to be, that **transgression** denotes the  
ontward act of transgression of the Law,  
the practical withstanding of its precepts,  
while **disobedience** occurs when we fulfil  
not, and have no mind to fulfil, the precepts of the Law: the former expresses, viewed *from without,* more something positive, the latter something negative, while at the same time it regards more the disposition of the man. Still, the distinction, as regards the moral region here treated of,  
is not of such a kind that each *transgression* may not also he treated as a *disobedience,* and each *disobedience* include  
or induce a *transgression*. Bleek) **received just recompence of reward** (this  
term is used only in this Epistle, and every  
where else in a good sense. To what  
does the Writer refer? To the single instances of punishment which overtook the offenders against the law, or, as Grotius  
suggests, to the general punishment of the  
whole people’s unbelief, as in ch. iii. 8; iv.  
11; xii. 21, and see 1 Cor. x. 6 ff.? I should be disposed to think, to the former: such penalties as are denounced in Deut. xxxii. 35, and indeed attached to very many of the Mosaic enactments: as Owen:  
“The law was so established, that the  
transgression of it, so as to disannul the  
terms and conditions of it, had by divine  
constitution the punishment of death temporal, or excision, appointed unto it”);

**3.] how shall we** (emphatic: including  
Christians in general, all who have received  
the message of salvation in the manner specified below) **escape, if we have neglected so great** (“*that* was a giving of laws only,  
but the other brought the grace of the  
Spirit, and the taking away of sins, and  
the announcement of the kingdom of  
heaven, and the promise of immortality:  
so that he had some reason to say **so great**.”  
Theodore of Mopsuestia) **salvation** (as in  
ch. i. 14); **the which** (equivalent to *‘seeing  
that it’*), **having begun to be spoken by  
means of** (he was the instrument in this ease, as the angels in the other; but both, law and gospel, came at first hand not from  
the mediators, but from God) **the Lord  
(by the Lord** is to be joined with the whole,  
**having began to be spoken,** not with  
**spoken** only. **The Lord,** as Bleck remarks, has here an especial emphasis setting forth the majesty and sovereignty of Christ:   
“He Himself, the Master of angels, first  
brought to us the doctrine of salvation,”  
Theodoret), **was confirmed** (see Mark xvi.  
19, where the word is used exactly in  
the same sense and reference. It seems  
to be used to correspond to *became binding*  
(or firm, the cognate adjective to this verb  
*confirmed*) above, signifying a ratification  
of the Gospel somewhat correspondent to  
that there predicated of the law: as also  
**spoken** here answers to *spoken* there)  
**unto us by those who heard** (*it?* or *Him?*  
In the sense, the difference will be but  
little: in either ease, those pointed at will  
be, as Theodoret, “those who were parakers of the apostolic grace:” the “eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word” of  
Luke i. 2. From the usage, however, of  
the Writer himself, I prefer understanding  
“it:” compare ch. iii. 16; iv. 2; xii. 19)  
**it** (on the evidence furnished by this verse  
as to the Writer of the Epistle, see Introduction, § i. parr. 130 ff.); **God also bearing witness to it** (Chrysostom remarks: “How then was it confirmed?  
What if those who heard it, themselves  
feigned it? To remove the shame of this,  
and to shew that the grace came not from  
men, he adds that God also bore witness.  
For had they been the inventors, God  
would not have borne witness to them:  
but now they are witnesses, and God is  
witness besides. We have not simply  
believed them, but have been helped by  
signs and wonders: so that we have not  
believed them, but God Himself”), **with  
signs and wonders** (Bleck remarks: “As  
regards the relation of the two expressions  
to each other in their combination here, as