clauses only, to which it is attached, than  
as belonging to the whole from ver. 23),  
as (*‘in proportion as,’* ‘the more:’ must  
be joined with *ye see,* not with *“approaching,”* ‘the nearer ye see’) **ye see**(this *ye see*, in the *second* person, is unexpected in the midst of a sentence in the  
*first* person. It appeals at once to the  
watchfulness and discernment of the readers  
as regards the signs of the times. That  
Day, indeed, in its great final sense, is  
always near, always ready to break forth  
upon the church: but these Hebrews lived  
actually close upon one of those great types  
and foretastes of it, the destruction of the  
Holy City—the bloody and fiery dawn, as  
Delitzsch finely calls it, of the Great Day)  
the day (this shortest of all designations  
of the day of the Lord’s coming, is found  
only in 1 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 4. “It  
is the Day of days, the ending-day of all  
days, the settling-day of all days, the Day  
of the promotion of Time into Eternity,  
the Day which for the Church breaks  
through and breaks off the night of this  
present world.” Delitzsch) **approaching.**

**26–31.]** *Caution*, arising from the  
mention of that day,—which will be not a  
day of grace, but a day of judgment,—*of  
the fearful peril of falling away from  
Christ*. The passage finds a close parallel  
in ch. vi. 4 ff., and much of what was there  
said will apply here.

**26.] For if we  
willingly sin** (contrast to the *“ignorant  
and erring,”* ch. v. 2. The sin meant is  
sufficiently defined by the connexion [**for**]  
with the preceding exhortations, and by  
the description of one who has so sinned in  
ver. 29. Neglect of assembling together,  
and loss of mutual exhortation and stimulus, would naturally result in [as it would  
be prompted by an inclination that way at  
first] the *“departing from God”* of ch. iii.  
12; the *“falling away”* of ch. vi 6.  
It is the sin of apostasy from Christ back  
to the state which preceded the reception  
of Christ, viz. Judaism. This is the ground-sin of all other sins. The verb is in the  
present, not the past. “If we be found  
wilfully sinning,” not “if we have wilfully  
sinned,” at that Day. It is not of an act.  
or of any number of acts of sin, that the  
Writer is speaking, which might be repented of and blotted out: but of a *state*of sin, in which a man is formed when that  
day shall come) **after the receiving** (having  
received) **the knowledge** (“the word used  
for knowledge is one which of necessity  
means a *thorough, heart-knowledge.* And  
the Writer, by the use of this word, gives  
us to understand that he means by it  
not only a shallow historical notion about  
the Truth, but a living, believing knowledge of it, which has laid hold of a man  
and fused him into union with itself.”  
Delitzsch. It is most important here to  
keep this cardinal point distinctly in mind:  
that these sinners willingly are not mere  
professors of religion, but real converts,  
or else ver. 29 becomes unintelligible)  
**of the truth** (the truth of God, as so  
often in St. Paul and St. John), **there  
is no longer left remaining** (see on  
ch. iv. 6) **a sacrifice for sins** (for there  
is but One true sacrifice for sins: if a  
man, having availed himself of that One,  
then deliberately casts it behind him,  
there is no second left for him. It will  
be observed that one thing is not, and  
need not be, specified in the text. That  
he has exhausted the virtue of the One  
Sacrifice, is not said: but in proportion  
to his willing rejection of it, has it ceased  
to operate for him. He has in fact, as  
Delitzsch observes, shut the door of repentance behind him, by the very fact of his  
being in an abiding state of willing sin.  
And this is still more forcibly brought out  
when, which Delitzsch does not notice,  
the scene of action is transferred to the  
great day of the Lord’s coming, and he is  
found in that impenitent state irreparably.  
This verse has been misunderstood, 1) b:  
the Fathers, who apply it to the Novatian controversy, and make it assert  
the impossibility of a second baptism:  
2) by Theodore of Mopsuestia and others,  
who interpret it only of those in a state of  
impenitence, understanding that on penitence they will again come under the  
cleansing influence of the blood of Christ),  
**but** (there is left remaining: this is common to both clauses) **a certain** (some one,  
out of all that might befall various men