in the term “*the things in the world*,”  
the *world* is apparently material and  
local: in the opposition which follows,  
between the love of the world and the  
love of the Father, the personal meaning  
begins to be evident: in what follows,  
“*all that is in the world*,” which at  
first sight seems material, is explained by  
“*the lust of the flesh*, &c.” which are the  
subjective desires of the “*things in the  
world*,” not the things themselves: then,  
finally, in ver. 17, where “*the world and  
the lust thereof*,” is opposed to “*he that  
doeth the will of God*,” it is plain that  
we have passed, hy the transition in the  
last verse, from the material to the personal  
sense altogether. This account may  
serve to explain that which has given so  
much trouble to Commentators here, the  
question whether *lust* is not put for the  
thing itself which is desired : the fact being  
that, the *world* including the material  
world *in* the men, the *lusts*, which are in  
the men, are in the *world*, as well as the  
things of which they are the desires, and  
which are in their turn included in them),  
**nor yet** (not merely meaning “*nor;*” but  
carrying with it an exclusive and disjunctive  
force, implying that what follows is not  
identical with what went before. That was  
spoken of the world itself, the totality: “have  
no love for this present world as such.”  
Butan escape from this prohibition might  
be sought by men who would deny in the  
abstract the charge of worldly-mindedness,  
but devoted themselves to some one object  
of those followed by worldly men: so that  
it is necessary to add, after “Love not the  
world,”—“no, nor any thing in it”) **the  
things in the world** (explained above:  
here, the objects after which the ungodly  
world’s *lust* reaches out, and on which its  
*vain-glory* is founded). **If any man** (see on  
the same expression above, ver. 1) **love the  
world, the love of the Father** (i.e. love *to*  
the Father, as opposed to his love to the  
world) **is not in him.**

**16.]** *Gives a reason for the assertion  
in ver.* 15: viz. the entire separation from  
one another of the world and God. In  
order to understand clearly the following,  
it is necessary to define strictly the things  
mentioned, and to lay down explicitly the  
apposition between “*all that is in the  
world*,” and the three particulars which  
follow as included in that category. This  
can only be rightly done by bearing in  
mind what was said before,—that, as the  
world is summed up in man, both those  
objective material things which are properly  
*the things in the world,* and those  
inward subjectivities which are in man  
and grounded on his worldly state, are regarded  
as being **in the world**, and these  
pass into, and are almost interchanged  
with, one another. Now here, the three  
things spoken of as examples of *the things  
in the world* are all purely subjective—  
“*lust*,” — “*lust*,” —“*vain-glory*.” But  
they are subjectivities having their ground  
in the objectivities of the ungodly world:  
the first *lust* springs out of (see below)  
the *flesh*, the human nature unrenewed  
by God: the second resides in that sense  
which takes note of outward things and  
so is inflamed by them: and the “*life*,”  
is that belonging to *vain-glory*, the manner  
of life of worldly men among one  
another, whereby pride as to display and  
pomp is cherished. Now each one of these  
three is included in, and includes in itself,  
love to the world: and he that loves the  
world falls into, walks after, becomes part  
of, these lusts, and this *vain-glory*, which  
is not of the Father but of the world.  
Loving the things of the world, he becomes  
*conformed* to the world, and following  
the lusts and pride which are in the  
world, he himself becomes one of the  
things in the world. **Because every thing  
that is in the world** (namely, or for instance),  
**the lust of the flesh** (**of the flesh**is not an objective gen., so that the words  
should mean, “lust after the flesh,” i.e,  
impure desire: this they include, but far  
more. The genitive is subjective, the flesh  
being that wherein the lust dwells, as in  
Gal. v. 16, Eph. ii. 3, 2 Pet. ii. 18, Rom.  
i. 24: see also Rom. vi. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 2),  
**and the lust of the eyes** (subjective genitive,  
as before: the lust which the eye  
begets by seeing), **and the vain-glory of  
life** (the *vain-glorious* is one who lays  
claim to credit or glory which is not his