**looking well lest any one falling short of  
the grace of God** (see on ch. iv. 1. The  
whole sentence is imitated from Deut. xxix.  
18: and the sense passes on to the verb **trouble**  
**you** below),—**lest any root of bitterness** (not  
the same as “*bitter root,*” but *bitterness* is  
the origin and the ingrained character of  
the root, not its mere attribute. So Chrysostom   
well, “He says not, ‘*bitter,*’ but, of  
**bitterness**. For a bitter root might bring  
forth sweet fruit, but a root and fount and  
foundation of bitterness can never bear  
sweet fruit: for all things are bitter, it  
has nothing sweet; all is bitter, all is unsweet,   
all is full of hate and abomination”)  
**springing up,—trouble you, and by its  
means the many** (the whole congregation:  
see Gal. v. 9 quoted below) **be polluted**  
(how? by intercourse, by compromise, by  
over-persuasion, by imitation. The kind  
of pollution he explains in the next verse  
to arise from fornication and profanity);  
**lest** (**there be**) **any fornicator** (to be taken  
literally, not as alluding to spiritual fornication,   
see Deut. xxxi. 16; Exod. xxxiv.  
15 f.: for as Delitzsch observes, this sense  
is foreign to the New Test., except in  
the Apocalypse: and it is very unlikely  
that the Writer should have used a meaning   
lying so far from the context, and not  
suggested either by the passage of Deut.  
to which he was before alluding, or by the  
history of Esau which he is now introducing.   
Nearly connected with the question   
of the scuse of **fornicator**, is that of  
the punctuation: whether by a comma after  
it we are to sever it from connexion with  
Esau, or not. Most Commentators join it  
with what follows: and explain it partly of  
the gluttony of Esau, partly of his having  
wedded strange women, partly by the character  
of a fornicator which is given him  
by later Jewish tradition. But others  
divide the word *fornicator* from what  
follows. It seems hardly possible to decide.  
The character of Esau, from Scripture as  
well as tradition, will very well hear the  
designation *fornicator*: and the balance of  
the sentence is better preserved by applying   
both to him, than by leaving the word  
*fornicator* insulated), **or profane person** (a  
mun of low views, who has no appreciation  
of any high or divine thing), **as Esau, who  
for one meal sold his own birthrigh**t (the  
reflexive **his own**, which must be read, may  
seem to be superfluous; but it serves to  
intensify the unworthiness of the act).

**17.**] **For** (gives a reason for the caution,  
from the terrible result in Esau’s case) **ye  
know** (it was a fact of which no Hebrew  
could be ignorant) **that when he afterward  
on his part** (*he* dishonoured his inheritance,  
but was in his turn rejected from the blessing)   
**wished to inherit the blessing, he was  
rejected** (some supply *by God*, some *by his  
father*. But there is no reason why both  
should not be joined. His father's blessing  
was God’s blessing; his father’s rejection  
was God’s rejection): **for he found not  
place of repentance** (*whose* repentance, *his  
own*, or *his father’s*? The former is held  
by all the Greek expositors: by Luther,  
Calvin, and many others. The latter, by  
Beza, and most of the moderns. But the  
former I believe to be the only admissible  
sense. It is no mean argument for it, that  
the Fathers thought not of the other,  
though it would have been so useful to  
them in the Novatian controversy. Theodore of   
Mopsuestia, though he wrests the  
passage from those who wished *to preclude*  
*repentance*, never hints at any other meaning.