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 som. us, that \*we should be called echil- hath bestowed upon us,   
 tseatoue. dren of God: + and [ t so] we are: that we should be called   
 ‘ancient therefore the world knoweth us not, the sons of God : therefore   
 vfoinar.1, Pbecause it knew him not. 2 Beloved, the world knoweth us not,   
 3 ay. ‘now are we children of God, and Because it knew him not.   
 xvii. 2 Beloved, now are we the   
 a cy sons of God, and it doth   
   
 literally love itself, or does it import doth not know (apprehend, recognize) us 5   
 some gift, bestowal, or fruit of love? Decause it didnot know Him (viz. Christ.   
 ‘Phere seems no necessity for diverting the —The insertion of the words, and we are   
 word from its proper meaning. As in ch. 80, appears to serve the purpose of bring-   
 iv. 9, the proof of the love is which is ing ont the reality of the state conferred   
 imported, not by the love itself, by the upon us with this title, spite of any non-   
 verb joined with itsas by “as manifested” recognition of it by the unbelieving wortd.   
 there, so by “hath Bestowed” here) the This clause is of the highest possible signi-   
 Father (spoken here not, as some think, of ficance. On its assertion depends the   
 God in general, the whole three Persons in therefore which follows: and we ARE God’s   
 the blessed Trinity, but personally, of the children : for this very reason, because we   
 Father, as distinguished from the Son, in bear not the name only but the essence, the   
 whom we have received our adoption) hath world knows us not: and then, as a reason   
 given (see above) unto us, that (how is for this ignorance following on this reality   
 that here to be taken ? is it to be to of our derivation fom Him,—because it   
 its strong sense, that our being knew Him not. The reality of a believer's   
 called the children God is the purpose of sonship of God, and his nou-recognition by   
 that gift of love just spoken of, or does it, the world, are’thus necessarily connected   
 as 0 often in St. John, introduce the pur- together. But Whom did the world not   
 port of that love, stated in the form of an know, and when? Him here, by the very   
 end to be gained by its manifestution ? reqnirements of the logic of the passage,   
 Liicke and others Keep the strong telic must be the Father, who not being recog-   
 sense. “What great love,” says Lticke, nized, neither are His children ; Augustine   
 “hath the Father shewn us [viz, in send- and others understand Christ. But this   
 ing His Son, ch. iv. in order to make can only be, if we understand that the   
 us children of 1” “But the objection world rejected that revelation of the Fa-   
 to this is, that thns a proof of the divine ther which was made by Christ His Son.   
 Love is hinted at in our verse which is not, And if we introduce this element, we dis-   
 expanded, but is left to be gathered from turb the strictness of the argument. It is   
 elsewhere : and the purpose introduced by the world’s ignorance of God, considered   
 that becomes the secondary and remote as one great act of non-recognition, dis-   
 subject of the sentence, whereas, from the obedience, rebellion, have, which makes   
 idea of children of God taking up the pre- them incapable of recognizing, loving,   
 ceding idea of birth from God, and being sympathizing with, those who are veritably   
 again taken up in ver. 2, it evidently the children of God: compare ch. v. 1).   
 primary subject. The other meaning is 2.) Beloved, now are we children of   
 taken by the ancient Greek expositors ; God (the world recognizes ns not: but onr-   
 “wbat manner of love . . . resulting in, sonship is real: none the less real, that we   
 proved by, onr being, &e.” The effect of ourselves know not our future condition in   
 the love, that at which is aimed in its all its manifestation. So that the next   
 immediate bestowal, is, that we should be member of the sentence is introduced not   
 called children of God: its nltimate pur- with a “Sut,” but with an “and.” the   
 pose is another thing. See vv. 11, 23, two are not contrasted, but simply put in   
 where we have the same construction) we juxtaposition as components of our present   
 should be called children of God (why has state, We are really sons of God, even   
 the Apostle rather used should be called now: and we look [this very word \* now”   
 than “should be?” Probably to\_bring suggesting a future] for an’inberitance in   
 forward the title, reality which, virtue of that sonship: it has not been yet   
 withstanding its non-recognition by the manifested of what sort that inheritance   
 world, he is ubont to assert immediately). shall be: thus much we know, &e. Such