must in English be expressed by **and**. It  
is *‘but’* in the A.V.: but that is because  
take ver. 16 in the manner above  
rejected, as an *assertion*) **with** WHOM **was  
He offended forty years** (see on vv. 9, 10,  
and the consonance, in the connexion of  
**forty years** with the verb, with that in  
the Psalm, which was there departed  
from)? **was it not with those who  
sinned, whose carcases** (literally, members  
of the body, but especially the legs: taken  
also for the legs and arms, i.e. limbs: probably with the meaning that their bodies should fall and perish limb from limb in  
the wilderness: so Beza: “By this word  
is signified not so much that they died by  
the ordinary means, or by any plague, as  
that they fell in the desert by their bodies  
gradually wasting away”) **fell in the wilderness** (see 1 Cor. x. 5. The words here are exactly those of Numb. xiv. 29. Again,  
we must remember, in explaining these  
words, that the Writer is not bearing in  
mind at this moment the exceptions, but  
speaking generally)? **And to whom sware  
He that they should not enter into His  
rest, except to those who disobeyed** (not,  
as A.V., *“believed not:”* this was a fact,  
and was indeed the root of their *disobedience*)?

**19.]** **And** [**thus**] **we see that  
they were not able to enter in** (however  
much they desired it: they were incapacitated by not fulfilling the condition of inheriting all God’s promises, belief and resulting obedience) **on account of unbelief** (see above on ver. 12. This verse forms a  
kind of ‘quod erat demonstrandum’ [as  
Ebrard], clenching the argument which  
has been proceeding since ver. 12. The  
Writer now proceeds to make another use  
of the example on which he has been so  
long dwelling).

**CHAP. IV. 1—13.]** *In the Son; Israel  
enters into the true rest of God.* On the  
mingling of the hortatory form with the  
progress of the argument, see the summary at ch. iii.

**1.] Let us fear** **therefore** (this form of expressing the caution seems purposely chosen to express the  
fear and trembling, Phil. ii. 12, with which  
every servant of God, however free from  
slavish terror anxiety, ought to work  
out his salvation), **lest, a promise being  
still left us** (notice the *present*—not  
*“having been left us.”* On the force of  
this present, very much of the argument  
rests) **of entering into His rest** (it is to  
be observed, that in the argument in this  
chapter, the Writer departs from the primary sense of the words *“my rest”* in the Psalm, and lays stress on *His*, making it  
*God's* rest, the rest into which God has  
entered; see below on ver. 10. And this  
is very important as to the nature of the  
rest in question, as importing, not the  
land of Canaan, but the heavenly home  
which that earthly rest mystically foreshadowed. Of course all references of the rest spoken of to the period after the  
destruction of Jerusalem, as Hammond,  
or to the cessation of Levitical ordinances,  
as Michaelis, are inadequate and out of the  
question), **any one of you** (although the  
communicative form has been used before in  
*“let us fear,”* the second person is here returned to; and of purpose. A similar change is found in ch. x. 24, 25: and in Rom. xiv.  
13) **appear** (see below) **to have fallen short of it** (i.e. be found, when the great trial of all shall take place, to have failed of,=  
to have no part in,—the promise. So that **appear** is, as so many both of ancients and moderns have taken it, a mild term, conveying indeed a sterner intimation behind