

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF THE MACROSTRUCTURE OF HEBREWS

The problems related to the macrostructure of Hebrews are complex and it seems impossible to come up with a definite structure to the satisfaction of all who wrestle with these problems. For example, Vanhoye's work appeared to be a definitive one because it was based on detailed analyses of literary criteria. But as we will see below, it is also criticized because of "some artificiality and unnaturalness" (A. B. du Toit 1974, 77) in trying to force Hebrews into a preconceived concentric structure and not paying due attention to content. Furthermore, the fact that each scholar seems to come up with his own structure is one of the compelling reasons to reconsider the macrostructure of Hebrews.

D. A. Black suggests three specific approaches to the structure of Hebrews (1986, 163):

the traditional view, which divides the epistle into doctrinal and practical parts; the detailed literary analysis of A. Vanhoye; and the "patchwork" approach, which follows the changing themes of the letter from chapter to chapter without submitting every detail to one overriding theory of structure.

He includes a so-called "tripartite" view in the traditional view, but I think that this scheme is distinct enough to be treated as a separate approach. There may be still different approaches. But under these four approaches (that is, traditional, Vanhoye's, patchwork, and tripartite) most views on the structure of Hebrews can be classified. We will look at

them one by one.

3.1 Traditional view

The traditional view is that Hebrews consists of two main parts, doctrinal and paraenetic. In this view the dividing point between these two parts is 10:19, where the practical application starts, based on the doctrinal teaching up to that point. Scholars such as J. Brown, D. Guthrie, and P. E. Hughes can be included in this category. J. Brown (1961, 10-11) divides the epistle into two parts - the first doctrinal (1:5-10:18), and the second practical (10:19-13:17). D. Guthrie (1983, 58-59) divides in a similar way: I. The superiority of the Christian faith (1:1-10:18), II. Exhortations (10:19-13:25).

P. E. Hughes does not explicitly divide the epistle into two parts, but in the end his outline is not much different from D. Guthrie's. He considers the theme of Hebrews to be "the supremacy of Christ." So Heb 1:1-10:18 is shown to teach that Christ is superior to the prophets, the angels, Moses, and Aaron. He is so inclined to emphasize this doctrinal theme that even the practical application (10:19-12:29) is termed as "Christ superior as the 'new and living way'" (1977, 3).

This kind of approach is too simplistic for a writing in which exposition and exhortation alternate and "topics are naturally foreshadowed and repeated" (D. A. Black 1986, 164). The tendency for this approach seems to have been influenced by the doctrine-exhortation pattern in Paul's letters.

3.2 Detailed literary analysis

The detailed literary analysis of Vanhoye drew much attention and was influential among some scholars such as Montefiore (1964, 31), Buchanan (1972, [ix], [1]-2), Dussaut (1981, v-vii, 17-18), Attridge (1989, 15-19), and most recently Ellingworth (1993, 55-58). In contrast to the patchwork approach (for example, works of Morris and Bruce¹), which is not concerned about the analysis of literary structure, this approach of Vanhoye is extremely concerned about literary analysis.

Vanhoye's analysis was preceded by several investigations by scholars such as Büchsel, Gyllenberg, Thien, and especially Vaganay. Büchsel at least brought attention to the significance of alternating expositions and exhortations. He divided Hebrews into five sections which consist of a pair of exposition and exhortation. His outline is as follows (see Gyllenberg 1957-58, 139): "I. 1,1-14 und 2,1-4; II. 2,5-18 (ohne angeschlossene Mahnung); III. 3,1-6 und 3,7-4,13; IV. Aufforderung 4,14-16, Darlegung 5,1-10,18, Mahnung 10,19-39; V. 11,1-40 und 12,1-29."

This outline has been improved by Gyllenberg. He has found a parallel structure between 1:1-4:16 and 5:1-12:29. It is displayed in a diagram (1957-58, 141):

¹ Bruce comments: "The Epistle to the Hebrews is a carefully constructed literary work, revealing a concentric symmetry and an elaborate inclusio. Its structure has been studied by L. Vaganay and most thoroughly by A. Vanhoye" (1985, 6). But he fails to interact with Vanhoye's analysis even in the revised edition of his commentary except for a brief comment in a footnote (1990, xxii).

	A	B
Die theoretische Erörterung beginnt	1,1-14	5,1-10
Eingeschobene Mahnung	2,1-4	5,11-6,20
Die theoretische Erörterung wird fortgesetzt	2,5-18	7,1-10,18
Ausführliche praktische Anwendung	3,1-4,16	10,19-12,29

So he came up with an outline consisting of five parts (1957-58, 145-46):

I. Christus als unser Heilsführer 1,1-2,18; II. Das wandernde Volk Gottes 3,1-4,16; III. Christus als unser Hohenpriester 5,1-10,18; IV. Der Glaubensweg der Gemeinde 10,19-12,29; V. Abschliessende Mahnungen und Briefschluss 13,1-25.

Thien's proposal (1902, 81-83) that themes are announced before they are taken up later in inverse order² was further developed by Vaganay (1940, 269-77) with his emphasis on the importance of "hook-words" or mots-crochets for the structure of Hebrews. Based on these literary devices such as announcement of themes and use of hook-words, Vaganay offered an outline showing a concentric structure which became the basis for Vanhoye's analysis. Vaganay's outline is as follows:

1:1-4 Introduction

1:5-2:18 Jésus supérieur aux anges

3:1-5:10

1. Jésus pontife fidèle (3:1-4:16)

2. Jésus pontife compatissant (5:1-10)

5:11-10:39

Précautions oratoires (5:11-6:20)

1. Jésus grand prêtre selon l'ordre de Melchisédech (7:1-28)

2. Jésus pontife parfait (8:1-9:28)

3. Jésus auteur d'un salut éternel (10:1-39)

² For example, the theme of "a merciful and faithful high priest" in 2:17 is developed in inverse order in 3:1-4:13 (faithful) and 4:14-5:10 (merciful). Also the themes of endurance (10:36) and faith (10:38-39) are taken up and well illustrated in inverse order in chap. 11 (faith) and 12:1-13 (endurance).

11:1-12:13

1. la foi (11:1-12:2)
2. la persévérance (12:3-13)

12:14-13:21 le grand devior de la sainteté dans la paix

13:22-25 Conclusion

Lane comments that "Vaganay's article remains a milestone in the structural assessment of Hebrews" (1991a, lxxxvi).

2.2.1 Vanhoye

Now we turn to Vanhoye's ground-breaking structural analysis.³ Building upon Vaganay's work,⁴ Vanhoye claimed to have found a concentric or chiasmic structure in Hebrews. He lists six structuralizing techniques that he believes the author of Hebrews used to achieve its literary perfection.

Those are:

- 1) Announcement of the subjects to be discussed;
- 2) Inclusions which indicate the boundaries of the developments;
- 3) Variation of literary genre: exposition or paraenesis;
- 4) Words which characterize a development;
- 5) Transition by immediate repetition of an expression or of a word, which is termed a "hook word";
- 6) Symmetric arrangements. (Vanhoye 1989, 20)

Among these techniques Vanhoye thinks that the announcement of the subject is the most important one and by utilizing this technique he comes up with his major five parts.

³ Our discussion on Vanhoye is based on Vanhoye (1989, 18-40), which is a slightly modified translation of Le Message de l'épître aux Hébreux (Paris, 1977).

⁴ As noted above, Vaganay's contention was that Hebrews displays a concentric structure, with Jesus, perfected priest (8:1-9:28), as the center of the whole epistle, and he emphasized mots-crochets as a method to determine Hebrews' structure (A. B. du Toit 1990, 81).

His general outline is as follows (Vanhoye 1989, 33):⁵

I.	The Name of Christ	1,5-2,18
II.	A. Jesus high priest worthy of faith	3,1-4,14
II.	B. Jesus merciful high priest	4,15-5,10
	--Preliminary exhortation	5,11-6,20
III.	A. High priest after the manner of Melchizedek	7,1-28
III.	B. Made perfect	8,1-9,28
III.	C. Cause of an eternal salvation	10,1-18
	--Final exhortation	10,19-39
IV.	A. The faith of the ones of old	11,1-40
IV.	B. The necessary endurance	12,1-13
V.	The straight paths	12,14-13,19

According to his outline, part III is the center of the concentric structure of Hebrews and that part is mainly concerned about the essential elements of Jesus' priestly role. And section B (8:1-9:28) is the center of part III.⁶ This central role of 8:1-9:28 is signified by the words "the point (κεφάλαιον) of what we are saying is this: We do have such a high priest ..." (8:1). He thinks that even the words nearest to the center - that is, Χριστοῦ δὲ (9:11) - confirms that "the name of Christ high priest has been chosen as the keystone for the entire structure" (1989,36).⁷

Responses to this new treatment were various. Negatively, some scholars such as Morris (1983, 58-59) simply ignored Vanhoye's work. Hagner mentions Vanhoye's work but thinks

⁵ There is a good summary of Vanhoye's structural analysis in D. A. Black (1986, 168-75).

⁶ This section is also considered to exhibit a following concentric symmetry: c(8,1-6) - b(8,7-13) - a(9,1-10) - a'(9,11-14) - b'(9,15-23) - c'(9,24-28) (Vanhoye 1989, 40a).

⁷ In his "Excursus: the Structure of Hebrews" this outline is presented in a special V-shaped diagram expressly showing the concentric structure (Vanhoye 1989, 40a).

Hebrews "by its very nature is susceptible to different structural analyses" (1990, 13). P. E. Hughes felt that Vanhoye "tends to find more stylistic symmetries and literary subtleties than are really present" (1977, 2), but he did not interact with him. Vanhoye has been criticized mainly for being too much concerned about formal features.

In his criticism on Vanhoye, Bligh tried to "raise a doubt as to whether a division based on purely literary criteria will reveal the conceptual structure of the Epistle." He concludes that "the situation seems to be that the verbal patterns do not always coincide with the conceptual patterns" (1964, 175).

Swetnam also pointed out that "formal literary principles alone are not a sufficient basis for analyzing structure" (1972, 385).⁸ Especially he noted "the problem of the psychological complexity" (1974, 346) when readers try to figure out the well-crafted concentric structure by taking into account all the literary criteria.⁹ For example, even for careful readers it would be difficult "to note that the word *τροχιᾶς* of 12,13 alludes to the word *τρέχωμεν* of 12,1, or to see that the word *χάρις* in 12,15 and 12,28 serves to indicate

⁸ Swetnam chooses the following criteria as primary because he thinks they "are intrinsically linked with content": "announcements", the genres of exposition and paraenesis, and length (1974, 333). His outline is as follows: Introduction (1,1-4); I. Exposition (1,5-2,18); II. Exhortation (3,1-6,20); III. Exposition (7,1-10,18); IV. Exhortation (10,19-39); V. Exposition-Exhortation (11,1-13,21). This outline is also under criticism because it depends almost entirely on the variation of genres.

⁹ It is pointed out that "Vanhoye's work seemed to assume that the epistle was composed by using modern literary conventions (chapter headings, clearly marked paragraphs, punctuation, and modern typographical layout)" (MacLeod 1989, 192).

an inclusion but that the same word in 13,9 is not so used. Or that the word ἐνετρεπόμεθα in 12,9 is to be linked with the word ἐκτραπή in 12,13" (Swetnam 1974, 346).

Ellingworth rightly points out that the application of formal criteria is sometimes too mechanical, disregarding meaning. For example, "the link between τροχιᾶς and ἐκτραπή in 12:13, which Vanhoye ... marks as significant, is purely etymological, not semantic" (1993, 57). Another example is a Vanhoye's assertion that Heb 5:9-10 announces the themes of the central section 7:1-10:18. His suggestion that the participle τελειωθείς of 5:9a deliberately refers to the section 10:1-18 and that αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου in 5:9b already introduces the theme of the section 8:1-9:28 (1989, 27-28) is not convincing even to an ordinary reader.

To Vanhoye everything in the text is placed there by design. He says that "nothing seems left to chance" (1976, [11]).¹⁰ But sometimes he is not consistent in applying these formal features to his analysis. This inconsistency allows him to adjust his analysis to what he thinks the literary structure should be like. For example, he separates 4:14 from 4:15. As pointed out by A. B. du Toit (1990, 84), Vanhoye splits 4:14-16 (which is inherently paraenetic) into 4:14 and 4:15-16 and then join the latter with the doctrinal section which follows, that is, 5:1ff. So Vanhoye's structure is as follows (1989, 40a):

A. WORTHY OF FAITH: 3,1-4,14

3,1-6 (exposition): Jesus worthy of faith, superior to

¹⁰ Cf. Lindars' criticism on Vanhoye that Hebrews must not be viewed as "a product of conscious artistry" because it "is addressed to a real and urgent situation" (1989, 383).

Moses

3,7-4,14 (exhortation): We should give him our faith

B. MERCIFUL: 4,15-5,10

4,15-16 (exhortation): Let us go to obtain mercy

5,1-10 (exposition): He has shared our suffering

This separation of 4:14 from 4:15 breaks the logical progression of thought from 4:14 to 4:15-16. The exhortation to hold fast to the confession in 4:14 and the exhortation to approach the throne of grace (which is the positive appropriation of that confession) logically belong together (A. B. du Toit 1990, 84).

Furthermore, in looking for an inclusion in a small section Vanhoye loses sight of an inclusion which is important for the structure as a whole. He points out the inclusion of 3:1 and 4:14 which is as follows (1989, 26):

3,1 This is why, holy brothers who share in a heavenly vocation, you should consider the apostle and the high priest of our profession of faith, Jesus....

4,14 Having then an eminent high priest who has gone through the heavens, Jesus, the son of God, let us maintain our profession of faith.

He concludes that "in 4,14 one has reached the end of the section which began at 3,1" (1989, 26).

However, he strangely misses a major inclusion between 4:14-16 and 10:19-23. Nauck notes Spicq's observation that 4:14-16 and 10:19ff. are to be associated together, and then further demonstrates the parallelism between them (1960, 203-4) in detail.¹¹ This parallelism is also noted by A. B. du Toit when he says that the central elements (to hold fast the

¹¹ We will investigate Nauck's view in detail when we come to the tripartite approach.

confession and to draw near to God) of the paraenetic unit 4:14-16 are taken up again in a chiastic manner in 10:19-23 (1990, 84). G. H. Guthrie also notes that "Vanhoye has failed to adequately answer Nauck's highlighting of the parallels found at 4:14-16 and 10:19-31, dismissing them as insignificant," and adds that "it may be argued that these two passages contain the most prominent use of parallelism in the whole book" (1991, 59). This is the main reason G. H. Guthrie comes up with a three-part division similar to Nauck's, even though he accepts many of Vanhoye's arguments and he himself still suggests a refined chiastic structure of the whole epistle.¹²

One more thing to note is the fact that Vanhoye correlates his five major parts with his three major themes and finds another concentric symmetry: I. Eschatology; II. Ecclesiology; III. Sacrifice; IV. Ecclesiology; V. Eschatology (Swetnam 1974, 345). But this scheme is forced and it is rightly criticized. For example, it is not easy to see the correlation between part I (Situation of Christ) and part V (The straight paths) and to explain "how 13:1-6 can be included under eschatology when 11:1-40 is omitted (cf. especially vv. 1, 9-10, 16, 40)" (MacLeod 1989, 192).¹³

2.2.2 Dussaut

Dussaut's work is worthy of being treated separately

¹² See Fig. 34. A structural assessment of the book of Hebrews, in G. H. Guthrie (1991, 215).

¹³ For further criticism, see Swetnam (1974, 345).

because his analysis is even more consistently form-oriented than that of Vanhoye.¹⁴ He consistently pursues the analysis of the surface structure in which he consciously tries not to be influenced by the analysis of the deep or semantic structure. His analysis is summarized in the following diagram (Ellingworth 1993, 53):

Part One	Part Two	Part Three
1:1-14; 3:1-4:5	5:11-6:20; 8:1-9:10; 10:1-18	11:1-31; 12:14-29
Christ		
2:1-18; 4:6-5:10	7:1-28; 9:11-28; 10:19-39	11:32-12:13; 13:1-21

At once we can notice the similarity with Vanhoye's analysis (and Dussaut freely acknowledges his debt to Vanhoye), even if it seems that Dussaut modifies Vanhoye's five divisions (1+2+3+2+1) to three (2+3+2) (Dussaut 1981, vii). The most prominent one is the concentric structure with 9:11 (more specifically the word *Χριστός*) at the center of the whole epistle. To come up with this concentric structure he also used many of the structural techniques Vanhoye suggested. These include hook words, announcement of the subjects, variation of literary genre, and inclusions. Dussaut is so concerned to be consistently form-oriented that he does not dare to impose titles on the sections of the epistle. He thinks "the unity, at four different levels, of each of the fourteen sections, each of the seven columns, the three parts, and the epistle as a whole" (Ellingworth 1993, 54) come from the text itself.

This attempt to find structures in the text itself

¹⁴ See Ellingworth (1993, 53-55) for a good summary of Dussaut's analysis.

presupposes that the author of the epistle consciously crafted his writing into the present form. The real problem with this approach is that this dichotomy between form and content is a modern one and thus it probably was not in the author's mind. The same problem also applies to Vanhoye's analysis, although he gives more attention to content than Dussaut. However, Ellingworth modestly concludes that "surface structure may reveal features of the text which complement those of content-oriented analysis" (1993, 55),¹⁵ even though he thinks it would be best to have a methodological separation between analyses based on form and on content.

3.3 Patchwork approach

This approach may be considered to be the opposite of the detailed literary analysis. For example, Bruce bases his analysis mainly on content. In his introduction Bruce does not have a section on literary structure at all. He is simply content to follow the argument from chapter to chapter without any theory of literary structure. In his table of contents the following outline is given (1990, vii-x):

- I. The finality of Christianity (1:1-2:18)
- II. The true home of the people of God (3:1-4:13)
- III. The high priesthood of Christ (4:14-6:20)
- IV. The order of Melchizedek (7:1-28)
- V. Covenant, sanctuary and sacrifice (8:1-10:18)
- VI. Call to worship, faith and perseverance (10:19-12:29)
- VII. Concluding exhortation and prayer (13:1-21)
- VIII. Postscript (13:22-25)

¹⁵ Swetnam also says: "This form (or lack of form) is also of necessity bound up with the content. ... Hence any real understanding of the form of a passage is bound to help in the understanding of the content" (1972, 368).

Then he gives us a section on the argument of the epistle that follows the changing themes (1990, xix-xxii). Only at its end, in a footnote, does Bruce even recognize what has been done in detailed literary analysis. He mentions Vanhoye's work along with its criticism by Bligh and Swetnam. But he says no more about it.

Morris also divides the epistle into 11 sections without any effort to group them under an overarching literary structure. His outline is as follows (1983, 13-15):

- I. Introduction (1:1-4)
- II. The excellence of the Christ (1:5-3:6)
- III. The promised rest (3:7-4:13)
- IV. A great high priest (4:14-5:11)
- V. The danger of apostasy (5:12-6:20)
- VI. A priest like Melchizedek (7:1-28)
- VII. A new and better covenant (I) (8:1-9:28)
- VIII. A new and better covenant (II) (10:1-39)
- IX. Faith (11:1-40)
- X. Christian living (12:1-13:19)
- XI. Conclusion (13:20-25)

This approach is self-defeating for Hebrews because it plainly disregards so many formal features prominent in this epistle. A detailed literary analysis like Vanhoye's may overestimate the importance of formal features, but disregarding formal features also means a failure to cope with Hebrews adequately.

3.4 Tripartite approach

We already noted that in Hebrews doctrine and exhortation alternate. The exhortations present throughout Hebrews (e.g., 2:1-4; 3:7-4:13; 4:14-16; 5:11-6:12; 10:19-31; 10:32-39; 12:1-13:25) cannot be simply brushed off as insertions or digressions, but rather form integral parts of Hebrews. At the

same time, the attempts to sharply differentiate between expositions and exhortations must be questioned (in fact, the variety of conclusions reached by these attempts speak against them).

Now it is agreed among many scholars that doctrine serves exhortation in Hebrews. In other words, "the doctrinal teaching is a means to the end of meeting what the writer considers to be his first readers' deepest needs" (Ellingworth 1993, 58).¹⁶ The exhortations interspersed throughout Hebrews should be considered to be the main concern of the author. Consequently, doctrinal teachings should be interpreted in the light of the exhortations.¹⁷ So Kümmel says that "the expositions are more than once interrupted by paraenesis (2:1-4; 3:7-4:11; 4:14-16; 5:11-6:12; 10:19-39; 12:1-13:17), which evidently are the actual goal of all the expositions (Michel¹⁸, Kuss, Nauck)"

¹⁶ Theron also argues that "the christology and refined eschatology that is basic to our author's thematic development finds its ultimate thrust in the paraenesis... every theme and sub-theme ... is utilized as motivational thrust behind ardent appeal" (1984, 325).

¹⁷ This intertwining of doctrine and exhortation is criticized on the grounds that there should be reasons for alternating two different genres and that each genre should have its own specific function. But the intertwining of doctrine and exhortation does not mean to ignore their different features. It means to recognize the primary function of exhortation while treating doctrinal exposition as the ground for exhortation. The mediating view is well expressed by Dahl (1951, 401): "Whether the main emphasis should be placed on the one or the other, however, is a fictive question. The doctrine leads to the exhortation, the exhortation is based on the doctrine." In a sense this is true, but it needs to be emphasized that the ultimate goal of the author is on the side of exhortation.

¹⁸ Michel says (1975a, 27): "Die Spitze des theologischen Gedankens liegt in den paränetischen Teilen, die den Hörer zum Gehorsam aufrufen und die Gemeinde zum Leiden bereit machen wollen."

(1966, 273). This judgment is confirmed by the author himself who calls his writing "my word of exhortation" (13:22).¹⁹

As we mentioned above when we pointed out the weakness of Vanhoye's analysis, there is a very prominent parallel between the exhortations in 4:14-16 and 10:19-23.²⁰ This parallel is the starting point from which Nauck proposes his tripartite scheme. Nauck presents this parallel as follows (1960, 203-204):

1. ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν (4,14) - ἔχοντες οὖν ... ἱερέα μέγαν (10,19.21);
2. διεληλυθότα τοῦς οὐρανοῦς (4,14) - εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον ... ἦν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος (10,19f.);
3. Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (4,14) - ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ (10,19);
4. κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας (4,14) - κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν (10,23);
5. προσερχώμεθα ... μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος

¹⁹ Filson says: "The writer obviously has no interest in theological discussion for its own sake. He is concerned to give the recipients a right view of Jesus Christ and his saving work, in order to show how great a privilege the recipients have and what an immense and irreparable loss they would suffer if they let the passage of time, the hardships of discipleship, or the lure of any other loyalty rob them of their joy in faith and faithfulness in life. We understand Hebrews rightly only if we keep this urgent note of exhortation clearly before us in all our discussion of the form and meaning of the writing" (1967, 21).

²⁰ The failure to recognize the parallel between 4:14-16 and 10:19-23 is also a weakness of a different tripartite scheme, which is: I. 1:1-6:20; II. 7:1-10:18; III. 10:19-13:17 (Goppelt 1982a, 241). Gräßer proposes almost the same tripartite scheme that suffers the same weakness. His outline is as follows (1990, 29): "A. Grundlegung: Der Weg des Erlösers 1,1-6,20; B. Entfaltung: Das Hohepriestertum des Sohnes 7,1-10,18; C. Folgerungen: Der Weg des Glaubens 10,19-13,25." According to these tripartite schemes the second major part, which is doctrinal, forms the climax. This is another weakness of these tripartite schemes because they do not duly recognize the primacy of paraenesis in Hebrews.

(4,16) - προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως (10,22; vgl. auch 10,19: παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων).

He thinks that these exhortations frame the central part of the epistle where the high priesthood of Christ is explained.²¹ He continues to comment (1960, 204):

Aber die Eigenart dieser Rahmenstücke [4:14-16; 10:19-23] besteht nicht in dieser Feststellung [Wir haben einen Hohenpriester], sondern in dem parännetischen Charakter. Sie ermuntern die Gemeinde, die Konsequenz aus der hohepriesterlichen Funktion Christi zu ziehen.

That is, the doctrinal teaching on Christ's priesthood serves as the basis for the exhortations.

Nauck wanted to take both expositions and exhortations into account even though the primacy is given to exhortations. Thus the themes of the major parts are expressed as follows (Nauck 1960, 204-6):

1:1-4:13 Hört aufmerksam, glaubend auf das Wort Gottes, das an uns in dem einzigartigen Sohn Jesus Christus ergangen ist, der über die Repräsentanten des Kosmos und des Alten Bundes erhaben ist!

4:14-10:31 Tretet herzu zu Gott und haltet fest am Bekenntnis, denn Jesus Christus hat diesen Weg eröffnet!

10:32-13:17 Stehet fest und folgt Jesus Christus nach, der der Anfänger und Vollender des Glaubens ist!²²

Nauck was also trying to base his outline upon broader characteristics than merely a rhetorical device such as mots-crochets. He found the same pattern in the first and third

²¹ 4:14-16 and 10:19-23 not only form an inclusion, but also are arranged chiastically. Two exhortations are given in inverse order: κρατῶμεν (4:14), then προσερχώμεθα (4:16) - προσερχώμεθα (10:22), then κατέχωμεν (10:23). For further details, see G. H. Guthrie (1991, 127).

²² 13:18-25 is excluded from the outline because it is thought to be attached to the sermon when it was sent (Nauck 1960, 204).

major parts as that in the second major part. That is, each major part is framed by parallel passages which are paraenetic. So the first major part 1:1-4:13 is framed by a "Christus-Hymnus" (1:2b-4) and a "Logos-Hymnus" (4:12-13) (1960, 205). Similarly, the third major part (10:32-13:17) is framed by 10:32-39 and 13:7-17, both of which summon the readers to recall the situation of sufferings (their own and their leaders' respectively) and draw the consequences out of it.

And Nauck tried to follow the logic and flow of the argument while not ignoring the prominent formal features mentioned above. He showed that the paraenetic goal of each major part followed a logical progression. The summons to pay attention to the word of God in the Son in the first major part naturally leads to the summons to draw near to God and hold fast to the confession in the second major part, and then leads to the summons to steadfastness on the way to the goal through obedience in the third major part. Nauck says this progression cannot be reversed. The way to the goal should be "der Weg vom Hören zum Bekennen und zum Gehorchen" and thus ultimately "der Weg der ὑπομονή (10:32, 36; 12:1, 2, 3, 7), des Auf-sich-nehmens der Welt und des Aushaltens in der Welt" (1960, 206).

In this formulation Nauck was influenced by Michel's tripartite scheme even though he could not agree with Michel on where to end the second major part. Michel's outline in the 1957 edition of his commentary is given in Nauck (1960, 200):

I. Kap. 1:1-4:13 Die Offenbarung Gottes im Sohn und ihre Überlegenheit über den Alten Bund; II. Kap. 4:14-10:18 Jesus der rechte Hohepriester; III. Kap. 10:19-13:25 Ermahnungen zur Glaubentreue.

But he later changed his position to the following outline

(1975a, [6]):

I. Kap. 1:1-4:13 Das Reden Gottes im Sohn und die Überlegenheit des Sohnes über den Alten Bund, II. Kap. 4:14-10:39 Jesus der rechte Hohepriester, III. Kap. 11:1-13:25 Der Glaubensweg des Volkes Gottes in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart.

This problem regarding where to end the second major part must be examined carefully. As we have seen, the prominent parallel we are concerned about is not between 4:14-16 and 10:19-31 (as Nauck implicitly suggests when he takes 4:14-10:31 as the second major part of Hebrews), but rather between 4:14-16 and 10:19-23. Nauck's division may, however, be explained reasonably.

First, 10:24-25 does not cause many problems as most of commentators take 10:19-25 as a unit. Indeed 10:23 and 10:24 are connected by a coordinate conjunction *καὶ* and 10:25 is a participial phrase depending on the verb *κατανοῶμεν*.²³ Furthermore, the three cohortatives in 10:22-24 form a unit suggesting the triad of Christian virtues, that is, faith, hope and love.

But what about 10:26-31? The position of 10:26-31 depends on how we determine the position of 10:32-39. It is not an easy task to determine where Heb 10:32-39 belongs in terms of the structure of the epistle as a whole. Even if we take the "tripartite" scheme, there are still three major options. The first option is that the third major part starts with 10:19, and 10:32-39 is just a continuation of the paraenetic passage

²³ The two participles *ἐγκαταλείποντες* and *παρακαλοῦντες* "probably function as imperatives (note *μή* before *ἐγκαταλείποντες* ...)" (Ellingworth 1993, 528). Thus NIV translates as follows: "Let us not give up ..., but let us encourage ..."

that starts at 10:19 (that is, the third major part of Hebrews is 10:19-13:17).²⁴ The second option is that the second major part ends at 10:31 and the third major part starts at 10:32. The third option is that 10:32-39 is the end of the second major part and the third major part starts at 11:1.

The first option is favored by many commentators.²⁵ They think that the doctrinal section of the previous part ends at 10:18, and a new major part which is mainly paraenetic starts at 10:19. That there is a change in the genre between 10:18 and 10:19 is the reason why the traditional view takes 10:19 as the starting point of the latter paraenetic section. But as we have seen above, this view does not fully take into account the literary characteristics of Hebrews.

The third option is an attractive one, and naturally some commentators follow this outline. The main reason for taking this option is the fact that even though there are announcements of the theme of "faith" (πίστις) and "endurance" (ὑπομονή), 10:32-39 is a part of 10:26-39, which is parallel to 6:4-12. The pattern in these parallel passages is that the dire warnings are followed by an encouragement, as we expect from an author who is pastorally minded in addressing his readers.²⁶

²⁴ The question of where the third major part ends (13:17, 13:19, 13:21 or 13:25) will be dealt with later.

²⁵ Cf. Hagner's comment (1990, 13): "in keeping with the majority of commentators, and against Vanhoye, 10:19 is regarded as a major turning point of the book." Most recently Weiß (1991, 8-10, 49-50) comes up with the following tripartite scheme: "I. 1,1-4,13 Gottes endgültige Rede in seinem Sohn; II. 4,14-10,18 Der christologische Grund der Glaubensparaklese; III. 10,19-13,25 Die Glaubensparaklese."

²⁶ This parallelism is displayed in a chart in Lane (1991b, 296-97).

In fact, there is another option which takes 10:32-39 as a transition. As it is generally recognized, it is not easy to have a clear-cut outline in a document like Hebrews characterized by the complexity of both its argument and rhetorical devices. So we cannot rule out the possibility that our passage is a transition.

But we commend the second option, which takes 10:26-31 with the second major part (4:1-10:31) as Nauck proposed. The main reason for this is that 10:32-39 displays a distinctive function with regard to the rest of the third major part (10:32-13:17). We cannot but notice the thematic markers of "faith" and "endurance" in 10:32-12:13.²⁷ Also the imagery of athletics²⁸ continues, as suggested by words like "contest" (ἀθλησις) or "publicly exposed" (θεατριζόμενοι) in 10:32-33 and "race" (ἀγών), "struggle" (ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι), or "trained" (γεγυμνάσμενοι) in 12:1, 4, 11.²⁹ By taking this option we can see that our passage introduces the themes of "endurance" (10:32, 36) and "faith" (10:38, 39), and that these themes are

²⁷ The word πίστις is introduced in 10:38-39 and used throughout chap. 11. Especially note the anaphoric repetition of πίστει 18 times in 11:3-31. The verb form πιστεύω is used only in 11:6. The use of this word reaches its climax in 12:2, where the readers are exhorted to fix their eyes on Jesus, τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτῆν. The word ὑπομονή occurs in 10:36 and 12:1. The verb form ὑπομένω occurs more frequently, namely in 10:32; 12:2, 3, 7.

²⁸ The imagery is one of "an athlete engaged in some kind of hard competition, perhaps a race (compare 12.1), or possibly a wrestling match ... the main idea is that of struggle and hardship" (Ellingworth 1983, 241).

²⁹ Cf. Paul's use of the same imagery in, e.g., 1 Cor 9:24-27, 1 Thess 2:2, or 1 Tim 4:7f.

expanded in chap. 11 and 12:1-13 in inverse order.³⁰

Nauck also points out (1960, 204-205) the correlation between ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε in 10:32 and μνημονεύετε in 13:7. Just as the author reminds the readers of the time of their sufferings which they have endured well (10:32-34) and then draws the consequence from it (10:35ff.), he once more reminds the readers of the time of suffering which their leaders have undergone (13:7) and draws consequence from it (13:9ff.).

Then as A. B. du Toit points out (1990, 87), 10:26-31 can be seen as spelling out the bitter consequence of "trampling the Son of God under foot" (10:29) in light of the coming judgment (10:25). This judgment motif in 10:26-31 gives greater urgency to the preceding exhortations in 10:19-25. Nauck points out (1960, 206) that each of the three major parts (1:1-4:13; 4:14-10:31; 10:32-13:17) ends with a reference to the judgment, that is, a reference to the necessity that an account must be rendered before God (4:12f.; 10:30f.; 13:17).

Therefore, 10:26-31 is considered to form a conclusion of the second major part along with 10:19-25. And 10:32-39 is regarded as the beginning of the third major part. It introduces the major motifs of faith, endurance, suffering and contest, which will be further developed throughout the third major part.

In conclusion, we follow the structure of Hebrews Nauck proposed. Nauck's outline not only takes into account both the

³⁰ Theron (1984, 185-86) also notices a similar chiastic pattern in 10:19-12:13 even though he adopts the third option above mentioned by taking 11:1 as the beginning of the third major part.

expositions and exhortations, but it also well reflects the primacy of exhortations by the imperatival forms of the outline. At the same time, it recognizes the importance of the parallel between 4:14-16 and 10:19-23. Also it reflects the logical progression of the flow of thought which reaches its climax in the third major part. Exhortations to faithfulness and endurance dominate this climactic, concluding major part.