resurrection body, I answer that in the  
realm where our thoughts are now employed,

I cannot appreciate that distinction  
between ethical and corporeal. We are  
speaking of things which eye hath not seen,  
nor mind conceived: what a *spiritual body*may imply, our ideas now do not enable us  
to conceive: but I suppose it must at all  
events be a body, all of whose senses are  
spiritually conditioned and attuned : that  
what *physical capacities* are to our  
bodies here, *spiritual capacities* will be  
there: and feeling this, however little I  
may know of the details of the great fact,  
it removes from me all insuperable difficulty

as to the words *“we shall see Him  
as* He *is.”* “I know that in my flesh I  
shall see God,” may not be the right expression

in Job, but it is the expression of  
my hopes as a son of God: it is the one  
expression of a hope in which all other  
hopes culminate and centre. And every  
son of God knows, that for it ever to be fulfilled,

he must be growing onward in likeness to Him,

pure, even up into His purity:

for in His light only shall we see light.

One point only must be noticed  
before passing onward; the fact that several of the great interpreters understand  
**Him** both times of *Christ*. This has partly  
of course been occasioned by their supplying

Christ as a subject to the verb *“shall  
appear,”* or *“shall be manifested,”* above.  
Augustine has one of his most beautiful  
passages, explaining how at Christ’s appearing,

the impious shall see only *the form  
of a servant*, but we *the form of God*.  
The whole view, however, does not satisfy  
the requirements of the passage. It is  
the *children of God* who are addressed :  
and the topic of exhortation is, that they  
be righteous as God their Father is  
righteous).

**3.**] **And every one that  
hath this hope** (viz. that of being like  
Him hereafter) **on Him** (i.e. rested and  
grounded on God. In God, and grounded  
on His promises, is all our hope), **purifieth  
himself** (these words are not to be taken in  
any Pelagian sense, as if a man could of  
himself purify himself: “apart from me,”  
says our Lord, “ye can do nothing.” John  
xv.5. The man who purifies himself has  
this hope resting upon God. This mere  
fact implies a will to purify himself, not  
out of, nor independent of, this hope, but  
ever stirred up by, and accompanying it.  
So that the will is not his own, sprung out  
of his own nature, but the result of his  
Christian state, in which God also ministers

to him the power to carry out that  
will in self-purification, See 2 Cor. vii. 1,  
which is remarkably parallel: and 1 Pet.  
i. 21, 22. The idea is much the same as  
that in ch. i. 9: it is entire purification,  
not merely from unchastity, but from all  
defilement of flesh and spirit), **even as He  
is pure** (Who is intended by **He?** Clearly  
below in ver. 5, Christ, from the facts of  
the case. But is it as clear here? Almost  
all the modern Commentators assume it,  
and the inference is upheld by a first view  
of ch. ii, 6, where much the same expression is used,

and used of Christ. But there  
are some weighty considerations against  
the view. First, it is the *Father*, of whom  
it is written, “Be ye holy, for [or as] I am  
holy,” 1 Pet. i. 15, 16, Levit. xi. 44, xix.  
2: compare also Matt. v. 48. Secondly, it  
would be very harsh thus to introduce a  
new subject, in the face of this Scripture  
usage. Thirdly, it would be against the  
whole spirit of the context: in which sonship

of God and likeness to God are joined  
together, and the hopes belonging to the  
state are made motives for the duty.  
Fourthly, if it be asserted that Christ is  
our Pattern, in whom we see the Father’s  
purity shewn forth; I answer that this  
would be perfectly intelligible, if allusion  
was made, as in ch. ii. 6, to some historical

manifestation in our Lord’s life:  
but being as it is in the present tense, it  
refers to the essential divine attribute of  
purity: and if so, then to that attribute in  
ary inherence in the Father. For  
these reasons and others which may be  
seen in my Greek Testament, I would interpret

**He** here of the Father, in whom  
essentially abides this perfection of purity,

and after continual increase of likeness to  
whom his sons, having the ultimate hope  
of being completely like Him, will be striving.

In ver. 5, the case is otherwise : see  
there, and also on ver. 7).

**4-10**] T*he irreconcilability of sin  
with the work of redemption, with communion with Christ, and with being born  
of God.* The difficulty has been, to  
mark distinctly the connexion with the  
foregoing. In order to discover this, we