being of God, of what relevance is it,  
to say that he that loveth not never knew  
God, because “God is love?” Put for  
these last words, “God is loving,” and we  
get at once a fallacy: He that loveth not  
never knew what love is: God is loving:  
but what would follow? that in as far as  
God is loving, he never knew Him: but  
he may have known Him in as far as He  
is just, or powerful. But take the proposition,   
**God is love**, of God’s essential  
being,—as a strict definition of God, and  
the argumentation will be strict: He that  
loveth not never knew love: God is love  
[the terms are co-essential and co-extensive]:   
therefore he who loveth uot never  
knew God).

**9, 10.**] *Proof of this* as far as we are  
concerned, in God’s sending His Son to  
save us. **In this** (viz. which follows) **the  
love of God was manifested in regard to  
us** (these words, **in regard to us**, must be  
taken with the verb, not with the love of  
God. Many have thus wrongly connected  
it, and in consequence have been compelled  
to distort the **in regard to** into *“towards:”*   
so Luther, &c., and the A.V.  
Connected then with the verb, it must  
not be taken as equivalent to *“towards,”*  
but as “in,” i.e. “in the matter of,” in  
regard of: see ver. 16 below: the manifestation   
not being made *to us* as its spectators,   
but in our persons and cases, as its  
“material.” **us**, i.e. believers in general),  
**that God hath sent** (perfect tense. The  
manifestation is regarded as one act, done  
implicitly when God sent His Son: but  
the sending is regarded in its present  
abiding effects, which have changed all  
things since it took place) **His only begotten   
Son into the world, that we might  
live through Hcm** (no words can be plainer  
than these, and need less explanation to  
any one acquainted with St. John. The  
endeavours of the old rationalists, Socinus,  
Grotius, &e., to escape from the assertion  
of Christ’s pre-existence, by substituting  
**for into** *the world, “to the world,”* for  
**only begotten,** *“dearly beloved,”* &c., may  
be seen in Düsterdieck. He well remarks,  
“Such expositors may naturally be expected   
to give an answer to the ‘question,  
how a Christ so understood could be our  
life [ver. 9], our atonement [ver. 10], or  
our salvation [ver. 14].”

The two emphatic words in the sentence are **only-  
begotten** and **live**. This was the proof,  
that SUCH a son of God was sent, that we  
might LIVE).

**10.**] *The same proof  
particularized* in its highest and noblest  
point, the atonement: and at the same  
time this brought ont, that the love manifested   
by it was all on God’s side, none on  
ours: was love to us when we were enemies,   
Rom. v. 8, and therefore all the  
greater. Ch. iii. 16 is very similar: except   
that there it is Christ’s personal love  
tous: here the Father’s, in sending His  
Son. **In this is love** (‘in this case,” “in  
this matter,” “herein,” *is*, ‘*is found*,’  
*‘exists*,’ Love; in the abstract. ‘This interpretation   
is necessary, on account of  
the disjunction which follows. If the word  
love meant, the love of God just spoken of,  
then it would be irrelevant to subjoin that  
this love was not our love to Him but His  
to us), **not that we loved God** (the verb  
refers to an indefinite time past—no act of  
Jove of ours to God at any time done furnishes   
this example of love, but an act of  
His towards us, It is not the *nature* of  
our love to God, as contrasted with His to  
us, of which the clause treats, but the non-  
existence of the one love as set against the  
historical manifestation of the other. Again  
that “ He loved us, though we did not love  
Him,” is so far in the words as it is given  
by the context [see above], but is not the  
meaning of the words themselves), but  
**that He loved us** (referring again to an  
*act* of Love, which is now specified), and  
(prove this love in that He) **sent His Son**  
**a propitiation** (see on ch. ii. 2) **for** (see  
ibid.) **our sins** (His death being therein