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 AUTHORIZED VERSION. AUTHORIZED VE RSION REVISED,   
 mitteth sin is of the devil ; beeanse the devil sinneth from the   
 for the devil sinneth from beginning. For this purpose the   
   
   
 in St. John’s repetitions, a new feature is cal dualism on the part of the Apostle,   
 brought in, which the following verses “The devil made no one, begat no one,   
 take up and further treat: viz. the created no one,” says Augustine here;   
 devil is the source of such practices of sin. “hut he who imitates the devil, ns if born   
 7.) Little children, let no one of him, becomes a son of the devil, by   
 deceive you (it does not seem that any imitation, not by birth. All sinners are   
 particnlar false is here in John’s horn of the devil, in so fur as they are   
 views but he alludes to all would sever ers. Adam was made by God: but   
 ethical likeness to God the Christian when he consented to the devil, he was   
 life): he that doeth righteousness (the born of the devil, and begat all sue   
 righteousness spoken of is but one, and as he himself was.” But be it observed,   
 God’s: the righteonsness which is that we have here no such expression aa   
 is righteous, even as He (here ap- “hath been begotten of the devil,” but   
 parently, God, notwithstanding the ap- only, is of devil. In the case of the   
 parent parallel of “Jesus Christ the dren of God, there is a definite known   
 righteous” in ch, ii, 2: for we are by hen they passed from death unto   
 this saying, as by that in ver. 3,—where ii. iii, 14; v. Jolm i. 12;   
 see note,—referred back to the great v. 24, &e.]: from which their   
 Source of our spiritual birth, ch. ii. 29, new life God dates: but there is no   
 and our likeness to Him insisted on) is such point in the life of those who are the   
 righteous. children of the devil; no regeneration from   
 This verse has absolutely nothing to do beneath corresponding to that from above :   
 with the sense which the Roman-Catholie the natural life of inen not changed hy   
 expositors have endeavoured to extract seed of the devil as it is by seed of God.   
 from it, that good works make us Rather may we say, that in those who are   
 righteous before God. This is altogether of the devil this latter change has never   
 to invert the proposition of the Apostle, taken place. Since sin has come to reign   
 who is reasoning, not from the fact of in the world by man’s sin, our natural   
 doing good works to the conclusion that birth, which is properly and essentially a   
 a man is righteous, but from the hypo- birth from God, a ereation by the eternal   
 thesis of a man’s being a child of God, Word, has become a birth from the devil:   
 born of Him and like Him, to the neces- so that it is, as Bengel expresses it, “a,   
 sity of his purifying himself and doing corruption, not a geucration:”” aud there   
 rightcousness. And in doing this, he is no trace of physical dualism in St.   
 ascribes the doing righteousness to its doctrine: nay, the idea is once precluded   
 source, and the doing sin to its source : by the fact, that according to the Apostle   
 the one man is of God, the other is of the (John i. 12] those who are children of God   
 devil. As Luther well says, “ Good works have become so from having been children   
 of piety do not make a good pious man, of the devil): because the devil sinneth   
 Dut a good pious man docs good pious from the beginning (‘sinned in the be-   
 works. ... Fruits grow from the tree, not ginning, and bas never ceased to sin   
 the tree from fruits.” since.’ But the question meets us, what   
 8.) Contrast to ver.7. He that docth is from the beginning? Bede and others   
 sin is of the devil (notice first “he that understand it of the beginning of all crea-   
 doeth [not, as the A. V. most unfortunately, tion. Many Commentators, to avoid all   
 ‘committeth”) sin,” as indicative not chance of dualism, make it mean not from   
 s0 much of individual acts as of a state, the time of his creation, but from that of   
 corresponding to “he that doeth righte- his fall, it of the beginning   
 ousness.” And then the words, is of the of our world. But again, others suppose   
 devil, must uot be rationalized away, as the term to mark the beginning of the   
 is done by those who deny the personal devil’s own apostacy : so Bengel, &e. And   
 existence of the devil. It is the distinct lastly, others again take it to mean,   
 opposite correlative of “is of God” [ver “from the time when any began to sin.”   
 10, &e.], and implies a personal root and And this seems, when we compare Jolin   
 agency, just as much as that other does. ‘iii. to be the true interpretation. He   
 But again, it does not imply any phy- y, as it were,   
 Vou. II.