

# THE RHETORICAL ARRANGEMENT OF HEBREWS

JOHN R. WALTERS

*[Author's note: The following paper was originally read at the 1989 Christmas Conference of the John Wesley Fellowship, held at Candler School of Theology. Since that time, numerous requests have been made for access to the paper, and it has now been cited in several published sources. The author has decided to make the paper available as originally delivered in order to remain consistent with its citations in the published literature, and an addendum has been attached to bring the article more up to date.]*

The Epistle to the Hebrews presents a number of critical challenges and complexities. Authorship, date of composition, literary genre, intended audience, purpose, and plan are debated with no real consensus to be found. This article attempts to further our understanding of the arrangement of Hebrews by way of examining the author's rhetorical use of biblical texts in this "word of exhortation" (13:22).

## A. A SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Scholars have produced markedly different results in the attempt to define the arrangement of this epistle. A brief survey of the analytical variety is offered to show both the limitations and the consensus of our scientific probing to date. Following that survey, another proposal will be offered.

A generation ago the common approach was to divide Hebrews into two portions, didactic and admonitory, much like the divisions seen in the letters of the pauline corpus. Nairne saw the argumentative core (5:1-10:18) enclosed by a prelude (1:1-4:16) and an exhortation (10:19-13:25).<sup>1</sup> Westcott took the theme of the epistle to be the finality of Christianity and divided its argument into five parts, the first four didactic and the final one admonitory.<sup>2</sup> Moffatt traces the argument of the epistle and notes the exhortations by way of digression. The

---

*John R. Walters is the collection development librarian at Asbury Theological Seminary.*

THE ASBURY THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

FALL 1996 • VOL. 51 • NO. 2

argument ends at 10:18 and is followed by appeals for constancy (10:19-13:24).<sup>3</sup>

Continental scholarship of that time was less inclined to follow this ready two-part arrangement. Windisch says, "Auch die früher übliche Zerlegung in einen mehr theoretischen (1,—10<sub>18</sub>) und mehr praktischen Teil (10<sub>19</sub> ff.) ist nicht angängig..."<sup>4</sup> Instead he argues that Hebrews is not composed as a seamless fabric well thought through, but as the jotting of one whose musings ebb and flow. It only really hangs together generally in its presentation of the high-priestly work of Christ.<sup>5</sup> In fact, it offers a series of six theological musings on the high-priesthood of Christ marked off by three intervening digressions (3:1-4:13; 5:11-6:20; 7:26-8:2), which are largely admonitory in nature. As of 10:18 these reflections are concluded, and paranetic considerations follow, again interrupted by a great digression (11:1-40).

Present scholarship likewise tends to view the paranetic passages as ancillary to the development of the main theme(s). Wikenhauser sees three parts to the arrangement of Hebrews: the superiority of the new revelation (1:1-4:13), Jesus the true High Priest (4:14-10:18), and exhortation to loyalty (10:19-13:17).<sup>6</sup> Grant apportions Hebrews into eleven sections, basing the divisions on the author's use of connectives and rhetorical periods. The fourth section (5:11-6:20) is offered only parenthetically because it consists of exhortation in consideration of the third point, viz., Jesus being the great High Priest who has passed through the heavens. The ninth section draws ethical implications (12:1-29), and the tenth section offers various injunctions (13:1-17).<sup>7</sup> Hunter also finds the argument interspersed with exhortation and, noting the author's habit, divides the discourse anyway into main argument (1:1-10:18) and closing exhortation (10:19-13:25).<sup>8</sup> Guthrie sees only two sections, argument and exhortation: the superiority of Christianity (1:1-10:18) and exhortations based thereon (10:19-13:17).<sup>9</sup> Kümmel, too, regards the presence of paranetic passages throughout the exposition as interruptive, though he recognizes "these are actually the real goal of the entire exposition."<sup>10</sup>

Recent scholarship has taken three paths. One focuses on the relationship of the paranesis to the theological argument in seeking to refine the outline of Hebrews. Childs, for example, finds a clue to the book's arrangement in the "interchange between dogmatic and paranetic sections of the letter."<sup>11</sup> Long ago Zahn pointed out that "the longer as well as the shorter theoretical discussions always end in practical exhortations."<sup>12</sup> This point has been overlooked by the scholarly community. Zahn goes on to state:

Nor do these exhortations give the impression of being an appended moral. The intensity of their language and the detail with which they are frequently worked out, would seem to indicate that they express the main purpose of the letter to which even the most artificial and detailed discussions are subordinate.<sup>13</sup>

Exhortation is not to be viewed as superfluous to the progression of thought in Hebrews. Rather, argumentation serves exhortation.

The second fruitful direction taken by more recent scholarship has been to investigate the author's use of Scripture as an indication of arrangement. Guilding suggests that lectionary readings may explain the author's selection of scriptural texts.<sup>14</sup> Bruce

goes a step farther to argue that the author treats the Old Testament writings as a *mashal* requiring typological and messianic explanation. The framework of the epistle in his view is supplied from the Psalter: psalms 8, 95, 110, and 40 heading the main sections of the work.<sup>15</sup> To that list of texts Lohse adds one more important biblical passage, Jeremiah 31, from which this sermon in its several sections is derived.<sup>16</sup> Koester is in agreement, stating, "The interpretation of Scripture is certainly the key for understanding Hebrews, and its outline can be explained as a sequence of scriptural interpretations under the heading of certain theological topics."<sup>17</sup> This point will be elucidated below.

Vaganay has taken a third, fresh approach to Hebrews. He suggests its plan is discernible and is characterized by the use of *inclusio* and *concatenatio*. The *inclusio* is denoted by a verbal correspondence between the beginning and the end of a literary unit. Vaganay argues for the occurrence in Hebrews of *mots-crochet*, "hook words," anticipating and linking the end of one unit to the onset of the next.<sup>18</sup> This approach has been followed and presented in more refinement by Vanhoye.<sup>19</sup> He has observed other rhetorical devices in the epistle, such as alternation of genres (exposition and exhortation), concentric symmetry, contrasts, and *les annonces du sujet*, i.e., oblique references in advance to a theme only later to be treated. He divides the book into concentric or chiasmic sections: Exordium, 1:1-4; A (Eschatology), 1:5-2:18; B (Ecclesiology), 3:1-5:10; X (Sacrifice), 5:11-10:39; B' (Ecclesiology), 11:1-12:13; A' (Eschatology), 12:14-13:18; Conclusion, 13:20-21. Indebted to the work of Vanhoye, Spicq and Swetnam offer their own variations.<sup>20</sup>

In this survey we have seen the variety of approaches taken with respect to the arrangement of Hebrews. Almost uniformly they are based on the doctrinal argument(s) presented there. Only the more recent studies are placing the paranesis on par with the exposition. Consensus has long recognized Hebrews to employ varied and creative rhetoric, but its definition and significance for the book's arrangement and argument are debated still. What can be said with confidence is that major breaks are noted commonly before 2:5; 3:1; 4:14; 8:1; 10:18; and less commonly before 5:10; 7:1; and 13:1.

In an article just published Lindars has brought various threads together remarkably well in an insightful analysis of the epistle's structure.<sup>21</sup> He rightly argues that the climax of the argument is not to be found in the treatment of the high priesthood of Christ, or of his sacrifice, but in the following section on faith (and its response). The author is not concerned to garner assent for his novel doctrinal presentations; rather, his aim is to persuade a dissident faction of Christians in a certain locale to change their behavior to be in conformity with their original confession of Christ. He states, "The whole composition is parenesis (or *παράκλησις*, 13:22), and the doctrinal exposition is subordinate to this purpose."<sup>22</sup> The central argument is not a proof of the efficacy of Jesus' death as sacrifice, but a proof of the *permanence* of its efficacy as sacrifice for sin once for all. The dissidents, in consciousness of their (post-baptismal) sins according to Lindars, are seeking remedial help once again in the ministrations of their former Judaism. This conjecture is debatable, but no one disputes that the author is calling them back to their original confession and urging them to move forward in

fidelity to Christ by stepping "outside the camp" of their former religious associations. Thus, in Lindars' view the grand finale is 12:18-29, and chapter thirteen reintroduces calm by way of closing. Lindars has chosen to lift up the rhetorical aims, methods, and responses embedded in Hebrews rather than to delineate the actual structural framework. So, this will be attempted below, and to do so (at least) one further rhetorical element to the puzzle needs to be lifted up.

In an article now thirty years old G.B. Caird presents evidence that links the structure of Hebrews to the argument it puts forward. Recognizing the ultimate purpose of the book's discourse to be a pastoral one, Caird proposes that the author's argument is arranged in sections around four biblical passages, each one after the first (itself introduced by a long *catena* of biblical quotations) placed at the head of its respective section. This marshaling of proof-texts is done with a purpose:

It is not the purpose of the author to prove the superiority of the New Covenant to the Old, nor to establish the inadequacy of the old order. His ultimate purpose, of course, is pastoral, for he has been appalled at the spiritual lethargy, the slackening of morals, which has overtaken his friends, and he writes to summon them to that constant striving towards maturity of faith which Christianity demands and makes possible. To this end he attempts to show them that they are living in the day of grace and opportunity to which the whole history and education of the people of God have been directed. His argument falls into four sections, each having as its core an Old Testament passage which declares the ineffectiveness and symbolic or provisional nature of the Old Testament religious institutions. All other scriptural references are ancillary to these four (Pss. 8, 95, 110, and Jer. 31), which control the drift of the argument.<sup>23</sup>

This proposal has the merit of explaining rhetorical features of the author's argumentation that many, Caird included, have not related to each other. More will be said about this in a moment.

It is well known that paranesis is interspersed in blocks throughout the document. W. Nauck has argued that the book is structured by means of the paranetic passages that mark the beginning and ending of each of the three major sections he sees: 1:1-4:13; 4:14-10:31; 10:32-13:17.<sup>24</sup> This is an important insight and explains in part the flow of the book. It has the important advantage of providing some rationale for the placement of exhortation in blocks throughout the epistle. However, it leaves further questions unanswered.

A variant on Caird's approach has been followed by two other investigators. F. F. Bruce finds an extensive use of the Psalter in Hebrews:

First a section of the Psalter is quoted more or less verbatim, and then words and phrases from the quotation are incorporated into the following exposition, somewhat in the manner now familiar to us from the *pesher* texts at Qumran. Again, more than once he starts a phase of his argument with a psalm quotation and then turns to other Old Testament passages dealing with the same theme for material to elaborate his argument.<sup>25</sup>

As Bruce sees the epistle's structure, the primary texts upon which it is based are Pss. 8, 95, 110, and 40. The purpose behind this selection is as follows:

The purpose of our author's exegesis of Old Testament scripture, as of his general argument, is to establish the finality of the gospel by contrast with all that went before it (more particularly, by contrast with the Levitical cultus), as the way of perfection, the way which alone leads men to God without any barrier or interruption of access.<sup>26</sup>

Again, this analysis is similar to Caird's with the one exception that Caird made the additional point that the texts chosen actually argue the self-attested ineffectiveness of the old covenant. The author's case is based on the Scripture's witness against itself. It is this observation that leads Caird to take Jer. 31 as the epistle's fourth main text rather than Psalm 40.

Eduard Lohse agrees with Bruce that scriptural citations are given and then explained in an argument designed to show the supremacy of God's revelation in Jesus Christ. Lohse differs, though, in his choice of primary texts. He takes the same passages suggested by Caird and Bruce and combines them together: Pss. 8, 95, 110, Jer. 31, and Psa. 40.<sup>27</sup> But, the particular strength of Caird's article is that it shows more clearly than do Bruce and Lohse the rationale behind the principal quotations and the connection between them in the author's overall argument.

A nagging problem remains. The various analyses of the arrangement of Hebrews leave 10:19-13:25 disconnected from what precedes. Even Caird, Bruce, and Lohse do not show precisely how the paranesis fits into the structure and argument of the letter. The tendency of scholars in approaching Hebrews has been to emphasize theology at the expense of exhortation in the epistle. In each case their concern is to explain the theological argument of the discourse, consequently their analyses of the epistle's arrangement are theologically oriented. Invariably, they do not go on to explain how the final chapters relate to the structure they propose but treat them as an appendage. Lindars alone has correctly placed the climax of the epistle in the paranesis of the closing chapters. After all, if this epistle recognized by all to have a pastoral or exhortative thrust reveals anything about the author's intentions, surely it is his desire to move his audience to keep their eyes fixed upon Jesus (12:1-2) and to go forth to him outside the camp (13:13). The exhortation throughout points in this direction, but the final three chapters really drive the point home. The analyses of Caird, Bruce, and Lohse leave the final three chapters somewhat disconnected from the tight theological argument they see employed through chapter ten.

The epistle is so rich theologically that one might easily but mistakenly focus on the content of the epistle rather than its intent. If, on the other hand, theology is the hand-maiden of paranesis in this λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως as the author himself describes it, then one should expect the employment of primary scriptural texts somehow to apply to the closing paranesis of the letter. The other blocks of paranesis noted by Nauck as significant for each section build to this final extended call; it is the paranesis that holds the various sections of the discourse together in a unified whole. Such passages as 12:1-2, 18-29 and 13:13-16 offer in miniature the entire purport of the book.

Nor is theology lacking in the last three chapters as might be concluded from the analyses of those who find no primary texts beyond chapter ten. The discussions of faith from a perspective of salvation history in chapter eleven and of divine disciplining in chapter twelve provide clear theological content. At the close of the book as all the way through it, theology serves paranetic interests.

### B. A PROPOSAL

Hebrews is the clearest New Testament example of rhetorical composition. The writer is not only a brilliant theologian but also a masterful orator. One rhetorical device employed is the emphasis on God speaking both in past and present via the Scriptures.<sup>28</sup> The entire introduction (1:1-2:4) focuses not on the superiority of Christ to angels but on the eschatological communication of God. Psalm 95 is introduced as the present (eschatological) communication of the Holy Spirit to the target community (3:7-14). Psalm 2:7 and 110:4 are the statements of God conferring upon Jesus the glory of high priesthood (5:5-6). Indeed, the author refers to Psalm 110:4 as the very oath of God sworn to Jesus (7:20-21). The new covenant prophecy of Jeremiah 31 is the performative pronouncement of God relegating the Mosaic dispensation to obsolescence (8:8-13). In quoting Jeremiah 31 again later on, the author introduces it as the present eschatological witness of the Holy Spirit to the target community (10:15-19). Habakkuk 2:3-4 is cited as the eschatological promise of God yet outstanding to those who do not shrink back but move forward in faith (10:37-38). The emotive climax of the whole work is the passage recalling the Sinai theophany (12:18-29). More precisely, it is a theophony because God is not seen but heard in trumpet blast and oracular voice. The warning is given not to refuse to hear the voice presently speaking from heaven. God is speaking, and the audience is called to respond in faith. Briefly put, that is the argument of Hebrews.

The author uses the additional rhetorical device of arranging his argument as a series of six scriptural explications, each framed with exhortation. A principal passage of Scripture is introduced, its eschatological message is expounded, and the admonition is applied freely yet pointedly. By way of this technique the whole book from 2:5 through 13:19 is arranged.

Another way of looking at the argument of the book will explain more fully the relation of the last three chapters to what precedes. According to Caird, the key citations serve the theological purpose of pointing out "that the Old Testament is not only an incomplete book but an avowedly incomplete book, what taught and teaches men to live by faith in the good things that were to come."<sup>29</sup> This point is important and must not be forgotten, but the issue involved at the heart of this word of exhortation (13:22)<sup>30</sup> is more than strictly a theological one.

The theological concern of the author is subservient to his pastoral office. The author does argue the avowed incompleteness of the scriptural record, to be sure. However, once he has proved his point about the avowedly provisional nature of the Old Testament cultus, he does not merely rest his case. Instead, he demonstrates the necessity of sustained response to the eschatological word of God in Jesus Christ. It is eschatological in one sense because it is the fulfillment of scriptural expectations. The

destiny intended for humanity has been achieved by Jesus who stands for us all (2:9). It is eschatological in another sense because it gives rise to expectations yet unfulfilled, i.e., promises that will be inherited only by those who hold fast to the profession of Christ (4:14). The argument of the epistle is directed to the eschatological call for unwavering faithfulness, particularly because Christ has come as high priest of the good things now in place (9:11).

The entire document falls readily into a structure organized according to scriptural quotations and directed toward exhortation, a structure eminently suitable for homiletic discourse and not simply doctrinal formulation. This structure carries forward through the whole book, but in order to show it a slight emendation of Caird's analysis is necessary. In addition to the four primary quotations noted by him, two later ones are present and carry the argument to its paranetic conclusion. This emendation posits six passages that make the eschatological point that the good things to come and to which the Scriptures avowedly pointed are now realized only in Christ, and faithfulness is required to see them finally realized in the lives of those who would follow him. It is the very same purpose Caird has stated above, but it is viewed from the pastoral rather than theological side. Caird overlooked the final two passages because they did not satisfy his theological requirement that a primary quotation demonstrate the avowedly provisional nature of Scripture's witness. His theological requirement overlooked the recognized fact that the book's ultimate purpose is pastoral and that theological considerations are offered to elicit a response from the audience. It seems only appropriate that having shown Scripture to point beyond its Levitical institutions to Christ the author should apply it motivationally to his audience.

Before we proceed to map out the organization of the book in more specific terms, something must be said about Psalm 40:7-9. Both Lohse and Bruce see this quotation in 10:5-7 as the key to a portion of the author's argument. If it is indeed a primary quotation like the others, one should expect the subsequent argumentation to derive from it as, for example, chapters three and four derive from Psalm 95, chapters five through seven derive from Psalm 110, and chapter eleven derives from Habakkuk 2. Unmistakably, though, the author uses Psalm 40 as the basis of his line of thought only for the next three verses before he returns again to his previous theme of the high priesthood of Christ and the supersession of the old covenant in the institution of the new. Indeed, he even quotes Jeremiah 31 again subsequently to his treatment of Psalm 40. It rather appears that Psalm 40 is ancillary to the more prominent theme offered by Jeremiah 31, i.e., the institution of the new covenant is to be seen in two pieces of evidence supplied by the Bible itself: the old covenant's provisions for sacrifice are not ultimately as pleasing to God as the body He himself has prepared as their replacement; secondly, someone has come with the express purpose of performing the will of God, the very thing the former covenant could not bring about. These two points provide a parallel to the thought of Jeremiah 31, which presents a new covenant to replace the old one and a new humanity capable of the obedience necessitated by relationship to God. Psalm 40 turns out to be of little more importance to the argument of this section than are Exodus 24:8, which is quoted in 9:20, and Deuteronomy 32:35 and Psalm 135:14, which are quoted in 10:30.

It is significant that Nauck's findings and Caird's thesis, with the emendation pro-

posed, correlate quite well together. The paranetic passages group themselves fairly uniformly in proximity to the six primary scriptural quotations, as the following table shows.

SECTION	VERSES	OT TEXT	PLACEMENT	PARANESIS	PARANESIS
Introduction	1:1-2:4	<i>catena</i>	1:5-13		2:1-3
1st Point: "You Crowned Him"	2:5-18	Psa. 8	2:6-8		
2nd Point: "Today"	3:1-4:13	Psa. 95	3:7-11	3:1,12-14	4:1,11
3rd Point: "A Priest Forever"	4:14-7:28	Psa. 110	5:6	4:14-16	5:11-6:12
4th Point: "A New Covenant"	8:1-10:31 <sup>31</sup>	Jer. 31	8:8-12		10:19-29
5th Point: "By Faith"	10:32-12:2 <sup>32</sup>	Hab. 2	10:37-38	10:32-36	12:1-2
6th Point: "Do Not Lose Heart"	12:3-13:19	Prov. 3	12:5-6	12:3-29	13:1-19
Closing	13:20-21 <sup>33</sup>				

Nauck's insight that the major sections of the epistle begin and end in paranesis holds even when the book is divided along the lines of Caird's analysis. Caird's point that each section (after the introduction) opens with a primary scriptural quotation is also valid. Under this arrangement the final three chapters are seen to be consistent with the previous chapters in following the same rhetorical device. This suggested emendation consisting of two additional primary quotations fully accounts for the analytical insights of both scholars, yet allows the argument of the letter to flow directly to its crowning, paranetic conclusion:

Let us then go to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured. For here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come. Through him, then, let us continually offer a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess his name (Heb. 13:13-15, NRSV).



### C. ADDENDUM

If anything, the most recent attempts to define the structure of Hebrews have failed to present any breakthroughs.<sup>34</sup> There remains no real agreement on the number of main sections to the epistle, where they begin and end, their connections one to another, their flow in relation to the author's overriding purpose and message. The use of literary and structural analyses to solve this problem has yielded masterful, if unconvincing, suggestions.<sup>35</sup> One extensive research proposal, however, deserves special mention. George Guthrie has revisited the whole discussion in a monograph on the structure of Hebrews.<sup>36</sup> After summarizing the attempts to explain the organizational scheme of the book from the patristic period to the present day, and after giving due emphasis to modern rhetorical analysis, he notes the difficulties of any method looking for similarities between Hebrews and ancient Greek oration crafted for legal or political venues.<sup>37</sup> The homily in the Diaspora Christian synagogue uses standard oratorical devices for its novel purposes, deviating freely from the public conventions of the day to accomplish its own goals. Guthrie chooses, then, to pursue text-linguistic (discourse) analysis as the method by which to unlock Hebrews. He focuses on cohesion shifts involving various categories such as genre, topic, perspective, actor, grammatical function, or lexical form, he focuses on *inclusio* as a device, and he focuses on lexical cohesion and transitions. On his analysis, the argument of the epistle falls into two discourses, each with embedded subelements and both treating the position of the Son in relation to other divinely ordained authorities. The second discourse, 4:14-10:25, closely follows Nauck's primary *inclusio* involving 4:14-16 and 10:19-25. He concludes that "the hortatory material builds on elements from the expository material" and that "the expository material serves the hortatory purpose of the whole work."<sup>38</sup> The two genres do interrelate, but are not closely integrated:

They move along different lines but hasten toward the same goal. Each in its own way builds toward the goal of challenging the hearers to endure. The expository material builds toward the goal by focusing on the appointed high priest as a superior basis for endurance. The hortatory passages move toward the goal by reiteration of warnings, promises, and examples used to challenge the hearers to endure.<sup>39</sup>

Even granting Guthrie the importance of Nauck's *inclusio*, I cannot agree that the author's intention is to urge the recipients of the homily to endure abuse. In 4:14-16 and 10:19-25, the passages that define the supposed *inclusio*, the emphasis is not on endurance per se, but holding fast to the confession of Christ and drawing near to the throne of grace when former alternatives appear to be more attractive. Both actions involve a conscious decision to confirm identity with and relationship to Christ, to grasp the benefits of a unique standing before God, rather than merely enduring opposition such as Jesus did. I find these conclusions frustratingly generalized, given the almost one-hundred and fifty pages of intricate analytical detail and close examination of stylistic elements. Nor does Guthrie explain clearly the author's placement of paranesis in relation to the organizational arrangement he proposes. The analytical data he assembles from text-linguistic analysis is interesting and helpful, but it by no means puts the question of the book's arrangement to rest.

The increasing complexity of our critical investigations can become more a reflection of our own analytical sophistication than an accurate rendering of the epistle's secrets. I remain unconvinced that the rhetorical arrangement of Hebrews is not fairly simple, an opening introduction utilizing a *catena* of texts and signalling the scriptural framework to follow in six main points, each of the six sections with its primary scriptural passage near the beginning of the section, and each section (after the first) typically punctuated with paranesis at beginning and end, the final, climactic section largely paranetical (as befits this self-styled word of exhortation), and followed by a simple conclusion.

The real question is what criteria of selection prompted the author to assemble the individual scriptural passages together in such a way as to frame an entire homiletic discourse from them? A theological answer as to the superiority or unique position of the Son is not sufficient, nor is the proposal that Scripture avows its own obsolescence in the greater purpose of God. Each of the six passages announces well in advance of that pivotal day the eschatological activity of God in moving beyond the familiar covenantal categories formerly known to Israel; each of the six passages places the hearer in an eschatological tension of fulfillment and anticipation; each of the six passages calls for a sustained response of faith in recognition of the one great divine act that changed the human predicament for all time to come. Endurance is less the issue than a full and complete recognition of the new situation, the new standing afforded God's people, and the steps needful to ensure it is not forfeited. Naturally, each passage under such an eschatological hermeneutic will bear new truth to the hearer and also call for a new and sustained response. When even one of the primary passages would have sufficed to garner the purposed effect, the author dramatically chose the reinforcement of an additional five such proofs. The close correspondence of 4:14-16 to 10:19-25, striking though it is as paranesis, is less an explicit rhetorical device gleaned from Hellenistic handbooks on oratory than it is a pastoral burden resoundingly reiterated to the assembled audience.

#### NOTES

1. Alexander Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913), p. 301.
2. B.F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The Greek Text with Notes and Essays* (3rd. ed.; London: Macmillan, 1903), pp. xlviii-xlix.
3. James Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), pp. xxiii-xxiv.
4. Hans Windisch, *Der Hebräerbrief* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1913), p. 10. "The earlier typical analysis in terms of a more theoretical (1:1-10:18) portion and a more practical (10:19 ff.) portion is not tenable...."
5. *Ibid.*
6. Alfred Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1958), pp. 454-456.
7. Robert M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 216-217.
8. A.M. Hunter, *Introducing the New Testament* (3rd. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), p. 161.

9. Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (3rd. ed.; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), pp. 728-733.
10. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), p. 390.
11. Brevard S. Childs, *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), pp. 415-416.
12. Theodor Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament, II* (1909 rpt.; Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1977), p. 314.
13. Ibid.
14. Aileen Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 72, 100. F.C. Syngé finds the author of Hebrews referring not to a lectionary but to a "testimony book" of scriptural passages assembled by the early church to bolster messianic claims for Jesus. See F.C. Syngé, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London: S.P.C.K., 1959), p. 54.
15. F.F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Marshall, Morgan, & Scott, 1964), p. li. He cites R. Rendall, "The Method of the Writer to the Hebrews in Using Old Testament Quotations," *Evangelical Quarterly* 27 (1955): 214-220, and S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: W.G. van Soest, 1961).
16. Eduard Lohse, *The Formation of the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), p. 197.
17. Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament, vol. II, History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), pp. 273-274.
18. L. Vaganay, "Le plan de l'Épître aux Hébreux," in *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris: Gabalda, 1940), pp. 269-277.
19. Since his first contribution in 1959 on the subject, he has produced a number of studies and refinements. The most recent is cited here; A. Vanhoye, "Discussions sur la structure de l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Biblica* 55 (1974): 349-380. He regards 1:5-2:18 as one entire section treating the name of Christ. The theme is introduced in 1:4, the hook word ἄγγελος links the introduction to the first theme by its use in 1:4 and 1:5. An *inclusio* is formed by the use of the word ἄγγελος at 1:5 and 2:16. Vanhoye has received only a slight following among scholars. Typical among dissenters is the review by T.C.G. Thornton, *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 15 (1964): 137-141, who rebuts Vanhoye's complex thesis, but appreciates his refinement of the author's use of certain literary devices such as announcements. See also Jukka Thurén, *Das Lobopfer der Hebräer: Studien zum Aufbau und Anliegen von Hebräerbrief 13* (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A., vol. 47; Abo, 1973), pp. 25-49. He in turn follows on R. Gyllenberg, "Die Komposition des Hebräerbriefes," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 22-23 (1957-58): 137-147, who poses two great parts to the epistle, 1:1-4:16 on the theme of the ἀρχηγός and 5:1-12:29 on the theme of the ὁρχιερεύς.
20. C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Sources Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1977), pp. 34-36, basically updates his 1952 two-volume commentary without deviating on his assessment of the plan of Hebrews. James Swetnam, "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6," *Biblica* 53 (1972): 368-385; also his "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13," *Biblica* 55 (1974): 333-348.
21. Barnabas Lindars, "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 382-406.
22. Ibid., p. 392, note 2.
23. George B. Caird, "The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5 (1959): 47.
24. W. Nauck, "Zum Aufbau des Hebräerbriefes," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 199-206.
25. F.F. Bruce, op. cit., p. li.
26. Op. cit., p. lii.

27. Eduard Lohse, *The Formation of the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), pp. 196-198.
28. Eg., 1:5-7; 3:7; 4:7-8; 5:5-6,12; 6:5,13-14; 8:8,13; 10:5,8-9,15,30; 12:19,25-26. The author also refers to himself as speaking in this communication: 5:11; 6:9; 9:5; 11:32.
29. Caird, op. cit., p. 49.
30. Acts 13:15 uses the very same language. If it is any clue, the author has intended this book to be a sermonic discourse.
31. Many commentators end this section at 10:18. There are good reasons for not doing so. 10:19 emphasizes the eschatological reality of entering even now the heavenly sanctuary directly in contrast to the lack of access under the old regime pointed out in 9:8. 10:20 is a restatement of 9:12 and 9:24. 10:21 echoes 8:1. 10:26 can only be understood as a hypothetical denial of the truth stated in 9:26. 10:29, in mentioning "the blood of the covenant," is directly dependent upon the Jer. 31 quotation, which is the focus of the entire section. The section properly concludes with 10:31.
32. Again, the sentence in 12:1-2 belongs more properly to what precedes than to what follows, as the connective *τοῦτο* suggests. Furthermore, the "cloud of witnesses" refers to the cavalcade of faith's heroes just called to mind throughout chapter eleven. More pointedly, *ὑπομονή* or endurance as a posture of faith is recalled from the beginning of the section, 10:36. Finally, 12:2 explains 11:39-40.
- 12:3 begins the final section, an extended call to consider Christ and take heart. The theme tolls repeatedly like a great bell throughout the section: 12:5,12,24-25; 13:8,12-13,15; and culminates in the powerful benediction of 13:20-21.
33. The final three verses of the book are not part of the discourse itself, but appear to be a brief note appended to it by the author at the time it was sent.
34. Here I include such works as the following: Harold W. Attridge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989); Walter G. Übelacker, *Der Hebräerbrief als Appell* (Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989); Erich Gräßer, *An die Hebräer* (EKK Band XVII/1; Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1990); Hans-Friedrich Weiß, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK Band XXX; 15. Aufl.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); William L. Lane, *Hebrews* (WBC vols. 47A&B; Dallas: Word, 1991); Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).
35. For example, Louis Dussaut, *Synopse structurelle de l'Épître aux Hébreux: approche d'analyse structurelle* (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1981), follows the concentric approach of Vanhoye centering on 9:11, and proposes a four-layer structure to the epistle: the work itself; the work in three main parts; the three parts in seven columns (2,3,2); the seven columns in fourteen sections, arranged in even and odd sequence chastically.
36. George H. Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994).
37. Ibid., p. 32f.
38. Ibid., pp. 141, 143.
39. Ibid., p. 146.