literally *love itself*, or does it import  
some gift, bestowal, or fruit of love?  
There seems no necessity for diverting the  
word from its proper meaning. As in ch.  
iv. 9, the proof of the love is that which is  
imported, not by the love itself, but by the  
verb joined with it; as by “*was manifested*”  
there, so by “*hath bestowed*” here) **the  
Father** (spoken here not, as some think, of  
God in general, the whole three Persons in  
the blessed Trinity, but personally, of the  
Father, as distinguished from the Son, in  
whom we have received our adoption) **hath  
given** (see above) **unto us, that** (how is  
**that** here to be taken ? is it to be kept to  
its strong sense, indicating that our being  
called the children of God is the *purpose* of  
that gift of love just spoken of, or does it,  
as so often in St. John, introduce the *purport* of that love, stated in the form of an  
end to be gained by its manifestation ?  
Lücke and others keep the strong telic  
sense. “What great love,” says Lücke,  
“hath the Father shewn us [viz, in sending His Son, ch. iv. 10],

in order to make  
us children of God!” But the objection  
to this is, that thus a proof of the divine  
Love is hinted at in our verse which is not,  
expanded, but is left to be gathered from  
elsewhere : and the purpose introduced by  
**that** becomes the secondary and remote  
subject of the sentence, whereas, from the  
idea of **children of God** taking up the preceding

idea of *birth from God*, and being  
again taken up in ver. 2, it is evidently the  
primary subject. The other meaning is  
taken by the ancient Greek expositors ;  
“wbat manner of love . . . resulting in,  
proved by, our being, &c.” The effect of  
the love, that at which it is aimed in its  
immediate bestowal, is, that we should be  
called children of God: its ultimate purpose

is another thing. See vv. 11, 23,  
where we have the same construction) **we**  
**should be called children of God** (why has  
the Apostle rather used **should be called**  
than “*should be?*” Probably to bring  
forward the title, the reality of which, notwithstanding

its non-recognition by the  
world, he is about to assert immediately).  
**And WE ARE [so]: for this cause the world**  
**doth not know** (apprehend, recognize) us;  
**because it did not know Him** (viz. Christ.  
—The insertion of the words, **and we are  
so**, appears to serve the purpose of bringing out

the reality of the state conferred  
upon us with this title, in spite of any non-recognition

of it by the unbelieving world.  
This clause is of the highest possible significance.

On its assertion depends the  
**therefore** which follows: and we ARE God’s  
children : for *this very reason*, because we  
bear not the name only but the essence, the  
world knows us not: and then, as a reason  
for this ignorance following on this reality  
of our derivation from Him,—because it  
knew Him not. The reality of a believer's  
sonship of God, and his non-recognition by  
the world, are thus necessarily connected  
together. But Whom did the world not  
know, and when? **Him** here, by the very  
requirements of the logic of the passage,  
must be the Father, who not being recognized,

neither are His children ; Augustine  
and others understand *Christ*. But this  
can only be, if we understand that the  
world rejected that revelation of the Father

which was made by Christ His Son.  
And if we introduce this element, we disturb

the strictness of the argument. It is  
the world’s ignorance of God, considered  
as one great act of non-recognition, disobedience, rebellion,

hate, which makes  
them incapable of recognizing, loving,  
sympathizing with, those who are veritably  
children of God: compare ch. v. 1).

**2.**] **Beloved, now are we children of  
God** (the world recognizes ns not: but our  
sonship is real: none the less real, that we  
ourselves know not our future condition in  
all its manifestation. So that the next  
member of the sentence is introduced not  
with a *“but,”* but with an *“and:”* the  
two are not contrasted, but simply put in  
juxtaposition as components of our present  
state, We are really sons of God, even  
*now:* and we look [this very word *“now”*  
suggesting a future] for an inheritance in  
virtue of that sonship: it has not been yet  
manifested of what sort that inheritance  
shall be: thus much we know, &e. Such  
seems to be the simple connexion, without