backward and forward: backward, for the  
children of God have already been designated   
by the absence of sin, ver. 9:  
forward, for the children of the devil are  
designated below by the presence of sin in  
the second half of the verse. **In this** (fact,  
circumstance: *in* better than *by this*, which  
the idea that this is the *only* sign)  
**are manifest** (it has been asked, *to whom?*  
Some say to God’s unerring eye alone.  
True, in the full and deep truth of the  
saying: but surely in degree and proportion   
to those whom the unction from the  
Holy One enables to know all things: in  
proportion as sin is manifested, or hatred  
and avoidance of sin is manifested, in a  
character. And the especial sign which  
follows, the sin of hate, is one which is  
plainly open to men’s eyes, at least in its  
ordinary manifestations) **the children of  
God and the children of the devil** (see  
these expressions explained and vindicated  
from the charge of dualism, above, ver. 8.  
Compare John viii. 44, Acts xiii. 10. Socinus   
remarks well, “From the Apostle’s  
words it may clearly enough be collected,  
that between the sons of God and the sons  
of the devil there are none intermediate”):  
**every one that doeth not righteousness**(see ch. ii. 29) **is not of God** (is not a child  
of God), **and he that loveth not his brother**   
(see below, these words pointing on  
to the next section).

**11–24.**] Of *brotherly love*, as the sum  
and essence of *righteousness*: as Christ’s  
command [ver. 11]: whereas in the world  
there is hate [12, 13]: bound up with life,  
as hate with death [14, 15]: finding its  
great pattern in Christ [16]; to be testified   
not in word only but in deed [17, 18];  
as the ground of confidence toward God  
and the granting of our prayers to Him,  
being obedience to His will [19–22];  
which obedience consists in faith and love  
[23], and is testified to by the witness of  
His Spirit [24].

Before entering on ver. 11, the latter  
half of ver. 10 must be considered, as belonging   
properly, in its sense, to this section,   
though in arrangement inseparable  
from the last. The *“and,”* which binds  
on the additional particular in the last  
clause, serves, as in ver. 5, to co-ordinate  
that clause with the foregoing : not in this  
case as excluded from the forementioned  
category, but as one in particular, taken out  
from among the general category, and put  
into a co-ordinate position with it. And it  
is thus put, as being the most eminent, and  
most of the nature of a summary, and criterion,   
of the rest, of any of those graces  
which are necessarily involved in *righteousness*.   
Augustine beautifully says, “Love  
alone distinguishes between the children  
of God and the children of the devil. All  
may sign themselves with the sign of  
cross of Christ: all may answer Amen:  
all may sing Halleluia: all may be baptized,   
may enter churches, may build  
the walls of the same: but the children  
of God are not distinguished from the  
children of the devil, except by Love.”  
And this love, thus constituted into the  
great test and touchstone, is necessarily  
the family love of brother for brother  
within the limits of those who are begotten  
of God. Universal love to man is a Christian grace   
—but it is not that here spoken  
of: it neither answers the description of  
the *“message”* given in ver. 11, nor corresponds   
to the context here in general, the  
drift of which is that a test of our belonging   
to God’s family is our love towards  
His children, who are our brethren in that  
family: cf. ch. v. 1 ff. But, while there  
can be no doubt that this is the right understanding   
of the brotherly love here insisted on,   
we incur at once a formal difficulty   
in applying this meaning to the negative or   
exclusive side of the test. He  
who does not love his brother, has in strict  
fact *no brother to love*, for he is not a child  
of God at all. Hence we must understand,  
strictly speaking, *“his brother”* in this  
case as importing his hypothetical brother :  
him who would be, were he himself a true  
child of God, a brother, and, if so, necessarily   
beloved. That this love does not  
exist in him, demonstrates him not to be  
of God’s family.

**11.**] **Because** (proof that absence of love  
of the brethren excludes from God's family)