

those who work hard at preaching and teaching." With the translation "that is," those who work hard at preaching and teaching are explicitly specified as the group which should be considered worthy of double honor. The suggestion of "that is" as the meaning for *malista* in a few, but not all passages where it occurs in the New Testament has been made and fairly well demonstrated by T. C. Skeat in the *Journal of the Theological Studies*, new series, 30 (1979):173-77. He shows that this meaning is found elsewhere in Greek literature and that it is a legitimate, indeed perhaps preferable meaning for several places in the New Testament (cf., for example, the great significance this would have in 1 Tim 4:10). The designation of some among the elders as "those who work hard at preaching and teaching" as a distinguishable group among the elders still remains the teaching of the passage on either understanding of *malista*.

3. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 2d ed (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979), 456.

4. See Robert L. Dabney, "Theories of the Eldership," *Discussions: Evangelical and Theological*, Volume 2 (London: The Banner of Truth [1967]), 133.

5. Why then was the term "evangelist" separated from that of pastors and teachers? Because evangelists, unlike teachers, as important as they are to the work of the church and the eldership, are not so intrinsically a part of the eldership in terms of the role of pastor that they should be mentioned as an aspect of pastoring. To be an elder in reference to the flock is by definition to be one of the pastors of the flock. And pastoring the flock involves of necessity some in the labor of the Word as teachers. But pastoring the flock does not intrinsically include evangelists. Evangelists are gaining lost sheep, not caring for saved and gathered ones. So the apostle has placed the evangelists in a separate category.

6. Further inquiry about the duties and responsibilities of those among the elders who labor in the Word and teach leads us not only to the passages about elders and bishops in general but also those passages that refer to Timothy and to Paul as teaching or preaching elders (cf. 1 Cor 9; 2 Cor 3-5; 1 Tim 4:6-16; 6:11-16; 2 Tim 1:3-14; 2; 3:10-4:8).

Richard B. Gaffin, Jr.

### 3 A Sabbath Rest Still Awaits the People of God

FROM ITS BEGINNING the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has had a concern for the sanctity of the Lord's Day as the Christian Sabbath, a concern which is not merely traditional but an element in its confessional commitment (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, XXI:7,8). I hope in this chapter to help maintain the vitality of that concern, in the face of signs that it is weakening and at a time when it is being challenged as never before.

In the perennial Sabbath-Sunday debate, *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*<sup>1</sup> unquestionably represents a significant milestone. In the words of its editor (D. A. Carson), "it is not merely a symposium but a unified, cooperative effort" (p. 11, see also p. 18), an effort calculated above all to convince the reader that the Lord's Day is not the Christian Sabbath. Even those, like myself, who remain unconvinced are bound to value the care, balance and, for the most part, the thoroughness with which this project has been planned and carried out. A cooperative response of similar magnitude would appear to be demanded of those who disagree with its major conclusion. My remarks here are limited to just one link, albeit a crucial and substantial one, in the argumentation for that conclusion.

Central in the design of the volume, particularly its exegetical parts, is the chapter by Andrew T. Lincoln, "Sabbath, Rest, and Eschatology in the New Testament" (pp. 197-220). The pivotal place of this chapter can be seen by the prominence of its principal conclusions in the final, integrating chapter ("From Sabbath to Lord's Day: a Biblical and Theological Perspective," pp. 343-412), also written by Lincoln. Within the former chapter the greatest amount of attention is given to Hebrews 3:7

-4:13, "the passage," as Lincoln says, "that contributes most to our investigation" (p. 205). In what follows I will comment briefly on the eschatological structure of Hebrews, discuss the interpretation of 3:7ff., assess Lincoln's treatment of this passage, and make several concluding observations.

### Eschatological Structure of Hebrews<sup>2</sup> *Already...*

1-2 ✓ The opening words of Hebrews give a pronounced eschatological, redemptive-historical orientation to the entire document: God's former speech through the prophets, "partial and piecemeal," not only contrasts with but culminates in his final speech in his Son "in these last days" (1:1-2). The present character of this "last days," eschatological revelation, embodied in the Son, is even more explicit in 9:26: in making sacrifice for sin Christ "has appeared once for all at the end of the ages"; in terms of the fundamental historical-eschatological distinction between the two ages, Christ's death and exaltation inaugurate the coming eschatological age. Accordingly, through God's word and the Holy Spirit the church already experiences ("tastes") nothing less than "the powers of the age to come" (6:5). Similarly, "salvation" is a present reality resulting from God's eschatological speech "through the Lord" (2:3; cf. 1:1-2:6:9). Again, believers have already come to "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem" (12:22) and are present in what is fairly described as the eschatological assembly gathered there (12:22-24). "Realized eschatology," then, undoubtedly has an integral place in the message of Hebrews.

Interchangeable w/ "inaugural Eschatology"?

... not yet  
At the same time, eschatological reality is seen to be still future. Christ, having "appeared" eschatologically, "once for all"<sup>3</sup> (9:26), "will appear a second time" (9:28). For believers that future, second appearance will be "for salvation" (9:28, cf. 1:14; 6:9). A "lasting city" is what they are still seeking; it is "the city to come" (13:14; cf. the "homeland" as well as the "city" in 11:10, 13-16). The "appearance" of the Son, salvation, the heavenly city (homeland), then, all eschatological in character, are both present and future in the view of the writer.

1. ✓ Two comments on this present-future pattern are in order here. First, the bond between believers and Christ, the high priest in heaven (e.g., 4:14; 6:20; 7:26; 8:1), explains how they presently enjoy eschatological blessings. They are "partakers of Christ," "those who share in (with) Christ" (*metochoi tou Christou*, 3:14). Even though this expression may not answer fully to Paul's teaching on union with Christ, it does accent a relationship of fellowship and solidarity (cf. the correlative expressions in 1:9; 2:11; 3:6).<sup>4</sup> In the mode of this union with Christ, the exalted high priest, they, while still on earth, have already entered the heavenly city-sanctuary, where he, their "author-leader" (*archēgos*, 2:10; cf. 12:2) and

"forerunner" (6:20), has gone before them; they are there, and already share in attendant eschatological benefits, because he is there.

Secondly, the still future, unrealized side of the writer's eschatology provides the scope for his considerable parenesis (exhortation). Hebrews is essentially parenetic; most likely, "this word of exhortation" (13:22) is intended to characterize the whole document. A careful survey reveals just how appropriate this label is. Not only are there numerous exhortations dealing with specific matters in chapter 13 and 12:12-14, but the well-known chapter 11 ("the roll call of faith") in its entirety is hortatory in effect. Beyond that, exhortations occur frequently throughout the entire book, not simply as the consequence or derivative of didactic portions, but as they themselves shape and determine the doctrinal discussion.<sup>5</sup> *Paranesis*

It is misleading to view Hebrews basically as an apologetic-polemical treatment of the person and work of Christ and the superiority of the new covenant to the old, to which various imperatives have been appended in a secondary fashion. On this view doctrine (e.g., the high priestly ministry of Christ) would be intelligible apart from considering the exhortation. Hebrews does provide profound and extensive teaching, especially in the areas of Christology and soteriology, but it does that only "in solution" with application, only as the parenetic element is pervasive and shapes the course of the argument as a whole.

In this respect, Hebrews is an exceptionally instructive example of the integration of doctrine and exhortation (life) that in various ways characterizes the entire New Testament. The author is sustained by "a firm belief in the efficacy of doctrine as a means of grace."<sup>6</sup> At the same time the hortatory materials serve to disclose an important dimension of the present circumstances of the readers (the church); the imperatives connote the indicative situation of the church. To be more specific, looking at the primary, more sweeping exhortation, the situation of the church is characterized by "holding fast" (3:6, 14; 4:14; 10:23) and "pressing on" (6:1); all in all a key ingredient is the need for endurance and perseverance (*hypomonē*; 10:36; 12:1; cf. 10:32 12:2, 7). Further, plainly at work on believers are forces which threaten to break their "hold," stresses which make endurance and diligence especially necessary and central. Much of the exhortation has a decidedly negative cast. It takes the form of warning: against, for example, "drifting away" (2:1), "neglecting salvation" (2:3), "falling away" (3:12), "being hardened" (3:13), "coming short" (4:1), "refusing him who is speaking" (12:25); in three passages warnings against apostasy occur with unusual gravity: 6:4-6; 10:26-31; 12:15-17. The situation of the readers, then, is one where testing and temptation are present in a quite fundamental way.

To sum up these remarks on eschatological structure, two factors constitute the situation of believers: triumph and testing. The present time is defined both by the eschatological triumph of Christ, their high priest in.

✓/ heaven, and the severe testing of the church. These two factors are always kept together; the one is never allowed to tone down or eclipse the other.

*Interpretation of Hebrews 3:7-4:13*

✓ At a first glance this section may seem parenthetical and therefore secondary in the writer's overall argument. It appears to interrupt his discussion of Christ as high priest, introduced on the one side in 2:17,18 (as the climax of much of the argument to that point), continued in 3:1-6, and picked up again on the other side at 4:14ff. It is not, however, a parenthesis or digression in any material sense, for it introduces considerations basic to the entire book. Primarily it serves to bring into sharper focus the situation of the church, for which Christ is high priest; it sets out a concrete model for viewing their experience.

(1) 3:1-6, making use of Num 12:7, elaborates the fundamental contrast already expressed at the outset in 1:1-2, now in terms of Moses (the Old Testament prophet, cf. Deut 18:15,18) and the Son ("Jesus, the apostle and high priest," v 1; "Christ," v 6). Anticipated implicitly, as in 1:1-2, is the contrast, made explicit in chapters 7-10, between the covenants, the old, "first" and the "new."

• Underlying this contrast, however, is a more basic continuity. Both Moses and the Son are involved in the construction of "God's house," the redemptive, covenantal edifice built by God; both are faithful to the building commission each has received (v 2). Where they differ is as the house and its builder (vv 3-4), as a servant in the house and the Son over the house (vv 5-6). The intent is to highlight, by contrast, the finality of the building activity of Christ and so of his sonship over the house (cf. 1:3-4). The work of Moses was anticipatory and pre-eschatological ("testifying to what would be spoken in the future," v 5; note the link with God's eschatological "speech" (*lalein*) in 1:2 and 2:3); Christ's work is final, eschatological.

(2) In v 6b ("whose house we are, if we hold fast our confidence and the boast of our hope"<sup>7</sup>) the discussion takes an unexpected turn. What up to this point has been a broad, sweeping treatment of the greater part of the whole history of redemption, involving general distinctions, is suddenly focused, in zoom-lenslike fashion, on the readers: [1] they have a place in the house, that is, they share in the great end-time salvation revealed in Christ (cf. "partakers of Christ," v 14; "partakers of the heavenly calling," v 1); [2] they have this share only if they hold fast until the end (cf. v 14).

It is fair to observe that v 6b brings to a focus the two basic, constitutive factors, noted above, in the situation of the readers, namely the *final and definitive*, yet *conditional* character of the church's present experience of salvation. The tension inherent in this experience comes out strikingly in the syntax of v 6b: the consequent contains a sweeping present indicative

("we are his house"; cf. the perfect indicative ["we have become partakers of Christ"] in the parallel construction in v 14), capturing the writer's sustained Christological-eschatological emphasis. But this indicative is conditioned on believers "holding fast"; in back of this conditional clause lies the entire hortatory element of the book. <sup>8</sup> A present place in the eschatological house is contingent on persevering into the future (cf. v 14).

As v 6b pinpoints this tension, the conditional clause in particular triggers what is said in 3:7-4:13, a unity which is more or less self-contained but is by no means isolated or subordinate. It performs the integral function of amplifying the situation of new covenant believers. It seeks to make clear and graphic the nature of the tension they are experiencing by means of a concrete model: the church as a wilderness community, a pilgrim people. This model provides, by way of historical analogy, a rationale especially for the exhortations that permeate the letter.

(3) The *mode* of argumentation in this passage is frequently experienced as baffling and has attracted a fair amount of scholarly discussion.<sup>9</sup> Without entering here into how closely it conforms to Jewish exegesis, especially the *pesher* method present in the Qumran materials, its midrash-like character is plain. Difficulties are created by the presumption that the writer is developing an argument that has its integrity and logical coherence apart from his use of Scripture, so that the Old Testament citations only have an auxiliary, corroborating ("proof-texting") role. Just the reverse is the case: in terms of basic structure, the Scriptures cited are the major, the writer's comments, the minor element. This passage is fairly seen as an annotated, interpretive handling of Scripture (apparently some form of the Septuagint), applied to the readers' situation. In particular it is an applied exposition of Ps 95:7-11, along with Gen 2:2, the only treatment of either passage in the New Testament.

(4) The writer makes Ps 95:7b-11 (LXX, Psalm 94) his point of departure for amplifying the conditional clause at the end of v 6. In that Psalm portion with its reference to Israel in the desert—specifically Israel between Egypt (3:16, "all those Moses led out of Egypt") and Canaan (4:8, "if Joshua had given them rest")—he finds those factors that bear directly on the situation of his readers and serves to define it: the voice of God speaking both promises and threats, the promise of imminently entering his rest held out to those who believe, the wrath of God eventually poured out on the wilderness generation and their failure to enter that rest because of unbelief. In short, pivotal are the factors of God's promise and warning, with their correlatives of faith and unbelief.

It is essential to grasp, then, that the entire passage rests on an assumption which is never spelled out; Israel in the wilderness and believers under the new covenant are in analogous situations. Christians receive the same promise of rest (3:11; 4:1); they are exposed to similar trials and the same

danger of unbelief and apostasy (3:12,19; 4:6); they are exhorted to the same perseverance in faith (3:8,14; 4:1,11). In New Testament as well as Old Testament times God's people are pilgrims and travelers; now, as then, they are a people "on the way." Believers have already experienced deliverance from the power of sin, pictured by the Exodus from bondage in Egypt; but they have not yet attained to that experience of salvation which is unthreatened and unchallenged, represented by the rest and peace of Canaan (see, e.g., Deut 12:9,10; Josh 1:13,15). The New Testament church is a wilderness community; it is a company of "aliens and strangers on earth" (11:13; cf. 1 Pet 1:1; 2:11). Without at all suggesting that the church as a congregation of wilderness-aliens is the basic theme of Hebrews, that notion is certainly central and all-controlling in this passage. It is as well the model that serves to clarify graphically the fundamental need for exhortation, not only here but in the rest of the document.<sup>10</sup>

(5) Two words or expressions in the Psalm citation are picked up by the writer and become focal in his own comments: "today" and "my [God's] rest." They appear several times, either alone or with the clauses where they occur. Note how they bracket the quotation; this is hardly mere coincidence but highlights their key function.

What, more exactly, is the reference of each? Despite numerous attempts to show the contrary and others who don't face the issue squarely,<sup>11</sup> their time reference is not identical or even overlapping.

(a) "Today" is plainly applied to the *present* situation of the readers. It refers to the time, any time,<sup>12</sup> in which "good news," "the word of hearing" is being proclaimed (4:2), in which "the promise of entering his rest remains" (4:1). It is the time of summons to faith and obedience, when, correlatively, unbelief and apostasy are present and very real threats (3:12,13,15; 4:6-7). It is the time, consequently, in which final judgment and the consummation associated with it are still future (cf. 9:28; 12:25-29). In short, "today" is the time of wilderness sojourn, when God's people "walk by faith, not by sight" (2 Cor 5:7; cf. the entirety of Hebrews 11).

(b) "My rest," as *rest*, stands in pointed contrast to the believer's present circumstances; it is the antithesis of exposure to hardship and temptation, to the *toil* which the present involves. Believers are presently at *work* (cf. 6:10; 10:24); they are not at rest, but are strenuously seeking it (*spoudazōmen*, 4:11).

"My rest," in distinction, is the particular focus of faith and hope; it is a matter of "promise" (4:1). It stands before the church as Canaan before Israel in the desert (4:8), as the land about to be inherited (cf. 1:14; note the identification of the land as rest, resting-place [and inheritance] in Deut 12:9,10; 25:19; Josh 1:13,15; 11:23; 22:4). Accordingly, it has an unmistakably *local* character; it is a place of rest.<sup>13</sup> Repeatedly it is what believers *enter into* (e.g., 4:1,11). It appears to be

identical to the "heavenly homeland" (11:16) and correlative with "the city with foundations" (11:10), "the lasting city to come" (13:14); note that "homeland" and "city" are natural counterparts, by opposition, to the wilderness.<sup>14</sup> It is correlative with "salvation" (1:14; 9:28) and "the eternal inheritance" (9:15; cf. 1:14), as still future.

All told, "my rest" is the eschatological order in the future, yet-to-be realized sense. Throughout the passage it is on the horizon; it refers to what is still future "as long as it is called today" (3:13). This exclusively future understanding of "my rest" is not merely based on explicit statements of the writer but flows out of the basic thrust of his argument, controlled by the notion of the church as wilderness-community. Objections to this conclusion will be taken up below in considering Lincoln's position.

(6) In 4:4 the writer adds to the scriptural base of his argument almost all the second main clause in Gen 2:2 (the only citation of, or apparently, allusion to this verse in the New Testament). This has the effect, along with v 9, of bringing the Sabbath into view, inasmuch as this is the only way Gen 2:2 is used elsewhere in the Old Testament (Exod 20:11; 31:17).<sup>15</sup> Here it is cited to support the last part of v 3 ("although his works were finished from the foundation of the world"). Together vv 3c and 4 serve to identify more precisely the origin and nature of "my rest" in 3b. This, in turn, is in the interests of establishing the unqualified nature of the antithesis: faith-unbelief, which is central to the entire passage.

The central thrust of vv 3-5 is that the wilderness generation failed to enter God's rest, not because of its nonavailability (it has been there "from the foundation of the world"), but solely on account of unbelief. Conversely, believers may be certain of entering it (v 3a). From Gen 2:2 in combination with Ps 95:11 the writer derives, respectively, the two premises expressed by the compound subordinate clause in v 6: [1] by God's design ("it remains"), some are to enter his rest, and [2] disobedience (lack of faith, cf. 3:18-19) bars entrance.

We must appreciate, then, what broad perspectives the writer opens up by introducing Gen 2:2. The rest of God, the consummation of redemption mentioned in Ps 95:11, of which the eventual possession of Canaan was only a shadow or type,<sup>16</sup> and which the new covenant people of God are presently seeking to enter — this rest is none other than the rest of God at creation. Eschatological redemption-rest is not merely an analogue of God's creation-rest; the latter is not simply the model for the former. Rather, the writer knows of only one rest, "my rest," entered by God at creation and by believers at the consummation.

Further, it appears that in Gen 2:2b (in its context) he finds not only a reference to the existence of God's rest, but the *design* and *mandate* that others should enter and share it; Gen 2:2 is prescriptive as well as descrip-

tive. If this were not the case, the first premise in v 6 ("it remains for some to enter it") would be without foundation.

The way in which Psalm 95 and Genesis 2 are brought together here indicates the scope of the promised rest in the writer's view. The fulfillment of the church's hope represents nothing less than the fulfillment of the original purpose of God in creation, or more accurately, the realization of his purposes of redemption is the means to the end of realizing his purposes of creation.<sup>17</sup>

A similar pattern of thought, apparently, is present in 1 Cor 15:42-49, where Paul anchors the believer's hope of bodily resurrection in the parallel between Adam and Christ. In the flow of his argument the contrast between the pre-eschatological body, subject to decay and death, and the eschatological, resurrection body (vv 42-44a) is expanded to include the persons of Adam and Christ, "the last Adam" (v 48); not only do they exemplify, respectively, these two bodies, but at the same time they are representatives of nothing less than two ages or creations, the original, "psychical"<sup>18</sup> creation, subject to death because of Adam's sin (cf. Rom 5:12ff.), and the new, "spiritual" creation. That this broadening is actually the trend of the argument appears from the generalizing expressions in v 46 (after which it would be a mistake to read "body"), as well as the shift to explicitly cosmological, spatial terminology in vv 47-49 (the contrast "heaven"—"earth" and correlative adjectives).

Particularly noteworthy for our interests is the fact that on the one side of the contrast in v 45, Gen 2:7 is cited to introduce Adam, not as fallen and hence mortal, but as he is by virtue of creation.<sup>19</sup> Further, as in Hebrews 4, the Genesis 2 narrative is also prescriptive: v 45c is syntactically dependent on "it is written" (45a), which introduces the Gen 2:7 quote; "the last Adam became life-giving Spirit" answers to God's design in the creation of Adam. For Paul, like the writer of Hebrews, eschatology and protology are related; the new, resurrection, "spiritual" creation order, brought about de facto, in view of Adam's fall, by the work of Christ, the last Adam, will be the realization of the purposes of the original, "psychical" creation. Note further that the eschatological order in view here is the order commensurate with and appropriate to the resurrection body (cf. esp. Rom 8:18-25), and so that order as it will *first* arrive at the return of Christ (v 49: "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly man";<sup>20</sup> cf. Phil 3:20-21).

(7) In 4:9, where we expect another occurrence of "my rest," the writer instead has "Sabbath-rest" (*sabbatismos*). This substitution is not only striking; it appears quite deliberate. Very likely he has coined the word on the basis of the Septuagint usage of *sabbatizō* (e.g., Exod 16:30; Lev 23:32; 2 Chr 36:21) and the Old Testament occurrences of *sabbaton* (e.g., Exod 16:23; 35:2; Lev 16:31), both of which describe Sabbath observance.<sup>21</sup>

The reference, then, is not so much to the Sabbath day itself as to its use or celebration, "Sabbath-resting," "Sabbath-keeping."

What motivated the writer to introduce this word is difficult to determine fully.<sup>22</sup> Certain effects, however, are unmistakable, or at least difficult to deny. [1] "My rest" (in its local character, see above) is a place of Sabbath-rest. In explicit fashion, reinforced by the use of Gen 2:2 in v 4, v 9 ties God's rest, in its sweeping, eschatological scope, to the institution of the Sabbath and its observance. [2] There is an inner connection between ongoing Sabbath observance and eschatological (Sabbath-) rest; this ostensibly is the tie between anticipatory sign and reality. Although the writer does not say so explicitly, the clear implication is that recurring Sabbath observance has its significance as a sign or type of eschatological rest.<sup>23</sup> [3] In view of the use of Gen 2:2 in v 4, it would appear to be the seventh day sign specifically, the typology of the *weekly* Sabbath, that the writer has in view, at least primarily.

(8) *Conclusion.* Our discussion of Hebrews 3:7ff has highlighted the following considerations: [1] In terms of composition or structure, this passage is biblical exposition, based on Ps 95 (LXX:94):7b-11, with the inclusion of Gen 2:2b. [2] The controlling motif, drawn from the Psalm and developed in the exposition, is the church as wilderness-congregation; the church is a gathering of the tempted and tested, and so of those who need to be exhorted (cf. Paul's use of the same motif in 1 Cor 10:1-13). [3] In relation to the present situation of the church ("today"), entrance into "God's rest" lies entirely in the future; in terms of the controlling model, this rest is the *non*-wilderness situation, the absence of exposure to trial and temptation. [4] This future rest is related to the institution of the Sabbath and is itself called "Sabbath-rest."

(For the sake of clarity it may be worth noting what so far I have not tried to argue. I have not suggested that the writer is concerned explicitly with the issue of Sabbath-keeping under the new covenant, or that 4:9, for instance, should be read: "it remains for God's people to keep the fourth commandment." The bearing of his statements on the notion of a Christian Sabbath have yet to be spelled out.)

#### Lincoln's Treatment of Hebrews 3:7ff

A large measure of agreement exists between Lincoln's treatment of this passage and my own, not only on individual points but also on a number of emphases. Where we differ is over "my rest" — on when believers enter it and, to a certain extent, on what it is. From this difference largely follows the decisively different conclusions each of us draws from this passage for the whole Sabbath-Sunday issue.

While Lincoln holds that "my rest" is future, he rejects the position, argued above, that it is entirely future. "This," he writes, "would not only be to ignore the evidence of this passage but to miss the structure of the

Doesn't the "Sabbath-rest" in 4:9 refer to the *final* Sabbath-rest? see 4:11 - "let us strive to enter that rest"

-?

-49

↑

2:11

writer's thought throughout" (p. 210). Accordingly, his arguments that the rest is already present are of two sorts, from the passage itself and from the rest of the book (pp. 210–213). To these we now turn, though not necessarily in the order he presents them.

(1) The substance of Lincoln's appeal to the wider context in Hebrews is that the writer holds to a realized eschatology. As believers are said to have already come to the heavenly Jerusalem of the future, as they already have access to the heavenly sanctuary, as "faith makes real in the present that which is future, unseen, or heavenly" (p. 211), as believers are partakers of Christ, their great high priest who has already passed through the heavens and entered the heavenly rest — so, too, they have already entered God's rest; "this rest has already become a reality for those who believe" (p. 210).

That "the eschatological benefits of salvation are already present" (p. 210) is beyond question. Certainly that is not the issue here; I myself have already drawn attention to the realized side of the writer's eschatology above (under "Eschatological Structure"). Nor should we question that the writer *could* have spoken of eschatological rest as already present for believers; a statement like that of Jesus in Matt 11:28–30 ("Come to me, all who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest.") is thoroughly in harmony with the eschatology of Hebrews. The sole issue here is whether in fact 3:7ff. teach, either expressly or by implication, that God's rest is already present for the church. How does the notion of rest function in these verses? The fact that realized eschatological elements are undeniable elsewhere in Hebrews has no decisive bearing on answering that question.

(2) Looking within the passage itself, Lincoln attempts to undercut the prominence of the wilderness or pilgrimage-motif. He faults the title of Ernst Käsemann's influential study on Hebrews, *The Wandering People of God*,<sup>24</sup> as misleading, and he appeals to the work of Hofius, who has argued in great detail that in his exegesis of Psalm 95 (94) the writer has in view, not the experience of the wilderness generation in general, but specifically the events of Numbers 14, at Kadesh, where the people are at the end of their travels (not *wandering* but *waiting*), about to enter the promised land, but rebel at the report of the returning spies.<sup>25</sup> From this Lincoln maintains that the writer's point of comparison with believers is that they "have arrived at the goal of their pilgrimage," and that the church is "confronted by this direct availability of the entry to heavenly rest" (p. 211).

I find this not only unconvincing but puzzling as an argument for the presence of the rest. Israel at Kadesh is not Israel in Canaan; the people "on the verge of entry into the promised land" (p. 211) are not the people in any sense entered into the land. Close proximity is not arrival. Granting that the writer is thinking, primarily at least, of Numbers 14 and in this

respect differs from the Psalmist himself, who likely has in view an earlier incident at Rephidim (Exod 17:1–7),<sup>26</sup> this difference is no more than one of emphasis. Both events exemplify basic elements in the writer's hortatory concern: (a) rebellion and rejection of God's promise, (b) under desert conditions, (c) short of the promised destination. The wilderness generation has its identity for the writer as "all those Moses led out of Egypt" (3:16). This is a clear indication that he has in view the structure and theological significance of their desert experience as a whole (from the outset), or at least that he sees continuity between Kadesh and their prior experience. (It is worth noting here that 3:16 is also a clear indication that deliverance from Egyptian bondage, *not* present rest, provides the element of realized eschatology in this passage; cf. 1 Cor 10:1–4).

The title of Käsemann's book is misleading only if "wandering" carries the connotation "wandering aimlessly," or is associated, as Käsemann does, with Gnostic speculation about the migratory return of alienated divine "sparks" to the heavenly world. Otherwise it is helpful, like the book itself despite substantial flaws in its overall argument, in drawing attention to one of the principal motifs in Hebrews. Darnell is right in observing that on this point we do not have to take sides in the debate between Käsemann and Hofius: in Hebrews 3–4 the people of God are both "on the way" and "waiting."<sup>27</sup> But they have not yet arrived.

(3) The present tense in 4:3, "we enter (*eiserchometha*) that rest," is often taken as an emphatic, undeniable indication that the rest has become a present reality for believers. Lincoln holds this to be a true present on the basis of the "general considerations" (p. 211) he has already mentioned. But we have just found that these considerations do not show that the rest is already present.

Of itself the present tense-form gives no more than a presumption of a present sense. In view of the various forces the present indicative can have, considerations from the immediate context are decisive. Here a true present is excluded because, as I have tried to show, it would violate the way the wilderness-model is being used. In terms of that model either of two translations fits: "we will enter," the use of the present tense giving a note of certainty,<sup>28</sup> or perhaps a progressive sense ("we are entering"), actually underway but not yet there.<sup>29</sup>

The closest parallel to 4:3 in the New Testament, as far as I can discover, is Acts 14:22. Though not an exact parallel syntactically, it is instructive on more than one count. There the substance, in part, of Paul's words to believers in Pisidia is that "through many tribulations we must enter (*dei hēmas eiselthein*) the Kingdom of God." [1] "Entering the Kingdom of God" corresponds materially to "entering God's rest." The Kingdom, more obviously than God's rest, is a comprehensive eschatological category. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts it is present (e.g., Luke 7:28; 11:20; 17:21). Yet, to my knowledge, none of the commentators find a present meaning here; Ac 14.22



an entirely future sense is obvious. [2] "Through many tribulations" answers to the desert situation of Hebrews 3-4. These tribulations are not the conditions under which the kingdom is now being realized, but through which believers must presently pass to reach the kingdom beyond. [3] The correlate of entering the kingdom is "continuing in the faith." Here perseverance (faith) does not possess the kingdom already come but reaches out toward the kingdom yet to come. [4] The whole of what Paul says is exhortation/encouragement (*parakalountes*; cf. the pervasively parenetic character of Hebrews, especially the writer's own assessment in 13:22).

(4) Lincoln holds that the use of "today" throughout the passage shows the rest to be present as well as future: "'Today' brackets the period of 'already' and 'not yet' as regards God's rest for those who live during the period when the ages overlap" (p. 212). But is this the case? Certainly "today" can't be detached from the writer's announced eschatological point of departure (1:1-2) or his stress throughout on the eschatological nature of Christ's work (e.g., 9:26). But that Hebrews has a realized eschatology is not the issue here. Within the passage (3:15,17), "today," picked up from Ps 95 (94):7, is plainly the wilderness-time, as the time when faith in God's promise of eventual entry into the land/rest ("if you hear his voice") is continually tempted to unbelief ("do not harden your hearts"). In the remaining occurrence, 4:7 ("God, through David, has set a certain day, 'today' "; cf. v 8b), the point is that "today" has its fulfillment or ultimate realization, not as the church's "time for entry into rest" (p. 212), but in the church as the new and final wilderness-congregation.

Lincoln at this point quotes approvingly C. K. Barrett to the effect that paradoxically the rest is both present and future, a paradox shared with all New Testament eschatology.<sup>30</sup> Undoubtedly, in keeping with his eschatology as a whole, the writer *could* have spoken of rest as present. But *does* he, in this passage or elsewhere, either expressly or by implication? That he has a realized eschatology does not mean that the rest in chapters 3-4 must somehow be present, no more than Jesus' statements that the kingdom is present mean that he cannot also, in other places, only speak of it as future.

(5) Lincoln holds that eschatological "Sabbath-rest" in 4:9 is not entirely future, not only for the reasons just considered, which he finds in the preceding verses, but also because of the way he understands v 10. This reading, in my judgment, brings to light a basic flaw in his understanding of rest throughout the passage; in fact, a proper understanding of 3:7ff as a whole pivots on rightly interpreting 4:10.

Verse 10 reads: "The one who enters his [God's] rest has himself rested from his [own] works, just as God did from his." At least two things are immediately apparent. [1] Through the introduction of Gen 2:2 in v 4 and the term 'Sabbath-rest' in v 9, God's rest at creation again comes into

view. [2] A parallel is drawn, with some deliberateness, between believers<sup>31</sup> and God: their resting is to their works, as God's resting is to his works.

What does it mean for believers to (enter) rest from their works? Lincoln understands these works to be what the writer elsewhere (6:1; 9:14) calls "dead works" (p. 213). Rest, then, means "cessation from reliance on one's own works" (p. 215; cf. p. 213), "cessation from evil works" (p. 397). In other words, the point of v 10 (and the present rest he finds elsewhere in the passage) is justification by faith (cf. p. 214). This exegetical decision, it should be noted, becomes a controlling assumption in the argumentation of the concluding chapter (pp. 365, 378, 396-97).

This interpretation has a venerable tradition, extending back at least to Calvin,<sup>32</sup> but it is hardly correct. For one thing it loses sight of the local character of "my rest" (as a resting-place) throughout the passage and fails to do justice to the writer's use of the wilderness-motif. Even more telling, it does not seem to perceive the jarring incongruity of drawing a direct (and therefore *positive*) parallel between man's sinful works and God's works.<sup>33</sup> Where elsewhere does the New Testament even remotely approach the notion that "repentance from dead works" is analogous to God's resting from his labors at creation? Does it really overstate to say that such a synthetic association is a glaring impossibility for any New Testament writer?

Correct interpretation of v 10 depends on seeing that the believer's works are being viewed positively. They are not "dead works," but their "love and good works" (10:24), their "work and love" (6:10). Both contexts further identify these works. "God is not unjust so as to forget" them (looking forward final judgment, cf. 9:28), "as you see the Day approaching" (10:25). These are works toward which believers are to "spur one another on" (10:24), for which they are to maintain the "diligence" (cf. 4:11) they have already shown, "to the very end" (6:11; cf. 3:14). They are works bound up with "holding fast," "without wavering," to the promised hope (6:11-12; 10:23), and with not being "lazy" but "patient/persevering" (6:12).

In a word, the works of 4:10 are *desert-works*, the works of believers in the present wilderness, that is, *non-rest* situation, looking toward the future, hoped-for, promised rest. They are the wilderness-works of the church on the way between exodus from Egypt/redemption (cf. 3:16; *here* in this passage, and in terms of its controlling model, is justification by faith) and Canaan/rest. The main verb in v 10a, then, the aorist "has rested" (*katepausen*), has a generalizing or gnomic force.<sup>34</sup> And the clause as a whole describes a future state of rest with the wilderness left behind, that rest toward which the writer immediately goes on to exhort his readers to *exert* themselves (v 11).

As far as I can see, it is necessary to hold Lincoln's view of v 10, or some variant thereof (the works are sinful, self-justifying works; the rest is

the forgiveness of sins, justification by faith), if present "spiritual" rest elsewhere in 3:7ff. is to be demonstrated convincingly. But this view cannot be maintained. Beyond the difficulties already noted, it breaks down the writer's basic distinction throughout the passage, the distinction which his choice of the wilderness/rest motif makes graphic, and on which the need for the parenthesis permeating the entire book is based: the distinction between the present necessity for perseverance (wilderness) and the future when there will be no need to persevere (rest). The opposite of rest, wilderness, is not sin but tested faith. The view which finds present rest in v 10 confuses the goal (rest) with what appropriates the goal (persevering faith), hoping with the object of hope (cf. Rom 8:24-25). It tries to *include* in the notion of rest precisely what (the present life of faith), in its wilderness character, the writer wishes, throughout this passage, to *contrast* with rest.

It is important to recognize that the wilderness in 3:7ff, while essentially a place of testing and temptation, is also a place of *redemption*; those in the desert are "all those Moses led out of Egypt" (3:16). The presupposition of temptation to apostasy (3:12), is salvation. Put another way, realized eschatology creates the wilderness-congregation (the church as *new* and *final* wilderness-community). Throughout the passage, not rest but the wilderness contrasted with rest is the index of present eschatological reality. This points up that the wilderness-works of v 10 are not dead, sinful works but that persevering faith and obedience, commanded elsewhere in the passage, which compare positively with God's works at creation.

The closest, though not exact, New Testament parallel to v 10a seems to be Rev 14:13. (In view are "the dead who die in the Lord," while rest in Hebrews 3-4 begins at the Parousia [cf. 9:28]. But the viewpoints are complementary; according to Hebrews the present assembly in the heavenly Jerusalem includes "the spirits of righteous men made perfect," 12:23.) Believers, the Spirit says in Revelation, "will rest from their labor, for their works will follow them." Or, as Hebrews says, "God is not unjust so as to forget" their works (6:10).

I conclude, then, that the rest of v 10 is not present but future and so, too, the eschatological Sabbath-resting in v 9, which v 10 functions to explain.

(6) *Conclusion*: Lincoln's interpretation of Heb 3:7ff. is faulty because he does not recognize that virtually every detail is determined by the model of the church as a pilgrim people or wilderness community. Because he misses the controlling significance of this motif, other factors from outside the passage, primarily of a realized eschatological sort, enter and dispose him to conclude that "my rest" is present as well as future. In fact, to try to read the concept of rest in Hebrews 3-4, determined *univocally* throughout as it is by its contrast to the wilderness, as *both* cessation from

unbelief (present rest) and cessation of (tempted and persevering) faith (future rest) is more than paradoxical; such a reading of the passage amounts to a semantic overload that distorts much of its argumentation and blurs its main point.

### Concluding Observations

(1) It would be perverse to suggest that the Sabbath-Sunday issue can be settled solely on the basis of Heb 3:7ff., and there is always the danger of reading into the passage what is not there. But it would be equally remiss to overlook or minimize relevant exegetical givens, whether explicit or implied.

Rest for the church in Hebrews 3-4, in gist, is:

- [a] eschatological,
- [b] entirely future,
- [c] called Sabbath-resting and
- [d] grounded in God's rest at creation.

1. In view of [a] and [c] the (weekly) Sabbath, whatever else may be its significance(s) and function(s), is an eschatological sign or type, a pointer to eschatological rest. To deny this is to suppose that the writer, as we have seen, not only apparently coined the term 'Sabbath-resting' for eschatological rest himself but also connected that rest with Gen 2:2-3 (which elsewhere in Scripture is only used for instituting the weekly Sabbath), yet that he did so without any thought of the weekly ordinance — a rather unlikely supposition.
2. In view of [b] the weekly Sabbath continues in force under the new covenant. To deny this is to suppose that for the writer the weekly sign has ceased, even though the reality to which it points is still future — again, an unlikely supposition. What rationale could explain such a severing, by cessation, of sign and unfulfilled reality?
3. In view of [d] the weekly Sabbath is a "creation ordinance." To deny this is to disagree with the writer's own interpretive treatment of Gen 2:2. He finds there not only a description of God's rest at creation but the (eschatological) design and mandate that mankind enter and share it (4:3b-4, 6a). Accordingly, the sign pointing to the reality mandated at creation is itself grounded in that mandate. As eschatology is the goal of protology, so the eschatological sign has a protological basis. There are no offsetting considerations to this inference in the context.<sup>35</sup>
4. *Sum*: For the writer the weekly Sabbath is an eschatological sign, grounded in creation and continuing under the new covenant until the consummation. He does not support the view that because of the "spiritual rest" already brought by Christ weekly Sabbath-keeping is no longer necessary or even appropriate. The notion of an evangelical



or Christian Sabbath is entirely in harmony with the teaching of Hebrews 3–4.

(2) One of Lincoln's reasons for denying that the weekly Sabbath is a continuing creation mandate is that the rest of Gen 2:2–3, whose eschatological orientation the writer of Hebrews makes clear, has been fulfilled and transformed, at least in part, by the (eschatological) salvation already revealed in Christ (e.g., pp. 215, 395–96). Here we come upon an important crux in the Sabbath-Sunday debate, one with far-reaching consequences.

In fact, the eschatological rest of Genesis 2 has not yet been realized. ✓ As *that rest is in view in Genesis 2* it is still entirely future. The finished work of Christ has secured it and guarantees it, but it will not arrive until his return. This the writer of Hebrews confirms by referring, without exception, to rest as future for the church.

In Genesis 2 eschatological rest is in view without respect to the fall and its consequences; it is a consummation order where sin and death are not relevant or conditioning factors. Genesis 2 teaches, and Hebrews 4 ✓ confirms, that "the eschatological is an older strand in revelation than the soteric."<sup>36</sup> But realized eschatology, the new creation already present in Christ (2 Cor 5:17), including the spiritual rest brought by him (Matt 11:28), is always eschatology in the context of, or in tension with, sin and its consequences; it is always a matter, to cite several biblical descriptions, of being "alive from the dead . . . in the mortal body" (Rom 6:12–13), of "having this treasure in clay jars" (2 Cor 4:7), of "walking by faith, not by sight" (2 Cor 5:7), of redemption into the wilderness (Heb 3:7ff.). In contrast, sin and death are irrelevant and no longer present for the eschatological order of Hebrews 3–4 (to which the weekly Sabbath sign points with continuing relevance). It is the order where sight will replace tested faith, it is the rest beyond the wilderness.

In the Introduction to *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, D. A. Carson observes that the Sabbath-Sunday question "touches many areas of theological study"; among these he mentions "the proper understanding of salvation history" and "biblical patterns of eschatology" (p. 17). This is in fact the case. The Sabbath-theology of Hebrews, rightly understood, is an important corrective against the tendency for the "already" — "not yet" pattern of New Testament eschatology to be expressed as a dialectic of paradoxical, virtually undifferentiated statements.

We have already noted the similarity between the pattern of argument in Heb 3:7ff. and 1 Cor 15:42–49. Here I would further observe that to argue that eschatological rest is in some sense present in the Hebrews passage is akin to arguing that Paul views the believer's *bodily* resurrection, ✓ and the eschatological "sight" inseparable from it (cf. Rom 8:18–25), as somehow already present. Lincoln is sensitive to this danger of a spiri-

tualizing overemphasis on realized eschatology and seeks to dispel the notion that the basic viewpoint of the book is "gnostic" (p. 403; cf. p. 215). Certainly his own position is not, but the tendency is there. In fact, the weekly Sabbath, grounded in the outlook on eschatological rest in Hebrews 3–4, is an important safeguard against the overreaching "enthusiasm" that constantly threatens Christian faith; it is a protection against tendencies to blur or even lose sight of the differences between the eschatological "already" and "not yet." The Sabbath is a sure sign to the church, the eschatological community, that it is still "on the way."<sup>37</sup>

(3) *From Sabbath to Lord's Day* finds significant support in Heb 3:7ff for its basic position that the Lord's Day is not the Christian Sabbath. Upon examination, however, that passage proves to be a significant loose end, one for which this position has yet to give an adequate accounting. As far as I can see, it cannot.

#### NOTES

1. ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982).
2. Helpful treatments of the eschatology of Hebrews are C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), 363–93; B. Klappert, *Die Eschatologie des Hebräerbriefs* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1969); G. Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 49–87.
3. The force of *hapax* is eschatological in the light of the following prepositional phrase *epi sunteleia tōn aionōn*.
4. ". . . not that of participation in Him (as in the Pauline expression 'in Christ'), but rather that of participation with Him . . ." (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 68).
5. Among fundamental, "first order" parentheses are the following: 2:1,3; 3:1,12–14; 4:1,14,16; 6:1,4–6; 10:26–27,35–36; 12:1,5–6,15,25.
6. Vos, *Teaching*, 69.
7. Even if the variant "until the end" (*mechri telous*) is not to be read, that is the virtual sense; cf. 3:14.
8. Note that this reverses the syntactical pattern in Paul, where the indicative is in the protasis, the hortatory element in the apodosis; e.g., *Gal 5:25; Col 3:1*.
9. Cf. e.g., D. Darnell, *Rebellion, Rest, and the Word of God* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1973), 15–25, 54; S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Wed. G. Van Soest, 1961), 71–75, 85–86.
10. E. Käsemann, *The Wandering People of God* (trans. R. A. Harrisville and I. L. Irving [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984], German original, 2d ed., 1957), especially, has argued that wilderness wandering is the principal motif of the letter. Lincoln's objection to this assessment will be considered below.
11. Cf. the commentaries.
12. The writer no doubt intends that "today" has its fulfillment or ultimate realization in the present gospel-day of the church, but it is also relevant to the generation of the Psalmist and so to anytime where God's promise is heard; cf. Darnell, *Rebellion*, 162–63.
13. Cf. esp. O. Hofius, *Katapausis. Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1970), 51–53.
14. Hofius's arguments that the rest is not the heavenly land or city, but specifically the Holy of Holies of the heavenly sanctuary (*Katapausis*, 53–54), are not convincing.

Does the "Lord's Day" position blur this distinction?

Is this section (3:7–4:12) meant to be parenthetical or didactic?

15. Cf. N. A. Andreasen, *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Traditional-Historical Investigation* (Missoula, Mont.: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 197–203.

16. Typology is no doubt subject to abuse, but to deny that in 4:8 the writer intends a typological (sign-reality) connection between Canaan and eschatological rest, as Hofius (*Katapausis*, 180, n. 351) and Darnell (*Rebellion*, 257f.) hold, is unduly cautious and in fact restricts the writer's outlook.

17. Cf. P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*, Vol. I (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, n.d.), 420. Note also the backhanded support of this conclusion by G. Von Rad, who says that the writer "has welded together" "proof-texts . . . which have absolutely nothing whatever in common" (*The Problem of the Hexateuch* [Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966], 101f.). It would have been fairer to the writer to have spoken of his making explicit in the light of Christ's work a connection that was latent in the Old Testament; close to Von Rad's assessment of the writer's hermeneutics is that of H. Strathmann, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (*Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 95f.

18. The usual translation "natural" for *psychikon* in vv 44, 46, as does the translation "soul" for *psychē* in v 45, masks the connection between the Greek adjective and noun; cf. "spiritual" (*pneumatikon*)-"Spirit" (*pneuma*) on the other side of the contrast.

19. This, apparently, happens already in v 44b, where Paul argues directly, not concessively, from the existence of the psychical body to the spiritual body; cf. G. Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979 [1930]), 169f., n. 19 and R. B. Gaffin, Jr., *The Centrality of the Resurrection* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978), 81–83.

20. Despite its weaker attestation, the future indicative is more likely on contextual grounds. In favor of the aorist subjunctive ("let us bear"), see A. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet* (Cambridge: University Press, 1981), 50f.

21. For detailed argumentation, see Darnell, *Rebellion*, 262–66; Hofius, *Katapausis*, 102–110.

22. Cf. Darnell, *Rebellion*, 266, 270f.

23. Cf. G. Vos, *Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 156–58.

24. See above, n. 10.

25. *Katapausis*, 117–39.

26. *Ibid.*, 117.

27. *Rebellion*, 93f., 163, 308.

28. See N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. III, *Syntax* (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1963), 63 (These presents differ from the future "mainly in the tone of assurance which is imported," quoting Moulton); A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 869–70 ("It affirms and not merely predicts. It gives a sense of certainty."); cf. E. D. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), 9f.

29. See R. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 168 ("Verbs of going [coming] however also have the meaning of 'to be in the process of going [coming]' for which reaching the destination still lies in the future.") By the way, this, not as Lincoln quotes him (p. 212), seems to be the view of H. Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 83. A few lines below the sentence Lincoln quotes in favor of a true present, Montefiore adds, "The text does not mean that Christians have actually entered, but that they are entering that rest," and that "there is no realized eschatology" in Hebrews (not even in 12:22!, see pp. 229f.)

30. See Barrett, "Eschatology," 372.

31. To refer "the one who enters" to Christ [e.g., J. Owen, *An Exposition of Hebrews*, Vol. 2 (Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1960 [1674]), 331–36], is not exegetically credible.

32. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 98f.

33. R. Jewett [*Letter to Pilgrims* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1981), 68] suggests that the point of comparison is "simply in the term rest and not that from which they rest." If that were true the writer would not likely have added *apo tōn idiōn* to describe God's rest.

34. Cf. Burton, *Moods*, 21; a proleptic use of the aorist also fits well here, see M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), 84.

35. In rejecting the Sabbath as a creation ordinance, Lincoln concludes: "The writer's quotation of Genesis 2:2 in Hebrews 4:3–4 is not in order to ground the Sabbath in creation but rather to ground the eschatological salvation rest, which God has for His people, in the divine rest at creation"; in Scripture "the notion of God's rest in Genesis 2 was treated eschatologically" but "was not held . . . to be a 'creation ordinance'" (p. 351). Why the disjunction? Why not both?, especially since the writer himself draws a connection between the Sabbath institution and the rest of Gen 2:2–3.

36. Vos, *Biblical Theology*, 157. Emminently valuable for a theology of rest and the Sabbath is his entire discussion of the fourth commandment (pp. 155–59).

37. It would be beyond the scope of the present study but the concern of an overall biblical theology of the Sabbath to show (1) that the protological origin of the Sabbath is without prejudice as to when a weekly Sabbath actually began to be observed (that is, the question of a patriarchal, pre-Mosaic Sabbath is not decisive for the issue of the weekly Sabbath as a continuing creation mandate); and (2) that the shift of the weekly Sabbath from the seventh to the first day reflects the present eschatological situation of the church (the change to the first day is an index of eschatology already realized, of the eschatological, new-creation rest inaugurated by Christ, especially by his resurrection; the continuation of a weekly rest-day is a sign of eschatology still future, a pointer to the eschatological rest to come at Christ's return).