added after the great events alluded to had  
taken place. But does not our Lord speak  
here, as in so many other cases, *proleptically*, of the fulness of the accomplishment.  
of those designs, which *in the divine counsels were* accomplished ? Is not this way  
of speaking natural to a discourse which is  
treating of the *development* of the new  
birth, itself not yet brought in till the  
Spirit was given? Sec a parallel instance,  
with the Evangelist’s explanation, ch. vii.  
37—39. (*c*) *on account of this use of* **only-begotten**, verses 16, 18, which is peculiar  
to John. But, as Stier well enquires,  
*whence did John get this word*, but from  
the lips of his divine Master? Would he  
have ventured on such an expression, except by an authorization from Him? (*d*) *It  
is asserted that John often continues our  
Lord’s discourses with additions of his  
own*;—and ver. 31, and ch. i. 16, are alleged as instances. Of these, ch. i. 16 is  
*beside the question*;—for the whole prologue is spoken in the person of the Evangelist, and the Baptist’s testimony in ver.  
15 is merely confirmatory of ver. 14, and  
then the connexion goes on with ver. 16.  
On the untenableness of the view with regard to vv. 31 ff., see notes there.

It would besides give us a very mean idea  
of the honesty or reverence of one who sets  
forth so sublime a view of the Divinity and  
Authority of our Lord, to suppose him  
capable, *in any place*, of attributing to his  
Master words and sentiments of his own  
invention. And that the charge amounts  
to this, every simple reader can bear testimony. The obvious *intention* of the Evangelist here is, *that the Lord shall have  
said these words*. If our Lord did not say  
them, but the Evangelist, we cannot stop  
with the view that he has *added his own  
remarks* to our Lord’s discourse, but must:  
at once pronounce him *guilty of an imposture and a forgery*. 1 conclude therefore on all these grounds that the words  
following, to ver. 21, cannot be otherwise  
regarded than as *uttered by our Lord in  
continuation of His discourse.*

**loved]** The indefinite past tense, signifying the  
universal and eternal existence of that love  
which God Himself *is* (1 John iv. 8).

**the world**, in the most general sense, as  
represented by, and included in, man,—  
Gen. iii. 17, 18, and i. 28 ;—not, *the elect*,  
which would utterly destroy the force of  
the passage; see on ver. 18.

The  
Lord here reveals *Love* as the *one ground  
of the divine counsel* in redemption,—*salvation* of men, as its *one purpose with regard to them.*

**he gave his only-begotten Son]** These words seem to carry  
a reference to the offering of Isaac; and  
Nicodemus in that case would at once be  
reminded by them of the love *there required*, the *substitution there made*, and  
the *prophecy there uttered* to Abraham, to  
which the following words of our Lord so  
nearly correspond.

**gave**—absolute,  
not merely *to the world*—**gave up**,—Rom.  
viii. 32; where, as Stier remarks, we have  
again, in the “*spared not*,” an unmistakeable allusion to the same words, said to  
Abraham, Gen. xxii. 16.

**that whosoever...]** By the repetition of this final  
clause verbatim from ver. 15, we have the  
identity of the former clauses established:  
i.e. the uplifting of the Son of Man like  
the serpent in the wilderness *is* the manifestation of the divine Love in the gift of  
the Son of God: “*the Son of Man*” of ver.  
14 is equivalent, in the strictest sense, to  
“*his only-begotten Son*” of ver. 16.

**17.] the world**,—the Gentile world,—was  
according to Jewish ideas to be judged and  
condemned by the Messiah. This error our  
Lord here removes. The assertion ch. ix.  
39, “*for judgment* (or, *condemnation*)  
*came I into this world*,” is no contradiction to this. The judgment there, as here,  
results from the separation of mankind into  
two classes,—those who will and those who  
will not come to the light ; and that result  
itself is not the *purpose why* the Son of  
God came into the world, but is evolved in  
the accomplishment of the higher purpose,  
viz. Love, and the salvation of men. Observe, the latter clause does not correspond  
to the former—it is not *that He might  
save the world*, but **that the world through  
Him might be saved**:—the *free will* of the  
*world* is by this strikingly set forth, in  
connexion with verses 19, 20. Not that  
the Lord is not the *Saviour of the world*(ch. iv. 42), but that the peculiar cast of  
this passage required the other side of the