and Plato, although the doubts raised above are such as to suggest the continued need for rigorous scrutiny of the assumptions and procedures involved in all stylometric work. The need for care in the application of statistics to St Paul's writings should be apparent. Are we still blind to the modulation between passages where there is careful choice of words, and others where there is a torrent of thoughts and jumbled or incomplete sentences pouring from the mind of this enigmatic man? Indeed, the hypothesis that the last words of his sentences bear the alleged significance may even be a psychological improbability.

P. F. JOHNSON

New Test. Stud. **20**, pp. 100–104

ΤΟΥΤ' ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΣΑΡΚΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ (HEB. X. 20): APPOSITION, DEPENDENT OR EXPLICATIVE?

When C. Holsten[1] wrote his study on Hebrews x. 20 as long ago as 1875 he commented that the phrase διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ 'ist seit alters Gegenstand unendlicher Erörterungen gewesen'.[2] Holsten's own conclusion – based on the fact that nowhere else in Hebrews is such a parallel between καταπέτασμα and σάρξ found – that the phrase is a gloss,[3] has done nothing to halt the discussion.

The grammatical problem turns on which preceding word or phrase the words τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ are to be related to.[4] The most common connection is to take τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as an appositional phrase to τοῦ καταπετάσματος.[5] On the other hand it can be understood as a genitive of dependence referring back to ὁδόν,[6] that is to read ὁδὸν...τοῦτ' ἔστιν [ὁδὸς] τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.[7]

[1] C. Holsten, *Exegetische Untersuchung über Hebräer 10:20* (Bern, 1875).

[2] *Untersuchung*, p. 6.

[3] 'Wir haben in diesen Worten also eine epexegetische Glosse. Nicht die ursprüngliche Gedankenbildung des Verfassers, sondern eine fremde Reflexion...' (*Untersuchung*, p. 15).

[4] The hermeneutical difficulties are over whether σάρξ refers to the incarnation or crucifixion and whether καταπέτασμα is to be understood as a hindrance or a means of access.

[5] Of the commentators one may name H. Windisch (1913[1], p. 87), E. Riggenbach (1922[3], pp. 315 f.), J. Moffatt (1924, p. 143), T. H. Robinson (1933, p. 142), F. F. Bruce (1964, pp. 248 f.) and O. Michel (1966[12], p. 345).

[6] This is strongly advanced by B. F. Westcott (1903[3], pp. 321 ff.) and finds support in A. Seeberg (1912, p. 113), A. Nairne (1913, pp. 161, 381 f.), C. Spicq (1954, II, 316), J. Héring (1954, p. 98 – Héring does not, as Hofius says, entertain C. Holsten's drastic solution) and H. Montefiore (*Hebrews*, 1964, pp. 173 f.).

[7] One can also relate τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as a genitive of dependence to καταπέτασμα = τοῦτ' ἔστιν [τὸ καταπέτασμα] τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ though this hardly commends itself.

A natural usage of τοῦτ' ἔστιν is where it introduces a phrase explicative of the preceding sentence as a whole.[1] O. Hofius has recently made a detailed attempt so to interpret Heb. x. 20, referring the phrase under discussion back to the whole of *v.* 20*a*, especially to the verb ἐγκαινίζω.[2]

The major objection made against taking τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ with ὁδός has been that of the word-order.[3] Westcott was cognizant of this and attempted to empty the force of the objection by appealing to the similar use of τοῦτ' ἔστιν in Heb. vii. 5 where τοῦτ' ἔστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν refers not back to the immediate τὸν νόμον but to the prior τὸν λαόν.

More recently a Catholic scholar P. Andriessen[4] has analysed Hebrews further in an attempt to establish that it is a habit of the epistle *not* to unite the immediately neighbouring substantives by τοῦτ' ἔστιν. He refers, as few others have, to the total usage of τοῦτ' ἔστιν by the Epistle to the Hebrews, namely ii. 14, vii. 5, ix. 11, xi. 16, xiii. 15.[5] He rightly brackets ix. 11 with a question-mark but maintains that the other four instances support his contention that the writer of Hebrews uses τοῦτ' ἔστιν to refer back to a substantive other than the immediately preceding one.

On examination two of these fail to stand up. In Heb. ii. 14 τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸν διάβολον refers back to the whole and directly preceding participial clause τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου. The fact that it is a noun clause rather than a single substantive that precedes τοῦτ' ἔστιν hardly makes it an example of Andriessen's thesis. Nor can one adduce Heb. xi. 16 as evidence merely because the verb ὀρέγω interposes between κρείττονος and τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου. Here τοῦτ' ἔστιν conjoins ἐπουράνιος with the immediately preceding comparative κρειττων.

However Heb. xiii. 15 is an example as Andriessen asserts where the immediate substantive is not the one qualified; thus τοῦτ' ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων refers back to θυσίαν αἰνέσεως not the immediate διὰ παντὸς τῷ θεῷ. On the basis of Heb. xiii. 15 and vii. 5,[6] the latter exampled as well by Westcott, it can be maintained that word-order is not decisive; the question between ὁδός and καταπέτασμα remains open at this point.[7]

We return for the moment to Hofius' article. First, Hofius observes that a literary brevity ('Brachylogie') appertains to the phrase τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ

[1] E.g. Rom. ix. 8, x. 7.

[2] O. Hofius, 'Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr 10, 19 f.', in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde*, Festschr. J. Jeremias ed. E. Lohse (Göttingen, 1970), pp. 132–41.

[3] Cf. F. F. Bruce, *Hebrews*, p. 247.

[4] P. Andriessen, 'Das größere und vollkommenere Zelt (Hebr 9: 11)', *B.Z.* XV (1971), 76–92, and 'Quelques passages difficiles de l'Épître aux Hébreux', *Biblica*, LI (1971), 207–20.

[5] τοῦτ' ἔστιν occurs eighteen times in the New Testament, six times in Hebrews, seven times in Paul and five times elsewhere, a fact against Holsten's view that Heb. x. 20*b* is a gloss.

[6] Andriessen's claim of support from Heb. ix. 2 and vii. 11 is not compelling; nor the claim that the absence of the article from ὁδός makes it the worthy object of the epexegetic phrase of x. 20*b*.

[7] To say that word-order is not decisive does not mean that it is irrelevant. In the case of Heb. vii. 5 and xiii. 15 the substantives qualified by the τοῦτ' ἔστιν phrase are the only ones that could be so qualified; whereas with Heb. x. 20 one must bypass the first possibility (καταπέτασμα) if one wishes to relate τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ dependently to ὁδόν.

and must be completed by the addition of διά.[1] Second, he maintains that along with such examples as Heb. ix. 11 f., I Pet. iii. 20*b* f., Rom. iv. 25, xi. 28, I Cor. xv. 47 there is in Heb. x. 20 an 'Inkonzinnität im Präpositionsgebrauch'. Such a variation in the meaning of διά is possible, he holds, once the non-appositional nature of Heb. x. 20 is accepted.[2] The usage of διά involves, he says, the two different instances of a local and an instrumental meaning. 'Während das διά vor τοῦ καταπετάσματος lokal zu fassen ist, hat es im τοῦτ' ἔστιν-Satz instrumentale Bedeutung.'[3]

Hofius' third point is that the structure of the verse is 'chiastische' and that the [διά] before τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is related to ἐνεκαίνισεν and the total statement of *v.* 20*a*. He demonstrates this as follows:

ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν	(*a*)
ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν	(*b*)
διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος	(*b*)
τοῦτ' ἔστιν (διὰ) τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ	(*a*)

This provocative essay has been approved and corrected by the mentor to whom it was originally offered, that is to say J. Jeremias.[4] Jeremias hails Hofius' study as possibly solving this *crux interpretum*. He approves of Hofius' examples of inconsistent prepositional usage (not all would) and adds Rom. ii. 28 f. to the list. He stresses also that once this inconsequence is accepted as present in Heb. x. 20 'dann besteht keine Notwendigkeit, ja nicht einmal die Möglichkeit, die Worte τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ als Apposition zu διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος zu fassen, also als Näherbestimmung des Vorhangs'.[5] He goes on to endorse Hofius' contention that the τοῦτ' ἔστιν phrase refers to the whole statement of *v.* 20*a*. From here on Jeremias with exegetical acumen corrects Hofius.

Hofius asserted that the enigmatic phrase τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ applies to the acceptance of the flesh and thus the incarnation; Jeremias counters that it points to the devotion of the flesh, that is, the crucifixion. This he supports by clarifying the analogous structure between *v.* 19 and *v.* 20, with the difference that in the former the believers are the subject while in the latter their πρόδρομος is the subject. Each verse treats successively of (*a*) the new way, (*b*) its purpose, (*c*) its opening through the sacrificial death of Christ. Jeremias lists the comparison as follows.

v. 19 Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, παρρησίαν	*v.* 20 ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν
(*a*) εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον	(*a*) ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν

[1] Cf. C. Spicq, II, 316. Hofius offers only Justin, *Dial.* 118. 3: διὰ τῆς κλήσεως τῆς καινῆς καὶ αἰωνίου διαθήκης, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is probably a genitive of dependence related to διαθήκης.

[2] 'Faßt man die Worte τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ nicht von vornherein als Apposition zu διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος auf, so ist durch nichts gefordert, für διά in beiden Fällen die gleiche Bedeutung anzunehmen' (*Inkarnation*, p. 136).

[3] *Inkarnation*, p. 136.

[4] J. Jeremias, 'Hebräer 10:20 τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ', *Z.N.W.* LXII (1971), 131.

[5] *Z.N.W.* LXII (1971), 131.

(*b*) τῶν ἁγίων
(*c*) ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ

(*b*) διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος
(*c*) τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ

The comparison at (*c*) gives strong support to Jeremias' position that it is the death of Christ to which Heb. x. 20*b* refers.

The acceptance that σάρξ here is alluding to the Cross, which is the meaning in the context, does not solve the difficulty of the word or phrase to which to refer back *v.* 20*b*. Montefiore agrees with Jeremias' exposition entirely but can still hold that τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is tied to ὁδόν,[1] not to ἐνεκαίνισεν and the whole of *v.* 20*a*. And on the other hand, those also who take *v.* 20*b* appositionally usually understand σάρξ as a reference to the death of Christ.[2]

We need to examine once again the total usage of τοῦτ' ἔστιν in the Epistle to the Hebrews and establish what varieties or harmonies are apparent in the writer's usage. τοῦτ' ἔστιν in Heb. ii. 14 connects the accusative τὸν διάβολον appositionally to the accusative participial clause τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου. In Heb. vii. 5 we find another example of an appositional accusative linked by τοῦτ' ἔστιν, namely τὸν λαόν and τοὺς ἀδελφούς. The genitive negation οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως is connected appositionally by τοῦτ' ἔστιν to the preceding genitive οὐ χειροποιήτου in Heb. ix. 11. We have also a genitive of apposition in Heb. xi. 16 and again connected by τοῦτ' ἔστιν, that is to say ἐπουρανίου is in apposition to κρείττονος.[3] Finally θυσίαν αἰνέσεως is qualified by the appositional accusative καρπὸν χειλέων which is once more introduced by τοῦτ' ἔστιν (Heb. xiii. 15). There is therefore a strong presumption that the sixth and remaining instance of τοῦτ' ἔστιν (Heb. x. 20) also introduces an appositional phrase.

If Heb. x. 20*b* was an example of a genitive of dependence attached to ὁδός we could expect a repetition of ὁδός before τῆς σαρκός as for example in Rom. x. 8 (τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως) where τὸ ῥῆμα is repeated. This is especially so because of the distance of ὁδόν from τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.[4] But even more damaging is the fact that Hebrews uses τοῦτ' ἔστιν as a customary habit (*Sprachgebrauch*) to introduce an appositional statement. There are therefore weighty grammatical reasons from within the epistle itself for accepting τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as in apposition to καταπέτασμα. It is of course impossible to connect σαρκός appositionally to ὁδόν for the former is a genitive and the latter an accusative. This also rules out any direct relationship with ἐγκαινίζω.

If we accept the appositional relationship between καταπέτασμα and τῆς

[1] *Hebrews*, p. 173.

[2] The suggestion that σαρκός is related to ἁγίων made by O. Glombitza ('Erwägungen zum Kunstvollen Ansatz der Paraenese im Brief an die Hebräer – x 19–25' in *NovTest* IX (1967), 135) can be dismissed.

[3] Ὀρέγω of course takes the genitive.

[4] In contrast to the example from Justin previously mentioned.

σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ are we obliged along with Jeremias and Hofius[1] to demand that διά must then be interpreted uniformly? Strictly speaking this would seem to be the case, for τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ has no preposition of its own and if in apposition to καταπέτασμα must be governed by the same διά which is before τοῦ καταπετάσματος.

The διά before τοῦ καταπετάσματος is clearly local and it would, as F. Gardiner says, 'on the face of it... be grammatically insufferable to change its meaning from local when it is expressed, to instrumental where it is implied in the same clause'.[2]

On the other hand, the close relationship between σάρξ (*v.* 20*b*) and αἷμα (*v.* 19) presses on us to understand the appositional phrase instrumentally; for αἷμα is in Hebrews a means of access (cf. ix. 11, 12).

These two elements are irreconcilable if we pedantically maintain grammatical niceties, but to one who knew Greek as the writer of this epistle did the ambiguity of διά would be close to mind as he added the appositional phrase. The problem was for the present writer solved as long ago as 1888 when F. Gardiner wrote:

> In other words, while by the exact force of the words and the precisely literal construction both genitives must be taken locally, yet really there was a gliding of the thought from one position to the other, so that while the διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος is to be taken locally, the following genitive τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is to be understood instrumentally, so that the real thought of the writer is precisely that which it is impossible to allow to the exact grammatical force of his expression.[3]

The grammatical grounds for taking τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as an appositional explicative to καταπέτασμα are coercive, as are also the reasons for the interpretation that the death of Christ is meant by the comparison. Why then do we find from time to time that scholars balk at this conclusion? Mainly because the 'daring, poetical touch'[4] is for modern minds often found too daring.

It is here in *v.* 20 of the pericope, as N. Dahl observes, that 'the difficulties are to be found'.[5] Provided however one is sober in one's exegesis the 'poetic touch' makes a sublime addition. What was once limited to the high priest and once restricted to one day in the year is now open to all and for ever,[6] and the means is no longer the death of a sacrificial beast but the obedient death of the Son.[7]

N. H. YOUNG

[1] Cf. H. Montefiore, *op. cit.* p. 173. L. Sabourin, 'Sacrificium ut liturgia in Epistula ad Hebraeos', *V.D.* XLVI (1968), 247.

[2] F. Gardiner, 'On Heb. x. 20', *J. Soc. Bib. Lit. Exeg.* (1888), p. 142.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 146. This is *contra* O. Hofius, *Inkarnation*, p. 136; J. Jeremias, *Z.N.W.* (1971), p. 131; and W. Michaelis, *T.D.N.T.* v, 77.

[4] J. Moffatt, *Hebrews*, p. 143.

[5] N. A. Dahl, 'A New and Living Way—The Approach to God According to Hebrews 10: 19–25', *Interpretation*, V (1951), 403.

[6] Taking ὁδὸν...ζῶσαν as meaning 'der immer gangbar ist (= ὁδὸς μένουσα)', rather than 'der zum Leben führt (= ὁδὸς ζωῆς)', see O. Michel, *Hebräerbrief*, p. 345.

[7] U. Luck, 'Himmlisches und Irdisches im Hebräerbrief', *Nov. Test.* V (1963), 209: 'Das Leiden und Sterben Jesu ist der Vorhang.'