

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

1-1-1946

Hebrews- A Rhetorical Study

Walter A. Jennrich

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_jennrichw@csel.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jennrich, Walter A., "Hebrews- A Rhetorical Study" (1946). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 154.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/154>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csel.edu.

HEBREWS: A RHETORICAL STUDY

A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Walter A. Jennrich
1946

Approved by:

W. A. D. S.

Paul H. Kretschmer

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

- p. 2, l. 30 read "untrustworthiness" for "unworthiness"
- p. 3, l. 22 read "and in the"
- p. 10, l. 16 read "to" for "by"
- p. 17, l. 2 read "and"
- p. 18, l. 25 omit "simple"
- p. 25, l. 18 insert "of" before "propping"
- p. 29, l. 24 read "for whom are all things" instead of "for whom all things are"
- p. 37, l. 12 read "so-called" for "socalled"
- p. 42, l. 7 read "paromoioses"
- p. 46, l. 1 insert after "30" the word "instances"
- p. 52, l. 22 insert "of" before "words"
- p. 55, l. 25 read "so-called" for "socalled"
- p. 56, l. 21 read "within" for "in"
- p. 57, l. 6 insert "of" before "one"
- p. 58, l. 8 omit "Case or"
- p. 61, l. 17 insert "by" after "expressed"
- p. 64, l. 24 read "attempts" for "attempt"
- p. 67, l. 19 omit "feet" after "dactylic"
- p. 79, l. 1 read "serve"
- p. 79, l. 14 read "Joseph" for "Jacob"
- p. 84, l. 27 insert "own" before "worthiness"
- p. 94, l. 30 insert "of" before "Holies"
- p. 105, l. 16 read "view" for "verdict"
- p. 105, l. 16 omit "the"
- p. 112, l. 15 insert "easy" before "range"
- p. 114, l. 16 read "instances" for "stances"

παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἀγάγετε
τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ
διὰ θραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν.

— Hebrews XIII, 22.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Introduction	1
I. General Remarks on Isocratean Style	6
II. The Diction of <u>Hebrews</u>	9
III. The Composition of <u>Hebrews</u>	25
IV. The Invention and Arrangement of <u>Hebrews</u>	72
V. The Nature of the Subject-matter in <u>Hebrews</u>	100
Conclusion	112
Bibliography	117

INTRODUCTION

The present study treats of the Epistle to the Romans almost purely from the point of view of external form and its practicality in a more general study of the whole subject of style and language in the New Testament. If it presents any notions of detail that are more or less arbitrary and will for purposes, one must bear in mind that it is only by the examination of details that one may come to a reasonably safe conclusion about principles. Even a cursory study of the works of literary critics will demonstrate the necessity of the reading that the general impression of an author which one gets after a superficial

To read; to understand; to love -- and to facilitate reading, understanding, and loving on the part of others -- these are the first and second commandments of the critic.

-- Sainte-Beuve

Let my study this epistle at all under the category of form and rhetorical -- the point of view may be taken, as it has been taken by some, that the writer spoke and wrote naturally, simply, of course, as the Spirit gave him utterance, and hence, used no rhetorical embellishment (or very little) he conveyed his message to his hearers. At the same time, however, the writer, if he drew use rhetorical devices, were already aware of popular speech with the greatest effect and would

* James Murray Brown, The Style and Language of Saint Paul, etc. Philadelphia, Pa., 1881, pp. 78, 79, 101.

INTRODUCTION

The present study treats of the Epistle to the Hebrews almost purely from the point of view of external form and is preliminary to a more general study of the whole subject of style and language in the New Testament. If it presents many matters of detail that are more or less tedious and call for patience, one must bear in mind that it is only by the examination of details that one may come to a reasonably safe conclusion about principles. Even a cursory study of the works of literary critics will demonstrate the necessity of the warning that the general impression of an author which one gets after a comparatively long study of him may not be a true one. That impression may be colored by past experience or by prejudice, in other words, may represent a purely personal idea of excellence. In fact, the literary critic and, in particular, the student of Greek, must continually guard against seeing in an author only what he wishes to see and making his work only the instrument for demonstrating the truth of a prejudice.*

But why study this epistle at all under the category of form and rhetoric? The point of view may be taken, as it has been taken by some, that the author spoke and wrote naturally, always, of course, as the Spirit gave him utterance, and hence, used no rhetorical embellishment (or very little) to commend his message to his hearers. At the most, (they continue) the writer, if he does use rhetorical devices, unconsciously makes use of popular speech with the greatest effect and avoids

*Thomas Shearer Duncan, The Style and Language of Saint Paul etc. Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. LXXXIII., No. 330, Apr. 1926.

all straining after effect through the observance of oratorical rules. He finds without effort the most striking form for his lofty ideas, and it is because his innermost self breathes through every word that this epistle bears so unique a charm.

This point of view is strengthened by the observation that the Christians in all times professedly expressed contempt for the devices of rhetoric as aids to the expression of spiritual truth. Gregory the Great (moral. praef. 1f.) expressed it thus:

ipsam loquendi artem despexi...quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba caelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati.

Whether this expressed contempt was in every instance sincere or not, it is, at any rate, easy to understand.

Then too, among the canonical writers themselves, one is faced with the declaration of St. Paul that he makes no pretensions to art in his writing. And even after one makes allowances for the fact that he is speaking in contrasts and is naturally depreciating his powers of expression in order to set forth more strongly the higher importance of the matter that is within him, yet one must seriously examine his statement. His claim is expressed in II Corinthians XI, 6: *ἰδιώτης τῶ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆ γνώσει*. In his first letter, I Corinthians II, 1f., he says further:

And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God...and my preaching and my speech were not in enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power.

Yet this depreciation of powers of expression was one of the common characteristics of the Greek rhetorician, as it is of the rhetorician always, and perhaps, while explicitly a condemnation of the unworthiness *untrustworthiness* of rhetoric, is a tacit admission of its effectiveness.

So then, some would altogether deny the conscious use of rhetoric

in the New Testament and attribute the devices which are found therein to the natural ability of the writer. But, turning now to the Epistle to the Hebrews (of which this paper is a study), even if one admits that the writer was a trained rhetorician, it need not be supposed that his training was derived from the study of the ancient Greek masters. For instance, that he had ever studied Isocrates whose style he very closely approaches is hardly capable of proof and is highly problematical. This question lines itself up with the broader question of the writer's acquaintance with the general body of Greek literature. About this there is no proof. Indeed, to establish as fact the supposition that he was highly read in Greek literature is a more than difficult matter, and to build up a theory of imitation or indebtedness in style on obvious similarities and parallels seems almost fatuous. Critics are always ready to carry analysis too far. Indeed, one cardinal principle of criticism seems to be to take from a given author as much as possible and assign it to some predecessor not only as the source of inspiration but as the original possessor.

This analysis of style neither suggests nor pretends to make any such fantastic claims of a borrowing or disciple relationship between Isocrates and the author of Hebrews. It is only hoped that this study will throw some light upon the questions of style in the New Testament, in general, and ⁱⁿ the book of Hebrews, in particular. It intends to set forth in detailed fashion the mode of style adopted by the writer of Hebrews. Hence, the primary purpose and scope of this thesis is to analyze the rhetorical art which the writer employed in the composition of this epistle.

The standard of literary criticism according to which the letter will be judged is the canon which Dionysius of Halicarnassus has set forth in his essay De Isocrate. This is a most severe standard by which

to examine the epistle, for it is a rule of style meant for application to classical literature, in particular, the prose of Isocrates, the greatest and foremost master of Attic Greek prose.

The eminent critic of classical Greek prose, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (flor. B. C. 7), is a competent arbiter in this field. In the first place, he approaches his work with genuine sympathy, for he is an ardent admirer of the Greek orators and has a fine appreciation of their talents. Secondly, he is qualified, for he is himself an enthusiastic student of oratory and is well-versed in the arts and devices which the orator employs in the various departments of rhetoric. And lastly, he endeavors (as far as is possible in so subjective a study as literary criticism) to be frank and unbiased in his opinions. As lavish as he may become in his praise of the merits of Isocrates' style, he is also equally severe in his censure of its defects. However, at best, his canon remains his personal opinion and as such it must be considered and respected.

The procedure in this treatise will be to establish the canon of Dionysius from his essay on Isocrates, examine the Epistle to the Hebrews on the basis of this standard, and then characterize generally its style as a result of this analysis. In addition, the style of Hebrews will be compared in detail with the style of Isocrates as the latter is found in his court-speech, the Aegineticus. This comparison should yield fruitful results for it will enable the student of rhetoric to compare Hebrews at first-hand with a classical composition of almost the same proportions. A word about the Aegineticus is in place. It is a fine example of studied art in forensic oratory. Because it is a court-speech it does not possess to the full the highest excellencies of Isocrates' rhetoric, but it does amply exemplify the Isocratean manner. It is of approximately the same length as Hebrews (being 13 Teubner pages) and therefore, comparisons between the two can readily be made on a statistical basis.

CHAPTER I

CENTRAL PRINCIPLES OF ISOCRATES' ART

Isocrates of Mallacrus, the eminent orator of classical Greece, distinguished three principal modes of composition in Greek prose: (1) the *epitaphic* (*ἐπιτύμβιος*), (2) the *epitaphic* (*ἐπιτύμβιος*), and (3) the *epitaphic* (*ἐπιτύμβιος*). Isocrates is the oratorical representative of the *epitaphic*, the *epitaphic*, and the *epitaphic* of the *epitaphic*. The *epitaphic* style of Isocrates is of special interest and importance for this study and therefore merits a further description. In describing the features of the *epitaphic* style of Isocrates, he writes:

Isocrates, the Greek prose artist, sought above all else to invest nobility of thought with beauty of expression -- this is his excellence, his power, his philosophy, his profession, or whatever you care to call it.

Isocrates is general in his view and believes in a broad appeal to the masses. He demands free access to the schools. He requires words to come sweeping along one on top of another, each supported by that which follows, like the ebb of a wave-carrying stream. It tries to combine and interweave the separate parts, and then give, as far as possible, the effect of one continuous utterance. This recalls the effect of an easily following the junctures that they make an agreeable and unobtrusive transition. From the point of view the style resembles finely woven stuffs, or perhaps in which the fibres melt imperceptibly into the shadings. It requires that all its words shall be melodious, smooth, soft as a mother's face, and it strikes but harsh, avoiding syllables, and carefully avoids everything rough and harsh. It requires not only that its words should be properly chosen and fitted together, but also that the clauses should be carefully woven with one another and all lines in a period. It limits the length of a clause so that it is neither shorter nor longer than the flight of a bird, and the length of the period so that a man's full breath will be able to cover it. It would not venture to construct a passage without periods, nor a period without clauses, nor a clause without a word. The rhythm is not the longest, but the intermediate, or shorter than these. It requires its periods to march on with a steady step, and by line and rule, and to close with a dignified fall. Thus, in fitting together its periods and its words

CHAPTER I

GENERAL REMARKS ON ISOCRATEAN STYLE

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the eminent critic of Classical Greek Oratory, distinguishes three principal modes of composition in Greek prose: (1) the austere ($\lambda\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$), (2) the smooth ($\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\sigma\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$), and (3) the middle ($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\varsigma$). Antiphon is his oratorical representative of the austere, Isocrates of the smooth, and Demosthenes of the middle. The smooth style of Isocrates is of special interest and importance for this study and therefore merits further description. In describing the features of the smooth style of Isocrates, he makes these general remarks:

It does not intend that each word should be seen on every side, nor that each word and all its parts should stand as broad, firm bases, nor that the time-intervals between them should be long; nor in general is this slow and deliberate movement congenial to it. It demands free movement in its diction; it requires words to come sweeping along one on top of another, each supported by that which follows, like the onflow of a never-resting stream. It tries to combine and interweave its component parts, and thus give, as far as possible, the effect of one continuous utterance. This result is produced by so nicely adjusting the junctures that they admit no appreciable time-interval between the words. From this point of view the style resembles finely woven stuffs, or pictures in which the lights melt insensibly into the shadows. It requires that all its words shall be melodious, smooth, soft as a maiden's face; and it shrinks from harsh, clashing syllables, and carefully avoids everything rash and hazardous.

It requires not only that its words should be properly dove-tailed and fitted together, but also that the clauses should be carefully inwoven with one another and all issue in a period. It limits the length of a clause so that it is neither shorter nor longer than the right mean, and the compass of the period so that a man's full breath will be able to cover it. It could not endure to construct a passage without periods nor a period without clauses, nor a clause without symmetry. The rhythms it uses are not the longest, but the intermediate, or shorter than these. It requires its periods to march as with steps regulated by line and rule, and to close with a rhythmical fall. Thus, in fitting together its periods and its words

respectively, it employs two different methods. The latter it runs together; the former it keeps apart, wishing that they may be seen as it were from every side. As for figures, it is wont to employ not the most time-honored sort, nor those marked by stateliness, gravity, or mellowness, but rather for the most part those which are dainty and alluring, and contain much that is seductive and fanciful. To speak generally: its attitude is directly opposed to that of the former variety in the principal and most essential parts.¹

This description serves to hint the broadest characteristics of Isocrates' style in its distinctive features, and reflects the sympathetic appreciation with which Dionysius approached his task of literary criticism. In his essay De Isocrate Dionysius applies more closely the general criticism just quoted. He examines rather minutely the details of language and composition which produce the general effect. His analysis falls quite naturally into four main heads as follows:

- (1) A criticism of the diction (ἡ λέξις).
- (2) A criticism of the composition of words (ἡ ἐκ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἁρμονία) and the figures which embrace the sentence structure (τὰ σχήματα).
- (3) A criticism of the invention and arrangement of the subject-matter (ἡ εὐρεσις καὶ ἡ τάξις τῶν πραγμάτων).
- (4) A criticism of the moral quality or nature of the speech as reflected by the principles set forth (ἡ προαίρεσις ἢ τῶν λόγων).

This is the canon of criticism according to which Hebrews shall be judged. Note again that this is a classical standard and hence a severe test of literary style for a piece of Koine literature. The writer of Hebrews will be compared with Isocrates in a detailed analysis as outlined in Dionysius' essay. What is said of Isocrates

¹Dion. Hal., De Compositione Verborum, 23. The translation is that of W. Rhys Roberts.

both in praise and reproach shall be applied to this author in order to determine how well he can stand the test of a classical critic.

The life of words: life involves existence of body and soul. The body of a word is its conventional form and its meaning is the soul. Life has a beginning and an end. Words have their birth or origin in history, in present experience, then change and develop during their lifetime, decay and die out. The life of words.

-- Haring

CHAPTER II

THE SUBJECT OF DISTINCTION

The first category of literary criticism which Hippias discusses is that of *distinction*. In examining the vocabulary of Iocastus, Hippias finds that the *dialect* (*ῥήματα*) which Iocastus employed is a combination of two opposite elements. It is a compromise between the elaborate *dialect* (*ῥητορική*) represented by Hippias and the plain *dialect* (*ῥητορική*) represented by Iocastus. But it is in some

The life of words! Life involves existence of body and soul. The body of a word is its acoustical form and its meaning is the soul. Life has a beginning and an end. Words have their birth or origin in history, in present experiences, then change and develop during their lifetime, decay and die out. The life of words!

— Nehring

Correctness or precision of *distinction* is, according to Hippias' view, obtained by a careful and select choice of words; or, as he himself explains it: it places no word without plan or purpose in a sentence (*ὅταν λέγῃ ἄριστος ὄνομα*). Further, it aims at employing the common (*κοινὰ*) or the usual (*κοινὰ*), and the proper (*ῥητορική*) word. However stated, this implies that *distinction* avoids the vulgarity or tastelessness (*κατασκευαστικὰ*) which arises from the use of old-fashioned or obsolete (*ἀρχαῖα*) words and peculiar or strange vocabulary (*ῥητορική*). The virtues of pure *distinction* is that the words carry a meaning which is easily understood and cannot be construed ambiguously. In this matter of purity of *distinction* Hippias pronounced Iocastus the

¹ *Dist. Dial. Hippias* 2-3.

² Hippias' criticism of Iocastus' *distinction* is found in *ῥητορική* 1-2 and 11.

CHAPTER II

THE DICTION OF HEBREWS

The first category of literary criticism which Dionysius discusses is that of diction. In examining the vocabulary of Isocrates, Dionysius finds that the diction (ἡ λέξις) which Isocrates employed is a combination of two opposite elements. It is a compromise between the elaborate diction (ἡ καλλιλογία) represented by Thucydides and the plain diction (ἡ ἀπλή λέξις) represented by Lysias. But it is more Lysian than Thucydidean.²

Of its Lysian qualities, Dionysius mentions purity (καθαρότης).³ This excellence of diction embraces two ideas, namely, correctness of idiom (ἄκρίβεια τῆς διαλέκτου) and secondly, the avoidance of obsolete and peculiar words (ἀποφυγὴ ἀπηρχαλωμένων καὶ ἡμειωδῶν ὀνομάτων).

Correctness or precision of diction is, according to Dionysius' canon, obtained by a careful and select choice of words; or, as he himself explains it: it places no word without plan or purpose in a sentence (οὐδὲν εἰκῆ τιθεῖσα ὄνομα). Further, it aims at employing the common (κοινός), the usual (ἑυνήθης), and the proper (κύριος) word. Reversely stated, this implies that diction avoid the vulgarity or tastelessness (ἀπειροκαλία) which arises from the use of old-fashioned or obsolete (ἀπηρχαλωμένα) words and peculiar or strange vocabulary (ἡμειώδης). The virtue of pure diction is that the words convey a meaning which is easily understood and cannot be construed ambiguously. In this matter of purity of diction Dionysius pronounces Isocrates the

²Dion. Hal., Demosth., 4.

³Dionysius' criticism of Isocrates' diction is found in De Isoer., 2 and 11.

equal of Lysias.

An analysis of the diction of Hebrews in the light of the above criticism reveals that the author has achieved the purity of diction which was characteristic of Isocrates in common with Lysias. This is shown by the careful selection and use of words which are common both in the Attic prose of classical times and in the Koine literature of a later date. Expressed in the language of statistics for the purpose of illustration, the basic vocabulary of Hebrews numbers approximately 2580 words. This count includes only nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, etc., or, in other words, that part of diction which most naturally reflects either a tendency towards simplicity (*ἐπιτότης*) or grandeur (*σεμνότης*) in vocabulary. Of this total, about 2250 words are the common, ordinary, and usual words of Greek classical prose and New Testament literature. Expressed in ratio form, this means that out of every 52 words which the author employs, 45 are of the common type, easily understandable ^{to} by the average person. In comparison with Hebrews, the Aegineticus of Isocrates numbers a basic vocabulary of approximately 1375 words. Of this total, 1355 are classified as common and ordinary in good Attic prose. Or in ratio form, 54 out of every 55 words reflect a simple and ordinary diction.

It would be unnecessary and impossible to list these common and ordinary words which are found throughout the epistle. Suffice it to present a representative selection:

ἀμεμπτος (VIII, 7): blameless, without reproach, Aesch., Plut., Xen., Plat., Soph.; blameless, free from fault, Lk., Phil., ITh., He., in LXX, 5 times in NT, common in Greek writers.

ῥαπὴν (I, 34): seizure, robbery, Solon, Aesch., Hdt.; plunder, Hdt., Aesch., Eur.; booty, prey, Aesch., Eur., Thuc.; greediness, rapacity, Xen.; rapine, pillage, robbery, He.; plunder, spoil, Mt., Lk., LXX. 3 times in NT.

- διακρίσις (V, 14): separating, dissolution, parting, Plat.; discerning, distinguishing, a deciding, interpreting, judgment, Plat., Xen., Paus.; a distinguishing, discerning, judging, I Co., Ro., He., 3 times in NT.
- δικαιοσύνη (I, 9; XII, 11 et al.): justice, Theogn.; uprightness, righteousness, righteous dealing, Hdt., etc.; justice personified, Anth.; righteousness, piety, very freq. in NT, also used of particular virtues; most freq. in LXX for $\rho\tau\delta$ and $\pi\rho\tau\delta$, rarely for $\tau\delta\pi$.
- ἔνοχος (II, 15): bound by, liable to, Plat., Xen., etc., Isocr., Andoc.; freq. in NT.
- ἐντολή (IX, 19): injunction, command, Pind., Hdt., and Att., Dem.; freq. in NT.
- ἐπιτυχάριον (VI, 15; XI, 33): meet with, Ar., Thuc., Hdt., Plat.; reach, attain to, Xen., Plat., Hdt.; be successful, Aeschin., Polyb.; attain, obtain, 4 times in NT, Ja., c. gen. of thing, He., VI, 15 and XI, 33; c. acc. of thing, Ro.
- εὐλογία (XII, 17): good speaking, good words, Plat., praise, panegyric, Pind., Thuc., good fame, glory, Simon.; freq. in NT as blessing, thanksgiving, also, alms-giving, a collection of alms.

The usage of such common and ordinary words which would be readily understood by his readers is by far the dominant feature of the diction in this epistle. This simplicity of diction is an important factor which Aristotle includes under his first principle of style (ἀρχὴ τῆς λέξεως). He calls it τὸ ἐλληνίζειν, that is, to use good clear Greek by employing the proper (ἴδικα) and not round-about (περιέχοντα) terms plus the avoidance of ambiguous terms (ἀμφίβολα).⁴ The virtue of simple diction is, of course, clarity and the latter is a primary requisite for every means of communication between man and man whether it be oral or written. Hebrews does have this perspicuity of diction.

⁴Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, III, 5. 1407a, 19.

And yet, like Isocrates, the author of Hebrews has a general bent towards grandeur in his diction. This is evident from the many instances in which he does not strictly and altogether avoid strange, archaic, and poetic diction. This more dignified and select vocabulary represents 330 words of the total 2580, or 7 out of every 52 words. By comparison, Isocrates uses only 18 words in the Aegineticus which are not common in Attic prose, but it must be remembered that the percentage is higher in his epideictic speeches.

This select and choice use of words in Hebrews is apparent in many ways and falls under various classifications. But it must be remembered that the vocabulary of Hebrews must take into account the use of a word over a long period of time, from the classic to the later Koine usage. Also to be considered is the influence of the LXX and the later ecclesiastical Greek. Accordingly, in the attempt to classify the vocabulary of Hebrews, words which occur in secular authors down to and including Aristotle (who died B. C. 322) are regarded as belonging to the classical period of the language and are accordingly classified. Words first met with between B. C. 322 and B. C. 150 are regarded as later Greek. It is in this class that the influence of the LXX makes itself felt for the period between B. C. 280 and B. C. 150. Words which occur within the period of the NT Koine writers are listed as such. Likewise, in a few instances, the ecclesiastical writings of the period after the apostles reflect usage of words as in the NT canon of Scriptures. However, in all this classification of NT vocabulary according to hard and fast chronological lines, the student of Greek must be careful to obviate, in some measure, the incorrect impression which the rigor of such a method might give. For it has often happened that in investigating the age of some word, the student discovers that a word which has dropped out of use for whole stretches of time suddenly and unaccountably reappears. Therefore, at best, any study of NT vocabulary must be content with only general

results and conclusions. No definite statements can be made but only the probability can be suggested. In accord with this word of caution, the following statistics and illustrations of vocabulary usage in Hebrews are presented only as a general indication of the flair which the author had for a more select and choice use of diction.⁵ The author uses about 87 words which are classified as either rare, unusual, archaic or poetic in classic Greek. That is to say, if the author had lived in the period of the flourishing of Attic prose, 87 words of his vocabulary would be distinctly out-of-the-ordinary; and this exhibits a strong tendency towards *καλλιλογία* in vocabulary, as Dionysius calls it. Note the following examples of such words:

αἰσθητικόν (V, 14): seat of the senses, organ of sense, Plat., Arist.; faculty of perception, NT. The usual classic term is *αἰσθησις*. Hapaxlegomenon in NT, He. V, 14. Found in LXX (Jer. IV, 19; IV Macc. XI, 22). Throughout its history, this word is rare and unusual.

μικίνω (XII, 15): to stain, dye, defile, soil, Hom., freq. in Tragg.; of moral stains, to taint, pollute, Pind. and esp. Tragg. Strictly a poetic word in classical Greek. Often in LXX, pollute, defile, in physical and moral sense, Jude 8; moral sense, Tit., He. XII, 15 for *Ἰσθῆτιον* Dt. 24, 6 (4); Jn. 18, 28.

πέζω (XI, 37): Rare in classical Greek. The more common word in prof. writ. Ar., Thuc., Eur., is *πέω*, to saw, Plat. Hapaxlegomenon in NT, He. XI, 37, to cut in two with a saw. To be sawn asunder was a kind of punishment among the Hebrews (II Sa. XII, 31; I Ch. XI, 3) which according to ancient tradition was inflicted on the prophet Isaiah. The word is freq. in later writ.

ἐκνεύω (IX, 13 et al.): Rare in classical Greek. The more common form

⁵It often happens that the same word fits into more than one classification, e. g., a poetic word in classical Greek may be a common or a hapaxlegomenon in the NT, etc. Hence, such a word is listed under each head.

is ἐκάλυω, to sprinkle, Hom., Pind., Eur.; to bestrew, Ar., Soph., etc.; to sprinkle, He. IX, 13.21; to purify, cleanse, He. X, 22; LXX: Ps., Lev., II Ki. etc.

ἀφανισμός (VIII, 13): Very rare in classical Greek. The usual word is ἀφανίσις, of the moon, Plut., making away with, getting rid of, Ar., vanishing, disappearance, Hdt. Hapaxlegomenon in NT, disappearance, destruction, He. VIII, 13. Often in LXX. Thucophr., Polyb., Diod., Leian.

In addition to these 87 words which are rare in classical Greek, another 40 words of the vocabulary in Hebrews are not even to be found in classical Greek literature. The following suffice for illustration:

τυμπανίζω (XI, 35): to beat a drum, Eupol.; to drum with the hand on them, LXX; to beat with a cudgel, to torture with the tympanum, an instrument of punishment, He. XI, 35 Hapaxlegomenon. The tympanum seems to have been a wheel-shaped instrument of torture over which criminals were stretched as though they were skins and then horribly beaten with clubs or thongs.

πρόσχυσις (XI, 28): a pouring upon, Longin., He. XI, 28 Hapaxlegomenon in NT; eccl. writ., e. g., Just. M., apol., 2, 12.

πληροπορία (X, 22 et al.): fulness, abundance, He. X, 22; VI, 11; Col. II, 2; full conviction, certainty, assurance, I Th. I, 5; not found elsewhere exc. in eccl. writ.

παράπικαλύνω (III, 16): LXX chiefly for $\pi\tau\tau$, to be rebellious, et al.; embitter, provoke, exasperate, He. III, 16 (Hapaxlegomenon) as in Ps. cx (cvi) 7, et al.; Ezek. and often. Philo.

ἐπιλαβμός (XII, 14): Used only by bibl. and eccl. writ., consecration, purification, sanctification, Re. 6, 19 etc. 9 times in NT; LXX.

On the basis of this vocabulary study, even from the viewpoint of classical usage, the author of Hebrews exhibits a distinct tendency for grandeur in his diction.

Studying his vocabulary within its proper sphere and period of NT Koine one notices that this tendency becomes more pronounced. This is easily illustrated by the fact that 60 of his words can be classified as rare, unusual, or archaic in NT Koine, LXX and ecclesiastical writings, while 140 are hapaxlegomena in NT literature. Of the unusual words note the following examples:

²Ἐνοχλέω (XII, 18): Common in cl. Greek., Dem., Aeschin., to trouble, disquiet, Plat., etc.; give trouble to, Isocr., Xen., be a trouble, nuisance, Ar., Pass.: be annoyed, Xen., Diod., but the word is rare in the NT occurring only two times (Lk. VI, 18).

¹Ἐκβαλεῖς (XIII, 7): Common in cl. Grk., going out, alighting, landing, Aeschin., way out, egress, Od., Xen.; but rare in NT occurring only two times (I Co. X, 13 Escape from temptation). In a sense foreign to prof. auth., the issue of an event of a matter, Epict., Sap., He. XIII, 7.

Ἐπύκτης (XII, 10): Not found in cl. Grk., and rare in NT occurring only two times, (II Co. I, 12) Besides only in II Mace. XV, 2.

Ἐκατόω (VII, 6.9): Grk. writ. use ^δἐκατεῶν, to exact or receive a tenth part, Hdt., Xen., Lycurg. Hapaxlegomenon in NT; found in LXX (Neh. X, 37); St. Clement.

^ὑὑπόβασις (I, 3 et al.): a standing under; Metaph., groundwork, subject-matter, Polyb., Diod.; subsistence, reality, Arist., Luc., a word very common in Grk. auth., esp. fr. Arist. on, in widely different senses, but rare in NT in the philosophical meaning.

^{σο}σοφός (XII, 18): darkness, gloom, Od., often in Hom., Ap. Rh., strictly poetic in cl. Grk. Occurs 5 times in NT; found in LXX.

^ββύελλα (XII, 18): Storm, hurricane, whirlwind, Hom. and Tragg., metaph., Aesch. etc. Rare in Koine literature, hapaxlegomenon in NT; found in LXX.

Among the hapaxlegomena note the following:

^{τε}τελειωτής (XII, 2): perfecter, finisher. The word occurs nowhere else.

προοχθένω (III, 10. 17): to be wroth with, displeased with. Not found besides exc. in the LXX (Ps. xciv, 10). Prof. auth. use ὀχθένω, more rarely ὀχθίζω. πρὸς denotes direction towards that with which one is displeased.

ἐπιπερικύκλιος (XII, 1): ἐπι-περικύκλιον, skilfully surrounding, i. e., besetting, so. to prevent or retard running; sin which easily besets one. Not found elsewhere.

δημιουργός (XI, 10): Often in Grk. writ. fr. Hom. down. Workman (soothsayers, surgeons, heralds, carpenters, etc.) Od., Plat., Hdt., Menand., Arist., Aeschin., Eur.; maker of the world, Plat., Xen. and so esp. in Neo-Platonic philosophy, as the name of God, Creator; name of magistrate, Thuc. God is called thus in Plat., Joseph. and often in eccl. writ., Clem. Rom., Philo. In the Scriptures besides, only in II Macc. IV, 1.

θύεσις (XIII, 15): Not found elsewhere in cl. Grk.; a praising, praise: θυία θυέσεως, fr. $\theta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ $\theta\eta\eta\eta$ LXX (Lev. VII, 13) a thank-offering. Often occurs in LXX, but Hapaxlegomenon in NT.

Thus far considered, both in the period of classical and Koine literature, Hebrews reflects a distinctively choice diction approaching close to that of Thucydides.

Yet further, the author displays, as Aristotle would say, a more dignified (βελνότερα) style by giving it a "foreign air" (ξένη) in the introduction of foreign words into his discourse. The latter, according to Aristotle, should be used much less frequently in prose than in poetry and should be concealed.⁶ The writer of Hebrews uses foreign diction to a good advantage by employing words borrowed from the Hebrew. Since the immediate recipients and readers of his epistle were Jewish-Christians, this usage of Hebrew words was neither unbecoming nor offensive, but rather well-received and fitting for the circumstances.

Arist., op. cit., III, 2. 1404b, 8sq.

A certain distinction of polish and education always attaches to the litterateur who displays a natural ^{and} unaffected use of foreign words and phrases in his speech, for by introducing un bon mot of a foreign tongue the author gives indication of being well-read in literature in general. This distinction belongs to Hebrews as is seen by the following words borrowed from the Hebrew either directly or through the LXX:

μάλλα (IX, 4): morsel, grain, Diosc., a sweet gum of Arabia, LXX, Galen. Not found in cl. Grk.; Joseph. (^εμάλλα) for Hebr. מַלְלָה. According to the accounts of travelers a very sweet dew-like juice, which in Arabia and other Oriental countries exudes from the leaves of certain trees and shrubs, particularly in the summer of rainy years. It hardens into little white grains and is collected before sunrise and used as an article of food. Manna is the miraculous food which was supplied by God to the children of Israel in the wilderness, cfr. Ex. XVI, 12sq.

πάρα (XI, 28): Chald. ܢܦܕܕܐ, Hebr. נִפְדָּה, fr. נִפְדָּה, to pass over. The LXX constantly uses the Chald. form πάρα, except in II Ch. and Jer. XXXVIII, 8 where it is φαβέκ; Josephus has φαβέκα, an indeclinable noun. Often in NT.

ἡσάβητος (IV, 9): a keeping of the Sabbath, Plut., Hapaxlegomenon in NT; eccl. writ.

ὑσσωπός (IX, 19): an aromatic plant, hyssop, Diosc., LXX; but different from our hyssop which is not found in Egypt or Syria. Hebr. יִסְוֵן, Ex., Num., hyssop, a plant which was used by the Hebrews in their ritual sprinklings: two times in NT, Jn. XII, 29.

ἡσούβη (IX, 5): Not found in cl. Grk.; also written ἡσούβειν, LXX, Philo, Joseph. Hapax. in NT; the author of Hebrews has Ex. 25, 18-20 in mind.

In connection with the mention of words borrowed from the Hebrew,

due attention must be paid to the influence which the LXX may have exercised upon the diction of the author. Approximately 132 words (this is a rough estimate) found in Hebrews occur also in the LXX. Of these 132, about 96 words are found in the letter in the various and many quotations which the author makes from the LXX. The extent of this influence can readily be seen from the following interesting statistics. Better than one third of the words (approximately 24 words) classified in Hebrews as rare in the classical Greek are found in direct quotation from the LXX. About one fourth of the words (app. 9 words) in Hebrews not to be found in classical Greek are directly quoted from the LXX. Approximately one fourth (i. e., 14 words) of the rare and unusual words in the NT Koine occurring in Hebrews are directly quoted from the LXX. And likewise, one seventh (20 words) of the hapaxlegomena in the NT which are found alone in Hebrews are in direct quotation from the LXX. Consequently, these percentages show that the LXX played a not inconsiderable part in coloring the diction of the writer of Hebrews and especially had quite a prominent role in giving his diction a more dignified air. This is, of course, a natural conclusion to expect since the subject-matter is of a so distinctive Hebrew character. And then too, as was stated before, the author amplifies this Hebrew subject-matter with many and frequent quotations from the Greek translation of the sacred Old Testament Scriptures. However, this influence should not be overlooked nor over-emphasized to the neglect of the ample demonstration which the author gives of his ability to use good Greek Attic prose.

Now then, the inclusion of such select and not altogether ~~simple~~ simple words in Hebrews (as demonstrated above) does not mar to any appreciable degree the purity of the author's diction. For, though he has not always avoided using rare, unusual, archaic, poetic and even foreign words, he has not become guilty of the tastelessness or lack of beauty (ἀπελοκκλήα) which arises from an injudicious use of such a

diction. If, (together with Isocrates) it cannot be said that the author of the Hebrews was the equal of Lysias in purity and simplicity of vocabulary, yet he is a close rival.

Continuing his criticism, Dionysius next turns to Isocrates' use of the figurative expression (ἡ τροπικὴ φράσις) in diction. The reference is, of course, to the trope, in particular, the metaphor. A trope is the use of a particular word in other than its normal sense, e. g., "Herod is a fox." (metaphor). Isocrates is judicious in his use of tropes. His general practice is to avoid them and use the individual word in its proper sense. But when he does employ them (as Dionysius remarks) they are proportionately blended (κέκρωται συμμετρῶς). By this he means that Isocrates blends the figurative expression sparingly into his sentences and not in a "heaped-up" manner. In this respect, his diction differs little from that of Lysias who prefers common words in their natural sense.

The special quality of a trope is that it lends vividness (ἐνάργεια) to the style. The word ἐνάργεῖς corresponds to such English words as "realistic", "life-like", "telling", "graphic", and "pictorial". Of course, vividness is not limited to the trope only. Any word which realistically describes an action or situation may be called ἐνάργεῖς .

Now it is easily recognized that, though the trope does give vividness, at the same time it militates against purity. Dionysius is not ignorant of this fact, for he is quick to add that Isocrates uses the figurative expression but not to the extent that it mars the perspicuity of the word in general (σαφήνεια). In regard to diction, one of its chief merits may be defined as perspicuity or clarity. This is shown by the fact that the word, if it does not make the meaning clear, will not perform its proper function. Perspicuity then seems to be the governing principle of good diction. It preserves purity by regulating a judicious use of figurative expressions.

Aristotle speaks in a similar vein in his discussion of the metaphor. He grants that they are useful in prose in that they give clearness, pleasantness, and a "foreign air". But care must be taken to choose a proportionate metaphor, i. e., it should not be far-fetched but fitting to the subject which it modifies, e. g., to call poetry the "scream" (*κεκρυγή*) of Calliope is altogether improper to the dignity of the Muse of poetry. For this reason, Aristotle presents a rule which is useful to bear in mind for using the metaphor to its best advantage: If one wishes to adorn and elevate the subject, draw the metaphor from a better element of the same genus; to censure and demean the subject, draw the metaphor from an inferior element. Improper use of the metaphor, either one that is unfitting or far-fetched, is one of the defects of diction which, according to Aristotle, produces coldness of style (*ψυχρότης τῆς λέξεως*).

In this same category belongs the simile which Aristotle defines as a metaphor plus a word of comparison expressed (which would be *ὡς*). It is useful in prose, but classical Greek permits it a not frequent (*ὀλιγάκις*) use because it is poetical (being the invention and favorite device of the divine bard, Homer).⁷

By contrast with the sparing use of the metaphor and simile in good Greek prose, the English language is very liberal and lavish in adorning style with metaphorical expressions. Therefore, the student of English is amazed to note that throughout the entire Aegineticus Isocrates employed only four metaphors! And this, according to Dionysius, is the special virtue of good clear Greek. And it is here that the diction of Hebrews offends in good Attic prose style, for it contains approximately 115 metaphors and metaphorical expressions and 9 similes. Of course, this abundance is due in great part to the allegorical treatment which the author employs in the treatment of the subject-matter. But classical Greek would not permit such elaborate allegory. This is rather the

⁷Arist., op. cit., III, 2. 1405a, 3sq.

influence of Oriental character and custom -- a natural and genuine product of the Hebrew mind. And then too, it is the natural tendency for a language in its development, especially in its later history, to tend towards a freer use of words, other than the primary meaning, i.e., the metaphor. That is true in the case of Greek. The Koine literature, being more of a popular character, reflects the idiomatic and metaphorical usage of words. Judged by its own age and in the light of extenuating circumstances, Hebrews exhibits a natural, freer and more abundant use of the metaphor. And to its credit, it must be said that they do add vividness and graphic detail to the diction. But judged by a classical standard (and that of Dionysius in particular) it cannot be said (as Dionysius praises in Isocrates) that the author has been judicious in his use of tropes and has not proportionately blended them into his style. But rather, in the opinion of Dionysius, the tropical expressions mar the perspicuity of his diction. By way of illustration, note just a few of the many tropes to be found in Hebrews:

ἄγγελους ... πνεύματ'κ ... λειτουργούς ... πυρὸς φλόγα (I, 7): "Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." The angels are likened to winds and a flame of fire, the tertium being swiftness, invisibility and restless energy.

γάλακτος (V, 12.13): milk is metaphorically used for the essential and elemental matters of instruction and learning.

ἐκκλησίας (VIII, 2): metaphorical for the Christian Church.

ἔργων ἄγνων (IX, 14): metaph. for worthless and inactive deeds.

ἀέριστος (XII, 1): metaph. for "countless number".

The occurrence of similes, though less frequent, are nonetheless an important factor in adding pictorial detail. Note the following examples:

ὡς ἱμάτιον (I, 11): "and they all shall wax old as doth a garment."

A simile suggesting the transiency of life.

Μωϋσῆς... ὡς δεκάτων (III, 5): "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant..." The tertium comparationis is servitude.

ὡς ἄγκυραν (VI, 19): "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil;..."

This simile is more extended than the others. The tertium is security and safety and does not extend beyond to the added thought that hope leads us to heaven.

καὶ ὡς τὰ ἄστρα... ὡς ἡ ἄμμος (XI, 12): "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable." The tertium in both cases is numberless descendants.

It should be noted that in the case of the author's use of similes, Hebrews does admirably conform to Aristotle's requisites of fittingness and not too frequent usage. Nor are they of the extended length to which Homer goes in his similes which he sometimes stretches out to beyond the point of comparison even to the beclouding of the tertium. This latter type of simile is strictly poetical and the prerogative of the divine poet alone.

This concludes the analysis of the diction in Hebrews. In summarizing the results, one may say that, in general, the diction measures up to the classical standard of Dionysius. Like that of Isocrates, its dominant feature is the usage of common and ordinary words which are readily understandable to the average person. Thereby it achieves a simplicity and clarity demanded by and characteristic of good Attic prose. As is the case with Isocrates, a touch of Thucydidean grandeur and the flavor of culture and wide-reading in literature is added by the author in the way of a judicious selection of choice vocabulary and even a few foreign words of Hebraic origin. Greater vividness is achieved by a moderate use of telling and graphic similes, but, unlike Isocrates,

the diction does offend classic taste in the too-frequent employment of metaphors and tropical expressions. If it cannot be said that the author of Hebrews is the equal of Isocrates in beauty of diction, yet he does run him a close second.

All the best scholars are convinced that the study of structure is of the utmost value, not merely for decoding the ear, but for stirring the soul. For in the first place, nothing can penetrate to the emotions that stumbles at the portals of the ear, and secondly, one is naturally attracted by harmonious sounds.

-- Schiller

CHAPTER III

THE COMPOSITION OF SENTENCES

All the best scholars are convinced that the study of structure is of the utmost value, not merely for charming the ear, but for stirring the soul. For in the first place, nothing can penetrate to the emotions that stumbles at the portals of the ear, and secondly, man is naturally attracted by harmonious sounds.

-- Quintillian

CHAPTER III

THE COMPOSITION OF HEBREWS

The analysis of the diction in Hebrews reveals that the author, in common with Isocrates, has the purity and precision of the plain style of Lysias with a general bent towards grandeur on occasions. But choice of words is of comparatively small importance in determining the style of Isocrates. He did not rely so much upon words as he did upon the composition of these words into rhythmical periodic sentences. In this respect he diverges widely from the plainness of Lysias and exhibits a distinctive tendency towards dignity.

Dionysius discusses and criticizes the merits and defects of Isocrates' composition (ἔκθεσις or σύνθεσις) in comparison with the manner of Lysias.¹ He opens his criticism by examining the periodic sentence structure of their respective styles.

But first, a few general remarks on style in composition. There are two kinds, the compacted (λέξις κτετακταμένη) which consists in periods, and the disconnected or running style (λέξις ἑρρομένη)², so called because the cola are but loosely united.

In the loose or running style the cola seem to be thrown upon one another in a heap without the union ^{of} propping, and without the mutual support which is found in periods. This style is characterized by a careless, meandering flow of unpretentious speech.

Artistic prose is differentiated from this "jerky" style by the clever use of cola (κῶλα, pl. of κῶλον, branch, limb, part). A colon is an integral part of a sentence much as an arm or limb is an

¹Dion. Hal., De Isocr., 2.3.11.12.13.14.15 and 16. These chapters contain Dionysius' criticism of Isocrates' composition.

²Cfr. Arist., op. cit., III, 9 sq. for material here presented.

integral part of the human body. Its chief function is to mark a complete thought within the sentence. Phrases of smaller compass are termed *commata* (κόμματα pl. of κόμμα, a piece cut off, chip). A comma is defined as a phrase less than a colon, as for example, the saying: "Know thyself."³ A combination of two or more cola, with or without *commata*, which suspends the thought until the end of the complete sentence is called a period. The period is a system (σύστημα) of cola (and *commata*) arranged so dexterously as to fit exactly the thought to be expressed. Ancient writers, on the whole, expressed themselves preferably in large masses of thought made up of smaller entities or logical elements, and this, no doubt, from a certain innate delight in artistic structure. For this reason it is essential for a period to have a certain rounding-out at the close (καμπήν τινά καὶ συβασίην) in such a way that the thought (if not the syntax) is sustained until the end. Aristotle's definition of the period as a form of expression that has a beginning and an end is very appropriate for the word period (περίοδος) implies that there has been a beginning at one point and there will be an ending at another, and that the reader is hastening towards a definite goal as runners do after leaving the starting-place. The name period conveys the image of a path traversed in a circle. To destroy the circular form is to lose the period, even though the subject-matter remains the same. By way of illustration, the cola in the periodic structure may be compared to stones which support and hold together a vaulted roof. Aristotle's period has been cleverly described as "a sentence movement forecast and fulfilled by the speaker, divined and held by the hearer, as a definite rhythmical and logical unit. Its characteristic is that conclusiveness which satisfies at once ear and mind. In sound and syntax, it is the opposite of formless aggregation, of the addition of clause to clause as by afterthought."⁴ In the

sphere of musical composition, the "beginning" and the "end" of a period correspond almost like prelude and main theme in a piece of music. This mode of composition whereby a certain unity is achieved by a sort of interlacing of clauses and phrases, was the favorite manner of expression among the ancients. This was the style which Isocrates adopted and developed to a high peak of perfection, and this is the type of composition which Dionysius now proceeds to compare with that of Lysias.

Speaking of Lysias' handling of the period, Dionysius says that he compresses (συγτρύφειν) the thoughts closely and brings them out (ἐκφύρειν) neatly rounded (εἰσογγύλως), that is, in a terse period (βραχυτομος). Such a compact and curt style of period is the characteristic feature of the plain and unaffected (ἀπεληΐς) arrangement of words. It succeeds in avoiding monotony (ὑπτιος) and as a result possesses a vigor which is essential and well-adapted (εὐθέτος) to forensic contests. This is the excellence of Lysias.

In contrast to this simple and natural arrangement, the period of Isocrates is artificially constructed (πέπολημένος) for showy dignity (βραχυτότης πομπικῆ). For instead of aiming at the compactness which is most suitable for real contests, it seeks to attain a rich profuseness (πλουσίως κεχυμένη) of expression. A luxuriant amplitude is the distinctive mark of the Isocratean period and the chief characteristic of the smooth style (χαρακτήρ γλαφυρός) of which Isocrates is the representative. And therefore Dionysius calls Isocrates a vigorous master of elaboration (ἰσχυρὸς ἀθλητῆς τῆς κατασκευῆς).

But such free and expansive periods are liable to serious defects in style which Isocrates has not altogether succeeded in avoiding. One of these is monotony. Isocrates' usual practice is to fit all his

³Later rhetoricians say that a comma is an expression of less than 8 syllables, a colon, one of more than 8, but less than seventeen, which is the ordinary length of a hexameter.

⁴C. S. Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, p. 29 (Macmillan, 1924).

thoughts into periods. He must always round his sentences. One long and finished period follows after another with little variety ($\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\delta\alpha\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu$) or relief because he fails to brace ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\tau\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\upsilon$) or relax ($\acute{\rho}\nu\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\lambda$) his framework. As a result of such monotony his speeches lack two important qualities which are essential for delivery, namely, the power of stirring the emotions ($\tau\omicron\ \pi\alpha\delta\eta\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$) and lively presentation or animation ($\tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\nu$). Lacking these features, his speeches are suitable not for declamation in the public assembly but rather for private reading.

Furthermore, not only the form but also the subject-matter suffers from this artificiality and uniformity of periodic structure. The invariable desire for a period drives Isocrates to use (as Dionysius says) $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\omega\nu$, that is, expletives or "padding", words and phrases which are not strictly necessary to give full expression to the thought, and only serve to draw out the speech beyond due propriety. Therefore, oftentimes the period is profuse while the thought is diffusely and weakly expressed in order to afford a symmetry of cola.

However, Dionysius is cautious in his criticism of the periods of Isocrates. He is not so foolhardy (he says) as to become guilty of broad generalization. For sometimes Isocrates composes his periods in a simple manner and breaks them up in a noble fashion in order to achieve a well-rounded style of period. This is the excellence of the Isocratean period.

Now it is in the composition of the periodic sentence structure that the New Testament literature differs widely from the classic style. Blass says:

Die Periode, d. h., die Zusammenfügung einer grösseren Anzahl von Sätzen und Satzgliedern zu einer Einheit, ist im Neuen Testament selten. Da sie dem kunstvollern Stil eigen ist, ist sie am meisten im Hebräerbrief zu treffen, der überhaupt nach der Komposition der Worte and Sätze durchaus zur Kunstprosa zu rechnen ist. Paulus gibt sich im allgemein nicht die Mühe, die ein so sorgfältiger Stil erfordert; daher sind kunstvolle Perioden trotz

aller Beredsamkeit nicht bei ihm zu finden, während harte Parenthesen und Anakoluthe zahlreich sind. Eine schöne Periode ist der Eingang des Lukasevangeliums; sonst freilich verschmählt Lukas dieses Kunstmittel; auch der Anfang der Acta ist keine Periode, sondern eine Anreihung; nur die Einleitung des Apostelsdekrets bildet eine eigentliche Periode.⁵

A more careful analysis of the sentence structure in Hebrews shows that the author employed the period on approximately 33 occasions. Isocrates used the period in the Aegineticus 49 times. This is a very favorable comparison for Hebrews, for, though it does not measure up to the classic standard to the fullest extent, yet it does reveal a decided inclination and habit of the author to express himself quite naturally and consciously in the periodic style. And upon closer examination of these periods one is amazed and delighted by the striking similarity which they bear to those of Isocrates.

Like Isocrates, the author knows how, and amply demonstrates his ability, to execute a typical Lysian simplicity in the period. He compresses the thoughts closely and brings them out neatly rounded in a terse period -- characteristic of the plain and unaffected arrangement of words. Thus he succeeds (with this curt style) in avoiding monotony and obtaining an essential vigor of expression. Of the 33 periods, 13 are fashioned in this manner. For purposes of illustration note the following examples:⁶

II, 10: "For it became him, for whom all things are, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." A period of 4 cola, moderate in length, the thought and syntax sustained until the end of the sentence by strategic placing of the important word $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\kappa\iota$ at the last. Typical Lysian simplicity.

IV, 10: "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." Period of 3 cola, concise, thought

⁵Fr. Blass--A. Debrunner, Grammatik d. nt. Griechisch, p. 267.

⁶For a thorough appreciation of the periodic structure, the Greek text must be consulted, of course.

and syntax suspense sustained until the end of the sentence in the important word θεός. Typical Lysian simplicity.

VII, 8: "And here men that die receive tithes; but there he receiveth them, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." A beautifully simple Lysian period of 2 cola, in the best classic style, thought and syntax curtly rounded by the μέν...δέ. Typical Lysian simplicity.

VII, 23.24: "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Typical Lysian period of 4 cola, in chiasmic arrangement, thought and syntax nicely rounded by the antithetic μέν...δέ.

IX, 23: "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." A beautifully simple Lysian period of 2 cola neatly rounded in thought and syntax by the classic μέν...δέ.

The remaining instances of the simple Lysian-type of period are in II, 17; VII, 20.21; 28; X, 32.33; XI, 15.16; XII, 9; 11; XIII, 11.

These examples of the simple Lysian period employed by the writer reveal the two types of period which are found in this epistle. The first type is that represented by the first two instances in which the thought and syntax of the sentence are sustained until the end for final completion. The suspense is achieved through the strategic use of hyperbaton. 18 of the total 33 periods in Hebrews belong to this class. Strictly speaking, this type is not the classic Aristotlean period which Dionysius has in mind in his criticism, but it is called and considered a period inasmuch as it requires the completion of the sentence for the full meaning. The truly classic period is that represented by the last three examples above wherein the classic μέν and δέ are employed as visible "sign-posts" for the eye and mind to indicate the trend of the

syntax and the thought. For an appreciation of Greek artistic prose one must bear in mind the general precept ~~that~~ the Greek idea of beauty always implies perfection of form. Applying this rule to beautiful prose it means that the μέν and the δέ, as a coordinating pair of (ofttimes untranslatable) particles, serve as outward tokens of perfect form in sentence structure. The μέν anticipates the δέ which, in turn, completes the former, thus achieving a balance of sentence structure which thoroughly satisfies the Greek mind. This strictly classic type of period (which is Dionysius' concern) is represented in Hebrews by 14 examples.

A few illustrations of the elaborate and extended Isocratean periods to be found in Hebrews are as follows:

I, 1 - 4 incl.: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholdeth all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." This πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως period of the opening is, as it were, the keynote of the rhythmical style of the whole epistle. It is a period of the first type described above, elaborated in the typical manner of Isocrates. The πολυμερῶς to the καὶ is a two-membered period to which the following members are intimately attached: ὃν to ἁπάντων is a two-membered period with rhetorical asyndetic anaphora of the relative, then follows the four-membered period from ὃς to ὑπεδαίς and to this yet is attached a two-membered period connected by the τοσοῦτω and ὀβω. This artificially-constructed type of period is found in Hebrews on 20 occasions,

while there are only 13 instances of the simple Lysian period. This indicates the affinity which the author has to the Isocratean manner of composition and shows, beyond a doubt, that he consciously strove for rhetorical effect in his sentence structure. Note the further examples of luxuriant amplitude in the periods:

V, 7 - 10: "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec." Consists of 8 cola, of luxuriant amplitude, weighty and overwrought, thought and syntax sustained till the closing cola.

VII, 1 - 3: "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." Consists of 12 cola, of luxuriant amplitude, thought and syntax sustained until the last cola which is the main theme of the discussion: Melchisedec abides a priest into eternity.

VII, 5 - 6: "And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take the tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: but he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises." 7 cola, of luxuriant amplitude, a good example of the Isocratean period

because it is enclosed within the μέν...δέ antithesis.

VIII, 4 - 6: "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount. But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." 11 cola, attains a rich profuseness of expression, long and involved exceeding moderate length, open to the serious defect of Isocrates' periods, viz., the subject matter suffers from the artificial uniformity of the periodic structure, for the phrase ^{ὄντων} to ^{ὄρει} is a parenthetic statement which is not necessary to give full expression to the thought, but only serves to draw out the sentence beyond due propriety. While Isocrates is guilty of such impropriety, this is the exception in Hebrews. The rest of the Isocratean periods occur in I, 7-9; II, 2-4; 8.9; III, 5.6; V, 1-3; VI, 4-6; 7.8; VII, 18.19; IX, 11.12; 13.14; 27.28; X, 11-13; 28.29; XII, 10.

This analysis of the periods in Hebrews reveals that the author abundantly made use of the periodic sentence structure (33 occurrences). Though he can turn a neat and curt period of the simple Lysian type (13 occurrences) yet his preference and general flair is towards the artificiality of the period of Isocrates (20 occurrences). Thereby he attains a rich profuseness of expression intended for showy dignity which is the chief characteristic of the smooth style. However, the author has succeeded in avoiding the monotony of Isocrates who insisted upon having one long and finished period follow after another with little variety of the λέξις ἐξομμένη inserted in between. Only on two occasions does the author follow one period with another, viz., VI, 4 - 6 and 7. 8;

and IX, 11.12 and 13.14. Otherwise, the λέξις εἰσομένη is freely used, even in preference to the periodic style. Though the author of Hebrews does not reach the heights of composition in periodic sentence structure as represented by Isocrates, yet, of all New Testament literature, he comes most closely to that classic style.

Next to the luxuriance of his periods, the special marks of the periodic style in Isocrates depend upon his use of figures. Now a figure of language is a combination of words for the artificial expression of an idea. Isocrates makes abundant use of such devices and Dionysius notes the three types which he chiefly favors. They are antithesis, parisosis, and paromoiosis. All of them are based on parallelism.

Antithesis (ἀντιθέσις) is a parallelism in sense which arises from a contrast of words or ideas or both.

Parisosis (παρίσῳσις) is a parallelism of form and size which arises from precise or approximate equality of cola as measured by syllables.

Paromoiosis (παρομοίωσις) is a parallelism of sound which arises when equal cola are heightened by the use of the same or similar words either in its opening or at its close or throughout.

The idea of these figures is to seek a mechanical balance in form and idea and, used moderately, they contribute to beauty (κάλος) of expression. But this craving for symmetry leads to serious defects in style when it is not guided by a sense of fitness and measure. And, in Dionysius' opinion, Isocrates too often fails to observe due proportion in this regard. For he overloads his periods with antithesis, parisosis and the like. This gives his style an over-elaborate (περίεργος) character which frequently mars lucid sentence structure and effects a tediousness produced by such repetitious use of the same figures for any and every subject-matter.

Furthermore, such labored (φορτικός) periods weighted down with the elaborately-wrought ornament of figures results in (what Dionysius calls) frigidity (ψυχρότης). As a general term in literary criticism, frigidity refers to any defect in style as opposed to κατὴ λέξις. Dionysius uses the term in a more specific meaning in this instance and defines it as an immoderate use (τὸ μὴ κρατεῖν τοῦ μετρού) of figures which are far-fetched (πρόρρωθεν) and not fitting to the subject-matter. Isocrates, in this respect, is like a portrait-painter who adorns and decorates all his subjects with the same garments and embellishments.

Not only the form but also the thought suffers. Too often it is subservient to the pretentiousness (δεικτικὰ) of his figures. Too often the naturalness of expression (τὸ ἀληθινόν) is abandoned in favor of ingenious elegance (κομψεία). This is not the best practice, for nature intends that the style follow the thought and not the thought the style. The result is a loss of effectiveness in delivery. For every pleasantry of style (χαριεντισμός) which is found in speeches that are delivered in serious circumstances or in trying situations is not only untimely but most adverse to the compassion (ἐλεος) of an audience. For example, the orator who, in counselling about war or peace, adorns his speech with elegancies of style will not strike a sympathetic chord in his hearers nor obtain their assent to his viewpoint because he gives the impression that he is more interested in how he presents his speech than in what he is proposing. Likewise, for a private citizen who is running the risk of his life in the court-room, such devices will not only prove a hindrance but actually result in definite harm.

Again Dionysius refrains from too broad a generalization in his criticism of Isocrates' figures. He does not find fault with the class of figures as a whole, provided they are moderately used, for (he says) this is the practice of many orators and historians who desire thereby to

compose in an artistic manner. Such moderation Isocrates achieves in his forensic speeches. Dionysius also notes that the speeches which were written at the end of his life are less characterized by immature (*μειρακλῶδης*) employment of figures than his earlier works. He conjectures as the reason that Isocrates had outgrown this youthful taste and had achieved a perfected sense of prudence in his old age.

Now it is remarkable to see with what loving care the author of Hebrews has adorned his periods with artificial figures of language. The first and most striking of the rhetorical figures employed is antithesis. Norden has drawn attention to the fact that the rhetoric of the Asiatic schools had one important characteristic in common with the fifth century schools.⁷ Each flourished in a time when everything was being questioned. The opposition between old and new was in the day of each being sharply stated, hence one would expect the antithetic form of sentence to be a common rhetorical form. Ancient Greek rhetoric grew up in the period of the overthrow of oligarchy and the rise of democracy, at a time when the will of Zeus was flouted and the right of the individual to realize his own life was asserted. The works of Euripides, Aristophanes and Plato show how great was the conflict between the opposing ideals. Certainly in the time of early Christianity everything was being questioned and tested by a new standard. There were the great opposites, sometimes irreconcilable, of Heaven and earth, light and darkness, life in Christ and death in sin, spirit and body, belief and unbelief, love and hate, truth and error, reality and appearance, longing and fulfillment, past and present, present and future, etc. It is no wonder, then, that a writer of such rhetorical ability as the author of Hebrews should clothe his ideas in the antithetic form of sentence which was suggestive of two points of view with no middle way between. Of the 33 periods 14 are cast

⁷Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa, II, p. 508.

into the antithetic form. Many more antitheses are employed (to be mentioned later) which are not cast in the Greek manner of μέν and δέ and which occur outside of the periodic sentence structure. For purposes of illustration and comparison, the Aegineticus of Isocrates has 49 periods and each is cast into the antithetic form.

If it is true that the author thought in terms of contrasts like knowledge and faith, suffering and consolation, etc. and hence used antitheses naturally as the necessary expression of his thought, yet he employed other embellishments of style that could hardly be said to spring naturally from the thought. One of these is parisosis. Of the 33 periods 28 are elegantly balanced in cola with parisosis and 8 of these are so-called isocola. Of the 49 periods in the Aegineticus 30 are adorned with parisosis and of these 3 are isocola. Another figure of an artificial nature used mostly in the periodic structure is paromiosis. There is only one period in Hebrews which has this embellishment, while Isocrates used it 13 times in the Aegineticus. Aristotle states that it is possible to have antithesis, parisosis, and paromiosis at the same time in one period, especially to give the effect of elaborate and showy composition. This was the regular practice of Isocrates, according to the criticism of Dionysius, and is easily seen from the statistics listed above. In order to show how closely Hebrews approaches to this elaborate style, the 33 periods in Hebrews are listed below showing the figures of language which are found in them:

I, 1: 10 cola of which 6 are in parisosis in the ratio of 10:11 and 21:17 and 14:18.

I, 7-9: Antithesis μέν... δέ. 8 cola of which 4 are in parisosis in ratio of 11:12 and 16:18 and one isocolon, 9:9.

II, 2-4: 6 cola of which 5 are in parisosis in ration 19:24:21 and 16:15.

II, 8.9: 4 cola in ratio 18:19:23:17. Parisosis.

- II, 10: 4 cola of which 3 are in parisosis in ratio 6:5:6.
- II, 17: 3 cola of which 2 are in ratio 18:21. Parisosis.
- III, 5.6: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 3 cola in ratio 15:16:13. Parisosis.
- IV, 10: 3 cola in parisosis in ratio 13: 14:11.
- V, 1-3: 8 cola of which 6 are in parisosis in ratio 15:14 and 2 iso-
cola: 18:18 and 7:7.
- V, 7-10: 8 cola of which 3 are in parisosis in ratio 14:15:12.
- VI, 4-6: 8 cola of which 2 are in parisosis in ratio 12:15:14 and
12:14.
- VI, 7.8: 7 cola and one parisosis, 12:10.
- VII, 1-3: 12 cola and 4 parisoses: 13:10 and 16:17 and 10:9 and 13:15:
13:11.
- VII, 18.19: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ 4 cola, 2 parisoses, 16:13 and
11:12. Homoioteleuton throughout.
- VII, 8: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 2 cola.
- VII, 20.21: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 5 cola, 2 parisoses, 19:18 and
7:9:9.
- VII, 5.6: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 7 cola, one parisosis, 16:13 and
one isocolon, 19:19.
- VII, 28: 4 cola, one parisosis, 16:13 and one isocolon, 11:11.
- VII, 23.24: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 4 cola, one parisosis, 15:14:
14:13.
- VIII, 4-6: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 11 cola, 2 parisoses, 7:6 and
10:9 and one isocolon, 15:15.
- IX, 6-8: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 6 cola, one parisosis, 15:13.
- IX, 11-12: 6 cola, one parisosis, 10:11 and one isocolon, 20:20.
- IX, 13.14: No figures.
- IX, 23: 2 cola, one parisosis, 24:19.
- IX, 27.28: 6 cola, one parisosis, 7:6 and one isocolon, 14:14.
- X, 11-13: Antithesis $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 7 cola, 2 parisosis, 16:13 and 11:8.

I, 28.29: 7 cola, one pariosis.

I, 32.33: Antithesis *ΜΕΝ ... ΔΕ* . 4 cola, 2 pariosis: 18:19 and 20:18:19.

XI, 15.16: Antithesis *ΜΕΝ ... ΔΕ* . 5 cola and one pariosis, 9:9:8.

XII, 9: 2 cola. No figures.

XII, 10: Antithesis *ΜΕΝ ... ΔΕ* . 4 cola and 2 pariosis, 10:11 and 8:14.

XII, 11: Antithesis *ΜΕΝ ... ΔΕ* . 2 cola and no figures.

XIII, 11: 2 cola. No figures.

As this analysis shows beyond a doubt, the periods of Hebrews attain to a rich profuseness of style in that they are moderately adorned with a mechanical balance in form and idea. With only three exceptions, every period (30) is made more beautiful by the use of either antithesis or pariosis. Two (2) of the periods have only the antithesis while 16 have only the pariosis. But in 12 instances the period is enhanced in its beauty by the addition of both devices, antithesis and pariosis; and, in one case, (VII, 18.19) all three devices are employed. These latter examples well illustrate the tendency of the writer towards grandeur and showy dignity in his composition. And in this respect the author imitates the mode of Isocrates who almost constantly adorned all his periods with at least antithesis and pariosis and, in addition, frequently with paromiosis. For example in the Aegineticus, the total of 49 periods are all clothed in antithesis, 30 have pariosis (and 3 isocola) and in addition 13 are over-elaborated with paromiosis. While Isocrates becomes guilty of frigidity in style due to his over-abundance of figures within one period and therefore, sometimes, the thought is subservient to the ingenious elegance of form, yet the author of Hebrews in every case has achieved the happy mean in his use of figures in the period and thereby attained to a beauty of expression unsurpassed in New Testament literature. His style possesses the charming beaute of the

great Attic prose master without the latter's fautes.

It is in the use of such ornate periods that Hebrews contradicts the opinion of those who may say that the author did not make much use of the school-rhetoric. Whether one maintains further that the use of the figures of speech that abound in the epistle was a perfectly natural one or whether it is held to be studied, the conclusions to be drawn from it are the same, namely, that the writer was well versed in the rhetoric of the Greek schools wherever his instruction was received. Not one example alone but many may be cited of the use of such rhetorical devices as asyndeton, polysyndeton, pariosis, anaphora, synonymia, paronomasia, catachresis etc., etc. IT is true that all these figures are not equally rhetorical, some of them are natural and reinforce the sense. All of them are intended to impress. But some of them are pure embellishment and, occasionally, an ornamentation that adds neither beauty nor force.

Besides the instances already mentioned of antitheses many occur outside the structure of the periodic sentence. Both the Greek writers and all Semitic authors (whether they composed in Hebrew or in Greek) were fond of expressing their minds by such parallelism of thought and structure. The Greek type, specifically, is a parallelism of form only, while the Hebrew is a parallelism of thought not so rigidly bound within such restrictions as the Greek particles $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. 23 antitheses are to be noted in Hebrews which are not set off by $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. Many of these are found in the quotations from the LXX and hence can be accounted for on the basis of a Hebraic origin. See I, 5 (2 antitheses); I, 7,9,10, 11, 11.12, 12; II, 6,7,12,16; VII, 2; VIII, 8,10 (2 antitheses); VIII, 11,12; X, 5,6, 16,30,37; XII, 5. In toto there are then 37 occurrences of antithesis in Hebrews (Aegineticus has 49 antitheses). The cumulative effect of a more or less exhaustive exposition like this is enormous and, together with other evidence, inclines one to the view that the author consciously strove for such antithetical effect.

In addition to the examples already given of pariosis which occur in the period there are many more which occur outside of the periodic structure. See I, 5,10,11 (isocolon), 11.12; II, 6-8, 12,16,18; III, 4; IV, 11; VI, 3,9 (isocolon); VII, 23.24, 23 (isocolon); VIII, 10 (2 parisoses), 11 (2 parisoses), 12; X, 5.6,16,18,30,37,38,39; XI, 1,3,5; XII, 5.6,7,8 (isocolon), 22; XIII, 4 (isocolon), 5,14,15,16,19. In all there are 65 instances of pariosis recorded (37 outside of the period). The Aegineticus has 30 parisoses. Again, the cumulative effect of this figure is enormous and, even though these citations do not exhaust the record, they are too numerous to be accidental. The use of this figure, moreover, will hardly be said to represent a manner that is conversational.

Outside of the one occurrence of paromiosis in a period (See VII, 18.19), there are a few additional instances found in the paratactic sentence structure. See for example:

II, 6.7: A quotation from the LXX:

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? (αὐτοῦ ;)
 or the son of man, that thou visitest him? (αὐτόν ;)
 Thou madest him a little lower than the angels;
 thou crownedst him with glory and honor, (αὐτόν)
 and didst set him over the works of thy hands: (αὐτοῦ .)

11, 17:

... πειραζόμενος

... ἀναδέξασθαι

11, 37: Two occurrences in pairs of threes:

ἑλιθάσθαι.

ἑπειλάσθαι.

ἑπείλασθαι.

and

ἕτερόμενοι.

θλιβόμενοι.

κακουχόμενοι.

All these cases of paromoiosis are also called homoioteleuton ($\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$) because a rime occurs at the end of the cola or commata. This figure, that came into use very early in the history of Greek rhetoric with the school of Gorgias in the last quarter of the fifth century and that was regarded by the Greeks themselves for long as inartistic and hence was used sparingly, appears in Hebrews a total of 5 times approximately. The Aegineticus has 13 paromoioses. Naturally not much of this extremely artificial figure is found.

Akin to the preceding figure is the figure of Cyclosis ($\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$), according to which a word that begins a member of the sentence is reproduced, or represented by a synonym at the end of the other member:

XIII, 22:

$\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\acute{\iota}\nu\ \dots\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\omega\varsigma.$

IX, 16:

$\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\ \dots\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu.$

IX, 17:

$\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\ \dots\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma.$

There are 5 instances of cyclosis noted, but there may be more. The Aegineticus has none. A beautiful extension of the idea of the cyclosis is to be found in comparing I, 12 with XIII, 8. At the beginning of his epistle the author quoted from the LXX the clause, $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\ \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}$ which is an excellent commentary on the sacred name of Jehovah, viz., יהוה i. e., יהוה יהוה יהוה . This is the name of the God of the Old Covenant. At the end of the epistle (XIII, 8) the writer says: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever." Here Jesus is described as the great "I AM" i. e., He is identified with the God of the Old Covenant, Jehovah. This is a beautiful effect which the author desires to attain for his immediate readers were in danger of forgetting

that Jesus was the God of the Old Testament.

Another variation of cyclosis, only on a grander scale, is to be found in V, 1 - 10. The author begins the paragraph with the idea and words, πᾶς γὰρ ἄρχιεὺς and he ends the paragraph with the same idea and words, ἄρχιεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ, which is the main theme of the epistle. By this device he gives a certain unity and emphasis to his letter, viz., the High Priesthood of Christ.

Another figure of language which is dependent upon the cola or commata is antistrophe (ἀντιτροπή) which is the repetition of the same word or phrase at the end of successive clauses. The following are examples:

II, 16:

... ἐπιλαμβάνεται

... ἐπιλαμβάνεται

and IX, 16.17:

... διαδέμενους

... διαδέμενους

These are the only two cases noted. The Aegineticus has none.

Anaphora (ἀναφορά), also called epanaphora (ἐπαναφορά) or epanalepsis (ἐπαναλήψις) is the repetition with emphasis of the same word or phrase at the beginning of several successive clauses. This figure appears frequently:

I, 7.8:

καὶ πρὸς μὲν...

πρὸς δὲ ...

In this case, anaphora further enhances the periodic sentence structure.

II, 13:

καὶ πάλιν ...

καὶ πάλιν ...

III, 16-18:

τίνας ...

τίβιν ...

τίβιν ...

IX, 16.17:

δαδῆκη ...

δαδῆκη ...

XII, 15.16:

μή τις ...

μή τις ...

μή τις ...

XIII, 24:

ἄλλοῦ ἄλλου ...

ἄλλοῦ ἄλλου ...

Perhaps the most extended use of this figure in all Greek prose-literature, both sacred and profane, is that found in chapter XI, 3 - 31 (the great Faith Chapter) where the author has effectively employed anaphora 18 times. After a concise (and almost Aristotlean definition) of πίτις in the first verse of the chapter, the author proceeds to amplify this theme by the examples of former great heroes of faith, introducing each example with the word πίτεϊ . The psychological effect of this repetition upon the reader is tremendous. It forcefully impresses upon their minds the idea of faith in Christ as the only means of grace. Surely everyone would agree that the author here has consciously striven for this effect and attained his end through the use of the devices of school-rhetoric. Anaphora is used 7 times in Hebrews; the Aegineticus has 3 instances.)

Another figure of language which depends upon sentence structure is that known as chiasmus (χιῶμοῖς). This figure is quite frequent in

Greek poetry but is exceedingly rare in good Attic prose. It should also be noted that the chiasmatic arrangement of words in a sentence is a common feature of style in Hebrew literature, especially in the more poetic sections of the prophetic books. The chiasm is a species of hyperbaton whereby the extremes and the means of a sentence are correlated to correspond. An example will make this definition clear:

IV, 16:

... λάβωμεν ἔλεος καὶ χάριν εὐρωμεν...

The normal word order would be:

... λάβωμεν ἔλεος καὶ εὐρωμεν χάριν...

But by placing the two verbs in corresponding positions at the extremes of the sentence and their respective objects in the corresponding mean position, the author has achieved the chiasmatic arrangement in sentence structure. The word itself, *χιάσμα*, by definition, represents the Greek letter of the alphabet, the Chi, χ . Hence, the figure really implies that the sentence takes the form of the χ . In poetry it actually does. For illustration, IV, 16 can be cast into two poetic lines as follows:

... λάβωμεν ἔλεος ...

καὶ χάριν εὐρωμεν ...

This gives the form of the letter as indicated. Note a few more examples of such chiasm in Hebrews:

VII, 3:

... ἄρχὴν ἡμερῶν

μήτε ζωῆς τέλος...

I, 9:

ἀγαπήσῃ τὸ πρῶτον ἕνα τὸ δεύτερον στήθη

There are approximately 30 ^{instances} of such chiasmic word order throughout the epistle. Aegineticus has no chiasms noted. In addition to the examples given, see I, 5,10; II, 7; IX, 10,11,12; X, 16; XI, 13,35,37; XII, 2,5,6,10,11,14,15,19,23,28; XIII, 4,12,14,17.

This figure is not limited to word order but is also extended to include phrases, sentences and even paragraphs which are cast artistically into the form of the χ .

Note for example:

XII, 10:

The initial $\acute{\alpha}\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ phrase corresponds in idea with the last phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$, while the two inner phrases $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{o}$ and $\acute{o}\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ also correspond with each other.

For a chiasmic arrangement with sentences, note:

I, 7-13:

- v. 7 refers to and speaks of the angels.
- vv. 8.9 refer to and speak of the Son.
- vv. 10.11.12 refer to and speak of the Son.
- v. 13 again refers to the angels.

Thus the initial and last sentence of this paragraph speak of the angels while the inner corresponding sentences speak of the Son.

For the most extended form of the chiasm, see:

V, 1-10: This is one of the most skilfully arranged paragraphs in the whole letter. It is divided into two parts:

- I. ch. V, 1-4.
- II. ch. V, 5-10.

The first part consists of two subdivisions:

- A. Certain qualifications of a high priest (vv. 1-3)
- B. Necessity of his being divinely appointed (v. 4)

The second part refers refers points A and B under the first part to Christ in a chiasmic form as follows:

- I. vv. 1-3 (A) v. 4 (B)
II. vv. 5.6 (B) vv. 7-10 (A)

Now it can hardly be maintained that an artistic arrangement such as this is purely accidental, nor even that it is the natural form of expression of one who has been thoroughly schooled in rhetoric. Rather it definitely shows that the writer purposely and consciously adopted this mode of presentation. As a matter of fact, the extensive use of the chiasmatic form in this epistle (app. 30 times) strongly suggests that this particular device was a favorite one with the author. It is, so to speak, the trade mark of his production. And, because of the highly poetic nature of this rhetorical device it adds a great deal of lustre to the showy dignity of his composition. It has been suggested that the frequency of the chiasm in Hebrews is probably due to the influence of Hebrew literature and hence this figure might be called a sort of Hebraism. However, it should be remembered that the chiasm is a frequent thing in Greek poetry and that the figure is natural and native in an equal measure to both languages. Hence, if it should be argued that the chiasm is hebraistic, it can be maintained with equal fervor that the author was well acquainted with the device through his reading of Greek poetry as he was from his knowledge of the poetic books of the prophets. At any rate, the pitched battle between the Hebraists and the Grecists still rages with no final verdict for either side. Because of the writer's ample use of the other figures of speech which are peculiar to the Greek language alone, and which are to be accounted for by the author's thorough acquaintance with Greek literature, it is just as (if not more) reasonable to assume that the chiasm in Hebrews is just another of the Greek rhetorical devices which the author freely employed.

Closely connected with the chiasm as a device of oratory is the wider term of hyperbaton. This phenomenon cannot be reproduced in the Hebrew since sentence structure in that language requires strict adherence to logical sequence of words for its meaning. Hyperbaton is peculiar to Greek because of that language's highly inflected character. Hyperbaton (ὑπέροβατον, fr. ὑπέε and βάλνω) is simply the separation of words which naturally belong together. It is used effectively as a rhetorical device when the author wishes thereby to give special emphasis to some word or phrase. In that case, the important word to be emphasized is placed either at the beginning of the sentence or reserved for the final position. This the author of Hebrews does frequently, as will be readily seen by an examination of the passages listed below. Hyperbaton is the mark of the elite litterateur, the token of the seasoned composer. The plain style in composition is satisfied with the natural mode of expression, while the elaborate style craves refinement and complexity. At any rate, this is true in the Greek language because of its great flexibility in word placement. Lysias strove for simplicity and was understood readily by the masses of the common people. Isocrates and Thucydides strove for complexity and directed their appeal to a more cultured and select audience. So here, the abundant use of hyperbaton in this epistle makes the reading of it more difficult and hence restricts its readers. This refinement suggests that the appeal of this letter was intended for those who could appreciate the delicate turn of a phrase and the intricate placement of words. One particular type of hyperbaton is peculiar to this author and, because he indulges in it so often, it serves as a "water-mark" of his handiwork. An example is:

II, 3:

ἡλικιωτέων ἀμεληγάντες ἑσπερίας.

The regular order of words would be:

ἄμελη⁶αντες τηλικαύτης βωτηρείς

but by hyperbaton, the author obtains a better emphasis. Because the ἄμελη⁶αντες is interposed between the τηλικαύτης and the βωτηρείς, all three words, as it were, stand apart and receive an individual emphasis.

Cpr.:

III, 3:

πλείονος γὰρ οὐτος δόξης

VI, 1:

Ἰεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετάνόους

See the further examples in I, 4; II, 9; IV, 8,10,11,11; V, 1,11; VI, 5, 11,19; VII, 4,22,24; VIII, 1,8; IX, 1,4,15,24; X, 1,11,12,27,29; XI, 1; X, 36; XII, 1,1,2,3,8,11,14,21; XIII, 6,8,11,20.

Almost all of the 42 instances of hyperbaton noted (this is not exhaustive) are of the type which the examples show, e. g., the noun is separated from its adjective by the verb of which it is the object, etc. In most cases a rhetorical effect is obtained because the disruption of the normal word order throws the weight of emphasis upon each individual word and thus calls the special attention of the careful reader to the idea expressed. At the least, such hyperbaton necessitates careful and slow reading and this compels the reader's undistracted attention and correspondingly assures the writer that his composition will not be hastily looked at and then be cast aside. One might say it reminds one of the old idea of concealing what is beautiful and true from the profane gaze of the multitude by covering it with difficulties surmountable only by him who truly seeks and finds. This peculiar trait of the author for the use of such hyperbaton together with his fondness for chiasm are indelible marks of his authorship.

Attention must be called to the good effect which the writer obtains

by his use of hyperbaton in :

II, 9:

... τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἄγγελους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν
διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξης καὶ τιμῆς ἐστεφανωμένον, . . .

By a clever device all his own the writer has placed Ἰησοῦν in the emphatic position. The usual place of emphasis is the beginning or end of the sentence, but here the writer has chosen the middle of the sentence. By a sort of pyramidic structure the author holds the sentence in suspense by beginning with τὸν δὲ, the article separated from its noun by a participial clause and a finite verb, then stating the important word Ἰησοῦν and finally rounding off the entire structure with a corresponding participial clause. The name JESUS stands between the two participial clauses like a diamond glistening in its setting. Now examine the contents of these clauses. The first speaks of Christ's humiliation, the second of his exaltation. What an excellent commentary on the theme of this epistle is conveyed by the mere outward form of this sentence: the word JESUS surrounded on the one side by a clause describing his humiliation and on the other side by a clause describing his exaltation! In other words, (the author would say) Jesus qualifies as High Priest, on the one hand, because he appreciates our difficulties by reason of his having been a man; on the other hand, because he can fulfill our requests by reason of his having been crowned with glory. He is the God-Man. But this is not all. Now look at the rhythmical pattern of the sentence: Ἰησοῦς is a most majestic word composed of two long vowels (Dionysius pronounces long vowels the best and most dignified). These two long vowels are surrounded on the one side by five short vowels, and on the other, by four short vowels. Thus the greatest prominence possible is given to the name Ἰησοῦν, thus: uuuuu—uuuu. All this might be accidental, but one is tempted to think that the author had in

mind to enhance, as best he could, the name of the Savior. And yet -- it is a wondrous thing to tell -- it does seem as though the author has deliberately taken in hand to glorify the name of his Savior every time that he mentions it in this letter. The name Ἰησοῦς occurs 13 times in the epistle and, with the exception of two passages (X, 19 and XIII, 12) it is always placed in the most emphatic position of the sentence. And consider this -- 7 of these times the author places Ἰησοῦς in the middle of the sentence structure and employs the identical arrangement as that described above in II, 9.⁸ Each time the name brilliantly glistens in its peculiar but appropriate setting and is further enhanced by a rhythmical flow of syllables. Such coincidence or accident (whichever it may be) in the placing of the name of Jesus adds wonderfully to the beauty of the composition. And since the author is a proven master in frequent use of hyperbaton, one is inclined to credit his excellence in this respect to a wide experience in the methods of rhetoric.

The figure asyndeton (ἀσύνδετον) was employed in Greek rhetoric to produce the effect of rapidity, a rapidity that was the result of intense feeling. Like a rushing mountain stream the words overwhelm the reader with a multitudinous effect. The following examples illustrate its use in Hebrews:

II, 32-35:

"And what shall I more say? For the time would fail me to tell of Gedeon, Barak, Samson, Jephthae, David and Sammel, and the prophets, who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might receive a better resurrection."

⁸Cfr. II, 9; III, 2; IV, 8, 14; VI, 20; VII, 22; X, 10, 19; XII, 2; XIII, 8, 12, 21, 21.

XI, 37:

"They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented;"

Both these illustrations show that the author understood the psychological effect which asyndeton produces, namely, that of giving the impression of more "muchness" than is actually expressed. See also I, 5, 1-3;

II, 7; X, 29. Used a total of 6 times. Aegineticus has no asyndeton.

The opposite effect, that of reason and deliberation, is produced by polysyndeton (πολυσύνδετον). Like asyndeton it serves the purpose of giving the impression of "muchness" only from the opposite point of view. The author employed the figure when he is setting forth something of which he is fully convinced:

IV, 12:

"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

XII, 18.19:

"For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice ^{of} words; which voice they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more;"

See also II, 4; IX, 2; XI, 38; XII, 22-25. A total of 6 times.

Aegineticus has 9 occurrences of polysyndeton.

Alliteration is a very formal and exceedingly artificial figure of speech. One would naturally suppose that a writer who used alliteration was indulging in an unnatural nicety of speech. An analysis of Hebrews reveals that the author had a strong penchant for just such artificiality.

Immediately at the outset, the very first words are alliterated in the letter (I^α 1). In all, this device is used 19 times and this abundance exhibits an inordinate fondness for the figure on the part of the author. See I, 13: π(3x); II, 2: λ(3x); II, 2: π(4x); II, 3: λ(3x); II, 7: π(4x); II, 18: π(4x); III, 12: απ(3x); VII, 3: α(3x); VIII, 13: π(3x); IX, 27: απ(4x); X, 3: α(4x); X, 13: π(3x); XI, 28: π(5x); XII, 3: ϑ(3x); XIII, 19: π(3x); X, 39: π(6x); XI, 1: π(6x, once β); XII, 11: π(4x). No alliteration noted in Aegineticus.

Another figure of a more or less artificial character is that known as anadiplosis (ἀναδίπλωσις, doubling) which is the rhetorical repetition of one or several words for purposes of emphasis. The author loves to repeat certain words or phrases, e. g.:

I, 1.2: λαλήθεις -- ἐλάληθεν

I, 2.4.14: κληρονομόνεσσι opr. with

VI, 17; XI, 17; I, 4: κεκληρονομήκεν opr. with

VI, 12; XII, 17; I, 14: κληρονομείν

II, 1.2: The παρακοή leads to παράβωσις which leads to παραουῶμεν

II, 5.8: ὑποτάττω occurs five times to stress subordination.

II, 7.9: στεφανώω occurs 2 times.

II, 13.14: τὰ παιδία

II, 16: ἐπιλαμβάνετε

He singles out a word or term and builds up an entire paragraph or section around that word, repeating it throughout the section:

I, 2: υἱός opr. I, 2-14.

I, 4: ἄγγελων opr. with I, 2-14.

II, 10: υἱός opr. with II, 10-18.

III, 2: οἶκος opr. with III, 2-6.

IV, 14: ἄρχεις opr. IV, 14 - V, 10.

VI, 20: κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελαχιγέδεσσι opr. VI, 20 - VII, 25.

VII, 26: *ῥεχειρῶς* cpr. VII, 26 - IX, 28.

X, 1: *τοῦ κῶρα* cpr. X, 1-18.

IX, 7: *ῥῆμα* cpr. IX, 7 - XI, 28.

XI: *πίσις*

III, 11: *κατάκωβιν* cpr. III, 11 - IV, 11.

The writer's fondness for this figure is extreme and comes close to passing all moderation. See I, 3,8,9,13; II, 6,10,14; III, 3,5; IV, 6; V, 1.2, 1.2; VI, 20; VII, 4; VIII, 1; IX, 16; XI, 37; XIII, 5; V, 6,10; VIII, 8; I, 1.2; II, 5.8, 7.9, 13.14; V, 3. A total of approximately 45 occurrences while Isocrates used it only once in the Aegineticus.

Closely related to the idea of the anadiplosis is the device called parechesis (*παρεήχησις*) which is the repetition of the same sound in words which follow in close succession. This adds a flavor of the poetic and hence it is only used on rare occasions in good Attic prose. Isocrates, for example, employed it only once in the Aegineticus. Because of the synthetic character of the Greek language, parechesis results quite naturally: as for example, a noun with its various modifiers in the same case, etc. In such instances it is not employed for rhetorical effect. The excellence of the figure is this that the similarity of the same sound in close succession is pleasing to the ear and further, it facilitates remembering. Beauty of sound was an important factor in determining excellence of style among the Greeks. And the Greek prose masters were so thoughtful of their hearers and readers that they made a conscious effort to impress their words upon the minds in an indelible manner and in a fashion easy to remember. Immediately at the beginning of this epistle the author swings into just such echoing of the same sound and thereby gives an indication of his manner throughout:

I, 1: *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*

- II, 2: πῶλα παύβωβις καὶ παύακοῦ
III, 4: ... καταβκευάξεται ... καταβκευάξας
VII, 3: ἀπᾶτωρ, ἀμητωρ
IX, 10: βρώμαβιν καὶ πόμαβιν

The figure, according to the taste of some critics, is overworked. See also I, 9,11,12; II, 6,7,9,11; III, 11,18; IV, 3,5,6,11,15; V, 1,1,2,8,14; VI, 2,4-6,7-9,10,13; VII, 9,12,26; VIII, 10; IX, 13,16,17,27; X, 4,13,16,17; XI, 33,37; XII, 22-25; XIII, 1,14,18; IX, 11,12. A total of approximately 47 occurrences. Such repeated use comes dangerously near to exceeding the bounds of natural speech and though some instances are unavoidable and hence can be dismissed as unrhetoical, yet even half of the total number would still indicate an oratorical usage.

Paronomasia (παρονομασία) is a play on words, the English "pun". Usually this figure is reserved for only the most rhetorical passages, in the passages where, in keeping with the high theme, the author employs what in secular poetry is called the dithyrambic manner. It is not used, as the English pun, for purposes of humorous and comic effect, but rather as a purely artificial flash of brilliance in style. A favorite manner of obtaining paronomasia is that called figura etymologica, i.e., two terms which are derived from the same stem are placed in approximate juxta-position to each other. The writer of Hebrews is very fond of this latter type of paronomasia, though it may be said to his credit that he quite often succeeds in concealing his art so that the reader is unaware of its presence. Throughout the entire epistle there are these bright gleams of brilliancy adding lustre to the style:

- II, 11: ἰσχυρῶν καὶ οἱ ἰσχυρόμενοι
IV, 4.5: κατέπρωβεν ... κατέπρωβιν
V, 14: καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ
VII, 9: δεκάτης λαμβάνων δεδεκάτωτα

VIII, 10: διαθήκη ἢ διαθήκομαι

II, 5-8: ὑπέταξεν... ὑπέταξας ὑποκίτω τῶν ποδῶν...

ὑποτάξαι... ἀνυπότακτον... ὑποτεταχμένα

VI, 13:

V, 8: ἔμαθεν ἄφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν οἱ πάντες μάθος Aeschylus, Ag. 164.

Apparently this phrase was an old saw which captivated the popular fancy. No one would be so rash as to intimate that the author of Hebrews was well acquainted with Aeschylus' opera and here borrowed a striking phrase. No, such saws are the common property of all ages and all men. But the similarity between the two does show that the author of Hebrews, in using such a play upon words, was approaching very close to poetic license. And when one considers the frequency of this figure, the idea naturally presents itself that the author was consciously using rhetorical devices to make his style more striking. Note the frequency: III, 4; VII, 12; IX, 10,16,17; X, 13,16; XIII, 22; IV, 4.5; VI, 10,12,13; II, 18; VII, 3,19,22,23,24; VIII, 7.8; IX, 28; X, 29,34,38,39; XI, 27, 5.6; X, 14; XII, 5.6.7, 7.8; XIII, 14. Isocrates used paronomasia only once in the Aegineticus; the author of Hebrews employs it on 34 occasions with a definite rhetorical effect, though again it must be said that he has succeeded in concealing his art from the casual reader. Surely the abundance of this highly unusual figure does suggest that the author had more than a passing acquaintance with the oratory of the schools.

A figure of speech which has more to do with individual words and is an outgrowth of the metaphor is the so-called catachresis (καταχρησμός). This is the misuse of a word (or a violent metaphor) for rhetorical effect. The situation is this: The writer becomes so engrossed in his subject-matter that he becomes guilty of breaches of propriety in word usage. This is a highly emotional type of figure and lends striking

vividness to the style. Note a few examples:

II, 9: *γέωγηται θανάτου* A violent metaphor by Greek standards.

VI, 7: *γη ... πιούβα*

VI, 7: *γη ... τίκτουβα*

VI, 19: *ἐλπίδος ... ἡν ... εἰσεχομένην...* How can hope (an abstraction) enter into that within the veil? At the least, the idea is striking.

Apparently, the author forgot (under the stress of emotion) that *ἐλπίς* was the antecedent of the *ἡν* and the *εἰσεχομένην* with which it is in agreement. The thought is surpassingly beautiful, and expressed as it is, it passes all human understanding. See also IV, 12 (where the Word of God is modified by 5 violent adjectives) and X, 20. The figure is used on 14 occasions in Hebrews. There are none in the Aegineticus.

Similar in idea and function to catachresis is the figure called oxymoron (*ὀξύμωρον*). By definition, it is the juxta-position of words apparently contradictory to each other. Both this and the previous figure are based on this psychological law in language that the emotional speaker, in failing to express himself adequately in proper and ordinary terms, feels the need of using violent and unusual words in queer contexts (catachresis) or even the contradictory term of what he really means (oxymoron) in order to give expression to the intense feelings which rise up ^{with} in him. By way of illustration, the classic example of an oxymoron is: "the sweet pangs of childbirth." Hebrews has about 6 such occurrences of this figure:

XI, 4: *ἄπο θανῶν ἐτι λαλεῖ* . How can a dead man speak? With this almost epigrammatic phrase the author has composed a fitting epitaph for the "tomb" of Abel. The juxta-position of these apparently contradictory terms makes the reader pause for thought and then marvel at the happy phrase which the author has coined. It is best (in translation) not to translate the participle as adversative (which it really is) thus:

"though he is dead, yet he speaks" but rather retain the apparent contradiction as the Greek ambiguously does: "dead, he yet speaks." The identical effect is achieved in

XI, 12: $\gammaενερωμενου$. "Therefore, sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead," (as the King James has). Better would be (from a rhetorical point of view): "Therefore sprang there even ^{of} one (and him dead) etc. " By retaining the contradictory terms, the expression remains more forceful, and emotional value is attached to the truth of the thought expressed.

XI, 27: $\alphaδρατον \omegaς ορατων$. How can one see the invisible?

VII, 3: $\alphaπαταρε, αμηταρε, αγενεαλογητας$. Who ever among those begotten of the flesh had no father, mother nor genealogy? The expression is exaggerated, of course. But the history of Melchizedek was so shaped by God without a recording of his genealogy that he "was made like unto the Son of God" in his unbegotten character. In pointed brevity of expression the holy writer has daringly uttered a thought which otherwise would require a considerable amount of circumlocution to express. And thus by the use of this ambiguous figure of language the author succeeds in expressing the paradoxes of Christian doctrine. There are 6 instances of oxymoron in Hebrews; the Aegineticus has none.

These last two figures give us an insight into the emotional character of the writer. Whereas St. Paul is ever, as it were, struggling with the scantiness of human speech to pour forth his crowding thoughts, thereby falling into rhetorical and grammatical irregularities, this author restrains his emotion (with the classic calmness and dignity of the Greeks) within the laws of language and makes them serve the purposes which he has in mind.

Enallage ($\epsilonναλλαγη$) is the substitution of one grammatical form for another, as plural for singular, etc. Its rhetorical value lies in

this that it adds special emphasis to the words thus transposed. A few instances of this figure are found in Hebrews. See I, 3: τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς δυνάμεως "the might Word", i. e., two nouns are placed in a nominative-genitive relation when really the one in the genitive is an adjective-modifier of the first and should be in the same case. All the instances of enallage are of this same type and because of the resemblance of this construction to the Hebrew Absolute and Construct (Case or) State relationship, it may be supposed that this phenomenon is nothing more than a translation of a Hebrew idiom. That may be. As a matter of fact 4 of the cases are taken from the LXX and hence are undoubtedly translations (rather literal) of the Hebrew. So it may be assumed that the remaining 4 are also due to the influence of the Hebrew idiom. But attention should be called to the fact that the Greek does have an analogous construction and since both languages use the common idiom, either or both can as well be responsible. See for instance, Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae, XIII, 599sq. quoting Hermesianax of Colophon:

ἑλίκων κομψά "delicateness of spirals" for "delicate spirals"

ibid.:

πυρός μένει "power of fire" for "fiery power".

The above are just casual discoveries of enallage in Greek literature.

However, one would not press the rhetorical use of enallage in Hebrews, though in a few instances emphasis is obtained for each word to a good effect. See the examples: I, 8; VIII, 1; IX, 2; X, 22,27; XII, 15; XIII, 15.

Pleonasm (πλεονεξμός) is a redundancy of language in writing, i. e., the use of more words than is necessary to express the bare idea. Note the one instance:

VII, 15: περισσότερον ἔτι κεινότητος is an apparent heaping up of re-

dundant words for purposes of emphasis. $\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\nu$ means "evident"; $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\nu$, the $\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\nu$ is strengthened by the preposition $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ and hence it means, "assuredly evident"; this is further strengthened by the $\pi\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\beta\beta\omicron\tau\epsilon\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ until we have the almost tantalizing tautology: "still more exceedingly assuredly evident". This manner of formation of comparatives and superlatives is a phenomenon of the Koine in general and hence not to be seriously regarded as a rhetorical device of the author.

Synecdoche ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\kappa\delta\omicron\chi\eta$) is a rhetorical figure by which a part is put for the whole. Note the two examples:

II, 14: $\kappa\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\beta\omicron\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ i. e., "flesh and blood" stand for "human nature and all its characteristics."

V, 7: $\beta\omicron\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ the part is put for the whole of "incarnation".

The greatest pains are bestowed by the author on such a matter of style as equilibrium of words and phrases. This is evidenced by the frequent use of the figure called synonymia ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\omega\nu\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$). It seems as though the author is always striving to attain a certain mechanical balance of structure even in the very midst of fervid declamation. The epistle attains a fine sense of proportion by this device which reveals that the author undoubtedly had a good feeling for the Greek ideal of beauty of form. Synonymia does not necessarily imply that the words are synonymous in the strict sense (though this often is the case) but often, another word will be added to the first to form a pair, thus affording a balance. The frequent use of this figure shows the richness and abundance of the author's vocabulary. Note a few examples:

II, 9: $\delta\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\xi\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$

IV, 12: $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$

IV, 12: $\delta\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\omega\upsilon$

IV, 12: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\upsilon\mu\acute{\eta}\beta\epsilon\omega\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\omicron\lambda\omega\upsilon$

V, 1: $\delta\omega\delta\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$

V, 7: δεήσεις τε καὶ ἐκτετησίας . . . κλαυθῆς καὶ δακρύων

There are three kinds of prayer; one more sublime than the others: prayer, wailing, tears. Prayer is made with the silent voice; wailing with the raised voice; but tears overcome everything.

A beautiful extension of this figure is found in VI, 1.2. The fundamentals of Christian doctrine are described in the following nouns which are connected in three pairs of two each. The first and last are connected by καὶ and the two inner ones by τε. καὶ is conjunctive; τε is adjunctive. καὶ merely adds an external condition; τε adds as something intimately related to each other (an inner relation):

First pair:

μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, καὶ
πίστεως ἐπὶ θεόν,

Second pair:

βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆν
ἐπιθέμεώς τε χειρῶν,

Third pair:

ἀναβάσεως νεκρῶν, καὶ
κρίματος ἁλωνίου.

Syndynymia is employed approximately 31 times in Hebrews; Aegineticus has it on 4 occasions. So, one can readily see that the sacred writer made deliberate use of this device for purposes of oratory. See II, 6; V, 2; VI, 19; VIII, 3,5,12,13; IX, 1,9,11,19; X, 5,8,8,17,29,33; XI, 10, 13,36,37,38; XII, 19,21,26; XIII, 1.2,4,4,4,17.

Climax (κλιμαξ) is a figure of language in which each clause surpasses the preceding in importance. This figure is very frequent in the epistle and no special reference is given to the instances, except to mention the classic example which chapter XI affords. The entire paragraph is artistically built up to the final climax by means of anaphora,

polysyndeton, and asyndeton. The great heroes of faith, each in his turn, majestically stride across our view. As the last figure fades from sight, the consoling and comforting voice of the author is heard to say: "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." It is then that the reader begins to understand the purpose of this panoramic view of church history as presented in the numerous thumb-nail biographies of the saints.

Apart from the figures of language there are also the so-called figures of thought which vividly reflect the speaker's own mood. These are more animated than the staid and mechanically-wrought figures of language and hence they are less congenial to the smooth and tranquil style of composition. And hence, we should not expect many such figures in Hebrews.

Meiosis (*μεῖωσις*) also called litotes (*λιτότης*) is a figure of thought in which an affirmative is expressed ^{by} the negative of its opposite, as "a citizen of no mean city" that is, of an illustrious city. It is a form of understatement which reflects the humble spirit of the writer who gently refrains from too enthusiastically espousing some cause or expressing the positive point of view. See the examples:

VI, 10: *ὃ γὰρ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεός.*

IX, 7: *ὃ χωρίς*

IX, 18: *οὐδὲ . . . χωρίς*

IX, 22: *χωρίς . . . οὐ*

XI, 40: *μη̄ χωρίς*

XII, 14: *χωρίς οὐδεὶς*

The rhetorical value of these examples may be questioned, but it is fairly certain from the author's frequent use of the negative *ὃ χωρίς* for the positive *μετὰ* that he seems to prefer the former. Cfr. also VII, 20.

Anacoluthon (ἀνακόλουθον) is the lack of grammatical sequence or coherence in a sentence; or, an expression in which the latter part does not syntactically correspond with the first part. Such breach of concord is often due to the high emotional strain of the speaker who, in such a state of excitement, forgets the mode of construction with which he began. This is characteristic of the dynamic personality of St. Paul and it is reflected abundantly in his style which frequently falls into such grammatical irregularities. But the style of this epistle flows regularly on with no such suspended constructions. Even where the subject induces long parentheses, the writer does not break the even flow and equilibrium of his style, but returns back to the point where he left it. He is elaborately and almost faultlessly exact about perfect agreement in all matters of concord. And it is in this wholly differing rhythm of sentences (wherein perhaps many words occur in common to both) that St. Paul is vastly different from the writer of this epistle. Only on one major occasion does the author break off his easy-flowing sentence structure to utter a parenthetical thought, and even in that case, (though the parenthesis is lengthy) he beautifully returns to his original construction and nicely resumes his discourse and binds the loose ends together with a corresponding $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\gamma\omega\gamma$ and $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$. See. VII, 20-22. How vastly different from the style of Paul! His impatience with the human language as a vehicle of divine truth led him to countless inconsistencies. But the writer of Hebrews always maintains his composure (the dignity of classic Greek art) and, instead of despairing of language and chafing under its limitations, he lifts the language to the sublimity of his theme and moulds both thought and form into a perfect unity of classic beauty.

Paraleipsis (παράλειψις) is a figure of thought by which a speaker artfully pretends to pass by what he really emphasizes. Demosthenes

was a past master at this art in classical Greek literature. It was his particular pleasure to denounce and "smear" his opponent by telling the audience that he will not mention what the rogue did on such and such an occasion, and then he proceeds, nonetheless, to discourse at length on the real or invented evil deeds of his protagonist. His trick was this: An unthinking audience would applaud Demosthenes for his generosity and nobleness in refraining from "mud-slinging" while in reality he slandered nevertheless. Because of the highly personal and often ironic flavor of this figure it is not congenial to the smooth style of Isocrates. He uses it three times in the Aegineticus. Nor is it frequent in Hebrews:

IX, 5: The author has just finished sketchily describing the furniture of the temple and then he says: "It is not now possible to discuss these things in detail."

XI, 32: This is an excellent example of the deep insight which the author has into the psychology of the human mind. He begins; "And what shall I more say? for time would fail me to tell of Gedeon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and Samiel, and of the prophets, etc., etc." And so on until the end of the chapter, instead of passing by in silence that which would take a lifetime to utter, he recounts one by one the heroes of faith and the sufferings of the faithful. His expressed inability to say more gives the impression to the readers that surely it must be a great cloud of witnesses to which he is referring and then when he proceeds to relate indetail, they are overwhelmed by his breath-taking recitation. Consequently, when he does say to them that they are compassed about with a cloud of witnesses they really and truly do understand the truth of that metaphor.

Isocrates is especially fond of the rhetorical question (τὸ
ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΕΥΣΤΙΚΟΝ ὁ Χῆμικ) in concluding an argument in his orations. A question is not asked for information or advice, but only for rhetorical effect.

And sometimes the speaker answers his own question. Aristotle speaks of the rhetorical question quite at length and states the times and conditions under which questioning ($\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$) for rhetorical effect is timely ($\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\nu$):

1. When it will make a previous statement of the opponent seem strange.
2. When it is evident that the opponent will admit one thing while another thing is obvious.
3. When one intends to show that the opponent is speaking contradictions or paradoxes.
4. When the only possible answer is a sophistical one.

These basic conceptions in questioning are well understood and well applied by the writer in this epistle. Note:

I, 5: An appeal to the obvious.

VII, 11: If the first clause is admitted to be true (as has been proven previously) then the conclusion is an obvious truth.

X, 2: An appeal to the obvious conclusion bespeaks the good sense of the readers in agreeing with him. Further examples are I, 13, 14; II, 2,3; III, 16,16,17,17,18; XI, 32; XII, 7,9; XIII, 6. A total of 15 occurrences; Aegineticus has 13.

Another figure usually classed under those of thought is that of citation. Citation is evidence of a cultured and well-read gentleman. It lends a certain polish to the style. Because of the controversial nature of any study which attempts to detect borrowed phrases or quotations from previous or contemporary authors, it is best to leave the matter unsaid. Parallelism of thought or ideas does not constitute dependence of the one upon the other. And conclusions based on such similarities usually end in unsatisfactory results. Mention has been made of the similarity of statement between Aeschylus and this writer, but it is a

similarity and nothing more. Indeed, to establish as fact the supposition that the author was widely read in Greek literature is a more than difficult matter, and to build up and prove a theory of imitation or indebtedness in style on obvious similarities and parallels is impossible under present circumstances. However, there are many citations and direct quotations from the Old Testament and this feature adds greatly to the magnitude of the style. No extensive investigation of the citations has been done for this paper. That is a study all its own. For the purposes of this treatise it is sufficient to note that the writer quotes from the Old Testament on approximately 79 occasions. This matter will be treated in greater detail under the criticism of the author's invention.

Thus far, this analysis has been concerned with the sentence structure in Hebrews and the figures which embrace them. Another important feature in composition is rhythm and Dionysius discusses and criticizes this aspect of Isocrates' style. In addition to the ornate embellishment of Isocrates' luxuriant periods, his composition is characterized by a literary prose-rhythm. Jebb briefly describes the nature of Greek prose-rhythm as follows:

The Greek theory distinguished a music proper to the continuous (ΒΟΥΕΧΗΣ) exertion of the voice in prose-declamation from the music of its exertion at intervals (ΔΙΚΕΤΥ ΜΚΤΑ) in singing. As singing can scarcely charm the ear or make claim to beauty until it has brought itself under definite laws, partly of rhythm, partly of harmony, so oratorical prose cannot give artistic pleasure until it has become, in its proper measure, rhythmic. This implies the bringing out of that musical element which is inherent in all language; and the technical Rhetoric early began to take account of the prose-rhythm into which this element must be wrought....Poetry has its strict correspondence of rhythms and its precision of metres. Prose has its irregular rhythms and its wandering melody in the fall of syllables--rhythms and metres not bound by any rigid framework, yet reducible to certain general laws which the attentive ear can discover, and which the skilful speaker can apply in ever-varying combinations.⁹

⁹Jebb, Att. Orat., p. 56.57.

It was Isocrates who developed this prose-rhythm and based it on the structure of his periods. As Dionysius remarks, he tried to comprehend the thoughts into periods which he constructed in a very Rhythmical fashion (ῥυθμιώδεις) not far removed from the poetic metre (ποιητικὸς μέτρος). By such harmonious composition of words Isocrates sought to achieve a musical euphony (μουσικὴ εὐφωνία) pleasant to the hearing. But, great artist that he was, he fell short of the highest excellence in this matter because he failed to hit the mean. He becomes (as Dionysius says) for the most part a slave to the measured cadence of his periods. As a result his composition is marred by a tediousness which offends (λυπεῖ) the ears. Naturally every expression does not readily admit the same rhythms as the next. Consequently, oftentimes, in adjusting the period to the rhythm, the thought is made subservient and is poorly expressed. This is Isocrates' common practice. The exception to this criticism is found in his forensic speeches.

To discuss adequately and analyze the rhythms which Isocrates or the writer of Hebrews employed (if he did) in the construction of his periods is a difficult task. The quality of a musical euphony in prose is hard to detect for the modern ear; and no modern critic can pronounce authoritatively upon this matter for which the ancient critic Dionysius vouches. Suffice it to accept the criticism of Dionysius as that of a competent judge of this problem. It may be significant to note, however, that it is Isocrates' usual manner in the construction of his periods in the Aegineticus to end the period with syllables which have a long syllable in quality. But no definite system of rhythmic feet was discovered. In Hebrews, the matter is just as difficult and one has less reason to expect to find any definite prose-rhythm. But a few interesting items noted may be worthwhile the mention, though Blass has this to say:

Nach Versen und Versstücken...d.h., nach Rhythmus zu suchen ist

undtzer Zeitvertreib, und was man gefunden hat, ist auch zumeist von solcher Qualität, dasz es besser unerwähnt bleibt.... Auch der Hebräerbrief wird hier schwerlich eine Ausnahme machen, ob schon es ein eigentümlicher Zufall will, dasz auf den tadellosen Hexameter von XII, 13 sehr bald nachher 2 ebenfalls tadellose Trimeter hintereinander folgen.¹⁰

The writer has a special fondness for syllables which have a natural long quality, viz., α, η, ω etc. These stately syllables give ponderance and dignity to the sound of the syllables as they are pronounced and were considered a very pleasant sound to the ear of the Greeks. A beautiful example of such a euphonious sentence is XII, 18.19:

αὐτὰρ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένα καὶ κεκαυμένα πύρι καὶ γρόφῳ καὶ ζόφῳ καὶ θυέλλῃ καὶ ἄλπιγγος ἦχῳ καὶ φωνῇ ἑμαίτων...

According to classical standards this sentence is the most beautiful in sound of any in Hebrews. Another instance of rhythmical flow in Hebrews are the sentences (mentioned previously) which contain the name of Ἰησοῦς (cf. sub hyperbaton). All these sentences give an indication of a logoaedic rhythm throughout, i. e., no definite feet can be ascertained but there is a flow of dactylic (feet) and trochaic feet in a rather indiscriminate manner. Outside of these specific instances, the writer obtains a smooth flow of rhythmical periods and balanced cola and commata. Such equilibrium of words and sentences naturally produces a kind of prose-rhythm, but in no case does Hebrews have the set rhythm which Isocrates employed. This is readily understood, for by the time of the writers of the New Testament the old Aristotlean insistence on rhythm (ἑυθυμῶς, Aristotle; numerus, Cicero) as the dominating characteristic of the period had largely yielded to more practical considerations. Henceforth, while rhythm was still tolerated, the element of thought became more conspicuous in the framing of a period.

It remains to mention one striking technical trait of Isocrates' composition which is the special cause of its smoothness (λεωότης).

¹⁰ Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., p. 284.

This is the avoidance of hiatus. Isocrates studiously avoids the concurrence of vowels ($\acute{\omicron}\gamma\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \varphi\omega\eta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\omega\iota$), that is, allowing a vowel at the end of a word to be followed by a vowel at the beginning of the next. To his sensitive ears, hiatus (or open vowels) destroys the harmony ($\alpha\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$) of the sounds ($\acute{\eta}\chi\omicron\varsigma$) and ruins the smoothness ($\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$) of utterance ($\varphi\theta\acute{\omicron}\gamma\gamma\omicron\varsigma$). Dionysius remarked (on a different occasion)¹¹ that he had gone through the whole of the Areopagiticus without finding one instance of such a collision of vowels. However, such is not the situation in the Aegineticus. There are 21 instances of hiatus which can be said to disrupt the harmony of the sounds and mar the smoothness of the utterance. Expressing this in approximate ratio-form out of every 12 possible hiatus 11 have been avoided by elision, or if not, they do not mar the smoothness of the utterance. Such a ratio indicates that there was a conscious effort on the part of Isocrates to avoid hiatus in his composition.

Harsh hiatus are less frequent in Hebrews (according to Blass, op. cit., p. 284) than elsewhere in the New Testament. But it is not a categorical matter or rule with the author to avoid hiatus. Compared with the classic standard of Isocrates he falls short of perfection in this respect. There are approximately 460 instances of hiatus in Hebrews (discounting those after any kind of pause in a sentence). Of these 158 are avoided either by use of the movable Υ (92) or by elision (66). But it should be said that in no case is any effort made to utilize the movable Υ or elision to avoid the hiatus because these same devices are used regularly on other occasions when hiatus is not in question. Hence, in ratio form, out of every 4 possible hiatus only 1 is avoided. This is a percentage of 25% which is a poor average by classic standards, especially that of Isocrates.

¹¹ Dion. Hal., De Comp. Verb., 23.

But even among the classic authors hiatus is a matter of personal taste. Isocrates studiously avoided it as a principle of his smooth style (*πλαγυροός*) while Demosthenes and Thucydides were indifferent about it and even on occasions purposely permitted hiatus as a principle of the severe style (*ἀνέστητος*).

This rather detailed criticism of Hebrews' mode of composition in its component parts has laid bare the devices which the author employed in fashioning his artistic prose. It has revealed the merits and defects which are inherent in their usage. There is a danger in such close examination. The literary critic, in concentrating upon the detail, may lose the impression of the whole. But works of art endure the scrutiny of the severest critic. And Dionysius, excellent critic that he is, now steps back a bit from his close examination and beholds the beauty of Isocrates' composition as a whole. He compares the beauty of Isocrates' composition with that of Lysias!

The crowning excellence of Lysias in the province of expression is his famous but indefinable charm (*χάρεις*). Dionysius is at a loss to explain this gracefulness of style. It baffles definition (as he says)¹² and must be seized by a cultivated instinct. The closest he can approach in describing it is by comparison. It is like an object, beautiful by nature, which requires no ornamental additions to enhance it. His art is compared with the skill of Calamis and Callimachus in sculpture. Each sought perfection in the fineness of detail in miniatures and attained excellence in the subtlety (*λεπτότης*) and charm of their respective productions.

The composition of Isocrates, on the other hand, does not possess this same indescribable charm. Instead, it is florid (*ἀνθηροός*)¹³ and

¹²Dion. Hal., De Lys., 11.

¹³The word florid has acquired a rather bad sense, whereas the Greek word suggests "flower-like", "full of color".

conducive to the pleasure (ἡδονή) of the listener. In contrast to the grace of Lysias, it is like an object which is enhanced in its beauty by ornate epithets (ἐπίθετα). Dionysius becomes enthusiastic in his praise of the sublimity (ὕψος) and grandeur (μεγαδοπρέπεια) of Isocrates' composition. It is more peculiar to the heroic nature than to the human. That is, it is more suited to describe the heroes of Greece than the ordinary run of men. His art is compared with the skill of Polycleitus and Pheidias in sculpture. Eachs ought the completion of his art on the grand scale and achieved an awe-inspiring majesty (βεβήκωσις) fitting to the gods. This is, indeed, lavish praise. And, with a few changes in local color, this lavish praise can be as well applied to Hebrews.

In brief summary of the analysis of the composition of Hebrews, one may say that the style conforms quite favorably to Dionysius' canon of criticism and compares rather well with the style of Isocrates.

The periods, though not as frequent as in Isocrates, are generally tersely moulded in the simple manner of Lysias with an occasional tendency towards rich profuseness in some instances.

The figures of language, antithesis, parisosis, paromoiosis, etc., when found in periods, are judiciously employed to add beauty to the sentence structure. In no instance do they result in frigidity of style. Other figures of language and thought (in some instances excessive) embellish the style with sublimity and grandeur fitting to the subject-matter.

There is evident a rhythmical flow of cola and commata and a proportioned equilibrium of words and sentences which is pleasant to the ear.

But there is no conscious effort to avoid hiatus.

Hence, in the composition, the epistle to the Hebrews is a good example of the smooth style as represented by Isocrates, the classic master.

CHAPTER IV

INVENTION AND ARRANGEMENT OF SUBJECT-MATTER

The style of lectures in the provinces of dialectic and composition is chiefly characterized by a logical simplicity coupled with a distinct flair for grandeur. This leading characteristic is apparent also in Aristotle's treatment of the subject-matter (*ἐπιπέπαιστος ἡ ἀρχὴ*) in his *poetics*. In this department of classical art, Aristotle distinguished two vital elements. The first is invention.¹

Invention (*εὕρεσις*) is the faculty of discovering the arguments that are available for the elaboration of the theme of the speech. For example, Aristotle, in his analysis of this branch of rhetoric, refers to one of the

Expositio ita nescientibus fiat cognita ut tamen scientibus non sit onerosa.

— Saint Gregory the Great

the topic (*τόπος*) of composition. The theme which he is presenting.²

The arguments which the orator employs in writing forth his evidence are called *enthymemes* (*ἐπιπέπαιστος*). Aristotle gives this word a very specific meaning and defines it as a rhetorical syllogism drawn, not from the premises (*πρότερον*) proper to any particular science, but from the propositions relating to contingent things in the sphere of human action and which are the common property of all *ἐπιπέπαιστος*.³

Closely related in meaning to the *enthymeme* is the term "epithymeme"

¹ Dion. Hal., *De Isocr.*, 4, 12. In these chapters Dionysius criticizes Isocrates' treatment of the subject-matter.

² Aristotle, *op. cit.*, 1, 2.

³ Aristotle, *op. cit.*, 1, 2-6.

CHAPTER IV

INVENTION AND ARRANGEMENT OF SUBJECT-MATTER

The style of Isocrates in the provinces of diction and composition is chiefly characterized by a Lysian simplicity coupled with a distinct flair for grandeur. This leading characteristic is apparent also in Isocrates' treatment of the subject-matter (ἑξερραβία τῶν πραγμάτων) in his speeches. In this department of rhetorical art, Dionysius distinguishes two chief elements. The first is invention.¹

Invention (εὐρεσις) is the faculty of discovering the arguments that are available for the elaboration of the theme of the speech. For example, Aristotle, in his analysis of this branch of rhetoric, refers to one of the favorite devices which Isocrates frequently used, namely, the topic (τόπος) of comparison for the purpose of magnifying the theme which he is presenting.²

The arguments which the orator employs in setting forth his evidence are called enthymemes (ἐνδυμήματα). Aristotle gives this word a more specific meaning and defines it as a rhetorical syllogism drawn, not from the premisses (ἄρχαί) proper to any particular science, but from the propositions relating to contingent things in the sphere of human action and which are the common property of all discussion.³

Closely related in meaning to the enthymeme is the term "epicheirema"

¹ Dion. Hal., *De Isocr.*, 4, 12. In these chapters Dionysius criticizes Isocrates' treatment of the subject-matter.

² Arist., *op. cit.*, I, 9.

³ Arist., *op. cit.*, I, 1-5.

(ἐπιχείρημα). Jebb has carefully distinguished these two terms.

Speaking of the enthymeme he says:

A misapprehension of Aristotle's meaning had, as early as the first century B. C., led to the conception of the enthymeme as not merely a syllogism of a particular subject-matter, but also as a syllogism of which one premiss is suppressed. The term "epicheireme" was then brought in to denote a rhetorical syllogism which is stated in full -- an "essay" to deal thoroughly with the issue at stake.⁴

From Dionysius' use of these two terms, it is evident that he maintains this distinction between enthymeme and epicheireme.

Speaking of the arguments of a speech, Aristotle remarks that since learning is pleasant to all, the arguments become clever (ῥητεία) and popular (εὐδοκίμοῦντα) when they are neither superficial (ἐπιπόλαια) nor hard to understand (δύστρούμενα), but when they cause quick learning, either as soon as they are spoken or soon afterwards. He recommends that the arguments be given neither in close succession, nor be sought for everything (lest the conclusion be better known and more credible than the premisses) nor be used when expressing emotion or character since by their very nature they are opposed to emotion and rather allied with logical reasoning. He considers the refutative arguments more popular and more effective than the demonstrative, because the former feign the vividness of an actual combat with a real antagonist.

Another means of amplification (ὑψηλοῦς) is the example (παράδειγμα). Examples are helpful for purposes of persuasion since they present a model or pattern of some previous person worthy of emulation or contrariwise, or of some past deed to be repeated or avoided in the future as the author indicates, etc. The example in rhetoric is parallel to induction (ἐπαγωγή) in dialectic, i. e., by reasoning from particular cases to general conclusions. Maxims (γνώμαι) are an excellent means for amplifying the theme and should be used both in the narrative and the

⁴ Jebb, Att. Orat., Vol. II, p. 291f.

proof because they express character and arouse emotion. As a matter of fact, Aristotle recommends that statements which show the character of the speaker should be purposely changed into maxims in order to obtain the psychological effect of the maxim.

Another method of invention useful and very beneficial in rhetoric is the rhetorical question. This matter has been previously discussed under the heading of figures of speech.

As regards this faculty of discovering the available resources of a theme, Dionysius pronounces Isocrates equal to Lysias, if not better on some occasions. Both, in his opinion, exercise prudent judgment in fashioning arguments (*ἐνδυσμῆματα*) which befit the subject-matter under discussion. Both exhibit a fertile cleverness in searching out many weapons of controversy which they then proceed to crowd one upon another so as to give cumulative effect to their proposition. But Isocrates shows greater ingenuity in his treatment of the epicheiremes. By this criticism Dionysius no doubt means that Lysias is usually content with a sketchy proof which is not formally complete (the *ἐνδύμμημα*); whereas Isocrates is more intent upon going through every step of his argument and aiming at a precise development (the *ἐπιχειρήματα*). With such inventive skill Isocrates has fashioned his arguments in the Aegineticus.

IN a similar way the author of Hebrews exhibits an admirable skill in invention. He employs all the types and manners of invention which Aristotle recommends, and always to good advantage. The magnificence with which the author develops his main theme is unique (to say the least) in the field of literature, both sacred and profane. His technique in invention may be likened to a monumental prelude and fugue of Bach -- almost infinite variation based on an economy of means! Even as a great organist the author strikes the keynote of the letter in chapter I, verse 3: *καθὼς ἰκομέν τῶν ἑμμοσιῶν παρηβόμενος*. This is the prelude. Christ

must first come down to earth and perform the work of redemption before He ascends to the Father in majesty and glory as the everlasting High-priest. In chapter I, verse 13 the thematic Psalm is intoned: $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\kappa$ $\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\omega\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$. This is the first introduction of the main thematic material and it foreshadows the glorious beauty of the grand theme which is finally unfolded in all its splendor and grandeur in chapter V, verse 6: $\beta\upsilon\ \epsilon\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\omega\nu\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\nu\ \tau\alpha\zeta\iota\nu\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\chi\iota\theta$. This is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews: JESUS CHRIST, OUR HIGH-PRIEST ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK FOR ALL ETERNITY. All other material and topics are subsidiary to this main theme and only serve as beautiful embroidery-like phrases which are inextricably interwoven into the woof of the shining fabric of this letter. A closer examination of the single threads which together produce the beautiful whole increases the admiration for the writer's skill.

Perhaps the most important and the most evident topic of invention used by the author is the comparison. This device of allegory in the treatment of his theme was a natural and happy choice in view of the author's audience. They were Jewish Christians who, from early childhood, thoroughly understood and appreciated the symbolism of the Old Testament temple worship and services. The Jews readily grasped the inner meaning of the allegorical element in literature and hence the author was very judicious in his use of this topic. He employs it a total of 38 times throughout the letter (which is an exceedingly high percentage compared with classic literature). Note the instances:

I, 4 - II, 18: son and angels

I, 11: life and a garment

I, 12: life and a wrap-around

I, 12: life and a garment

II, 2.3: angels and us

- II, 5-11: angels and Christ
- II, 14.15: children and Jesus
- III, 1ff.: Jesus and Moses
- III, 5: Jesus and Moses
- III, 5: Moses and servant
- III, 6: Jesus and son
- IV, 2: NT and OT people
- IV, 14f.: Jesus and high-priest
- IV, 12: word and sword
- V, 1-3: Jesus and high-priest
- V, 4f.: Jesus and Aaron
- V, 6: Jesus and Melchizedek
- V, 10: Jesus and Melchizedek
- V, 12: Christianity and milk and food
- VI, 1: foundation and Christianity
- VI, 7: earth and Christians
- VI, 19: hope and anchor
- VI, 20: Jesus and Melchizedek
- VII, 1f.: Jesus and Melchizedek
- VII, 5.6: Levi and Melchizedek
- VII, 27: Jesus and high-priest
- VIII, 3f.: Jesus and high-priest
- VIII, 8-12: Old and New Covenant
- IX, 1-10: first and second tabernacle
- IX, 6f.: Christ and high-priest
- IX, 13-15: blood of goats and blood of Christ
- IX, 23: heavenly types and realities
- IX, 25: Christ and high-priest
- X, 11: Christ and high-priest

I, 20: veil of temple and Christ's body

XIII, 10: Christianity and Judaism

XIII, 20: Jesus and shepherd

XIII, 12: Jesus and high-priest

In these examples note the frequency with which Christ is compared with the high-priest, thus expanding the main theme of the letter. Only he who can appreciate the intricacies of Old Testament symbolism will truly see the inner beauty of the allegorical treatment in Hebrews.

The author also knows the value of the demonstrative argument. Like Isocrates he prefers (3 to 1) the more elaborate epicheireme. The latter he uses on 15 occasions whereas he uses the more sketchy enthymeme only 5 times. And it is worthy of special note that the writer never casts his arguments into the refutative form as though he were confuting an imaginary foe. This latter style of argumentation is especially characteristic of Paul in his letters and is suitable to the dynamic personality of St. Paul. The demonstrative argument, on the other hand, is more suitable to the smooth style of composition and bespeaks the calm dignity of the writer. Hence, the lack of refutative argument in Hebrews strongly suggests that Paul is not the author. Note the examples of the enthymeme:

III, 3: "For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house."

The argument is not formally stated in full with all its premisses and hence it is classed as an enthymeme. If formally and more fully stated, it would look like this:

Major premiss: The builder of the house has greater honor than Moses.

Minor premiss: Christ is the builder of the house.

Conclusion: Therefore, Christ has more honor than Moses.

VIII, 7: "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Formally and fully stated:

Major premiss: A faultless covenant is not superseded.

Minor premiss: The first covenant was superseded.

Conclusion: Therefore, the first covenant was not faultless.

See also VIII, 6; X, 23-30; XI, 15.16.

Examples of the more elaborate epicheireme are:

II, 2.3: "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will?" Here the argument is more fully developed; no intermediate steps are omitted, though it is not stated formally as in the syllogism of logic.

VII, 23-25: "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Again the argument is fully stated in the form of the epicheireme.

See further II, 14f.; 16f.; IV, 6.7; 8.9; VI, 17; VII, 8-10; 11.12; 20-22; VIII, 4f.; IX, 13-16, 27f.; X, 1; 8.9; XII, 25.26; 27.28.

The writer's inventive skill is further evidenced by the abundance of examples which he adduces in order to develop his arguments or implement his words of admonishment or consolation, as the case may be. This device widens the scope of the letter and brings the readers into contact with history past, present and future, so to speak. It means that the author is a student of history, well read in the events of the past and well acquainted with the personages in the train of Jewish history. Of course, the author refers to Jewish history in his examples because his readers would best be acquainted with the sacred accounts of their own

illustrious ancestors. Both deeds and persons are brought forth to serve as examples:

VI, 2: Exx. of fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion.

XI, 3ff.: Examples of the heroes of faith in OT history follow:

v. 4: Cain and Abel

v. 5: Enoch

v. 7: Noah

v. 8: Abraham

v. 9: Isaac and Jacob

v. 11: Sarah

v. 17: Abraham

v. 20: Isaac, Jacob, and Esau

v. 21: Jacob and the sons of Joseph

v. 22: ^{Joseph} Jacob and the sons of Israel

v. 23: Moses' parents

v. 24: Moses

v. 27: Exodus

v. 30: capture of Jericho

v. 31: Raab

v. 32: Gideon, Barak, Sampson, Jephthae, David, Samuel and the prophets

XI, 33f. occur 17 instances of heroic actions of the saints as follows:

v. 33:

conquered kingdoms

enforced justice

received promises

stopped mouths of lions

v. 34:

quenched raging fires

escaped the edge of the sword

won strength out of weakness

became mighty in war

put foreign armies to flight

v. 35:

women received their dead by resurrection

some were tortured

v. 36:

others suffered mocking and scourging, chains and imprisonment

v. 37:

stoned

sawn in two

killed with the sword

went about in skins of sheep and goats

v. 38:

vagabonds and wanderers over the earth

XII, 6: Esau

XII, 21: Moses

XII, 24: Abel

The device of example is used on 48 occasions and its use in chapter XI is tremendous because of its cumulative effect. It reveals the wide range of the writer's acquaintance in Hebrew history, even of sources which are no longer extant today. The rhetorical effect of these examples upon an audience of Jewish Christians was undoubtedly intended by the author to arouse their Christian as well as their Jewish consciousness, for all these Old Testament heroes lived and died by faith in Christ the high-priest.

The fine moral character of the writer is reflected in the many statements which he casts into the form of maxims. A maxim is a generally accepted truth which has stood the test of time and proved its worth.

Its rhetorical effect is this: as soon as it is spoken it immediately meets with the approval of the hearer, and requires no extensive proof. By this device, then, the writer is able to gain the attention and approval of the readers with a minimum of effort. And further, because of its emotional force it compels acceptance or else stigmatization in a society which does accept such general principles. Examples of such general truths are:

I, 11: "They (i. e., the heavens and the earth) shall perish; but Thou remainest; and thou shall wax old as doth a garment."

III, 4: "For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things i s God."

V, 13: "For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe."

VI, 16: "For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmat^on is to them an end of all strife."

See further examples in I, 12,12; III, 3; IV, 12,13; V, 14; VII, 12, 28; VIII, 3; IX, 16,17, 22,27; X, 4,18,26,27,30,30,31,28; XI, 1; XII, 7, 8,14; XIII, 4,5,6,8,14. Total of 34 times.

The writer's use of the rhetorical question has been considered under the discussion of the figures of speech. Suffice it here to note that he uses the question to excellent advantage on 15 occasions, especially in those instances where the epicheireme is turned into a question requiring an answer in accord with the intent of the author.

A distinctive feature of the inventive skill of the writer is his very frequent use of citation from the canonical books of the Old Testament. It stamps him as a serious student of the Holy Scriptures and one may suppose therefrom that he was, perhaps in his earlier career, a teacher of the law. And yet, by the same reasoning, one could likewise conjecture that he was a priest of the tribe of Levi because of his in-

timate knowledge of the priestly office and services. Hence, it is best to leave the supposition unsaid. At any rate, the author evinces a wide acquaintance with the Old Testament authors and quotes freely from their works. One notes that he always quotes from the sacred canon with finality and authority. He bolsters up his statements and proofs with affirmation from the Old Testament. He liberally cites examples and comparisons from the ancient records of Israel's history -- and always with an attitude of reverence and profound respect for the absolute truth of the Old Covenant Scriptures! If Scripture has spoken on the subject which he is discussing he adduces the pertinent passage as proof and is satisfied that the matter is settled -- no more questions or doubts or conjectures or suppositions! God has spoken! Often one is amazed and dumbfounded at the daring which the author exhibits in his interpretation of some of the Old Testament Scripture texts. He takes liberties of exegesis which ordinarily are not permitted mortal men. But this matter is reconciled by the fact that he speaks by the prompting of the Holy Spirit who is also the author of the passage quoted. And surely it is the prerogative of any man to interpret his own words! So also the Holy Ghost, if one must limit Him to the rules of human language (as, in truth, He has limited Himself to some degree) has the right and privilege of interpreting his own words. A thorough study of citation and its use in Hebrews is a fit subject for a separate study. Suffice it here to point out the rhetorical implications. The same attitude of reverent and ready acceptance of the author will likewise be produced in the readers. The contagion of his staunch and firm belief in the authority of Scriptures will have its effect on his audience. They, together with him, will receive the words into their hearts. Thus, the task of the author is made lighter. He has the aid of a higher authority which commands acceptance of the views which he propounds. The heads and hearts of the hearers bow in

deepest reverence to the ipse dixit of God the Holy Ghost.

It has not been deemed necessary to list the occurrences of citation in this paper because of their frequency and easy access for every careful reader. The author quotes from the Old Testament Scriptures approximately on 80 occurrences. He quotes from the following books in the order of their frequency: Psalms, Genesis, Isaiah, Deuteronomy, Exodus, 1 Kings, Leviticus, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Proverbs, Zechariah and Habakkuk. In short, more than any other epistle, Hebrews goes to the Old Testament Scriptures, the Levitical institutions, historical events, and to the poetry of the Psalms, and shows from all not only the fulfillment of types, sacrifices, prophecies, but proves throughout the completeness, perfection and glory of the New Covenant. It is the Epistle of Perfection, and the Perfection which it unfolds is Jesus Christ entered into the Holy of Holies, a Priest after the order of Melchizedek.

By analogy, it is interesting to the student of profane and sacred Greek literature to compare the methods of citation which both employed. For example, in classic Greek literature, the works of Homer occupy roughly the same place as the Pentateuch did to the author of Hebrews in Hebrew literature. Plato and Aristotle quote from Homer with finality. Sometimes, perhaps, one does not readily see the connection which the passage from Homer may bear to the point in question, but, nonetheless, Homer is produced as an authority for most any subject under the sun. For instance, in the Metaphysics, Aristotle finally arrives at a monistic view of the universe at the end of Book XII (The Prime Mover); then he says:

As for those who maintain that mathematical number is the primary reality, and so go on generating one substance after another and finding different principles for each one, they make the substance of the universe incoherent (for one substance in no way affects another by its existence or non-existence) and give us a great many governing principles. But the world must not be governed badly:

The rule of many is not good; let one be the ruler.⁵

⁵Arist., Metaph., XII, 1075b, quoting Homer, Il., II, 204.

This manner of quotation is similar to the method of Hebrews. But, of course, this is as far as the analogy goes.

With such inventive skill (as illustrated above) the author of Hebrews has elaborately developed his theme. The second element in the treatment of the subject-matter is arrangement.

Arrangement (*τάξις*) refers to the marshalling of the subject-matter of a speech and the distribution of its parts (*μερίσματα*). The usual partitions of a speech in their accustomed order are:

Proem (*προοίμιον*)

Narrative (*διήγησις*)

Proof (*πίστις*)

Epilogue (*ἐπίλογος*)

Aristotle says that the necessary divisions are:

προῶδ *πρόδ* *εἰσις* (a setting-forth, the same as *διήγησις*) and

πίστις (proof)

while the maximum divisions are the four as listed above.

The Greek insistence on form demanded, of course, that a speech likewise be constructed along lines of such rules of beauty. Accordingly, a speech must have a beginning, a middle, and an end. This seems obvious, and yet, the important thing is that the reader is always aware of these parts as he reads the speech.

According to Aristotle the proem is the beginning of the speech: *προοίμιόν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ λόγου*. In epideictic speeches the proem may be concerned with praise or blame or advice (i. e., persuasion or dissuasion). It is similar to a prelude of a flute (dithyramb). In forensic speeches the speaker may appeal to the indulgence of the hearers in the proem, slander his opponent or magnify his ^{own} worthiness, etc. But, in general, the primary and peculiar function of the introduction is to manifest the purpose of the speech or subject-matter. The absence of the proemium makes the speech appear to be given off-hand.

According to Aristotle the narration should not be continuous because then it is hard to remember, but rather in parts (κατὰ μέγρος) which facilitates memorization. He defines it as that part of speech which depends on art and shows the occurrence, the character (ποτόν) and the extent (ποτόν) of an action. It is necessary merely to recall and not to narrate at length on well-known persons, e. g. Achilles. (Cpr. here the list of well-known persons merely mentioned in chapter XI of Hebrews--what an artistic stroke of the pen!) It should be of moderate length (μετρίως or εὔ) i. e., just long enough to manifest the subject-matter and its importance (τηλικῶτα). Narration on the side (παραδιηγείσθαι) i. e., not immediately pertinent to the subject under discussion, is profitable for the sake of variety. It is especially important that the narration should reflect the character of the speaker.

According to Aristotle the greatest part of the Πίσις will be concerned with amplification (ἀξίσησις) on the nobility and benefit (καλῶ and εὐφρέδεια) of an action. Proof for the occurrence of an action is needed only if the act is not believed. So also, proof is needed if someone challenges the occurrence, or justice, or benefit, or extent of a future action. This part of the speech is mainly occupied with the devices of invention which were mentioned previously. The proofs should not be given in quick succession because then they will lose their force. Furthermore, a speaker must not presume upon the attention of an audience for continuous logical thinking for any long period of time. The mind cannot concentrate long on any subject and therefore it is advisable to break up the proof with frequent interpolations of narrative. In this way the mind will be relaxed and refreshed, ready for the next important proof.

According to Aristotle, the epilogue serves the following four purposes:

(1) to make the hearers favorable to the speaker and unfavorable to the opponent.

(2) to amplify (ἀξέω) and debase (καταπεινῶ).

(3) to arouse the hearer's emotion.

(4) for recollection (ἀνάμνησις) or recapitulation.

The latter two points are applicable to a production like Hebrews.

Lysias arranges his speeches into the uniform framework of the four parts and neither alters the sequence of these parts nor elaborates his plan with finer subdivisions. Isocrates diverges from this simple execution of parts which Lysias followed. His distinctive skill lay in the management of a more complex system.

According to Dionysius, the difference between their systems is this that Isocrates knows how to diversify (διαλαμβάνει) his style so as to avoid the monotonous uniformity (ὁμοειδέεια) which arises from a too strict adherence to the customary sequence of the fourfold divisions. This variety in Isocrates' adjustment of the parts of speech arises, first, from new combinations or transpositions (μεταβολαί) within the subject itself. For example, instead of rigidly observing the regular sequence, he sometimes interfuses the elements by cleverly interweaving the narrative with the proof. This arrangement not only tends to break up the monotony, but also serves a useful purpose. For sometimes the subject-matter involves a long and intricate narrative and it would be difficult or even impossible for the reader or listener to follow the proofs if they were detached from the facts of the narrative.

The second device which Dionysius has noted as contributing to the variety of Isocrates' arrangement is the introduction of foreign episodes (ξένα ἐπιλόγια) which are not strictly proper to the subject. A good example of this artifice is found in Isocrates' Helenean Encomium. The main theme of this speech is, of course, Helen. But Isocrates, in the proem, begins with an attack on the Eristics. This is merely an accessory

incident; more than that, it is absolutely foreign to the subject inasmuch as the Eristics have nothing to do with Helen. But its introduction into the speech is justified in that it breaks up the monotony and affords variety which is one of the essentials of good writing, not only in Greek, but in all other languages as well.

The arrangement of the parts of the speech Aegineticus reveals Isocrates' dexterous ingenuity in adjusting and interfusing the elements of proof and narrative in a manner that can best help his case. Such a combination of vivid recital of facts together with precise reasoning not only adds a much needed variety to the speech but also lends a greater clarity to the points at issue.

The Epistle to the Hebrews shows the same skill in the arrangement of the subject-matter as will be seen by the following outlines of the letter.

In general, the epistle is roughly divided into two main parts:

- I. CHAPTER I, 1 - X, 18. CHIEFLY DIDACTIC INTERMINGLED WITH MANY ADMONITIONS.
- II. CHAPTER X, 19 - XIII, end. MAINLY PARAENETIC ADDING MANY A DOCTRINAL THOUGHT ENDEAVORING TO EXHAUST THE SUBJECT - MATTER.

Expanded into a fuller, yet somewhat brief outline as follows:

- I. CHAPTER I, 1 - X, 18. CHIEFLY DIDACTIC INTERMINGLED WITH MANY ADMONITIONS. THEME: THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

A. Introduction. Ch. I, 1-3. Person and Office of Christ

1. Exalted person, v. 1.2.3.
2. Exalted office, v. 1.2.3.

verse 4 is transition (indicative of smooth style)

B. Ch. I, 5 - X, 18. The Superiority of Christ, the New Testament High Priest.

1. Superiority of Christ to OT mediators, I, 5 - IV, 13.
 - a. I, 1.2.
 - b. I, 4 - II, 18.
 - c. III, 1-6.
 - d. III, 7 - IV, 13.
2. The Priesthood of the Son, IV, 14 - X, 18.
 - a. IV, 14 - V, 10.
 - b. V, 11 - VI, 20.
 - c. VII, 1-25.
 - d. VII, 26 - IX, 12.
 - e. IX, 13 - X, 18.

II. CHAPTER X, 19 - XIII end. MAINLY PARAENETIC ADDING MANY A DOCTRINAL THOUGHT ENDEAVORING TO EXHAUST THE SUBJECT - MATTER.

- A. Ch. X, 19-39. Transitional thought (indicative of smooth style)
- B. Ch. XI - XIII. Faith, Hope, and Love.
- C. Conclusion. Ch. XIII, 18-25. Final words and greetings.

A fuller and more elaborate outline follows:

I. CHAPTER I, 1 - X, 18. CHIEFLY DIDACTIC INTERMINGLED WITH MANY ADMONITIONS. THEME: THE HIGH - PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

- A. Introduction. ($\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\mu\omicron\nu$). Ch. I, 1-3.

The introduction ends with verse 3 and verse 4 is the transition. This is peculiar to the style of the writer -- a smooth style. The introduction is the basis of the whole letter. The embryo. The author calls attention to Christ's exalted person and office:

Person and Office of Christ.

1. His exalted person; The God-Man.
 - a. According to His divine nature: the Son of God; the Creator and Preserver of the universe; the brightness of God's glory; the express image of God's essence.
 - b. According to His human nature: He has been appointed heir of all things; He sits down at the right hand of God; He is made higher than the angels.
2. His exalted office: Royal High Priest.

- a. He is our prophet by whom God spake to us.
 - b. He is our royal high priest having purged our sins, He sits at God's right hand.
- B. Main body of the letter. Narrative (*διήγησις*) intermingled with the proof (*πίστις*). Ch. I, 5 - X, 18. Expanding the thoughts briefly stated in the introduction, the author points out the superiority of the New Covenant. He does so by showing the pre-eminence of the Mediator of the NT over all the mediators in the OT. There are five classes.

The Superiority of Christ, the New Testament High Priest.

1. The superiority of Christ to OT mediators.
 - a. In the prologue he had mentioned the OT prophets. The prophets mediated to man the Word of God. Christ is superior to them. I, 1.2.
 - b. In the final verse of the prologue he had referred to the angels, I, 4. Ministers of the Word in the government of the world, I, 7 and particularly in the service of believers, I, 14 and he shows the excellency of Christ above the angels. I, 4 - II, 18.
 - c. Moses, the mediator of the OT, yet Christ is greater. III, 1-6.
 - d. Joshua, by whom God led His people to the promised land; Christ is more excellent. Christ brought them to the true rest. III, 7 - IV, 13.
2. The priesthood of the Son.
 - a. OT priesthood. IV, 14 & V, 10.
 - b. Transition. V, 11 - VI, 20.
 - c. Jesus Christ, a priest according to the order of Melchizedek. VII, 1-25.
 - d. Christ, a priest greater than Aaron. VII, 26 - IX, 12.
 - e. Christ, Eternal Priest and King. IX, 13 - X, 18.

II. CHAPTER X, 19 - XIII, 25. MAINLY PARAENETIC ADDING MANY A DOCTRINAL THOUGHT ENDEAVORING TO EXHAUST THE SUBJECT - MATTER. PRACTICAL OR HORTATORY.

- A. The transitional thought, ch. X, 19-39: Since we have so great a High Priest, let us remain steadfast in faith, 19-22 and 38.39; in love, 24-31; in hope, 23.24. 32-37.
- B. This thought is carried out in the last three chapters. Faith, ch. XI; Hope, XII, 1-11 and 18-29; Charity or sanctification, ch. XII, 12-17; ch. XIII, 1-25.

The proemium of this epistle is unique in NT literature, if not in all Greek literature. As a careful examination shows, it is the embryo of the entire epistle from every point of criticism. As far as the thought content is concerned, it contains the idea of Christ as the high priest within its brief compass. Therest of the epistle is merely an enfolding of this idea in the prologue. From the point of view of the diction, the introduction immediately reflects the general character of the diction throughout. It has the touch of grandeur in its select choice of rare, unusual and poetic diction. From the point of view of the composition and the figures of speech, the prelude consists of one long and majestic period beautified and adorned with parisosis, alliteration, asyndeton and parechesis. From the point of view of the invention, the proem immediately suggests the extensive use of the topic of comparison upon which the entire epistle is largely built. Truly, one need only to read the proemium of Hebrews and he has had a taste of the whole! The prologue is a prologue in the true sense of the word!

The main body of the epistle is a clever combination of narrative and proof closely interwoven with each other so that the reader is never exhausted by the constant insistence of logical thinking nor merely aimlessly entertained with a rambling narrative. It is a good example of the type of arrangement which Isocrates used and perfected. The effect is so unobtrusive that the inventive skill and the due disposal and marshalling of facts do not show themselves in one or two touches; they gradually emerge from the whole tissue of the composition. The following outline of the main body of the epistle attempts to show the author's excellence in arrangement. Note especially how cleverly he breaks up the narrative with proof and thus affords variety in the arrangement:

Προομιον (I, 1-4) See above.

Πιγεις (I, 4-14) The excellency of Christ above the angels is proved by

the greater excellency of the name given to Him in the OT Scriptures: divine names, attributes, works and glory and honor being ascribed to Him.

$\pi\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\delta\iota\chi\eta\gamma\eta\gamma\iota\varsigma$ (II, 1-4) Since Christ has been made so much better than the angels, we are even under greater obligation to be loyal to His Word than we were to the Old Covenant spoken by the angels. How can we escape if we neglect His Word of salvation?

$\pi\iota\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\varsigma$ (II, 5-18) The superiority of Christ over the angels is further proved by the fact that although angels are spiritual and heavenly beings, while Christ is human and for a time made lower than the angels, yet the universe, the present and the future world is subject not to angels, but to Christ. This Christ and not any angel is the author of our salvation. His human nature and His humiliation, far from disqualifying Him from the work of the Messiah, enabled Him to become a merciful and faithful high-priest.

$\pi\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\delta\iota\chi\eta\gamma\eta\gamma\iota\varsigma$ (III, 1.2) Admonition based on the preceding chapter to consider Jesus.

$\pi\iota\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\varsigma$ (III, 3-6) Three proofs are advanced to support the above admonition:

1. He is the Apostle and Prince of our profession, our anointed Savior.
2. He is greater than Moses.
3. We are in his house if we are loyal to Him.

$\pi\iota\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\varsigma$ (III, 7-11) Proof is brought forward (in narrative fashion) to show that those who do not hold fast to the Word, but harden their hearts to it, shall not enter into God's rest.

$\pi\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\delta\iota\chi\eta\gamma\eta\gamma\iota\varsigma$ (III, 12-19) A warning against unbelief based on the above proof and an exhortation to hold fast to the Word unto the end. $\pi\iota\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\varsigma$ is interwoven inseparably into this $\pi\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\delta\iota\chi\eta\gamma\eta\gamma\iota\varsigma$.

(IV, 1-11) is a intermingling of $\pi\iota\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\varsigma$ and $\delta\iota\chi\eta\gamma\eta\gamma\iota\varsigma$ utilized to good effect. The warning is set forth, immediately backed up with proof. Or

again, the proof is presented first and then an exhortation is based on it. Brief survey: A warning not to come too late, v. 1. We are at no disadvantage over the Jews. Like them we have been evangelized (2a). We have no advantage over the Jews. Like them we are lost if we believe not (2b) for only believers enter into God's rest. And only God's wrath excludes us (3). Hence, the failure of the Jews to enter is not due to the fact that the rest was not yet ready. It was ready since creation (3b and 4a). Nor was it due to the fact that it was not ready for them. Their refusal to enter provoked God's wrath (5). Therefore, do not postpone faith. God is still willing to have men enter (6a). Since many did not enter (6b) God once more, four hundred years after Israel entered Canaan admonishes them through David to enter (7). For the rest which Joshua brought was not the rest God had prepared for His people (8 and 9). That (God's rest) is a rest from all works which God now enjoys and which He has in readiness for us (10). Let us labor, therefore, to enter into that rest (11) into which Jesus alone can bring us.

Παράκλησις (IV, 12-13) Really an ²ἐπεὶ λόγος or discourse on the power of the Word. Jesus alone can bring us into the eternal rest for the Word extending this invitation is the living Word, able to save and able to condemn.

Παράκλησις (IV, 14-16) We have a great high priest! Let us hold fast to him and our confession. Let us approach His throne of grace.

Διήγησις (V, 1-5) This paragraph is an admonition to remain loyal to our great high priest and to come to His throne of grace in full assurance that He has the necessary qualifications of a priest.

Πίστις (V, 6-10) Jesus has the qualifications of a priest because:

I. Like Aaron Jesus is divinely-called.

II. Like Aaron He is able to bear with our infirmities, having himself

learned obedience in that He suffered.

III. Greater than Aaron He is the high priest according to the order of Melchizedek.

ἡμεῖς ἀδελφοί (V, 11-14) Or ἑπείγουσιν . The writer rebukes his readers because they have again become children in knowledge, whereas they ought to be teachers. Their lack of understanding makes it difficult for him to present his subject -- the office of Christ as a high priest according to the order of Melchizedek.

ἀδελφοί (VI, 1-3) An exhortation to strive for perfection and be done with fundamentals.

ἡμεῖς (VI, 4-8) A motivation for vv. 1-3. Unless we strive for perfection, there is danger that we harden ourselves against the Word of God and by our own fault make repentance and salvation impossible for us.

ἡμεῖς ἀδελφοί (VI, 9-12) The sacred author acknowledges their past and present work of love, 9.10; and encourages them to faithful endurance by reminding them of the patient hope of all believers, 11.12, particularly that of Abraham.

ἡμεῖς (VI, 13-18) The writer points out to them the certainty of their hope based on God's Word and an oath and on Christ's entry into Heaven as their forerunner and high priest forever, 18-20.

ἀδελφοί (VII, 1-10) Jesus Christ, a priest according to the order of Melchizedek. The excellency of Melchizedek's priesthood:

I. The personal dignity of Melchizedek, 1-3.

II. The excellency of this priesthood, 4-10.

ἡμεῖς (VII, 11-25) Christ as the anti-type of Melchizedek in a priesthood abrogating the Levitical priesthood, is greater than Aaron:

I. Christ is not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah, 11-14.

II. Christ is not merely a human priest, but imbued with the power of an endless life, 15-19.

III. Christ unlike the Levitical priests was established priest by a divine oath, 20-22.

IV. While the incumbents of the Levitical priesthood had to die and surrender their offices, Christ has an unchangeable priesthood, 23-25.

προαδελφῆς (VII, 26-28) The necessity of such a priesthood after the order of Melchizedek in order that our high priest might accomplish His work.

δελφῆς (VIII, 1-3) Before the author carries out the thought of what it is that Christ offers, he first brings out the necessity of Christ's heavenly priesthood.

πῶς (VIII, 4-13) Three reasons why he brings out the necessity of Christ's heavenly priesthood:

I. No room for Him on earth as a priest, 4.

II. The Levitical priesthood foreshadowed a heavenly priesthood and Christ would not have fulfilled this type if He had not been a heavenly high priest, 5.6.

III. The OT was in itself not sufficient. There had to be a better covenant and priest, 7-13.

δελφῆς (IX, 1-5) A description of the furnishings of the OT tabernacle .

δελφῆς (IX, 6-10) The author takes up the thought of VIII, 3 and shows what Christ had to offer. The purpose for which the tabernacle served:

I. As the place where the priests performed their services, 6.

II. It was, together with the veil, the means through which the high priest entered into the most holy, 7.

III. The high priest entered through the Holy into the Most Holy to atone for his own and the people's sin, 7.8.

IV. This atonement was effected by blood, 7.8.

πῶς (IX, 11-14) In contrast to the OT priesthood and their tabernacle, Christ, the God-Man, has performed His service in a more perfect tabernacle, His flesh. He has entered into the true Holy ^{of} Holies. God's own dwelling.

with a perfect offering, a perfect fulfillment of the Law and his own blood by which offering He has obtained eternal redemption and can cleanse the conscience from sin to serve God.

ΠΙΓΤΙΣ (IX, 15-28) The eternal sacrifice of the Son of God satisfies all requirements of the new covenant:

I. It perfects all those called in the Old and New Testaments, 15.

II. It fulfills the necessity that a covenant comes into effect only at the death of the testator, 16-18.

III. That without the shedding of blood, there is no forgiveness, 19-22.

IV. That a perfect sacrifice needs no repetition, 23-26.

V. That a perfect sacrifice obtains eternal salvation for us, 26-28.

δὲ ἕνωσις closely interwoven with ΠΙΓΤΙΣ throughout. (X, 1-18) This section may be divided into four parts. The closing verse of each striking the keynote of each part:

A. X, 1-10. While the Old Covenant had only signs and symbols, the NT has a perfection of the blood of Christ willingly offered and able to sanctify.

I. The blood of animals cannot take away sins, 1-4.

II. By God's will, we are sanctified once for all by the blood of Christ, 5-10.

B. X, 11-18. Unlike the service of the OT high priest who daily stood offering continually the same ineffective sacrifices, our high priest now sits at the right hand of God, having accomplished forever His work of redemption.

I. By one offering Christ has perfected forever them that are sanctified, 11-14.

II. Where remission of sin is, there is no more sacrifice for sin, 15-18.

ΠΙΓΤΙΣ (X, 19-39) The admonition is divided into three parts:

I. An exhortation to remain loyal to Him at all times by coming to our high priest, by holding fast to the profession of truth, by rousing our brethren to like loyalty, 19-25.

II. A solemn warning against apostasy lest they lose their salvation, 26-31.

III. An expression of conviction that they will receive the promise, 32-39.

δηγησεις (XI, 1.2) Definition of the quality of Christian justifying faith. Justifying faith takes hold of Christ. If Christ can save me, then all things are possible for God. The power of justifying faith to grasp the unseen as though one saw it.

παραδηγησεις (XI, 3-40) This section contains numerous short and brief *παραδηγησεις* which are illustrative and exemplary of Christian faith.

δηγησεις (XII, 1-3) Let us run the race before us in confidence and hope.

I. We are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, 1.
Cpr. ch. XI.

II. Jesus Himself went through to glory out of shame, 2.

III. This Jesus is the Author and Finisher of our faith, 2.3.

παραδηγησεις (XII, 4-11) The purpose of chastening is to strengthen our hope.

I. It confirms our sonship, 4-8.

II. It leads to the fruitful peace of righteousness, 9-11.

παραδηγησεις (XII, 12-17) Exhortation to sanctification of life.

I. Pursue peace and brotherly love, 12-14.

II. Avoid bitterness and dissension, 15-17.

παραδηγησεις (XII, 18-29) Mount Sinai compared with Mount Zion.

I. The severity of the Mount of the Law, 18-21.

II. The beauty of Mount Zion, 22-24.

III. Final warning against apostasy, 25-29.

δευτέρως (XIII, 1-17) Various exhortations to charity and sanctification of life.

- I. Cultivate brotherly love, 1-3.
- II. Beauty of chaste marriage, 4.
- III. Perfect contentment, 5.6.
- IV. Remembrance of teachers, 7.
- V. Avoidance of false doctrine, especially of Judaism, 9-13.
- VI. Acceptable sacrifices unto God, 14-16.
- VII. Obedience to leaders, 17.

ἐπίλογος (XIII, 18-25) Final words and greetings.

- I. Pray for us! 18.19.
- II. Doxology, 20.21.
- III. Personal remarks, 22.23.
- IV. Mutual exchange of greetings, 24.
- V. Final doxology, 25.

It is only in the closing remarks of chapter XIII that the reader realizes that the composition was primarily a letter written to a definite audience in a definite locality. The epistle does not open in the conventional manner of the other NT epistles (surely not as those of Paul); no indication is given that the work is really a letter until the final chapter of valedictory. Hence, although this composition does not have the customary classic epilogue and therefore it cannot be criticized in this respect, yet the author does achieve an excellent effect at the close of this letter by the personal remarks which he appends. His remarks and good wishes coupled with a twice-repeated doxology serve as a fitting and pleasant conclusion to the author's doctrinal presentation. He leaves his readers with a sense of well-being and good will. He wishes them God's speed, earnestly exhorts them to heed his words, humbly begs them to accept his words of admonishment in a friendly spirit, recalls to their

minds mutual acquaintances (a factor which goes far to create and maintain good relations between two parties), exchanges a final word of good cheer, and closes with the heartfelt yet simple doxology of the New Covenant: GRACE BE WITH YOU ALL! Thus the final impression of the author which is left in the minds of the readers as they turn their gaze from the written page is that of a friend in Christ earnestly seeking their spiritual welfare. Indeed, the arrangement of this letter is superbly drawn by a master hand! Commencing in the style of a doctrinal treatise but constantly interrupted by fervent and affectionate admonitions, warnings, and encouragements, this grand and massive book concludes in the epistolary form, and in the last chapter, the inspired author thus characterizes his own work: "I beseech, you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation; for I have written a letter unto you in a few words." -- by all odds a classic example of understatement!

In summary of the remarks in this chapter one may say that the author's treatment of the subject-matter in Hebrews conforms in a high degree to the favorable criticism of Dionysius' classical canon. He equals (if not excels) Isocrates in invention, for he shows a clever ingenuity in searching out manifold devices whereby he can amplify his subject, viz., demonstrative arguments, citation, comparison, example, etc. In arrangement he attains variety and clarity of argumentation (equal to Isocrates) by interweaving the narrative with the proof.

THE THEORY OF THE SUBJECT - MATTER

In his theory of literature, Longinus attributes a passage from the Iliad as a typical example of the style which the Greek master employed in his deliberative speeches.¹ He notes the flash (ὄρσις) and loftiness (ὑψιπύνη) and brevity of the periods and complexity of the words, elaborate and theoretical (ὑπερφανής) character of the figures, etc. He continues, the readers ought to overlook these ornaments of style and consider that we are worthy of their interest. Rather let them pay close attention to the noble principles which the speech proclaims. This is the theory which

**Sublimity is the true ring of a noble mind.
And so even without being spoken the bare
idea of itself wins admiration for its in-
herent genius.**

-- Longinus

In his general estimate of moral worth,² he has a secondary interest in the moral purpose (ἠθικὸς σκοπός) of his speeches and directed all his talents and energies to the pursuit of the beauty (καλότης) of his theme (ὑπόθεσις). This quality is the supreme excellence of invention and especially well properly attaches to his speeches the attributes of elevation in thought as well as in style. As a matter of fact, his elevated style of composition is justified for this reason that it is in harmony with the high moral tone of his theme.

The great purpose which Longinus sets forth in his treatise is

¹Long., *op. cit.*, ch. 10, 11-17. The passage quoted from the Iliad is in Iliad 2-11 and 4-11.

²Long., *op. cit.*, ch. 1, 11. These chapters contain Longinus' estimate of the various of literature's subject-matter.

³These here refers to the inherent goodness of thought and style.

CHAPTER V

THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT - MATTER

In his essay on Isocrates, Dionysius excerpts a passage from the De Pace as a typical example of the style which the Greek master employed in his deliberative speeches.¹ He notes the flat (ὄπισιος) and tedious (ἀναβεβλημένον) movement of the periods and complains of the over-elaborate and theatrical (θεατρικός) character of the figures. But, he continues, the readers ought to overlook these blemishes of style and consider them not worthy of their interest. Rather let them pay close attention to the noble principles which the speech proclaims. This is the policy which Dionysius adopts for himself.

In his opinion, the distinctive mark of Isocrates' subject-matter is general nobleness of moral tone.² He had a consuming interest in the moral purpose (προαίρεσις) of his speeches and devoted all his talents and energies to the pursuit of the beauty (κάλδος)³ of his theme (ὑπόθεσις). This quality is the supreme excellence of Isocrates and rightfully and properly attaches to his speeches the attribute of elevation in thought as well as in style. As a matter of fact, his elevated style of composition is justified for this reason that it is in harmony with the high moral tone of his theme.

The great purpose which Isocrates sets forth in his speeches is

¹Dion. Hal., De Isocr., 16.17. The passage taken from the De Pace is De Pace, 1-17 and 41-53.

²Dion. Hal., op. cit., 4.12. These chapters contain Dionysius' criticism of the nature of Isocrates' subject-matter.

³Κάλδος here refers to the inherent goodness of thought and ideas.

defined in his philosophy or theory of culture.⁴ Briefly stated, it is the art of speaking and writing on large political subjects in preparation for advising or acting in political affairs. In this respect, Isocrates is distinguished from the ordinary sophist and teacher of rhetoric in his day for his vision is not limited to the narrowest circle of an Athenian's interests. His object is not to prepare his students to become able and clever speakers in the Athenian law-courts. On the contrary, his aim is to enlarge the mental horizon of his pupils by exercising them on subjects of a wider and nobler scope. In brief, his purpose is eminently practical and concerned with the larger public interests of his country-men.

Dionysius cites the Panegyricus and the De Pace as examples of the nationally political or Hellenic subjects which Isocrates chose. The Panegyricus, for example, sets forth the thesis that Athens has a better right than Lacedaemon to the hegemony in Greece. The theme of the De Pace is an exposition of the measures needed to reform the foreign and home policy of Athens. Dionysius takes extracts from both these speeches in order to exemplify the great and beneficial influence which the elevated themes of Isocrates can wield upon the reader. In his opinion, the speeches of Isocrates have the power of instilling in the souls of the youth a genuine interest and zeal for civic activities of a higher and wider scope than those suggested by the daily routine of business and pleasure. His speeches are, as it were, handy manuals for the education of the youth. Young men nourished on such ennobling principles will be of great service and benefit not only to the home and local city but to the whole of Greece.

He who would intend to acquire not some isolated part of political power but the whole of civic virtue, let him have the speeches of Isocrates

⁴The two documents for this theory are the discourse Against the Sophists and the speech Antidosis.

at his finger-tips for ready reference (continues Dionysius). He who would seek a true philosophy of life which is not only theoretical but also practical, let him imitate the principles which Isocrates indicated in his speeches. He who would devoted his talents to the benefit and service of his fellow-men, let him strive to put into practice the noble precepts which Isocrates proposes. These are the friendly exhortations of Dionysius to the youth of his day.

Dionysius concludes his discussion with the statement that no orator of classical times can compare with Isocrates in the brilliancy (*λαμπρότης*) of his themes. Isocrates far outstrips all those who have ever treated the subject of rhetoric. In comparison with him, they seem less than children. This last statement of Dionysius is a reference to Plato's remarks on the talents of Isocrates in the Phaedrus.⁵ In this dialogue of Plato, Socrates prophesies a brilliant career for the young Isocrates. He says:

He seems to me to have a genius above the oratory of Lysias, and altogether to be tempered of nobler elements. And so it will not surprise me if, as years go on, he should make all his predecessors seem like children in the kind of oratory to which he is addressing himself; or if -- supposing this should not content him -- some diviner impulse should lead him to greater things. My dear Phaedrus, a certain philosophy is inborn in him. This is my message, then, from the gods of the place to my pet Isocrates -- and you have your message for your Lysias.⁶

If, in Plato's opinion, Isocrates never did eventually rise to that high career of philosophy which Socrates envisioned for him, yet, in the judgment of Dionysius, Isocrates was led by "some divine impulse" to become a master stylist of artistic prose.

Naturally one cannot expect to find in the Aegineticus a philosophical treatment of Isocrates' theory of culture. It is a court-room speech

⁵ Plato, Phaedrus, 279a.

⁶ Translation by Jebb, Att. Orat., Vol. II, p. 3.

written for victory in the court at Aegina and its subject-matter is determined by the exigencies of the situation. But it is interesting to see how Isocrates has invested his subject with a high moral tone and brought out its higher aspects.

In its general impression, the speech is marked by a respect and love for worthy sentiments. Throughout, it is tempered by a habit of moderation which carefully selects its thoughts as well as its words to befit the moral worthiness of the speaker. It is wholesome in its just dislike for dishonest argumentation. On no occasion does Isocrates resort to tricky devices to win his point. It is never marred by vehement outbreaks of anger or rashness. To be sure, there is an occasional bit of sarcasm and light irony, but it is never bitter or offensive. The speech neither degrades itself nor those who listen to it or read it. It sets forth generous and uplifting ideas which reflect the author's noble character.

In a much higher sense does Hebrews reflect the noble character of the speaker. This is evidenced in many ways. As has been indicated in the previous chapters, the choice of diction, the gentle and smooth type of composition, the resources of invention, the refinement of its arrangement, all these contribute to the moral atmosphere which surrounds the epistle as a sacred halo. Especially is the gentle spirit of the author evinced in the many and various admonitions which he has occasion to address to his readers. For instance, note:

II, 1: "Therefore we ought to give more earnest heed to the things which we have heard. lest at any time we should let them slip."

Here is the first admonition of the apostle. Note how skilfully he uses it. He includes himself in the warning -- a splendid captatio benevolentiae. Later, he uses the pronoun "you" in III, 1, but note the honorary titles which he gives to the brethren before he admonishes them. Again, note the skilful manner of clothing the second "you" admonition in III, 7-13 in words of Holy Scripture preceded by the statement "as the

Holy Ghost saith" and reverting in v. 14 to "we". The whole fourth chapter is "we". In V, 11-14 he tells them a bitter truth only after a careful preparation. In VI, 1 "we"; XII, "we" v. 1.2; "you" v. 3-8; "we" v. 9.10; "you" v. 11-25a; "we" 25b; and so forth, the entire epistle breathes a spirit of nobility of character.

Yes, one is attracted and riveted by the majestic and sabbatic style of this epistle. Nowhere in the New Testament do we meet language of such euphony and rhythm. A peculiar solemnity and anticipation of eternity breathe in these pages. But this is the important thing to remember -- the glow and flow of language, the stateliness and fulness of diction, are but an external manifestation of the marvellous depth and glory of the spiritual truth into which the inspired author is eager to lead his brethren. Then alone do we grasp the true intent of the author's surpassingly beautiful style when we ponder the profound thoughts which he presents. The truth of God's Word is the only excuse for beauty's being. Here it is that the author has attained to the consummate excellence of sublimity of thought. And in the last analysis it is this alone which gave to the greatest poets and historians of the past their preeminence and clothed them with immortal fame.⁷ For the true sublime, by some virtue of its nature, does not persuade but rather transport the readers out of themselves. It casts a spell of wonderment upon them and is superior to what is merely convincing and pleasing. Convictions are a stable thing and usually under control, but passages of sublime thought exercise an irresistible power of over-mastering and get the upper-hand with every member of an audience. Uplifted with a sense of proud possession at having shared the noble thoughts of the writer, the reader is filled with joyful pride as if he himself had produced the very thing he read.

⁷Cfr. Longinus, On the Sublime, II, 1ff.

What, then, constitutes the sublime in literature, in particular, in this epistle? How does one come to perceive it, to judge it? The judge of such things must be a man well-versed in literature who, after reading a passage several times, if he finds that it does not leave behind in his mind more food for thought than the mere words at first suggest, but rather that on careful consideration it sinks in his esteem, then it cannot really be the true sublime since its effect does not outlast the moment of utterance or glance. For what is truly great gives abundant food for thought; it is irksome, yes, even impossible to resist its effect; the memory of it is stubborn and indelible. This is the effect which Hebrews invariably produces upon the individual reader. The individual bears in his heart the indelibly-burnt memory of its ideas. And to be sure, this is sufficient reason for the individual to cherish the epistle for its beauty of thought. But when men who differ in their habits, their lives, their tastes, their ages, all agree in holding one and the same ^{view} verdict about ~~the~~ the epistle, then the unanimous verdict, as it were, of such discordant individuals and judges, makes one's faith in the admired letter more objectively strong and unshakable.

But the sublime in this epistle is more substantial than this shadowy appreciation of it. In its highest moments it may perhaps escape definition and description, but finally its sublimity of thought can be traced to the moral purpose which the author sought to express in the various themes which he presents.

The central idea of the epistle is the glory of the New Covenant, contrasted with and excelling the glory of the Old Dispensation; and while this idea is developed in a systematic manner, yet the aim of the writer throughout is eminently practical. Everywhere his object is exhortation. He never loses sight of the dangers and wants of his brethren. The application to conscience and life is never forgotten. The letter is rather

a sermon than an exposition.⁸ IN all his argument, in every doctrine, in every illustration, the central aim of the epistle is kept prominent -- the exhortation to steadfastness. Surrounded by temptations of a peculiar character, tested by persecution and reproach most suited to shake their faith and their loyalty to the Messiah, rejected by the nation, the writer speaks to them in language of intense and piercing earnestness, of the fearful danger of apostasy and points out to them that it was a mark of the true Israel and a necessary sign of the follower of Jesus to be despised and persecuted. Their proper place as God-chosen saints, as believers, was "outside the camp", bearing the reproach, enduring the cross, and despising the shame. Representing to them the awful danger of drawing back and the glory and blessedness of the cross, he entreats them, by the whole spirit of their past history, and all the mercies of Jehovah, which in Jesus find their perfect and eternal fulfillment, to hold fast the beginning of their faith unto the end and to continue steadfast in the faith and wait (as did Jesus) for the joy set before them.

The immediate readers of this epistle were sadly in need of just such encouragement. They were, as many hold, Christian Jews, and as Christians they were being persecuted as transgressors of the Mosaic Law. As a result they were subject to sufferings and reproaches which were felt most keenly. It was, perhaps, a small thing that their goods were confiscated, but it meant more to them, much more, that they were banished from the holy places. Hitherto they had enjoyed the privileges of devout Israelites; they could take part in the beautiful and God-appointed services of the Jewish sanctuary, but now they were treated as unclean Gentiles and apostates from True Israel. Unless they would give up faith in Jesus and forsake the assembling of themselves together, they would not be allowed to enter the temple at Jerusalem; they would be banished from the altar, the sacrifices, the high priest, the House of Jehovah, the Covenant-God.

⁸ Cfr. Adolph Saphir, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 2ff.

Readers of a later generation and later centuries may find it difficult to realize the piercing sword which thus wounded their inmost heart. That by clinging to the Messiah they were to be severed from God's people was indeed a great and perplexing trial. That for the hope of Israel's glory they were banished from the place which God had chosen and where the Divine Presence, the "I AM", was revealed was indeed a sore and mysterious trial. That they were to be no longer children of the Covenant and of the House, but worse than Goyim, excluded even from the outer court, and cut off from the commonwealth of Israel -- this threatened to be their undoing. Cleaving to the promises made to their fathers, cherishing the hope in constant prayer that their nation would yet accept the Messiah, they were faced with the severest test to which their faith (or anybody's faith, for all that) could be put. Their loyalty to Jesus involved separation from all the sacred rights and privileges of Jerusalem, yes, even separation from the dear members of their own families, from a father or mother, sister or brother, from loved ones who still adhered to the rigors of the Old Covenant!

This was indeed a challenge for the author of this epistle! Here was a noble purpose to serve! Here was a task to tax the abilities of no mean man! Yea, it was for one greater than man! Therefore, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the sacred writer enters fully and lovingly into the difficulties of these Jewish Christians. He comforts them in his exhortation by showing them the unspeakably greater glory of the New Covenant in which they now stand by faith in their Savior. Hence, the subjects spoken of here are the priesthood, the sacrifice, the altar, the holy of holies.

In order to establish and comfort them, the author unfolds the glory of the New Testament, reminding them both of the unity and connection, and of the contrast which exists between the two dispensations. He tells them

that they are the true Israel. Through his words they are listening to the same God who spake of old by the prophets to the fathers, who has in these latter days sent the perfect and ultimate revelation of Himself in His Son, who is Lord above all. Previously children of the Law, which was given by the administration of angels, they were now reconciled and ruled over by the royal High Priest whom the Father exalted above all principalities and powers. Previously the disciples of Moses who was faithful as a servant in all God's House, they were now partakers of Him who is the Lord and Master of the House, the Son, who abides forever. Previously brought into the promised land by Joshua, they had now, through faith, entered that true rest of which their history was but the shadow and imperfect type. Previously the priesthood of Aaron was precious as a picture and pattern of the Atonement, but now Jesus was the true High Priest who offered a perfect sacrifice never to be repeated, whose intercession is all prevailing, whose compassionate love is boundless, and whose glory and power are the substantial and infinite fulfillment of the prophecy of Melchizedek. The tabernacle, with all its symbols and services was undoubtedly glorious, but how much more glorious is the heavenly sanctuary into which Christ has entered and how much greater is the perfection, nearness and liberty of worship which He gives unto all believers!

"We have" the author says so frequently because his readers imagined that they had lost treasures and blessings. Yet, though they were really deprived of the temple with its priesthood and altar and sacrifices, the writer reminds them, nonetheless, that "we have" the real substantial temple, the great High Priest, the true altar, the one sacrifice and the true access into the very presence of the Most High.

And thus having reminded them that the glory which belongs to Israel was truly and fully theirs, he exhorts them to steadfastness and encourages them by their whole past history, throughout which for thousands of years the one golden thread of faith and the scarlet thread of reproach and

suffering unmistakably marked them as the chosen nation of God and His peculiar people. But far more than that! Even from the beginning of the world the true people of God were despised and persecuted! Righteous Abel believed the sacrifice he offered and himself was slain. Enoch testified to an ungodly generation and was then translated beyond the sufferings of this world. Noah was the only one who saved himself and his household. Abraham and all the patriarchs were strangers and pilgrims; they had to leave their home and their kindred; they had to sacrifice what was dearest. Moses had to suffer the reproach of Christ. All their ancestors and prophets lived and suffered in faith, waiting for the city which has foundations, whose builder and maker is God. And he who is the crown of Israel, as well as Israel's Lord, Jesus, the root and offspring of David, in whom all Israel's history culminates, the glory of the temple, the Lord of the Sabbath, the messenger and mediator of the New Covenant, -- yea, Jesus the Lord Himself was rejected by His people and as a malefactor, as one unworthy to live in the beloved city of Jerusalem, He was cast outside the camp, and there He was crucified and nailed to the accursed tree! Therefore, if the readers are the true children of Abraham, if they are the true disciples of Jesus, they must not wonder that their place is also outside the camp and that they also are called to endure the cross and despise the shame.

Hence, the word FAITH in its full meaning is "writ large" across the expanse of this letter. The external beauty of expression subserves to enhance and make more glorious the inner meaning of faith. And thus every doctrine and illustration of this epistle, all the resources of the human mind and tongue, in diction, in composition, in invention and in arrangement, go straight to the heart and conscience of the readers. Truly, in its fullest sense, the skill of this writer in expression is ars rhetorica cordis. His art appeals to life, addresses itself to faith.

It is one continued and sustained fervent and intense appeal to cleave to Jesus, the High Priest. It directs the reader to the substantial, true and real worship. It is a most urgent and loving exhortation to be steadfast, patient, and hopeful in the abiding presence of God, in the love and sympathy of Jesus, in the fellowship of the great cloud of witnesses.

To be sure, the noble purpose of Isocrates' orations was laudable. He taught and inculcated in the youth of his day the excellent principles of political philosophy and the whole of civic virtue. And the young men nourished on such ennobling ideas undoubtedly were of great service and benefit not only to the home and local city but to the whole of Greece. And likewise even to this day these same principles of civic activity are of enduring worth to modern society and government for they transcend the fleeting moments of their utterance and are of universal application.

And so too, (but in a larger sense) the writer of Hebrews fitted his message to the urgent needs of his readers -- needs which were pressing upon their physical well-being in this world. He presented to them the only solution to their temporal troubles. And yet more-- far more-- he directed their gaze beyond the horizons of this life, he guided the affection of their hearts away from the tawdry things of the moment, he bent their wills to conform with the inscrutable purposes of God, he led them, as a father does his child, into the loving presence of Jesus, the leader and perfecter of their faith.

Our canonical writers and doctors possessed
Eloquence as well as wisdom, a kind of Eloquence
becoming in men of their character.

— St. Augustine

CONCLUSION

The literary fame of Isocrates as a master stylist of Attic prose rests upon the productions of his later years. His epideictic and deliberative speeches represent the full development of an artist who sought above all else to invest nobility of thought with beauty of expression. With becoming modesty Isocrates could truthfully boast that he had chosen to speak and write about subjects of momentous importance in a dignified and polished manner, and had gained therefrom a more gracious reputation than many.

The Aegineticus is a fine example of such studied art in forensic oratory. It represents, in many respects, a high degree of workmanship -- the efforts of a "workman that needeth not to be ashamed". For Isocrates has succeeded admirably in blending the elegancies of artistic prose with a vividness and directness essential for combative contests. This is apparent from an analysis of the speech. For the diction, in the main, is precise and direct in its simplicity and within ^{easy} range of the vocabulary of the ordinary man. In a few instances, the selection of words is above the common run and indicative of the richer vocabulary and finer tastes of a cultured and well-read gentleman of Athens. The composition is guided generally by a straightforwardness of utterance obtained by compact and tersely expressed periods. On some occasions, the periods attain a rich profuseness through the judicious use of alluring and fanciful figures of speech which give the oration an air of beautiful grandeur. But clarity of thought is never subservient to the elegance of style. In the treatment of the subject-matter, the speech exhibits the ingenuity of its

author who marshals his arguments to the best advantage of his case, and achieves variety and utility by interweaving the proof with the narrative. Especially characteristic of the noble aim of Isocrates in the field of oratory is the manner in which he has kept the moral tone of this speech on a high plane and endeavored throughout to emphasize the nobler aspects of his theme.

These leading characteristics of Isocrates' style in the Aegineticus find their fuller development in his later discourses on nationally political themes. Far from being a reproach to the genius of its author, this speech merits high praise as a preview of those outstanding works which were yet to come from the pen of this mighty master of artistic prose.

The similarity in style between the classic master Isocrates and the Koine author of Hebrews is striking. The literary preeminence of the writer of Hebrews as a master stylist (in the classic vein) of good Greek prose in New Testament literature is acknowledged on all sides by every critic. His epistle represents the full development of an artist who sought above all else to wed nobleness of thought to beauty of expression. With becoming modesty he begs the kind indulgence of his readers for their careful perusal of his letter and himself calls it a "few words". But these "few words" have stamped him as the outstanding stylist among the canonical writers of the New Testament.

Like that of Isocrates, the dominant feature of the diction in Hebrews is the usage of common and ordinary words which are readily understandable to the average person. Thereby it achieves a simplicity and clarity demanded by and characteristic of good Attic prose. As is the case with Isocrates, a touch of Thucydidean grandeur and the flavor of culture and wide reading in literature is added by the author in the way of a judicious selection of choice vocabulary, and even a few foreign

words of Hebraic origin. Greater vividness is achieved by a moderate use of telling and graphic similes, but, unlike Isocrates, the diction does offend classic taste in the too frequent employment of metaphors and tropical expressions. It is probably superfluous to explain at length to those who have read the epistle, how the choice of the right word and the fine word has a marvellously moving and seductive effect upon the reader. For the diction of Hebrews, in its own right, gives to the style at once grandeur, beauty, a classical flavor, weight, force, strength, and (as Longinus says) a sort of glittering charm, like the bloom on the surface of the most beautiful bronze statues. Its diction endues the facts, as it were, with a living voice. Truly, the beautiful words are the very light of the thought of this epistle.

The style of smooth composition in Hebrews compares quite favorably with the manner of Isocrates. The periods, though not as frequent as in Isocrates, are generally tersely moulded in the simple mode of Lysias with an occasional tendency towards rich profuseness in some ^{my} stances. There is evident a rhythmical flow of cola and commata and a proportioned equilibrium of words and sentences which is pleasant to the ear. With a happy facility, the writer employs a composition which is a kind of melody in words -- words which are part of man's nature and reach not his ears only but his very soul -- stirring myriad ideas of thought, things, beauty, and musical charm, all of which are born and bred in the sensitive nature of man. Moreover, by the blending of its own manifold tones, the composition brings into the hearts of the reader the writer's actual emotion so that all who read him share it; and by piling phrase on phrase (as he does in some cases) it builds up one majestic whole and casts a spell on the reader and turns his thoughts towards what is majestic and dignified and sublime and finally wins a complete mastery over his heart and soul.

Likewise, the author well understands how to use figures of speech

as natural allies of sublimity of thought in his composition. Antithesis, parisosis, paromoiosis, and like figures, are judiciously employed to add beauty to the sentence structure. In no instance do they result in frigidity of style. But a definite danger does lurk in the too frequent use of such figures. There is an inevitable suspicion attaching to the unconscionable use of them. It gives a suggestion of treachery, craft, fallacy, etc. However, one finds that a figure is always most effective when it conceals the very fact of its being a figure. Long ago Longinus observed that art is only perfect when it looks like nature and Nature succeeds only by concealing art about her person. Accordingly, the author of Hebrews has applied this principle in his writing. For the sublimity of the thought and its effect upon the emotions of the reader is a wonderfully helpful antidote against the suspicion that accompanies the use of figures. The effrontery of the artifice is somehow lost in the brilliant setting of beauty and grandeur which surrounds JESUS the high priest. The figures are no longer obvious and thus avoid all suspicion. In the same way that dimmer lights vanish in the surrounding radiance of the sun, so the all-embracing atmosphere of grandeur which halos JESUS, the captain of salvation, obscures the rhetorical devices. Something of the same kind is to be found in painting. Though the high lights and shadows lie side by side in the same place, yet the high lights spring to the eye and seem not only to stand out but to be actually much nearer. So it is on the magnificent canvass which Hebrews represents. The sublime and moving figure of JESUS, the True High Priest, lies nearer to the heart of the Christian, and thus, partly from the love which the Christian holds for him, and partly from the brilliance of effect which the writer of Hebrews achieves with his brush, JESUS always strikes the eye long before the rhetorical figures, thus throwing their art into the shade and keeping it hid, as it were, under a bushel.

The author's treatment of the subject-matter in Hebrews conforms in a high degree to the favorable criticism of Dionysius' classical canon. He equals (if not excels) Isocrates in invention, for he shows a clever ingenuity in searching out manifold devices whereby he can amplify his subject of JESUS, the High Priest. Such means of amplification are the demonstrative argument, citation, comparison, and example. In arrangement, he attains variety and clarity of argumentation and narrative (equal to Isocrates) by interweaving the narration with the proof.

All this -- and JESUS too! The glorious fact of this letter is that the author makes every faculty of his art subserve the immense sublimity of his theme -- JESUS! Out of the midst of all this beauteous adornment of human expression we somehow seem to hear the still small voice of the God-breathed writer directing the human heart from the cross to the throne:

βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν.

Then, and then only, does the reader begin to understand that the human tongue, after all, falters and fails to express the ineffable mysteries of Eternal Truth Incarnate. And with true humility of heart and mind the devout reader joins with the writer of this Epistle in the final doxology of praise and glory to God the Holy Ghost who, in His inscrutable Wisdom, sent the winged Seraphim to touch his stammering lips with a living coal of fire and who then determined, by the foolishness of preaching, to save those who fix their face in faith on JESUS:

ὡς ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

τῶν αἰώνων.

ἀμήν.

The sun of Hellas sets in the New Testament;
but that sun, even in its setting, is still
the sun:

Δυόμενος γὰρ ὁμῶς ἥλιός ἐστιν ἔτι.

- Norden

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, C. D., Lysias, New York, Copyright 1905.
- Baldwin, C. S., Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, Macmillan, 1924.
- Bauer, W., Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments. 3rd Ed., Berlin, 1937.
- Blass, F., Isocratis Orationes, Vol. I, II, Leipzig, 1904.
- Blass, F., Die Attische Beredsamkeit, 2ed. Leipzig, 1892.
- Blass, F., - Debrunner, A., Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, 6ed. 1931.
- Cope, E. M., The Rhetoric of Aristotle, Vol. II, Cambridge, 1877.
- Duncan, T. S., The Style and Language of Saint Paul in His First Letter to the Corinthians. Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. LXXXIII, No. 330, Apr. 1926.
- Jebb, R. C., The Attic Orators, Vol. I, II, London, 1893.
- Kleist, J. A., The Gospel of St. Mark, Milwaukee, 1936.
- Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford, 1940.
- Mahaffy, J. P., A History of Classical Greek Literature, Vol. II, New York. No date.
- Mueller, K. O., and Donaldson, J. W., A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, Vol. II, London, 1858.
- Moulton, J. H., A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. I. Prolegomena. 3rd. ed. Edinburgh, 1908.
- Nestle, E., Novum Testamentum Graece, 16ed. Stuttgart, 1936.
- Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopaedie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, 9ed. Vol. 1916.
- Roberts, W. R., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, The Three Literary Letters, Cambridge, 1901.
- Roberts, W. R., Demetrius on Style, Cambridge, 1902.
- Roberts, W. R., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, De Compositione Verborum, London, 1910.
- Saphir, A., The Epistle to the Hebrews, Vol. I. N. Y.
- Smyth, H. W., A Greek Grammar For Colleges, N. Y., 1920.
- Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.
- Usener, H., and Radermacher, L., Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula, Vol. I, Leipzig, 1899.

Ἐπευνοῦτε εἰς τὰς Γραφάς