of Isaiah”), **after** (the lapse of) **so long a time** (viz. the time between Joshua and David); **as it hath been said before** (viz. ch. iii. 7,15: there can hardly be a question that the reference of the words is  
backward, to what has been already cited,  
not forwards to the words which follow),  
**To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not  
your hearts.**

**8.]** Confirmation of the above,as against an exception that might  
be taken, that notwithstanding the exclusion of many by unbelief, those who  
entered the promised land with Joshua  
*did enter* into that rest of God. **For if  
Joshua** (it does not appear that any  
parallel between the typical and the great  
final Deliverer is intended: but it could  
hardly fail to be suggested to the readers.  
Our translators, in retaining “Jesus”  
(the Greek form of *Joshua*) here, have introduced into the mind of the ordinary English reader utter confusion. It was  
done in violation of their instructions,  
which prescribed that all proper names  
should be rendered as they were commonly used) **had given them rest** (led  
them into this rest of which we are treating), **He** (God: the subject of *“limiteth”* and *“saying”* above) **would not speak**  
(not *‘have spoken,’* as A.V.) **after this of  
another day.**

**9.]** *Consequence from the proposition* in ver. 6. *Some* must  
enter therein: some, that is, analogous to,  
inheriting the condition of and promises.  
made to, those first, who did not enter  
in because of disobedience. These are now  
specified as *“the people of God,”* doubtless  
with a reference to the true spiritual character of Israclites indeed, represented under their external name: and their rest  
is no longer a *“rest”* merely. but (see below) is called by a higher and nobler name. **Therefore** (see above) **there is yet  
reserved** (see on ver. 6: remains as yet unexhausted, occupied, unrealized) **a  
keeping of sabbath** (the term is used  
here to correspond to *“my rest,”* specified and explained in ver. 4. God's  
rest was a *keeping of sabbath:* so also  
will ours be. The idea of the rest hereafter being the antitype of the Sabbath-rest, was familiar to the Jews. They spoke  
of the *“age to come”* as the “day which  
is all sabbath.” It is hardly probable that  
the sacred Writer had in his mind the  
object which Calvin mention: “I doubt  
not that the Apostle purposely alludes to  
the Sabbath, to dissuade the Jews from  
its outward observance: for thus only can  
its abrogation be understood, by the understanding its spiritual end.” Still more alien from the sense and context is it  
to use this verse, as some have absurdly  
done, as carrying weight one way or the  
other in the controversy respecting the  
obligation of a sabbath under the Christian  
dispensation. The only indication it furnishes is negative: viz. that no such term as *“keeping of sabbath”* could then  
have been, in the minds of Christians,  
associated with the keeping of the Lord’s  
day: otherwise, being already present, it  
could not be said that **it is yet reserved**)  
**for the people of God** (the well-known  
designation of Israel the covenant people.  
It occurs again, ch. xi. 25. Here it is  
used of that veritable Israel, who inherit  
God's promises by faith Christ: compare Gal. vi. 16).

**10.]** is taken in two ways: 1. as a general axiom, justifying the use of the words *“keeping of sabbath”* above: **For he that entered  
into his** (God’s) **rest, himself also rested  
from his** (own) **works, like as God rested  
from his own.** This has been the usual  
explanation, Theophylact says, “He is  
explaining, in what sense he called such a  
rest a *sabbatism:* because, he says we