

church are in analogous situations.³ What once applied to Israel now finds its full meaning with respect to the church.

The precise issue before us, however, is the writer's interpretative handling of the psalm. There is little question that the writer is quoting the LXX rather than the MT. Yet, the author's quotation of the psalm is not entirely consistent with the LXX. We might say that in wishing to make this psalm more relevant to his readers, he says things *about* Psalm 95 that are not actually found in Psalm 95. The writer's particular understanding of the psalm for his readers is reflected in three significant variations from the LXX. The most significant variation is the insertion of the conjunction δὴ 'therefore' in v. 10. The second is the prepositional phrase ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ 'with scrutiny', in v. 9, where the LXX and MT both have a verb (LXX ἐδοκίμασεν 'they tried' and MT עָבְרוּ 'they tried me'). The third variation is τούτῃ 'this' generation, in v. 10, where the LXX reads ἐκείνη 'that' generation.

We are given some insight into the author's theological concerns first by his insertion of δὴ in v. 10. This particle is absent in the LXX and has no corresponding particle in the MT. Neither is there any manuscript evidence for this variant. Verses 9-10a in the LXX read, 'Where your fathers tested, they tried, and saw my works. I was angry with that generation for forty years.' Similarly, the MT reads, 'Where your fathers tested me, they tried me even though they saw my works. I was angry with that' generation for forty years.' The point is that both of these texts state that God was angry for forty years. In other words, God's anger was a characteristic of the wilderness period, an observation that a reading of the wilderness narratives quickly bears out. The addition of δὴ in Heb. 3.10, on the other hand, changes the meaning significantly. The forty-year period refers now not to the period of God's wrath, but to the period of God's activity in the desert. 'Your fathers tested with scrutiny and saw my works for forty years. Therefore [δὴ] I was angry with this generation.' God was not angry for

3. C. Spicq argues that the use of Psalm 95 '... presupposes an exact correspondence between the successive generations of the people of God, and perfect steadfastness in God's conduct toward them. ...' citing 1.1-2 as anticipating this idea (*L'épître aux Hébreux* [Paris: Gabalda, 1953], p. 71). I agree with Spicq's observation, but would emphasize that 3.1-6 in particular presents Jesus as the second Moses and the church as the new Israel.
4. There is no demonstrative in the MT. It is added here to smooth out the translation.

THE INTERPRETATION OF PSALM 95 IN HEBREWS 3.1-4.13*

Peter Enns

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the theological concerns that motivated the author of Hebrews to interpret Ps. 95.7b-11 the way he did. This part of the psalm deals with the rebellion of the wilderness community at Meribah and Massah, and is quoted in Heb. 3.7b-11. The writer's particular understanding of Psalm 95 is apparently motivated by a desire to recontextualize the psalm for his audience. His handling of the psalm exhibits similarities to *pesher* exegesis in which a particular passage is given an eschatological interpretation, 'relating to the sect's own position in history, and rooted in its peculiar attitude to the biblical text'.¹ It is significant that he does not quote the psalm as a proof-text to support a preceding argument, as is the case for his Old Testament quotations in the first two chapters. The psalm does not provide data to support a theological point. Rather, it is quoted simply 'for the sake of exposition and application'.² This tells us something about the writer's understanding of the church's situation in redemptive history. In the same way that the original exodus community, which rebelled at Meribah and Massah, was a community wandering through the wilderness, so too is the church a community of wilderness wanderers living between Egypt and Canaan with the ever present possibility of rebellion. It is already assumed on the basis of 3.1-6 that Israel and the

* A fuller and slightly revised version of this paper, which includes a discussion on the structure and interpretation of Psalm 95, may be found in P. Enns, 'Creation and Re-Creation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3.1-4.13', *WTJ* 55 (1993), pp. 255-80.

1. D. Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT, 2.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 507.

2. S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Van Soest, 1961), p. 85.

forty years. Rather anger is what follows the forty-year period in which they saw God's works.

Why does Hebrews insert $\delta\iota\acute{o}$? Why does he remove the notion of God's anger from the wilderness period, where it certainly seems to belong, and place it after? It seems that he is concerned to portray the wilderness period in a positive light—one that is not characterized by wrath. But why would he want to do this? Because his purpose for quoting Psalm 95 is to warn the church, the new wilderness community.

To elaborate: the syntax of the LXX and MT equate the period of God's activity with that of God's wrath. After all, the entire forty-year period of wandering is the punishment for Israel's wanting to return to Egypt in Numbers 14. Psalm 95 views the wilderness period negatively. But this negative impression will not do for Hebrews.⁵ The church's period of wilderness wandering is not one of wrath but of blessing. The church is not subject to God's punishment as was the first wilderness community. Those that make up the body of Christ are rather 'partakers of a heavenly calling' (Heb. 3.1), or in the language of Heb. 2.4, they have witnessed 'signs, wonders, various miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit'. What were the works *they* saw? Not wrath, but the coming of the Messiah and the inauguration of the church age. For the author of Hebrews this is clearly not a show of God's anger, but of his blessing—indeed the climactic realization of his redemptive plan.⁶ The new Moses had come and the new Israel was born, and this was attested to by 'signs, wonders, and miracles'. These are the 'works' that the new Israel had seen during her period of wilderness wandering. The

5. The innovation on the part of our author is certainly not in giving a positive evaluation of the wilderness period, since such an evaluation has ample Old Testament precedent. For example, the desert was seen as a place where God showed his benevolence to his people (e.g. Pss. 78.15-20; 105.41; 107.6; 114.8; see also Wis. 11.4-14; *Bib. Ant.* 10.7; 11.15; 20.8; 1 Cor. 10.1-4). The innovation is in the fact that the author interprets *Psalm 95* in this way. Moreover, the fact that the author of Hebrews refers to the *Tabernacle* as the copy of the heavenly sanctuary (8.1-2; 9.1-2.11) rather than the *Temple* is further evidence of his positive opinion of the wilderness period.

6. E. Gräßer comments briefly that the purpose of $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ is to emphasize the experience of God's salvific activity (*Heilsverföhrung*), what he refers to as 'vierzig Jahre Wunderweisungen Gottes' (*An die Hebräer [Hebr 1-6]* [EKKNT; Zürich: Benzinger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990], p. 176). See also H. Attridge's comments (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989], p. 115).

insertion of $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ serves to make the clear distinction between the forty-year period of God's activity, and the subsequent period of his anger. Anger is what follows upon disbelief in God's activity, not what characterizes the period of God's activity. Hence, in applying the psalm to the church, the writer of Hebrews is telling his readers that their wilderness period is one of blessing, not wrath or punishment. If they are unfaithful by following the example of the Israelites, and 'testing with scrutiny God's works', this present age will be *followed* by God's anger in which they forfeit the promise of rest.

That the writer is fully aware of his exegetical technique is made certain in 3.17. There, regarding *Israel's* disbelief (not the church's), he asks, 'And with whom was he angry for forty years?'. Here the writer follows the syntax of the LXX, which reads the forty years as a period of God's wrath. This is the exact opposite of what he did in 3.10. This raises the following question: why would the author of Hebrews give the same verse, which for him was Holy Scripture, two different meanings? Apart from the ubiquity of exegetical techniques such as this in first-century Judaism, I suggest the following theological motivation: in 3.10 he is talking about the church, whereas in 3.17 he is talking about Israel. Simply by quoting this psalm, the author is making a statement regarding the *continuity* between Israel and the church: both have a wilderness period. Yet, the negative overtones in Psalm 95 regarding the wilderness period would not suit the reality of the church age as one of great blessing. This is why he inserts $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ in v. 10. The syntax of 3.17, however, is not intended merely to reflect more accurately the syntax of the LXX, as if his exegetical conscience suddenly began to bother him. Rather, he is making explicit in 3.17 what was implied by the insertion of $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ in v. 10: there is a distinction between the two periods of wilderness wandering. The Israelite wilderness period was one of wrath: 3.17, 'With whom was he angry for forty years?'. The church's wilderness period is one of divine blessing: 3.10, 'They saw my works for forty years'. Although Israel may have fallen away shortly after her exodus, thus characterizing her wilderness wandering as a time of wrath, the period following the church's exodus is characterized by 'signs, wonders, various miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit'. For the writer of Hebrews, then, there is continuity and discontinuity between the two wilderness periods. The two are analogous, but not merely so.⁷ This is in keeping with what is perhaps the major

7. P.E. Hughes argues that there is an 'ambivalence of association' regarding

theme throughout the book of Hebrews: the new supersedes the old.⁸

Besides the addition of $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ in v. 10, a second factor that highlights this emphasis on God's activity is the prepositional phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in v. 9. Attridge suggests that '... $\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ has connotations of close and even skeptical scrutiny', which yields the translation, 'Where your fathers tested with scrutiny and saw my works...'⁹ We should notice that the object of the testing in Hebrews is not God, as is the case with the MT, but the works. Here Hebrews agrees with the LXX. But our author goes beyond the LXX by changing the verb $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ to the prepositional phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$. The effect is to draw further attention to the faithlessness of the exodus community in view of these works. He does not say with the LXX: 'Your fathers tested, they tried my works'. Hebrews reads: 'Your fathers tested with scrutiny my works'. He is telling his readers that the age in which they live, and the blessings in which they partake, are themselves a certain and true witness to God's ongoing faithfulness in bringing the new exodus community to its rest. Skepticism and disbelief regarding these sure signs are unthinkable.¹⁰

the forty-year period, but the 'overall sense of the passage is not altered' (*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977], p. 143). Hughes, however, may be missing the theological point of the writer's handling of the psalm. Attridge comments, that $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ 'is somewhat surprising in view of the association of forty years with the wrath of God in the following exposition (3.17), but it is possible that the author conceived of two periods of forty years, one of disobedience and one of punishment' (*Hebrews*, p. 115). It seems, rather, that these two forty-year periods pertain to two different people in two different eras. Kholok-Khng Yeo suggests that 3.10 and 17 serve to equate the period of testing with the period of God's wrath ('The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of "Rest" [$\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ and $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$] in Hebrews 3:7-4:13', *AJT* 5 [1991], p. 5). This solution does not seem to give $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ its due force, however, as Attridge also remarks (*Hebrews*, p. 115).

8. Although for different purposes, Paul's exegesis of Gen. 12.7 in Gal. 3.15-29 is analogous to the author of Hebrews' exegesis of Ps. 95.9-10. Since Gen. 12.7 refers to Abraham's 'seed' ($\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$) in the singular, Paul argues in Gal. 3.16 that its proper referent is Christ. In Gal. 3.29, however, Paul states plainly, almost matter-of-factly, 'you are [plural] Abraham's seed'. That Paul sees Gen. 12.7 as having a dual referent is quite consistent with his understanding of the close identification of Christ and his church elsewhere, e.g., his use of 'in Christ'.
9. *Hebrews*, p. 115.

10. Yeo's argument, that the prepositional phrase is '... used to keep the place name כְּבֹד־יְהוָה [sic] of the MT... is unconvincing, since $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ corresponds not to כְּבֹד־יְהוָה in v. 8 but כְּזִנְיֹתָי in v. 9 ('The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of

A final change that the author of Hebrews uses to actualize the psalm is the insertion of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta$ in v. 10. Reading 'this generation' where the LXX reads 'that' ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta\eta$) further concretizes the psalm—indeed, the whole exodus experience—for the readers. By quoting the psalm the way he does, he is showing his readers that *this* is the generation with which God is ultimately concerned.¹¹ The commentaries are largely divided over the significance this change has. Spicq, for example, says that this change makes the psalm, 'more urgent for the present community', a position with which I am in agreement.¹² The opposite opinion is represented by Attridge, for one, who sees this as 'a minor variation from the LXX... [which does not] seem to serve any particular purpose in Hebrews' application of the psalm'.¹³ But we have already seen with $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ that our author's exegesis of the psalm is careful and deliberate. Of course, this does not mean that every change is necessarily theologically significant. There are, for example, two 'minor', or perhaps better 'stylistic' variations, namely the more common verb forms $\acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\dot{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu$ in Hebrews rather than the Hellenistic forms in the LXX, as Attridge, too, remarks.¹⁴ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta$ does not seem to be a minor or stylistic variation, but of a completely different order. Perhaps the point should not be pressed too far, but the author's exegesis of Psalm 95 in general supports the understanding of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta$ as a purposeful and deliberate change from the LXX.¹⁵

"Rest", p. 4). Another solution is offered by K.J. Thomas who argues that the phrase in Hebrews refers to God's testing of man rather than man's testing of God as the LXX has it. This yields the translation, '... where your fathers, during their testing, tried and saw my works for forty years' ('Old Testament Citations in Hebrews', *NTS* 11 [1965], p. 307). The Greek syntax is too ambiguous for such a translation, and hence I do not find this solution as helpful as Attridge's.

11. An insight that cannot be given full consideration here is brought out by Karen H. Jobes ('Rhetorical Achievement in the Hebrews 10 "Misquote" of Psalm 40', *Bib* 72 [1991], pp. 387-96). She argues that the change from $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta\eta$ to $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta$ 'achieves phonetic assonance' with $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta$ in the previous line (p. 391). Jobes gives several strong examples of such 'phonetic manipulation', which '[communicated] the author's intended semantic sense... while simultaneously achieving assonance' (p. 392).

12. Spicq, *L'épître*, p. 74.

13. Attridge, *Hebrews*, pp. 115-16.

14. Attridge, *Hebrews*, p. 115.

15. Another argument, this by Yeo, is unconvincing ('The Meaning and Usage of the Theology of "Rest"', p. 5). Yeo argues that the author of Hebrews changes the LXX 'that generation' to 'this generation' because 'that generation' does not occur

For the author of Hebrews, the church is the new Israel. The church has seen the new Moses and God's mighty acts in the new wilderness. *This* (ταύτη) is the generation with which God is concerned. What Psalm 95 may have referred to at an earlier time was merely prelude to this new era, 'at the end of the age' and 'in the fullness of time'. The threefold repetition of σήμερον in 3.13, 15 further accents the present fulfillment of what was spoken of in Psalm 95. Both ταύτη and σήμερον make specific in Hebrews what is left ambiguous in Psalm 95. The promise of God's rest is for *today*, for *this* generation. In other words, both terms have a decided redemptive-historical dimension. 'Today' or 'this generation' is the present situation of the church, a situation in which those who are partakers of Christ's blessings wander in the wilderness, between slavery and the better, heavenly country awaiting them.¹⁶ The appeal is not merely to the individual in his moment of existential decision (although it is that, too), but to the individual living in the eschatological age when the new Moses is leading his people through the wilderness to their final rest. We see then that both Psalm 95 and Hebrews apply the example of the wilderness rebellion to

anywhere else in the New Testament (See also Kistemaker, *Psalms Citations*, pp. 35-36). He argues further that since the verb προσώχθησα in v. 10 is past tense, 'this generation' must refer to the Israelites, who lived in the past, and not the church. In other words, Yeo cites common New Testament usage to explain why the author of Hebrews changes the LXX 'that generation' to 'this generation', while at the same time arguing that Hebrews' 'this generation' refers to Israel because the verb is in the past tense. The problem with this is that of all the uses of 'this generation' in the New Testament, not once does it refer to a past generation, as Yeo says it does here. Furthermore, one need not assume that Hebrews has in mind either Israel or the church, as if a choice were to be made. To argue, as I do, that the near demonstrative is used to actualize the psalm, is not to argue that in v. 10 Israel is no longer in view. The referent is not either Israel or the church, but both. The author of Hebrews is, after all, citing Psalm 95 and thereby drawing on the past, but his application of the psalm shows that his primary theological concern is the church. The strength of the warning is precisely in bringing the two exodus communities together, to warn the new on the basis of the old without losing sight of either one. The tense of the verb is not the determining issue. Thomas is a bit ambiguous in seeing ταύτη as a reminder of Jesus' words (e.g. Mt. 23.36) that strengthens the Old Testament warning, yet 'is not intended to designate some other than the wilderness generation' ('Old Testament Citations', p. 307).

16. But this point is not to ignore the strong element of realized eschatology in the epistle, for example, 12.22, 'But you have come to Mt. Zion, to the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God'.

motivate their communities to obedience. The difference between the two is that the writer of Psalm 95 makes the warning 'timelessly concrete' by leaving the identity of the rebellious generation and the 'today' ambiguous. The author of Hebrews, on the other hand, accomplishes his admonitory purpose in precisely the opposite fashion—by making the psalm as time specific as possible.¹⁷

The author of Hebrews' understanding of Psalm 95 for the church is reflected first and foremost in how he quotes it. We have seen that διό, ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ, and ταύτη are variations from the LXX that reflect his theological motivation to make this psalm more relevant to his readers. This motivation is the same as his motivation throughout the book: to show that the full significance of the Old Testament is realized by the church and only proleptically by Israel.

A second issue discussed here is the author's understanding of creation as a paradigm for deliverance.¹⁸ His participation in this broad theme is suggested by three factors: the argument from Gen. 2.2 in Heb. 4.4, the double meaning of ἔργα, and of κατόσκειν αὐτόν.

By citing Gen. 2.2, our author is arguing that the rest that is the reward to the faithful new exodus community is to be understood not as physical land, but as an eschatological rest; specifically, the rest that God has enjoyed since the completion of his creative work. Gen. 2.2 reads 'God rested (κατέπαυσεν) from his works'. Our psalm ends, 'They shall never enter into my rest (τὴν κατόσκειν μου)'. For the author of Hebrews, creation is the consummation of the exodus. In the

17. It is still a question why Psalm 95 was written in the first place. If the role of the exodus theme in Hebrews is predominantly eschatological, what is the case for Psalm 95? Commentators have remarked on the liturgical use of the psalm in the synagogue, which suggests a more existential function. Still, the issue of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Psalm 95 is somewhat of a mystery. That it is cultic does not answer the question. One would still need to ask why Psalm 95 was written for the cult. A possible answer is that the psalm has an exilic context. In this sense, the experience of the exodus community had obvious relevance for the 'exodus community' of the exile. This might suggest, although perhaps not a full-blown eschatological perspective, at least an application of Israel's past deliverance from Egypt to the deliverance from Babylon. Hence, both the original audience of Psalm 95 and the audience of Hebrews would be second exodus communities to whom an exodus warning had been applied.

18. Psalm 95 itself is one Old Testament example of the juxtaposition of creation and deliverance. This is discussed more fully in Enns, 'Creation and Re-Creation', pp. 255-69.

Old Testament, for example, creation is typically thought of not as the consummation of the exodus but a paradigm for the exodus. In other words, creation is not the goal of the exodus as it is here in Hebrews, but a broader pattern of which exodus is one example. These two perspectives are quite different, and the distinctiveness of our author's application of this theme should not be lost.

Nevertheless, we still have to deal with the question of why the warning directed to the new exodus community is supported by an appeal to creation imagery. Clearly, an important factor in Hebrews bringing Gen. 2.2 and Ps. 95.11 together is the root *καταπαύω*, which appears in both.¹⁹ But this merely explains what allowed him to make the exegetical connection, not necessarily what motivated him to make this specific exegetical connection. Why call upon Gen. 2.2 to 'explain' Ps. 95.11 when it appears to introduce a whole new subject into the discussion—creation? After all, the writer could simply have said that the church's rest is not earthly but heavenly and be done with it, without even introducing the subject of God's creation-rest. Or if he really wanted to bring another passage into the discussion, he could easily have found one that contains *καταπαύω*, but pertains directly to the rest of the faithful, rather than the seventh day of creation. So why introduce this distant verse into the discussion? The motivating factor seems to be in Ps. 95.11. The psalmist says 'They shall never enter *my* rest', not 'they shall never enter *their* rest'. The exegetical problem our author is trying to explain is why Ps. 95.11 refers to the rest in the *land* as '*my* rest', that is, God's rest, when in fact it is *Israel's* rest? It is this exegetical problem in the text that, so to speak, backs him into a theological corner. 'My rest' virtually requires the author to see some sort of relationship between deliverance and creation. The church as the new exodus community, redeemed, or 'created' as it were, has as its goal the original rest of creation. It is the consummate rest—God's rest.²⁰ Nothing less than God's creation rest can be expected for those

19. It is certainly to the advantage of our author's argument that the LXX uses *καταπαύω* in both Gen. 2.2 and Psalm 95, thereby strengthening the connection between the passages, whereas the MT uses שָׁבַת and בְּנוּחַת, respectively.

20. A similar idea is found in 'Abot R. Nat. 12. Regarding Moses' death we read, 'Moses, thou hast had enough of this world, for lo, the world to come awaits thee: for thy place hath been ready for thee since the six days of Creation' (*The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan* [trans. J. Goldin; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955], p. 65).

who are 'partakers of the heavenly calling'. The faithful share God's creation rest because they are co-heirs with Christ (to use Paul's words, Rom. 8.17). The physical rest Joshua (4.8)²¹ gave his people as well as the rest of Ps. 95.11 (however this is to be understood) were merely proleptic of this final rest.²²

The use of *ἔργα* and *κατασκευάζω* make this relationship between deliverance and creation more explicit. *ἔργα* occurs four times in this passage. The first reference to 'my works' is, as we have seen above, in 3.9 (*τὰ ἔργα μου*), and pertains to the blessings of the church age. The other three references (4.3, 4, and 10) are spawned by the reference to Gen. 2.2 and pertain to the works of God during the six days of creation (*τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ*). The result is a wordplay, which is worthy of consideration in the context of the present argument. The *ἔργα* in 3.9 refer to the works of deliverance. The *ἔργα* of ch. 4 refer to the works of creation. Both creation and deliverance are God's 'works'. To take it one step further, in Gen. 2.2, God works (creation) and then rests. In Hebrews 3, God also works (deliverance/second creation), and then, not he, but the *faithful* rest—in *his* rest. This striking parallel suggests an integral relationship between creation and deliverance in the author's thinking.

κατασκευάζω is used in Heb. 3.3 and 4. Attridge comments that in certain contexts this word refers to God's creative activity. He cites Wis. 9.2 and 13.4 as examples,²³ as well as Isa. 40.28; 43.7; 45.7 and 9 (MT = כָּרָא).²⁴ This verb is used in Hebrews 3 in two ways. First, in v. 3, it refers to Jesus' building of the 'house' (*οἶκος*). It is also used in v. 4 to refer to God's act of creation. In v. 3, Jesus is the builder

21. The fact that both Joshua and Jesus are the same name in Greek (*Ἰησοῦς*) certainly strengthens the author's typological connection. See also Attridge, *Hebrews*, p. 130; J. Moffatt, *Epistle to the Hebrews* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924], p. 52.

22. The meaning of rest in antiquity is a diverse and complex matter (both Attridge [*Hebrews*, pp. 126-28] and Spicq [*L'Épître*, pp. 95-104] devote an excursus to the subject). Of particular interest are instances where rest is described as a new creation, for example, 4 *Ezra* 8.52; 2 *Bar.* 78-86; 1 *En.* 45.3-6; *T. Levi* 18.9; and 4QFlor 1.7-8 (Attridge, p. 126; Spicq, pp. 95-96). A discussion of this issue would take us far from our topic. In any event, it is clear that the author of Hebrews is making the connection between rest and creation.

23. Wisdom is also a clear example of the juxtaposition of creation and deliverance. See Wis. 16.24-18.4; 19.6-7; and 19.18-21.

24. Attridge, *Hebrews*, p. 110.

(ὁ κατασκευάσας) of a house. In v. 4, God creates all things (κατασκευάσας). The question is, what does it mean for Jesus to be the 'builder of a house'? Heb. 3.3 reads, 'Jesus has been found worthy of greater honor than Moses, just as the one who builds the house has greater honor than the house itself'. There seems to be an analogy being made: Jesus : Moses : builder : house. A strict reading of this analogy yields that Jesus 'built' Moses, which does not make much sense. Hence, we should be cautioned against making too much of this analogy. Nevertheless, for the analogy to have any force, we must make something of it. I suggest that Moses is here a metonymy for the people Moses brought out of Egypt—the exodus community. Several commentators mention this possibility.²⁵ Mary Rose D'Angelo argues on the basis of the Targums, rabbinic literature, and intertestamental literature that understanding 'house' as 'people of God' has ample precedent.²⁶ If this is so, both Jesus in v. 3 and God in v. 4 are engaged in creation activity: God creates everything; Jesus, the new Moses, 'creates' his people. Creation language is again used to express deliverance.

Conclusion

The author's exegesis of Psalm 95 is driven to a large extent by his concern to bring this portion of Scripture to bear more directly on his readers' eschatological situation. They are witnesses to the climax of God's covenant relationship with his people—first Israel, now the church. Apparently, the author seems to have no difficulty in taking certain liberties with the text in order to make his theological point. His exegetical technique is similar to what we find, for example, in the commentaries of the Qumran community (for example, 1QpHab). They also believed that they were God's faithful remnant living in the consummation of the ages, and therefore assumed that the ultimate meaning of Scripture must be defined in terms of their own privileged place in the unfolding drama of history. The belief of the author of Hebrews

that his own age constituted the final eschatological eon (albeit of undetermined length) is further seen in his presentation of God's creation—rest as the church's final destination. Whatever Psalm 95 might have meant at an earlier time, the author of Hebrews tells his readers that its ultimate and therefore proper meaning concerns the church's participation in God's blessing, both now amid certain trouble and temptation, and later in the world to come for those who remain faithful.

25. Attridge cites Moffatt (*Epistle*, p. 42) as well as H. Montefiore (*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [New York: Harper, London: Black, 1964], p. 72) and Teodorico (*L'epistola agli Ebrei* [La Sacra Bibbia; Turin: Marietti, 1952], p. 79) as examples, yet he seems to dismiss this possibility too quickly without offering an alternate solution.

26. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* (SBLDS, 42; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 95–149, esp. pp. 145–49.