God” (which rendering in the A. V. is  
entirely without authority), which brings  
out rather our *adoption*, and hope of inheritance (Rom. viii. 14 ff.), whereas the  
other involves the *whole generation and  
process* of our life in the Spirit, as being  
from and of God, and consequently our  
*likeness* to God, walking in light as He  
is in light (1 John i. 5—7)—free from  
sin (ib. iii. 9; v.18) and death (ch. viii.  
51).

**to them that believe on his  
name] His name** is *His manifestation as  
that which He has given Himself out to be:  
i.e. as a Saviour from sin;* see Matt. i.  
21, “*Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for  
He himself shall save His people from  
their sins*.”

**13.]** The Jews grounded  
their claim to be children of God on their  
descent from Abraham. St. John here  
negatives any such claim, and asserts the  
exclusive divine birth of all who become  
children of God by faith. It is to be noticed  
that the conjunctions here are not  
merely disjunctive ones, which would necessitate  
the ranging the clauses as co-ordinate   
and parallel, but exclusive ones, which  
rise in climax from one clause to another,—  
‘*not* of blood, *nor yet* of the will of the  
flesh, *nor yet* of the will of man, *but* of God.’  
-Many Interpreters have seen in “*the will of  
man*” (the word in the original is that expressing the *man* as distinguished from the  
*woman*) the male, and in “*the will of the  
flesh*” the female side of human concupiscence   
(so Augustine, Theophylact, &c.) ;  
or in the former the higher and more conscious,  
in the latter the lower and animal  
side (Bleek, Luthardt). But both these  
interpretations seem to be objectionable.

**14.] And** must not be understood  
as giving a reason for the verse before; it  
is only the same copula as in vv. 1,3,4,5;  
sing on to a further assertion regarding  
the Word.

**became flesh]** the most  
general expression of the great truth that  
He became *man*. He became that, of which  
man is in the body compounded. ‘There is  
no *reference* here to the doctrine of the  
Lord Jesus being the second Adam, as  
Olshausen thinks ; but although there may be *no reference* to it, it *lies at the ground*of this wideness of expression. The doctrine  
in this form may have been, as Lücke  
observes, alien to St. John’s habits of  
thought, but not *that which is implied in  
the doctrine*, the taking of the *nature of  
man* by the Eternal Word.

The simplicity of this expression is no doubt directed  
against’ the Docete of the Apostle’s time,  
who maintained that the Word only apparently   
took human nature. Therefore he  
says, absolutely and literally **became** flesh:  
—see 1 John iv. 2. The word rendered  
“*dwelt*,” properly is *‘sojourned*,’ or  
**‘tabernacled,’** in us. There is no reference  
to the flesh being the *tabernacle* of the  
Spirit ;—but the word is one technically  
used in Scripture to import the *dwelling  
of God among men*. **us]** “men, who  
are flesh,” Bengel.

**we beheld]** See  
1 John i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 16. This is the  
Apostle’s testimony as such, see Acts i. 21.

The mention of **glory** seems to be  
suggested by the word **tabernacled**, so frequently   
used of the divine Presence or  
*Shechinah*, and cognate in its very form  
with it.

This glory was seen by the  
disciples, ch. ii, 11; xi. 4: also by Peter,  
James, and John, specially, on the mount  
of transfiguration : to which occasion the  
words “*as of the only-begotten from the  
Father*” seem to refer: but mainly, in the  
whole converse and teaching and suffering  
of the Lord, who was full of grace and truth,  
see below. On the term **as**, Chrysostom  
remarks that ‘it is not a word of mere  
likeness, or comparison, but of confirmation,  
and unquestionable endowment: as  
if he had said, We saw glory such as became,   
and such as was likely would be possessed  
by, the only begotten and genuine  
Son of God the King of all.”

**only-begotten]** This word applied to Christ is  
peculiar to John, and occurs in ver. 18;  
ch. 16,18; 1 John iv. 9 only. In the  
N. T. usage it signifies the *only* son :—in  
the LXX, Ps. xxii. (xxi. 21 of the LXX) 20  
(Heb., *my only one from the hand of the  
dog*), the *beloved*. It has been attempted  
to render the word in John, according to