also rest from our works, as also God, when  
He rested from His works in creating the  
world, named the day the Sabbath.” This  
explanation labours under two difficulties  
(a) the past tense, **‘entered** into his  
which thus is made into a perfect or a   
present: (b) the double reference **of** **his**,  
first to God, and then to the man in  
question, especially when God’s works are  
taken up by the strong term **his own**,  
2. The other interpretation has been that  
of Owen, and others, and recently Ebrard,  
who refer **he that entered** to Christ: **For  
He that entered into his** (own or God’s)  
**rest, Himself also rested from His works  
like as God rested from His own:** and  
therefore, from our Forerunner having  
entered into this sabbatism, it is reserved  
for us, the people of God, to enter into  
it with and because of Him. Thus, as  
Ehrard says, Jesus is placed in the liveliest  
contrast to Joshua, who had not brought  
God’s people to their rest; and is designated as “That one, who entered into  
God's rest.” And to this view I own I  
am strongly inclined, notwithstanding the  
protest raised against it by Bleck, Lünemann, and Delitzsch. My reasons are, in addition to those implied above, a) the  
*form* of the assertion, as regards Joshua  
here and Jesus in ver. 14. That a  
contrast is intended between the Jesus  
who did not give them rest, and the  
“Great High Priest who is gone through  
the heavens, **Jesus the Son of God,**” seems   
very plain. And if so, it would he easily  
accounted for, that Christ should be here  
introduced merely under the designation  
of **He that entered into his rest.** b) the  
introduction of the words **he himself also**,  
lifting out and dignifying the subject of  
this clause as compared with **God**, in a  
way which would hardly be done, had the  
assertion been merely of any man generally. c) Seripture analogy. This rest,  
into which the Lord Jesus entered, is  
spoken of Isa. xi, 10, *“And His rest  
shall be glorious:”* and this work of His,  
in Isa. xl. 10, *“His work is before Him:”*  
and by Christ Himself, John ix. 4, *“I  
must work the works of Him that’ sent  
me while it is day.”* d) The expression  
**that rest** below, which stands harshly insulated, unless it refers to the **rest** in this verse. e) The whole context: see summary at ch. iii. 1. Render then: **For He that entered into His** (either, “God’s;” or more probably merely “his,” reflective, as in Isa, xi. 10 above) **rest, He Himself  
also** (on this, see above) **rested from his  
works** (see above) **as God from his own**  
(His own, not with any distinction of  
kind, but used only to mark distinction  
of possession).

**11—13.]** *Exhortation*, so frequently interspersed in the  
midst of the argument: see on ch. iii. 1.  
**Let us therefore** (consequence from vv. 3–7; seeing that the promise is held out to us, as it was to them, and that they  
failed of it through disobedience) **earnestly  
strive to enter into that rest** (viz that  
mentioned in ver. 10, into which Christ  
has entered before: compare ver. 14,  
ch. vi. 20), **lest any one fall into** (not, as  
A.V. and others, *“fall after”*) **the same  
example of disobedience** (not, *unbelief:*  
see on ch. iii. 18. It was *they that  
disobeyed* who failed to enter in).

**12,13.]** Apart from the difficulties of some  
terms used, we may give the connexion  
thus: Such an endeavour is well worth all  
our *earnestness—for* we have One to do  
with, who can discern and will punish  
every even the most secret disobedience.  
**For the word of God** (in what sense?  
1) The Personal Word has been understood by many, e.g., the Fathers in general, and not a few moderns. To this the  
first obvious objection is, that this mode of  
expression is confined to St. John among  
the New Test. writers. This however,  
though clearly not to be met by alleging  
such passages as Luke i. 2; Act xx. 32,  
is not decisive. For our Epistle, though  
perhaps anterior to all the writings of St.  
John, is yet so intimately allied to the  
Alexandrine terminology, that it would be   
no matter of surprise to find its Writer  
using a term so nearly ripe for his purpose  
as we find *“the Word”* in Philo [see below].  
The real objections to the Personal *Word*  
being simply and directly here meant, lie in  
the Epistle, and indeed in the passage itself  
*In the Epistle:* for we have nowhere in  
it this term used with any definiteness of  
our Lord, nor indeed any approach to it;