancient matrix, now hidden from view because of the centuries-long development experienced by the literature, is a highly complex and, in its results, uncertain enterprise. It is only stating the obvious to admit that we cannot move here beyond the realm of hypotheses to the sphere of hard data or bruta facta. This, however, is not to say that the matrices did not actually exist, that they are no more than modern constructs projected back into the biblical period and forced upon the texts. On the contrary, ancient Israel, like any society, had a structured life-world, a configuration of meaning-spheres which affected the communication act and contributed to the production of the meaning of such communication. Thus while we can be sure that matrices existed, we cannot be so certain of accurately describing them.

Our only access to these matrices is through the linguistic structure of our received texts. Indications of the levels of meaning can often be evaluated through linguistic analysis, but the recovery of extralinguistic referential data which also contributed to the sense of a discourse is more problematical. Such data comprise what since Gunkel has commonly been known as the Sitz im Leben, but which we prefer to consider as the societal and institutional matrices. And as important as such information is for our understanding of the text, we can never be entirely certain, e.g., what expressive actions accompanied the narrator's oral delivery of a saga, or to whom the personal

pronoun in the psalm refers.

We can hope to determine something about the matrices only through a process of extrapolation and synthesis; the objects of the immediate analysis are form, genre, content, linguistic structure, and rhetorical and stylistic characteristics. As important as content is in this analysis,⁴⁷ one is advised against using this to construct an hypothesis which then functions as a schema for further interpretations. A classic example of this is Mowinckel's thesis of a New Year's festival and its cult drama of the enthronement of Jahweh; as has been aptly stated,⁴⁸ this amounted to building a pyramid upside down, with the tip bearing the weight of the whole structure which would come crashing down if its small support eroded. A reconstructed matrix increases in likelihood, the wider the synthesis of data ranges. Yet it is still difficult to get beyond tentative results, even though "les exégètes admettent généralement qu'il n'y a pas cercle vicieux à rechercher le Sitz à partir du texte, même si le Sitz est destiné à compléter le sens du texte."⁴⁹ According to Lapointe, this is possible only insofar as we treat the biblical text as an "indice".⁵⁰

Another aspect of the problem can be stated in this way: Is the matrix an actual historical entity to be recovered, or is it an idealized typification and heuristic tool? Richter's position is clear, though his reasons are not: "Der 'Sitz im Leben' ist keine historische Grösse; man hat mit ihm kein historisch genau festlegbares Datum erreicht."⁵¹ In contrast to this it would seem more likely that the matrix, as the existential parameters of the text to be interpreted, can become the object of research because of the sign-power of language.⁵² For us, the matrix functions basically as a typification and heuristic tool, but its impact and actuality in the original situation cannot be doubted.

B. The Applicability of Matrix Criticism

As has been pointed out above, Gunkel conceived of Sitz im Leben as being applicable only for genres during their oral phase, but it is now widely accepted that "there is no 'neutral' speech or writing, which does not fall into literary types, and this is because each person, as soon as he speaks or writes, is adapting himself, usually unconsciously, to a particular situation."⁵³ This means that any unit of communicative expression can be associated with some matrix, or several matrices. It is thus possible to speak of the matrix of a formula, a fixed expression (Richter: "geprägte Wendung"), a structural scheme, a genre, a tradition, an individual textual pericope, a larger text complex (e.g., the Jahwist, the Deuteronomistic History), redactional pieces and actual literary compositions (cf. the concept Sitz in der Literatur, which we call the literary matrix),⁵⁴ matters of content, and perhaps even individual figures (i.e., their relationship to their intellectual or cultural matrix⁵⁵). Obviously, not all types of matrices will be relevant to each of these.

C. The Multiplicity and Interrelationship of Matrices

As can be seen in Schutz' phenomenological structuring of the "life-world", human beings are faced with a complex of mean-

ings to which they orient themselves and which in turn affect them. These multiple structures, which we are calling matrices, were present also in Israel; but it would surely be an impossible task to catalogue and describe them all as one lists genres.⁵⁶ However, with respect to their effect on the above-mentioned objects that develop within their midst, it may be helpful to distinguish functionally between formative matrices and contextual matrices. The former are directly responsible for the creation of the entity in question, be it a formula, tradition, text, genre, etc. The institutional and societal matrices comprise primarily this category, in that it was within these settings that laws, legends, rituals, wisdom sayings, and similar communicative substances were formed and sustained. Also the linguistic matrix, in our narrower sense of the concept, is the formative agent of myths and certain other genres. There is thus a genetic relationship in these cases between the matrix and the entity.⁵⁷ It is highly beneficial, though also problematical, to specify each formative matrix as explicitly as possible; e.g., "cult" is nearly meaningless unless the specific cultic activity or festival is given, though this in turn is often tenuous.⁵⁸ And finally, it is a moot point whether or not cultural or ideological matrices can also function formatively on individual figures (e.g., Wolff's description of Amos), but it is probably best to consider this within the next category.⁵⁹

With contextual matrices the element of causality is one step removed. Here we are understanding "context" in nearly the sense specified by Lapointe, as described above. Such matrices contribute quantities of meaning to text, form, and content without controlling the totality of meanings and linguistic structure that constitute this entity. They explain "the function of types or texts only in terms of their general intelligibility".⁶⁰ The specific matrices that fall within this category are the cultural (or historical), ideological/intellectual, and literary matrices.

A final point needs to be emphasized: These multiple matrices are not mutually exclusive but often overlap and continuously exercise an effect on each other. This is true among institutions (e.g., prophetic impact on the kings, priestly influence on the later prophets), between cultural and societal spheres (e.g., the effect of the Davidic-Solomonic period on social structures), etc. In similar fashion a formula, tradition, genre, or other unit of communication can be affected, concurrently or successively, by two or more different matrices contributing meanings to it. This can easily be seen with respect to the next problem.

D. The Relation of Genre to Matrix

We have now to address a problem which has recently been receiving an increasing amount of attention. As can be seen in the extended quotation from Gunkel above, he considered the Gattung and its Sitz im Leben to be integrally related. This notion that the Sitz belongs to the definition of the genre has persisted,⁶¹ so that genre, content, and Sitz are often regarded as an inseparable package. This position, however, is now under fire because of insights gained from the study of myth and the history of genres. Especially Knierim has argued persuasively that, contrary to the traditional view, "a genre is no longer to

be constituted by its societal setting."⁶² The reason given is that myths are no longer regarded, especially not by structuralists, as the creation of their societal setting, but rather as the expressions of prerational structures of the mind. Thus it would almost be accurate to say that this "conceptual genre" creates the setting, rather than that the setting creates this genre of myth. A similar point about a mental, non-societal matrix is made by the linguists (e.g., de Saussure) as well as by A. Jolles, who attributed all elementary genres to a Geistesbeschäftigung as it expresses itself in language.⁶³ It becomes fairly obvious here that Knierim is objecting to an essential coherence between genre and setting or Sitz im Leben (understood in the traditional sense of a societal or institutional matrix) -- not between genre and matrix per se. On the contrary, the examples of myth and certain folk genres demonstrate that another matrix must be sought, viz. a mental or linguistic one. From this we may conclude that genres, as also individual texts, emerge from and reflect some matrix, albeit not necessarily societal or institutional matrices. Thus in this broader sense, the matrix is constitutive for any genre, and genre analysis should include reference to a matrix. It is not necessary to force a societal or institutional matrix on every genre (or text), for a mental or linguistic matrix can account equally well for the configuration of meanings that go into some genres.

A genre, like a text, can transfer matrices and thereby be affected by its new context. This transfer can be necessitated by an alteration or disappearance of the matrix itself; e.g., the Davidic-Solomonic historical matrix brought about a politicizing of the earlier tribal narrative, and with the fall of Jerusalem prophetic traditions came under new influences (e.g., Deuteronomistic and priestly). But a genre can also move from one institutional or societal matrix to another without historical impetus; e.g., the prophetic adoption of the royal messenger-formula and of the mourner's lament. Not all of the former characteristics of the transferred genre will be lost, and this permits us to determine the original matrix as well. The question of genre imitation is also pertinent because of the insufficient stock of genres developed by some matrices.⁶⁴

At this point we might call attention also to possible tensions occurring when a genre or tradition moves from the oral to the written sphere.⁶⁵ As determined empirically by A.B. Lord and later applied to biblical studies by Güttingmann,⁶⁶ there is not only a basic difference between these two modes of communication, but more importantly the genre itself is altered when it is moved from the oral to the written level. A sociological break occurs at this point, so significant that the new (literary) locus of the genre must be form-critically reevaluated.⁶⁷ This is what we are calling the literary matrix. As a consequence of this shift in essence, it becomes considerably more difficult for us to reconstruct the genre and its matrices during its preliterate existence. Methodologically, this requires the form critic to examine first contours of the genre in its literary matrix before steps to move behind this can be ventured.

E. The Linguistic or Mental Matrix

Since it has been advocated by Güttingmann and others that

form criticism should yield to a method based on modern linguistic sciences, it seems advisable that we clarify what we mean by "linguistic matrix" and how it can be considered within form criticism. Güttingmann objects to the common understanding of the *Sitz im Leben* as a sociological, non-linguistic situation that precedes language (*langue*), and he redefines it as the cultural context-situation which includes language (*langue*) and in which the actual act of speaking (*parole*) occurs. The *Sitz* is thus not the prelinguistic, social phenomenon -- it is itself a linguistic phenomenon. "Linguistic" here is understood in the sense of Saussurean signification, incorporating the world of meanings into the structure of the language. Thus the sociological is not foundational to the linguistic; rather, the two are identical.⁶⁸ It might be noted that Güttingmann's new definition of *Sitz im Leben* is quite similar to Lapointe's notion of the context.

One gets the impression that, while Güttingmann's broadening of the scope of *Sitz* to include the total configuration of a culture's meanings respects the thesis of linguistic sciences, he has at the same time dealt himself out of the specificity and differentiation which are needed in the criticism of an ancient literature like the Bible. These are not precluded in his construction, but they are also not included in any form similar to the matrices which we have delineated. Furthermore, he seems to rule out the existence of extralinguistic data, which Lapointe terms the "referents" and which contribute significant meanings to the communication.

Rather than in this broad sense, it may be best to define "linguistic matrix" more narrowly so that it can take its place alongside all the other matrices. Thus it might refer to the preconceptual, prelinguistic, mental structures that exist apart from (and prior to?) actual societal, institutional, or historical matrices. Such mental structures can be seen classically in Levi-Strauss' analysis of myth.⁶⁹ This linguistic matrix, then, does not comprise the sociological dimension, nor is it identical to it. It is an activity of the human mind that, without direct control from external matrices, creates and structures a reality that finds its expression in language and in certain genres. "Linguistic", in this sense of preconceptual and mental, is thus to be distinguished methodologically from socio-cultural matrices.⁷⁰

F. Concepts of Function and Intent

These matters are significant not only for analysis of genres and text units, but also for matrix criticism. We follow the distinction between the intent or intention as the desired effect and the function as the actual effect.⁷¹ While the intent is contributed to the communication by either the formative matrices or the individual communicator (whether speaker or writer), the function is an external, not inherent aspect of the event and is realized only to the extent that the communication has an effect. For example, the threat embodies in form and content the prophet's intent, but whether the people actually felt threatened (and then returned to Jahweh) is another question entirely.

We have already asserted that the intent is often derived

from the matrices; the enigma, however, lies with the precise relationship between the matrices and the function. The problem might be indicated best by reference to a suggestive study by I. Soisalon-Soininen.⁷² He advances the thesis that for many traditions, especially of the narrative type, their societal function is more important than their *Sitz im Leben*. Consequently, in describing the genre or the individual tradition, not only the *Sitz* and the intent but especially the function must be considered.⁷³ As difficult as it may be to determine this function,⁷⁴ we can be sure that the absence or cessation of function, whether in its initial or in a later matrix, would have meant the death of the tradition.⁷⁵ This is especially true for folk literature which thrives on its effect on the public. Examples of functions, which can be exercised by different literary types, can be taken from the field of folklore studies:⁷⁶ amusement or entertainment, joke, validating collective beliefs, controlling human activities, giving norms and expressing social approval of behavior, teaching, frightening.

The problem takes on a new dimension when we consider the task of translating the ancient text into a modern language. Are we primarily to be concerned with the surface-level convergence of content with form, or with the deep-level meaning-structures and intent? Stated differently: Is a translation to be judged for accuracy according to its formal linguistic correspondence (words, syntax, etc.) or according to its ability to evoke a response similar to that elicited by the original communication act?⁷⁷ To the extent that one desires the latter, the function of the original text must be determined, and this requires an analysis of its matrices.

We cannot help but conclude that the issue of function is not irrelevant for form criticism. On the contrary, it may in some cases even be more important than the intent. The intended purpose precedes and accompanies the act of communication, whereas it is the actual function or audience response which will affect the subsequent retention of that discourse. The matrices not only contribute the meanings and intent to the communication, but they also constitute the context in which the discourse functions and evokes responses.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the preceding pages we have called attention to the limitations of the traditional view of *Sitz im Leben* and have suggested a way in which it can be expanded and restructured. It is assumed, in accord with the phenomenologists, that a society, whether ancient or modern, is comprised of multiple worlds of meanings and that individuals orient themselves primarily to such meaning-complexes, not to objects. This plurality of "realities" can be broken down into a number of matrices, each of which is an assemblage of meanings and is located temporally and spatially, though not necessarily socio-culturally. Any communication event occurs within the context of one or more such matrices, from which the communication derives meanings and in which it functions. Some of the predominant matrices are societal, institutional, mental, cultural, ideological, literary. Certain of these have a more direct effect on communication than do others. Meanings are rarely created but are

derived from the conditions of life. It is the task of the form critic thus to relate the biblical literature, in its smaller and larger parts, to the matrices from which it emerged and which it still reflects. The text, especially in its linguistic structure, still retains indications of these matrices, and the recovery of them will enable us better to understand each literary unit.

Notes

1. Aside from the third chapter of K. Koch's The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method (trans. S. M. Cupitt, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), the only study devoted specifically to Sitz im Leben is that by R. Lapointe, "La valeur linguistique du Sitz im Leben", Biblica 52 (1971), pp. 469-487. Of course, the subject is treated in greater or less depth in the numerous methodological studies that have appeared, but in all of these cases it is the larger form-critical method that is under discussion. The question, primarily as it pertains to the Gospels, receives extensive analysis by E. Güttgemanns, Offene Fragen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, BEvTh 54, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1970.

2. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 469.

3. The origin of the present sensitivity for the sociological aspect of ancient literary genres is related to, but not identical with, the rise of genre criticism. This is made especially clear in Martin J. Buss' chapter, "The Study of Forms," in Old Testament Form Criticism, ed. J. H. Hayes, San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974, pp. 1ff. From classical times many literary critics have been aware of the significance of purpose or aim (intention) for each genre, and this implies the social dimension of the use, if not also the origin, of the genres. Despite the common conception that it was Gunkel's "genialer Einfall" (so K. Koch, Was ist Formgeschichte?, 2nd ed., Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967, p. 47; supported also by W. Klatt, Hermann Gunkel, FRLANT 100, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969, pp. 104ff, 144ff.) to incorporate the Sitz im Leben into genre analysis, Buss (op. cit., pp. 51f.) has showed that the idea was current -- though not predominant -- during the 19th century before Gunkel. The extent to which Gunkel was actually dependent on his predecessors, however, is difficult to establish -- even more so for Sitz im Leben than for genre analysis. In light of the attention given this question in the above mentioned publications as well as in another paper to be read at this meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, we will make no effort here to deal with the origin of the research into the Sitz im Leben.

4. Cf., e.g., the statement by H. Conzelmann, "Die formgeschichtliche Methode," Schweizerische theologische Umschau 29 (1959), p. 55: "Die Formgeschichte bedeutet die Aufnahme einer soziologischen Betrachtungsweise: Ein Text ist nur zu verstehen, wenn man die erzählende Gemeinschaft in die Exegese einbezieht, wenn man seinen 'Sitz im Leben' erkannt hat (diese Betrachtung ist natürlich nur bestimmten Texten angemessen, nämlich solchen des vorliterarischen Typs)." Cf. also Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 486.

5. Cf. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Réflexions sur les genres littéraires des Psaumes," in Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen...dedicata, Wageningen: H. Vennsman & Zonan, 1966, p. 277.

6. Gunkel, Reden und Aufsätze, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913, p. 33; reprint of DLZ 27 (1966), cols. 1797ff., 1861ff.

7. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law," in Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. R. A. Wilson, Oxford: Blackwell, 1968, p. 87; first appeared in 1934 and reprinted in Kl. Schr. I, p. 284.

8. Cf., e.g., Gunkel's statement that the oldest genres had originally "eine ganz bestimmte Stelle im israelitischen Volksleben besessen, von dem sie einen wichtigen Teil darstellen, und eben deshalb, weil sie nicht auf dem Papier, sondern im Leben bestanden haben, sind auch ihre ältesten Einheiten so kurz gewesen, entsprechend der geringen Aufnahmefähigkeit der alten Hörer"; "Literaturgeschichte, Biblische", in RGG, 2nd ed., Vol. 3, Tübingen 1929, col. 1679. On this whole question of the limiting of the Sitz im Leben to the oral sphere, cf. also Gütgemanns, Offene Fragen, pp. 155ff.

9. S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas, Vol. 1, Nashville: Abingdon, 1962, p. 36.

10. G. von Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch (1938); reprinted in Ges. Stud. I, especially pp. 10f., 28.

11. Cf., e.g., L. Alonso Schökel, "Die stilistische Analyse bei den Propheten", Congress Volume, Oxford 1959, VTS 7, Leiden: Brill, 1960, p. 162; Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 470; W. Richter, Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, pp. 117, 121, 145ff.; R. Knierim, "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered", Interp 27 (1973), pp. 463ff.; and Gütgemanns, Offene Fragen, pp. 82ff., 155ff., 168ff., 252f.

12. E.g., Koch, Growth, p. 29.

13. While Gunkel (cf. the lengthy quote above) considered also institutions as possible "Sitze im Leben", this is strongly opposed by (E. Sellin -) G. Fohrer, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 10th ed., Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1965, p. 27 (the translation is misleading in the English edition, p. 28).

14. Cf., e.g., the articles by Lapointe and van der Ploeg, mentioned above in footnotes 1 and 5.

15. Cf., e.g., the English edition of Koch's Growth, pp. 26ff.; also Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), pp. 463ff.; and G. Tucker, Form Criticism of the Old Testament, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971, p. 15.

16. Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), p. 464, admits that "setting" is probably not adequate as a general designation.

17. "Les genres littéraires après l'ère gunkélienne", Eglise et théologie 1 (1970), pp. 16f.

18. This appears to be the situation of the narrator's oral delivery, as described by A. B. Lord, The Singer of Tales, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; cf. also Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), pp. 443f.

19. VTS 7 (1960), p. 162.

20. Richter, Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft, pp. 145ff.

21. Sellin-Fohrer, Einleitung, p. 27; "rhetorical setting" in English.

22. Cf., e.g., J. Barr, Old and New in Interpretation, London: SCM Press, 1966, p. 158; and Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), pp. 464f. I am thus suggesting that we go a step further than Knierim, who uses "matrix" but still holds to "setting" as the technical term, despite his recognition (p. 464) of its inadequacy.

23. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, Vol. 1, New York: Harper & Row, 1962, pp. 48-56.

24. Cf., e.g., H. W. Wolff, Amos' geistige Heimat, WMANT 18, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964; trans. by F. R. McCurley, Amos the Prophet: The Man and His Background, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973; also O. H. Steck; "Das Problem theologischer Strömungen in nachexilischer Zeit", EvTh 28 (1968), pp. 445-458.

25. Cf. Barr, Old and New in Interpretation, p. 158; Knierim, Interp, 27 (1973), pp. 438ff.; Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), pp. 469-487; and our discussion below, III. E.

26. It would be interesting and probably very fruitful to examine the phenomenological structuring of the social world; significant gain for our matrix delineation and description could be expected. The starting-point for such study would surely be the writings of Alfred Schutz: Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt, Vienna: Springer, 1932; 2nd ed., 1960; trans. by G. Walsh and F. Lehnert, The Phenomenology of the Social World, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967; Collected Papers, I: The Problem of Social Reality, ed. M. Natanson, 2nd ed., The Hague: Nijhoff, 1967, especially pp. 207ff.; and with Thomas Luckmann, The Structures of the Life-World, trans. R. M. Zaner and H. T. Engelhardt, Jr., Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973. Cf. also Karl Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge, ed. P. Kecskemeti, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1968, especially pp. 33ff. and 43ff.

27. These are reviewed briefly by Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), pp. 437ff.

28. P. Böckmann, Formgeschichte der deutschen Dichtung, Vol. 1, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1949; cf. also Koch, Growth, pp. 37f.

29. Cf., e.g., such works as: L. Loewenthal, Literature, Popular Culture, and Society, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961; R. Escarpit, Sociologie de la littérature, Paris 1960 (also in English translation); D. Laurensen and A. Swingewood, The Sociology of Literature, London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1971; H. A. Glaser, et al., Literaturwissenschaft und Sozialwissenschaften: Grundlagen und Modellanalysen, Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971; G. Lukács, Schriften zur Literatursoziologie, ed. P. Ludz, Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand, 1963; and H. N. Fügen (ed.), Wege der Literatursoziologie, Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand, 1968.

30. Cf. especially the standard survey by B. Malmberg, New Trends in Linguistics: An Orientation, trans. E. Carney, Stockholm and Lund: The Nature Method Institutes, 1964.

31. Note especially Güttgemanns, Offene Fragen; Richter, Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft; W. Schenk, "Die Aufgaben der Exegese und die Mittel der Linguistik", ThLZ 98 (1973), cols. 881-894; also W. C. Doty, "Linguistics and Biblical Criticism", JAAR 41 (1973), pp. 114-121, and the literature and current projects he mentions; cf. also the reservations expressed by K. Koch, "Reichen die formgeschichtlichen Methoden für die Gegenwartsaufgaben der Bibelwissenschaft zu?", ThLZ 98 (1973), cols. 801-814.

32. Cf. Malmberg, New Trends in Linguistics, pp. 34ff. and 68ff.

33. On this distinction between langue and parole, cf. de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics, ed. by C. Bally and A. Sechehaye and trans. by W. Baskin, New York: McGraw-Hall, 1966, pp. 7-20.

34. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), pp. 469-487.

35. Ibid., p. 473; cf. also Koch, Growth, p. 27.

36. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), pp. 474-487, from which the details in the following discussion are drawn.

37. Cf. de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics, pp. 66ff., 102f.

38. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 477, italics his.

39. L. J. Prieto, quoted by Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 478. A more detailed study, on which Lapointe also draws, is G. Mounin, "La notion de situation en linguistique et la poésie", Les temps modernes 22 (1966), pp. 1065-1084.

40. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 481. There are some isolated exceptions, such as Josh. 7:26--"they raised over him a great heap of stones that remains to this day".

41. Lapointe discusses these three literary categories in more detail in his article in Eglise et théologie 1 (1970), pp. 29-38.

42. Cf. Koch, Growth, pp. 34-37.

43. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), pp. 483f; T. Slama-Cazacu, Langage et contexte: Le problème du langage dans la conception de l'expression et de l'interprétation par des organisations contextuelles, 's-Gravenhage: Monton, 1961.

44. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 484.

45. Ibid., p. 485.

46. Ibid., p. 487.

47. Note Richter's estimation (Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft, p. 146): "Bei der Erarbeitung von Daten zur näheren Bestimmung des 'Sitzes im Leben' kommt man... nicht ohne inhaltliche Angaben aus. Diese lassen sich in der Regel nicht in der untersuchten Gattung finden, sondern sind beliebig in der Literatur verstreut oder ergeben sich aus anderen Sachdaten."

48. This analogy has been attributed to my former teacher, Prof. Einer Molland of the University of Oslo, though I cannot verify it.

49. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 484.

50. Ibid., pp. 484f., 487.

51. Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft, p. 147.

52. Lapointe, Bibl 52 (1971), p. 486.

53. Koch, Growth, p. 27.

54. Redactional and literary creations can only with great difficulty be related to a "setting in life" if one follows Koch's understanding of it as a "social occurrence"; cf. Growth, p. 28. The concept of literary matrix, on the other hand, includes also consideration of literary activity that can be associated with no social occurrences.

55. Cf. above, footnote 24.

56. For example, A. Ohler, Gattungen im Alten Testament: Ein Arbeitsbuch, 2 vols., Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1972-73; J. Schreiner, "Formen und Gattungen im Alten Testament", in Einführung in die Methoden der biblischen Exegese, ed. Schreiner, Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971, pp. 194-231; and Koch, Growth, passim.

57. Cf. Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), p. 464.

58. Cf. H.F. Hahn, Old Testament in Modern Research, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954, pp. 138ff.; E. Fascher, Die formgeschichtliche Methode, BZNW 2, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1924, pp. 214ff.; and Koch, Growth, pp. 29f.

59. The problem is not that the influence on Amos was geistig, as Knierim (Interp 27, 1973, p. 464) maintains, but rather that human individuality and choice in orienting oneself to his "life-world" put the formative influence in a

different light.

60. Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), p. 464.

61. Cf., e.g., K.-H. Bernhardt, Die gattungsgeschichtliche Forschung am Alten Testament als exegetische Methode: Ergebnisse und Grenzen, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1959, pp. 39-42.

62. Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), p. 438. A basically similar position is taken by Lapointe, Eglise et théologie 1 (1970), pp. 14f.

63. Jolles, Einfache Formen, Halle (Saale): Niemeyer Verlag, 1929; 2nd ed., 1956; cf. also Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), pp. 439-442.

64. On the topics of matrix transfer and genre imitation, cf. H. Barth and O.H. Steck, Exegese des Alten Testaments Leitfaden der Methodik, 2nd ed., Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971, pp. 62-64; Koch, Growth, pp. 34-37; and Richter, Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft, pp. 147f.

65. For a detailed description of the ways these two modes of transmission have been treated by past researchers, cf. the writer's Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel, SBL Dissertation Series 9, Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

66. Lord, The Singer of Tales, especially pp. 124ff.; Güttingmanns, Offene Fragen, pp. 82ff., 155ff., 168ff., 252f.

67. Güttingmanns, Offene Fragen, p. 169: "Während die Seinsweise einer mündlichen Gattung ein esse in potentia, esse in actu, esse in functione ist, das aktualisiert wird, wenn die Zeit des 'Sitzes im Leben' gekommen ist (wenn die soziologische Verwendungssituation eintritt), ist die Seinsweise einer schriftlichen Gattung ein esse in obiectivione scripturae und damit grundsätzlich nicht unbedingt von einer bestimmten Verwendungszeit abhängig" (italics his).

68. Ibid., pp. 170, 174ff., 255f.

69. Cf. especially his "The Structural Study of Myth", in Structural Anthropology, trans. C. Jacobson and B.G. Schoepf, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967, pp. 202-228.

70. Cf. also Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), pp. 440f.

71. Tucker, Form Criticism of the Old Testament, pp. 16f.; Knierim, Interp 27 (1973), p. 466; also H.W. Hoffmann, "Form--Funktion--Intention", ZAW 82 (1970), pp. 341-346.

72. "Begreppet funktion i gammaltestamentlig traditionsforskning", SEÅ 33 (1968), pp. 55-67; cf. also this writer's Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel, pp. 320f., 327.

73. Cf. SEÅ 33 (1968), especially pp. 56-60.

74. Tucker, Form Criticism of the Old Testament, p. 17.

75. Soisalon-Soininen, SEÅ 33 (1968), p. 58.

76. Cf. B. Alver, "Category and Function", Fabula (Zeitschrift für Erzählforschung) 9 (1967), pp. 63-69.

77. The former is termed "formal correspondence", while the latter is "dynamic equivalence". Cf. especially E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, The Theory and Practice of Translation, Leiden: Brill, 1969; Nida, Toward a Science of Translating, Leiden: Brill, 1964; and Nida, "Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship", JBL 91 (1972), pp. 73-89. Cf. also numerous articles in the United Bible Societies' journal, The Bible Translator.