**20.**] The connexion is most close:  
and the error great of those who have made  
a new section begin here. This *love* is  
sal, necessarily manifested in *both* of  
great departments of its exercise.  
Love, living and working in the heart as a  
principle, will fix first upon objects at  
hand and seen: those objects being natural   
objects for it to fix on, How then can  
a man love God, the highest object of love,  
who is removed from his sight, and at the  
ame time refuse to love his brother, bearing   
the mark of a child of God, before his  
eyes from day to day? Put in a brief  
form, the argument, as connected with the  
last verse, is this: His love has begotten  
*us* anew in love: in this *us* are included  
our brethren, objects of our daily sight: if  
therefore we do not love them, we do not  
love Him. **If any say** (“have said;” i.e. at  
any time: the saying once, rather than the  
habit, is the hypothesis), **I love God, and  
hate** (present tense, of habit) **his brother,**  
**he is a liar: for** (here again the argument  
needs supplying from our common sense,  
which tells us that sight is an incentive  
towards love) **he that loveth not his brother   
whom he hath seen** (perfect tense,  
implying,—and continues to feel the influence   
of that sight. We do not say “**I**  
have seen him” of the dead, but of the  
living only), **cannot love God whom he  
hath not seen** (At. John does not say that  
there is no love without sight; nor that we  
love all we see better than any thing we  
do not see: his argument rests on a deeper  
and truer position: viz, on that assumed  
in the term **his brother**, which carries with  
it the consideration that he of whom it is  
said is begotten of God. Both terms, **his  
brother**, and **God**, are used within the  
limits of the Christian life, of which that  
is true, which is unfolded ch. v. 1, that  
this *brother*, as begotten of God, is a necessary   
object of love to one that loves Him  
that begat him. *Here*, a lower step of the  
same argument is taken ; but without this  
eat truth, lying beneath the word *brother*,  
it wonld carry no conviction with it).

**21.**] And besides this argument from  
common sense, there is another most  
powerful one, which the Apostle here  
adds: “How lovest thou Him, whose commandment   
thou hatest?” as Augustine  
says. **And this commandment we have  
from Him** (God: not, Christ: see below),  
**that he who loveth God, love also his brother**   
(where have we this commandment?  
In the great summary of the law, “Thou  
shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy  
heart, ... and thy neighbour as thyself  
so often cited by our Lord: see Matt. xxii.  
37—39),

**CHAP. V. 1.**] And who is our brother?  
and why does this name carry with it  
such an obligation to love? These questions,  
in closest connexion with the last  
verse, the Apostle answers in this,  
**Every one that believeth that Jesus is  
the Christ hath been begotten of God** (to  
whom do these words apply? from what  
follows, in the verb **hath been** [or,  
**is**] **begotten** is taken up by **him that is  
begotten**, to the brother whom we are  
to love as a necessary accompaniment  
of our loving God. But most Commentators   
assume that it is of *ourselves*  
that this is said: *our* birth of God depends   
on and is in closest union with  
our faith, ch. iii. 23. Then the connexion  
between this and the following clause must  
be made by filling up an ellipsis, “and if  
begotten of God we love God.” But this is  
far-fetched ; and, as has been above shewn  
implicitly, alien from the context, the  
object of which is to point out who those  
are whom we are bound to love, if we love  
God. Then having made this predication