the character of God.’

**am come** conveys the result of **proceeded forth**, as Meyer;  
who also remarks that mere *sending* will  
not exhaust the term **proceeded forth**,  
which must be taken in its deeper theological meaning, of the proceeding forth of  
the Eternal Son from the essence of the  
Father.

**43.**] to **understand** a man’s  
**speech**,—as here used, is literally to *understand* *the idiom or dialect* in which a man  
speaks, his **manner of speech;**—see Matt.  
xxvi. 73, where the same word is used in  
the original. But this of course does  
not here refer to the mere outward expression of the Lord’s discourses, but to  
the *spiritual idiom* in which He spoke,  
and which can only be spiritually understood. Then **my word** is the *matter* of  
those discourses, the Word itself.  
The connexion of the two clauses is, **Why  
do ye not understand my speech? Because ye** *cannot* **receive**, hear with the  
inner ear (see ch. vi. 60), **that which I say**.  
And the verification and ground of this  
*cannot*, is in the next verse.

**44.**]  
This verse is one of the most decisive testimonies for the *objective personality* of  
the devil. It is quite impossible to suppose an accommodation to Jewish views,  
or a metaphorical form of speech, in so  
solemn and direct an assertion as this.

**ye like to do**] The rendering of the  
A. V. here, as in several other places where  
the same expression is used in the original  
(compare for instance ch. v. 40; Matt. xi.  
27; Luke xi. 31), is wholly inadequate and  
misleading. The words “*Ye will do*”  
convey to the mind of the reader a mere  
*future*, whereas the original means, **your  
will is to do, you love,** or, **are inclined, to  
do.** The expression indicates, as in ch. v.  
40, the *freedom of the human will, as the  
foundation of the condemnation of the sinner.*

**a murderer**] The most obvious  
reference seems to be, to the murder of  
Abel by Cain:—see the Apostle’s own comment on these words, 1 John iii. 12, 15.  
But this itself was only a result of the  
introduction of death by sin, which was  
the work of the devil: Adam and Eve  
were the *first* whom he murdered. But  
then again both these were only *manifestations* of the fact here stated by divine  
omniscience respecting him: that he was  
*a murderer.*

**from the beginning,**  
the author and bringer in of that hate  
which is *equivalent to murder,* 1 John iii.  
15.

The mention of **murder** is introduced because the Jews went about to kill  
Jesus; and the typical parallel of Cain  
and Abel is certainly hinted at in the  
words.

The A. V. “*abode*,” is ungrammatical, the original word being *present* in sense. Still, it is not a *mere*  
present, but a present dependent on and  
commencing with an implied past fact.  
And that fact here is, the *fall* of the devil,  
which was not an insulated act, but in  
which state of apostasy from the truth he  
standeth,—it is his condition.

**the  
truth** is *objective:* *the* **truth** of God:—in  
this **he standeth not,** *because* **there is no  
truth** (‘*truthfulness,*’ *subjective*) **in him.**  
His *lie* has become his very nature, and  
therefore he is thoroughly alien from the  
truth of God. He shewed this when he  
spoke a lie to our first mother.

**of  
his own,** not, ‘*according to his character,*’—but ‘out of his own resources,’ ‘treasures:’ see Matt. xii. 35.

**the  
father thereof**] i.e. either **of that which  
is false,**—the **lie**, implied in the word **liar**,  
which has just preceded,—or, of the *liar  
generally*. The former is *not the fact,*—  
for the devil is not the father o**f that  
which is false,** but **of liars,** by being  
himself one whose very nature has become  
*a lie.* Certainly by this he has become  
the author, promoter, of falsehood among  
men; but this kind of paternity is not  
here in question: the object being to shew  
that he was the father of these lying