

Conclusion

This is the summary of the conclusions. In xix 28 "the scripture" is the same one as Jesus quoted at the Feast of Tabernacles, namely Zechariah xiv 8 (understood in conjunction with Ezekiel xlvii). This scripture contained the promise of God to give new life in order to make a holy people for Himself. Without the fulfilment of this promise creation cannot attain to the completeness and perfection which God has planned for it. xix 28 is to be translated in a different way so that the *ἵνα* clause is subordinate to the verb of the preceding clause, *τετέλεσται*. It means that all the necessary things had been accomplished so that the promise would now come to fruition. It is the work of the Son of God to finish His Father's work of creation and to breathe into mankind the eternal life-giving Spirit. Since 'the scripture' described this 'work' John can speak of the Son's work in terms of bringing this scriptural promise to its fulfilment, or, fruition. The scripture is not interpreted literally, but in a spiritual sense, developed along the lines of moral and spiritual interpretations of other matters by the prophets. The true Temple of God is the humanity of the Son, in whom God dwelt among mankind and revealed His glory and holiness in the magnitude of His love. The water of life which flows out of the Temple is the divine Spirit of Grace, which is poured out into the world through the crucifixion of the Son, a deed which is the forgiveness from God. The beloved disciple is portrayed discreetly as the first-born of the children of God, and the symbolic figure of all those who, through his record of the evidence, believe.

The "scripture" has nothing to do with the thirst of Jesus, except by way of a paradoxical contrast. Instead, 19:28 should be translated in some such way as this,

"After this, Jesus, knowing that everything had been completed in order to bring the scripture to fruition, said, 'I thirst'."

New Testament

Vol XI

Oct. 1969

Fasc. 4

ON THE LITERARY GENRE OF THE "EPISTLE" TO THE HEBREWS

BY

JAMES SWETNAM

Rome

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been and is the object of so much divergent theorizing in the history of modern exegesis that one is tempted to doubt whether any substantial agreement about it is possible, at least in the foreseeable future. A happy exception to this sad state of affairs is the rather general consensus on the literary genre of the "epistle". Inasmuch as the author of Hebrews himself says that his work is a *λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως* (xiii 22)¹), and inasmuch as this phrase denotes a homily in Acts xiii 15, the conclusion would seem to be that the "Epistle" to the Hebrews is basically a homily, with a few words attached at the end after the manner of a letter²). For an understanding of the literary form of the epistle, then, it would seem advisable to study the form of the early homily.

The most thorough discussion up to the present of the literary form of the homily with reference to Hebrews is that of HARTWIG THYEN, *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*³). It is THYEN's thesis that a number of Jewish and Christian writings in Greek in

¹) "The 'word of exhortation' [*λόγος παρακλήσεως*] refers to the whole of the preceding epistle. In Acts xiii 15, where the rulers of the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch send a message to Paul and Barnabas inviting them to pass on any 'word of exhortation' that they may have for the assembled company, the phrase clearly denotes a homily; it is thus a very suitable description for this epistle, which is a homily in written form, with some personal remarks at the end". F. F. BRUCE, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (The New London Commentary on the New Testament; London-Edinburgh, 1964), p. 413.

²) "Dass die jüd.-hell. Synagogenpredigt von Einfluss auf den Hb war, ist heute *communis opinio* und wurde zuletzt von H. Thyen überzeugend begründet". E. GRÄSSER, "Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963", *Theologische Rundschau* N.F. XXX (1964), p. 153.

³) HARTWIG THYEN, *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, N.F. 47; Göttingen, 1955).

the period in or close to the first century A.D. share in the style of a Jewish-Hellenistic homily¹). This style is discussed under three broad headings: 1) the influence from the Cynic-Stoic diatribe; 2) the use of the Old Testament; 3) the ways in which paraenesis is handled.

THYEN's work is admirable in many ways, but one of the very real defects is the lack of indices. In order to find the instances in which Hebrews (or any other writing) is cited, the reader must search laboriously through the text and footnotes²). Thus the utility of the book is markedly diminished. Hence it would seem useful to make a brief presentation of THYEN's book as it touches explicitly on Hebrews. The present paper attempts such a presentation³). Then it attempts an evaluation designed to put THYEN's book in focus with regard to Hebrews as an aid to present understanding and future investigation.

HEBREWS AS JEWISH-HELLENISTIC HOMILY

In its use of paraenesis Hebrews particularly resembles Philo's allegorical commentary on Genesis (p. 10)⁴); in its themes it resembles I Clement (p. 11); in its "tractatus de fide" in ch. xi it resembles IV Mc. (p. 13). Except for the few verses which follow xiii 21, Hebrews is a carefully constructed homily of the type given in a Diaspora synagogue (p. 17). The final verses were added when the homily was sent as a written communication (p. 17). The Greek of Hebrews is good Greek and thus resembles the Greek of the Epistle of James except that the latter is written in short sentences whereas Hebrews uses longer periods (p. 17). The author of Hebrews had a command of many diverse rhetorical devices and had a remarkable knowledge of the Septuagint (p. 17). The frequent change from "we" to "you" to "I" is a mark of the preacher (p. 17).

¹) The writings discussed by THYEN: Philo's allegorical commentary on Genesis, the First Epistle of Clement, the Fourth Book of Maccabees, the Epistle of James, the Epistle to the Hebrews, parts of the First and Third Books of Maccabees, the speech of Stephen in Acts vii, chapters i-vi and xvi of the Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, parts of the Book of Tobit, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Wisdom of Solomon.

²) Except, of course, for the section which cursorily treats of each of the works individually (pp. 7-39).

³) The present paper is not designed to supplant THYEN on Hebrews but to supplement him for the reader particularly interested in the "epistle".

⁴) The page references are to THYEN's book.

The many contacts between Hebrews and Jewish-Hellenistic writings, particularly Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon; the use of Scripture; the exegetical method employed—all these indicate that the author of Hebrews was a Hellenistic Jewish Christian (p. 17). Ch. xi of Hebrews is an especially good example of the Hellenistic synagogue's way of proving a point by listing Old Testament witnesses (p. 18; cf. p. 30). In this respect Hebrews resembles parts of I and III Mc. The Greek of Hebrews shows resemblances to the Greek style of the Letter of Barnabas and the speech of Stephen in Acts vii (p. 23).

As regards the influence of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe THYEN cites Heb. iii 1 (*κατανοήσατε*) (p. 43), the use of the rhetorical device of the "catalogue of circumstances" (*"Peristaseskataloge"*) at Heb. xi 36-38 (p. 47), the rhetorical device of anaphora in the repetition of *πίστις* in Heb. xi (p. 50), the use of rhythmic clauses (p. 50), rhetorical questioning (Heb. xi 32—the text reads "11/23" but this must be a misprint for "11/32") (p. 53), the use of a thematic word (*"Schlagwort"*) in Heb. xi (*πίστις*) (pp. 58-59).

The use of the Septuagint as a source is one of the characteristics of the Jewish-Hellenistic homilies and is, of course, one of the characteristics of Hebrews (p. 62)¹). In the Jewish-Hellenistic homilies the Pentateuch is frequently cited, of course, as are the Psalms, and this, too, is true of Hebrews (p. 67)²). Jewish apocalyptic literature served as a source for the homilies in general and for Heb. x 37 ff. in particular (p. 68). The way in which citations of the Septuagint are made in Hebrews has much in common with the way in which such citations are made in the other Jewish-Hellenistic homiletic works: *λέγει* at Heb. i 6, 7; x 5 (p. 69); *καὶ πάλιν* at Heb. i 5; ii 13 [*bis*]; iv 5; x 30; *καί* at Heb. i 10; *καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει* at Heb. v 6 (p. 69). Attribution of a citation to the holy spirit is made at Heb. iii 7 as it is made elsewhere in Christian homiletic literature (p. 70)³). In Heb. i 1 God is said to be the

¹) Thyen is favorable to the theory of collections of "testimonies" drawn from the Bible and used by Jewish and Christian writers. Cf. the extensive note 12 on pp. 65-66.

²) "Nächst dem Pentateuch sind die Psalmen von grosser Bedeutung für die hellenistischen Juden" (THYEN, p. 67).

³) "... dass der Hl Geist als Sprecher des Zitates eingeführt wird, ist nicht erst spezifisch christlich, sondern ist schon den Rabbinen geläufig: cf. STR.-B., IV. Bd., S. 443 f. Der Geist ist in diesen Formeln als Geist der Inspiration gedacht". THYEN, p. 70, note 53.

source of all the Bible's words as he is said to be elsewhere in the homiletic literature (p. 71). At times the addressee of a citation is explicitly given, as at Heb. viii 8 (p. 71). At Heb. x 5 the expression $\delta\iota\theta\ \dots\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ is used, which is more closely connected with the diatribe form (p. 72) use of a rhetorical question at Heb. i 5 is characteristic of the way sources are cited in the homiletic literature and can be traced to similar usage in both the diatribe and among the rabbis (p. 73). Another characteristic—one more closely associated with the diatribe—is the manner used by the author of associating himself with the addressees in reacting to a citation, as is done by the author of Hebrews at xiii 6 (p. 73). Much source material in the homiletic literature is not formally cited but is used as the basis for the development of a passage, as might well be the case with Pss. xciv and cx in Hebrews (p. 75). A characteristic of Hellenistic as opposed to "Palestinian" Judaism is the way it uses source material from the Old Testament as a method of proof. Whereas Palestinian rabbis tend to look for words as unifying themes and therefore merely relay what the Scriptures explicitly state, the Hellenistic Jews tend to make their citations the result of an exegesis which finds examples of what they wish to prove independently of the explicit statements of the text. In Heb. xi there is an outstanding example of this Hellenistic technique in the evocation of Old Testament personages who witnessed to faith (pp. 75-76; 115). Yet such rabbinical argumentation as the free adaptation of the biblical text is also used by the author of Hebrews at ii 2 (p. 77). Despite the fact that allegory played an important role in the Hellenistic synagogue homily and thus, presumably, in the early Christian homily, only in Barnabas and, in a certain respect, in Hebrews, is such allegorizing found (p. 80). Exemplification of the use of the rules of allegory in Hebrews is found at xi 14 ff. where allegorical interpretation demands that the "fatherland" which the patriarchs sought be not the land of their origin, since if it were they would have been able to reach it (p. 81; cf. Heb. iii 11 ff. and iv 8 f.); at viii 8, where the implications of $\mu\epsilon\mu\phi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ are carried out in the following verses (p. 83)¹; and at Heb. i 5, 13, where the fact that no angel was ever addressed as "son" or told to sit at God's right hand indicates that the one to

¹) THYEN is not explicit here with reference to Heb. viii 8 but the general meaning seems to be that words are to be placed in their context and the implications of a context are legitimately read into a word.

whom the words are addressed must be of more value than an angel (pp. 83-84). The use of etymological argumentation regarding the word Melchizedek in ch. vii of Hebrews is a final example of allegorical exegesis (p. 84).

In the third section of his work, Thyen adopts Dibelius' definition of paraenesis as a "listing together of diverse, often unrelated admonitions in a uniform style of address"¹). Heb. xiii is an example of such a genre (p. 87). In fact, the whole homily proper which is Hebrews can be divided into two parts: Heb. i 1-x 18, a theological discourse with occasional sections of paraenesis, and Heb. x 19-xiii 21, a section which is primarily paraenetic (p. 88). Some specific indications of paraenesis are the use of the term " $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$?" at Heb. iii 1, 12 and x 19 (p. 89); the use of "we" at Heb. x 24-25 (p. 91) and Heb. xii 1-2 (p. 93). Admonition is occasionally connected to exposition with some such phrase as $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ (Heb. ii 1; iv 1 [$\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$]) (p. 93). Comparisons with everyday life are a frequent source of paraenetical expressions. So, for example, the athlete (Heb. xii 1) (p. 94), the food of infants and of adults (Heb. v 12-14) (p. 94). Admonition in the second person is found at Heb. iii 12 (p. 96). Admonitions are occasionally given in the form of gnomic utterances phrased so as to be easily remembered, as at Heb. xi 6 (p. 103). The Jewish-Hellenistic homily ended in paraenesis in the strict sense, with the admonitions connected. Heb. x 19-xiii 21 (with an excursus at ch. xi) is a good example (p. 106). The introduction to this final section in Hebrews is achieved by the use of a participle with $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ at x 19 (p. 107). Eschatological considerations are often part of the final paraenesis, as at Heb. x 37-39 (p. 107). The theme of the "way", which appears in much of the early Christian paraenetic material, appears in Hebrews at x 19 (p. 110).

EVALUATION

These are the principal points given by THYEN at which Hebrews touches on the form of the "Jewish-Hellenistic homily". THYEN's work has been termed "convincingly established" by one critic²), but others have been somewhat more reserved. One reviewer took

¹) "Paränese nennt man eine Aneinanderreihung verschiedener, häufig unzusammenhängender Mahnungen mit einheitlicher Adressierung". M. DIBELIUS, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* (Sammlung Göschen; Berlin, 1926), II, 65. Cited by THYEN on p. 85.

²) Cf. the view of GRÄSSER cited above p. 261, note 2.

THYEN to task for assuming that there was a uniform homiletic style throughout Diasporic Judaism which was different from the "Palestinian" style-without discussing the latter ¹). Another points out that many elements and forms in the early Christian homily are so basic to any type of communication that they need not necessarily have come from the "diatribe" ²). Still another review sums up THYEN's work as being 1) a stimulus for investigation of the formal elements in the homily and other religious literature of the Diaspora and 2) as providing a valuable collection of evidence presented in relation to historical aspects which transcend what is purely formal ³).

This latter view seems to the present writer the only justifiable one in regard to Hebrews. While there is no doubt that THYEN's remarks have thrown valuable light on the literary form of the "epistle", they are not "definitive" ⁴). The following remarks are designed to indicate areas of research which might prove profitable for a better understanding of the literary genre of Hebrews.

It should be stated in fairness to THYEN that he is not certain that Hebrews can be unqualifiedly categorized as "Hellenistic-Jewish". In several places he indicates that there are elements in Hebrews which are [better] labeled "Palestinian", though he fails to study this latter phenomenon in its own right ⁵). Thus, on p. 68, he remarks that the final doxology at Heb. xiii 21 is from the "Palestinian synagogue tradition". On p. 60 he remarks that the inference "a maiore ad minus" or "a minore ad maius" appears more often in the "Palestinian" homiletic tradition than in the

¹) "Too often, the argument seems based on the tacit supposition that one style of sermon was consistently affected throughout diasporic Judaism. Also, the author explicitly supposes (p. 5) that this 'hellenistic' tradition is to be contrasted with a quite different 'Palestinian' one, which he does not discuss". "M. S.", in a review of THYEN's book in *Anglican Theological Review* XXXIX (1957), p. 378.

²) "In dem Artikel Diatribe im 'Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum' (III, 1007) hat MARROU m. E. mit Recht darauf hingewiesen, dass manche Elemente und Formen der frühchristlichen Predigt so elementar sind, dass man nicht notwendig gleich von 'Diatribe' reden sollte. Das gilt auch von der hellenistisch-jüdischen Homilie. Jedenfalls darf man den Einfluss der kynisch-stoischen Diatribe, der gar nicht geleugnet werden kann, nicht überschätzen". D. W. SCHNEEMELCHER in a review of THYEN's book in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* LXVIII (1957), p. 394.

³) G. DELLING, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* LXXXII (1957), col. 354.

⁴) Pace J. DANIELOU, *Recherches de science religieuse* XLV (1957), p. 587.

⁵) Cf. note 1 above.

diatribe, and cites Heb. x 28-29 as an example. And on p. 62, in summing up the comparison with the diatribe, he admits that the homily of the Hellenistic synagogue cannot be said to have the form of a diatribe, and at the same time he cites an author who has argued in favor of a similarity of style between the diatribe and the "homiletic tradition of Palestine" ¹). Thus, in THYEN's own work there are indications of a reserve as regards too facile a separation of Hebrews from the "Palestinian" tradition of Jewish homily in favor of the "Hellenistic" tradition.

On the supposition that Jewish homilies given in Palestine and/or given in Hebrew or Aramaic represent a "Palestinian" tradition, it might be worthwhile to make a few remarks on Hebrews in relation to such a tradition.

First, there is the question of a possible subdivision of homilies into various types. The author of Hebrews calls his effort "ὁ λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως" (xiii 22). This same expression is used of the speech of Paul at the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii 15) ²). L. ZUNZ, in his classic study *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt* ³), says that some homilies were called ברכות ונהמות ⁴). Now ונהם is a root whose forms are translated by παρακλήσεις in the Septuagint ⁵). Is this coincidence casual or is there some intrinsic interconnection? P. BILLERBECK says that the homily in the synagogue was properly styled a "κήρυγμα" ⁶). This statement would seem to be borne out in the case of Luke's account of Jesus' preaching in the synagogue, for it is the word used at Lk. iv 44 to describe this activity ⁷). The term is also used of Paul's

¹) The reference is to A. MARMORSTEIN, "The Background of the Aggadah", *Hebrew Union College Annual* VI (1929), pp. 141 ff.

²) Cf. p. 261, note 1 above.

³) 2. Aufl. (Frankfurt a. M., 1892).

⁴) *Ibid.*, pp. 348 and 350.

⁵) Cf. Job xxi 2; Ps. xciv[xciii] 19; Hos. xiii 14; Nah. iii 7; Is. lvii 18; Jer. xvi 7.

⁶) "Die Predigt, der freie Vortrag, hiess *Darascha*, vom Verbum *darasch* = forschen, auslegen und öffentlich vortragen; griechisch hiess der freie Vortrag κήρυγμα. Der Vortragende oder Prediger wurde *Darschan* genannt, griechisch κηρύσσω". P. BILLERBECK, "Ein Synagogengottesdienst in Jesu Tagen", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* LV (1964), pp. 156-157. Incidentally, it is interesting to note the words in Hebrews which are associated in one text or another of the Septuagint with the Hebrew root כָּרַע: ζητέω (Heb. viii 7); ἐκζητέω (Heb. xi 6; xii 17); ἐπιζητέω (Heb. xi 14; xiii 14); ἐπισκοπέω (Heb. xii 15); κρίνω (Heb. x 30; xiii 4); προσαγορεύω (Heb. v 10).

⁷) Cf. Lk. iv 18-19.

preaching in the synagogue at Acts ix 20¹⁾. The apparent conflict in terminology between *παράκλησις* and *κήρυγμα* might be explicable on the basis of a distinction between types of homilies: the term *κήρυγμα* might be used for a homily which formally proclaims; the term *παράκλησις* might be used for a homily which formally consoles. It is worth noting that both Hebrews and the homily delivered at Pisidian Antioch stress the forgiveness of sins²⁾, and that the word *κήρυγμα* (*κηρύσσειν*) is not found in Hebrews.

Then there is the question of the form of the "Palestinian" homily. THYEN notes (p. 75) that Hebrews and the other examples of the "Hellenistic" homily which he has chosen lack the proem which characterized Jewish homilies in the Palestinian tradition. But perhaps it is necessary to distinguish. Only toward the end of the first century A.D. did the proem apparently begin to assume its later lengthy form³⁾. Hebrews is noted for the rhetorical period with which it opens⁴⁾. Could this period not be explained as the proem in its earlier, primitive form? Thus Hebrews would date from before the end of the first century A.D. or would be modeled on homilies from before the end of the first century.

One of the characteristics of the Palestinian homily was the use of comparisons and "parables"⁵⁾. THYEN says that the Jewish-Hellenistic homiletic literature, as distinguished from the Jewish-Palestinian, has no "novellas" or "parables"⁶⁾. Yet "parables" figure importantly in Hebrews: at ix 9 the word *παραβολή* is used to describe the relevance of the anterior tent of the desert tabernacle to Christ, and at xi 19 the word *παραβολή* is used to connect the story of Abraham and Isaac with Christ.

¹⁾ Cf. Acts xv 21.

²⁾ Heb. ix 13-14; Acts xiii 38-39. The word *παράκλησις* is found in Hebrews also at vi 18 and xii 5; the verb *παρκαλέω* is found at iii 13, x 25, xiii 19, 22.

³⁾ Cf. H. L. STRACK - P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, IV/I (München, 1928), p. 173.

⁴⁾ C. SPICQ compares the introduction to Hebrews to the prologue to John's Gospel. C. SPICQ, *L'épître aux Hébreux*. II. *Commentaire* (Études bibliques; Paris, 1953), p. 1.

⁵⁾ Cf. ZUNZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 364 and 369. The use of "comparisons" ("meshalim") in Hebrews includes more than just "parables". For example, in regard to Heb. vi 7-8 a study of the "meshalim ouverts à une période" as treated by RAYMOND PAUTREL would be desirable (cf. R. PAUTREL, "Les Canons du Mashal rabbinique", *Recherches de science religieuse* XXVI [1936], pp. 16-42). (Suggestion courtesy of A. VANHOYE.)

⁶⁾ THYEN, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

One of the techniques of the Palestinian homily was the use of surprise to lead the listener from a familiar text of Scripture to some apparently irrelevant area and to show that there was a connection¹⁾. This would be a plausible background for Heb. ix 11 with its phrase "through the greater and more perfect tent not made with hands", a phrase which refers to something known to the audience ("the . . . tent") but which is based on something unconventional, as the puzzlement of generations of commentators on Hebrews testifies²⁾.

The Palestinian homily was characterized by unusual words³⁾. This characterization might apply to Hebrews, which has a rather large number of *hapax legomena*⁴⁾.

CONCLUSION

Establishment of a literary genre is essential for the full understanding of any piece of literature. Hebrews is no exception. HARTWIG THYEN's *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie* marks an important advance in the establishment of the genre of Hebrews. Important, but not definitive. More work needs to be done by masters in Jewish literature and liturgy before anything definitive can be said to have been accomplished. It is hoped that the present journeyman's study may help by stimulating such masters to investigate the matter further.

¹⁾ "Die Übergänge und Variationen des Textes . . . verliehen dem Vortrage lebhafteres Colorit; es war dabei oft auf Überraschung abgesehen, indem man den Zuhörer plötzlich aus dem Text in ein fremdes Gebiet entführte, dessen Nähe und Heimathlichkeit, durch die Kunst des Redners bewirkt, dann doppelt ergötzte". ZUNZ, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

²⁾ It is one of the virtues of THYEN's book that he considers the influence of the liturgy and art on the homily and on the study of the homily.

³⁾ ZUNZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 364-365.

⁴⁾ Cf. SPICQ, *op. cit.*, I. *Introduction*, p. 353.