And thus referred to Esau himself, it  
will mean, that he found no way open  
to reverse what hud been done, by repentance:   
the sin had been committed  
and the consequence entailed, irrevocably.  
He might change, but the penalty could  
not, from the very nature of the circumstances,   
be taken off. So that *repentance*,  
in its full sense, had no *place*. And such  
is the meaning of *a place for repentance*,  
wherever occurring. We do not mean by  
it an opportunity to repent in a man’s  
own bosom, to be sorry for what he has  
done, for this may be under any circumstances,   
and this might have been with  
Esau: but we mean, *a chance, by repenting,   
to repair*. So when a condemned  
criminal has a *place for repentance* allowed  
him, we do not mean that he may die  
penitent, but that he is reprieved. I see  
not how else to understand this, and what  
follows: and thus understood nothing can  
be plainer), **although he earnestly sought  
it** (*what? not the blessing*, as many think,  
for this would be, as Ebrard characterizes  
it, most unnatural, the antecedent being  
thus separated from the pronoun “*it*” by  
a whole intervening clause, which will not  
hear parenthesizing..... Regarding **repentance**   
then as the only admissible antecedent   
for **it**, the explanation will be very  
simple. *Place for repentance is*, in fact,  
*repentance*. He found no place for *repentance*:   
if he bad found one, *repentance*  
would have been secured: this was what  
he sought) **with tears** (Gen. xxvii. 38. It  
is obvious, that our passage, rightly understood,   
cannot by any means favour the  
exclusion of any sinner from repentance.  
Tn Esiu’s case the *place for repentance*was closed, by circumstances themselves:  
the blessing had been given and could not  
be recalled. And this is our warning. It  
may be so, in many cases, with us. That it  
is always so, is not even hinted: but warning   
is given us that a path is not safe where  
even such a possibility may be encountered.  
See Prov. i. 24—32).

**18—29.**] Connected with what has preceded   
by **for**. *Take heed that there be  
not such* [as in vv. 15,16] *among you:*for *(not only have we the solemn warning  
of Esau, but) we are not under the law  
with its terrors, but under the Gospel  
with its promises,—hearing one who speaks  
for the last time, who speaks from heaven  
—and receiving a kingdom’ which shall  
not be moved.*

**18, 19.**] {18} **For** (see  
above) **ye have not drawn near to** (‘in  
your approaching unto God [in the original  
text], it has not been to... .’ The A.V.  
‘ye are not come to,’ omits the approach to  
God, implied in the words **draw near**) **that  
which was being touched** (so literally :  
“*mountain*” must be understood, which is  
expressed below with Zion, and hence has  
come in as a gloss here. **That might be  
touched** has been variously interpreted.  
Some understand it, *touched* by the fire of  
God, compare Ps. ciii. 32, “*He toucheth  
the hills, and they smoke.*” But this seems  
hardly consistent with the present participle,   
nor indeed at all with the sense of the  
word itself, which is to touch by feeling  
about, as a blind man does. And this  
sense will I believe fit our passage very  
well. Mount Sinai was a material mountain,   
which not only *might* be *touched*,—  
but *was being touched*, would have been  
touched by the people had it not been for-  
bidden), **and which was burnt** (kindled)  
**with fire** (the same expression occurs in  
Deut. iv. 11, v. 23, where nearly the same  
words, “ darkness, clouds, and thick darkness,”   
follow), **and to blackness, and darkness,   
and tempest** (see Deut. iv. 11, cited  
above), {19} **and to sound of trumpet** (see  
Exod. xix. 16. The Writer avoids the  
word “*voice*” there used, having so soon  
to speak of “*the voice of words*”), **and the  
voice of words; which they who heard  
intreated that** (more) **discourse should not**