


THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF

JOHN

CHAPTER 1

The term (καθολική), *catholic* or *general*, applied to the Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude, was used from the second century onward in the sense of something addressed to the faithful *generally*, as distinguished from Christians of particular nations or cities, as the Galatians or Ephesians. Hence, Clement of Alexandria speaks of the letter of Acts 15 as “*the catholic letter* of all the Apostles, given to the faithful.” The term was also used of letters specially addressed, but with a general application, which made no claim to canonical authority.

In the later Western Church the group of letters known as *catholic* was called *canonical* through a mistaken interpretation of the words of Junilius, ^{fb56} who referred to the letters of James, 2 Peter, Jude, 2 and 3 John as added by many to the collection of *canonical* books. This was understood to mean that the term *canonical* applied to those books peculiarly.

1. Compare  John 1:1, 9, 14. The construction of the first three verses is somewhat involved. It will be simplified by throwing it into three parts, represented respectively by vv. 1, 2, 3. The first part, *That which was from the beginning — Word of Life*, forms a suspended clause, the verb being omitted for the time, and the course of the sentence being broken by ver. 2, which forms a parenthesis: *and the Life — manifested unto us*. Ver. 3, in order to resume the broken sentence of ver. 1, repeats in a condensed form two of the clauses in that verse, *that which we have seen and heard*, and furnishes the governing verb, *we declare*. Thus the simple sentence, divested of parenthesis and resumptive words would be, *We declare unto you that which was from the beginning, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled concerning the Word of Life*.

That which (ὅ). It is disputed whether John uses this in a personal sense as equivalent to *He whom*, or in its strictly neuter sense as meaning something *relating* to the person and revelation of Christ. On the whole, the (περί), concerning (A. V., *of*), seems to be against the personal sense. The successive clauses, *that which was from the beginning*, etc., express, not the *Eternal Word Himself*, but something *relating to or predicated concerning* (peri) Him. The indefinite *that which*, is approximately defined by these clauses; that about the Word of Life which was from the beginning, that which appealed to sight, to hearing is, to touch. ^{fb57} Strictly, it is true, the περί is appropriate only with *we have heard*, but it is used with the other clauses in a wide and loose sense (compare ^{}John 16:8). “The subject is not merely a message, but all that had been made clear through manifold experience *concerning it*” (Westcott).

Was (ἦν). Not ἐγένετο *came into being*. See on ^{}John 1:3; 8:34; 8:58. It *was* already existing when the succession of life began.

From the beginning (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς). The phrase occurs twice in the Gospel (8:44; 15:27); nine times in the First Epistle, and twice in the Second. It is used both *absolutely* (3:8; 2:13, 14), and *relatively* (^{}John 15:27; ^{<D>}John 2:24). It is here contrasted with “*in the beginning*” (^{}John 1:1). The difference is that by the words “*in the beginning*,” the writer places himself at the initial point of creation, and, looking back into eternity, describes that which was already in existence when creation began. “The Word *was in the beginning*.” In the words “*from the beginning*,” the writer looks back to the initial point of time, and describes what has been in existence from that point onward. Thus, “*in the beginning*” characterizes the absolute divine Word as He was *before* the foundation of the world and *at* the foundation of the world. “*From the beginning*” characterizes His development in time. Note the absence of the article both here and in ^{}John 1:1. Not *the beginning* as a definite, concrete fact, but as apprehended by man; that to which we look as “*beginning*.”

Have heard — have seen (ἀκηκόαμεν — ἑωράκαμεν). Both in the perfect tense, denoting the still abiding effects of the hearing and seeing.

With our eyes. Emphasizing the direct, personal experience in a marvelous matter.

Have looked upon (ἐθεασάμεθα). Rev., correctly, *beheld*. The tense is the aorist; marking not the abiding effect of the vision upon the beholder, but the historical manifestation to special witnesses. On the difference between this verb and ἐώρακαμεν *we have seen*, see on ^{<414>}John 1:14,18.

Have handled (ἐψηλάησαν). The aorist tense. Rev. *handled*. For the peculiar force of the verb see on ^{<424>}Luke 24:39. The reference is, probably, to *handle me* (^{<428>}Luke 24:39), and to ^{<417>}John 20:27. This is the more noticeable from the fact that John does not mention the fact of the Resurrection in the Epistles, and does not use the word in his own narrative of the Resurrection. The phrase therefore falls in with the numerous instances in which John assumes the knowledge of certain historic facts on the part of his readers.

Of the Word (περὶ τοῦ λόγου). Better, as Rev., *concerning* the Word.

Of life (τῆς ζωῆς). Lit., *the life*. See on ^{<404>}John 1:4. The phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, *the Word of the Life*, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The nearest approach to it is ^{<506>}Philippians 2:16; but there neither word has the article. In the phrase *words of eternal life* (^{<416>}John 6:68), and in ^{<415>}Acts 5:20, *all the words of this life*, ῥήματα is used. The question is whether λόγος is used here of *the Personal Word*, as ^{<401>}John 1:1, or of the *divine message* or *revelation*. In the four passages of the Gospel where λόγος is used in a *personal* sense (^{<401>}John 1:1, 14), it is used *absolutely*, *the Word* (compare ^{<403>}Revelation 19:13). On the other hand, it is often used *relatively* in the New Testament; as *word of the kingdom* (^{<408>}Matthew 8:19); *word of this salvation* (^{<405>}Acts 8:26); *word of His grace* (^{<402>}Acts 20:32); *word of truth* (^{<5018>}James 1:18). By John ζωῆς *of life*, is often used in order to characterize the word which accompanies it. Thus, *crown of life* (^{<4010>}Revelation 2:10); *water of life* (^{<4010>}Revelation 21:6); *book of life* (^{<4015>}Revelation 3:5); *bread of life* (^{<4155>}John 6:35); *i.e.*, the water which is living and communicates life; the book; which contains the revelation of life; the bread which imparts life. In the same sense, ^{<4165>}John 6:68; ^{<4150>}Acts 5:20. Compare ^{<5002>}Titus 1:2, 3

Though the phrase, *the Word of the Life*, does not elsewhere occur in a personal sense, I incline to regard its *primary* reference as personal, ^{fb58} from the obvious connection of the thought with ^{<401>}John 1:1, 4. "In the beginning was the Word, — in Him was life." "As John does not purpose

to say that he announces Christ as an abstract single *idea*, but that he declares his own concrete historical experiences *concerning* Christ, — so now he continues, not *the* Logos (Word), but *concerning* the Word, we make annunciation to you” (Ebrard). At the same time, I agree with Canon Westcott that it is most probable that the two interpretations are not to be sharply separated. “The revelation proclaims that which it includes; it has, announces, gives life. In Christ life as the *subject*, and life as the *character* of the revelation, were absolutely united.”

2. This verse is parenthetical. Compare, for similar interruptions of the construction, ver. 3, [Ⓜ]John 1:14, 3:16, 31; 19:35.

And (καὶ). See on [Ⓜ]John 1:10; 8:20.

The Life (ἡ ζωὴ). The Word Himself who is the Life. ^{fb59} Compare [Ⓜ]John 14:6; 5:26; [Ⓜ]1 John 5:11, 12. *Life* expresses the nature of *the Word* ([Ⓜ]John 1:4). The phrase, *the Life*, besides being equivalent to *the Word*, also indicates, like *the Truth* and *the Light*, an aspect of His being.

Was manifested (ἐφανερώθη). See on [Ⓜ]John 21:1. Corresponding with *the Word was made flesh* ([Ⓜ]John 1:14). The two phrases, however, present different aspects of the same truth. *The Word became flesh*, contemplates simply the historic fact of incarnation. *The life was manifested*, sets forth the unfolding of that fact in the various operations of life. The one denotes the objective process of the incarnation as such, the other the result of that process as related to human capacity of receiving and understanding it. “The reality of the incarnation would be undeclared if it were said, ‘The Life became flesh.’ The manifestation of the Life was a consequence of the incarnation of the Word, but it is not coextensive with it” (Westcott).

Have seen — bear witness — shew. Three ideas in the apostolic message: *experience, testimony, announcement*.

Bear witness. See on [Ⓜ]John 1:7.

Shew (ἀπαγγέλλομεν) Better, as Rev., *declare*. See on [Ⓜ]John 16:25. So here. The message comes *from* (ἀπὸ) God.

That eternal life (τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον). A particularly faulty translation, since it utterly fails to express the *development* of the idea of

life, which is distinctly contemplated by the original. Render, as Rev., *the life, the eternal life*; or *the life, even the eternal life*. For a similar repetition of the article compare ^{<1008>}1 John 2:8; 4:9; 2 John 11. This particular phrase occurs only here and 2:25. John uses ζῶν αἰώνιος *eternal life*, and ἡ αἰώνιος ζῶν the *eternal life*, the former expressing the *general conception* of life eternal, and the latter eternal life *as the special gift of Christ*. Αἰώνιος *eternal*, describes the life in its quality of *not being measured by time*, a larger idea than that of mere *duration*.

Which (ἣτις). Not the simple relative ἥ *which*, but defining the *quality* of the life, and having at the same time a kind of confirmatory and explanatory force of the word *eternal*: *seeing that* it was a life divine in its nature — “with the Father” — and therefore independent of temporal conditions.

With the Father (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα). See on *with God* (^{<1001>}John 1:1). In living, active relation and communion with the Father. “The preposition of motion with the verb of repose involves eternity of relation with activity and life” (Coleridge). The life eternally tended to the Father, even as it emanated from Him. It came forth from Him and was manifested to men, but to the end that it might take men into itself and unite them with the Father. The manifestation of life to men was a revelation of life, as, first of all and beyond all, centering in God. Hence, though life, abstractly, returns to God, as it proceeds from God, it returns bearing the redeemed world in its bosom. The complete divine ideal of life includes impartation, but impartation with a view to the practical development of all that receives it with reference to God as its vivifying, impelling, regulating, and inspiring center.

The Father. See on ^{<1026>}John 12:26. The title “*the Father*” occurs rarely in the Synoptists, and always with reference to the Son. In Paul only thrice (^{<1004>}Romans 6:4; ^{<1005>}1 Corinthians 8:6; ^{<1028>}Ephesians 2:18). Nowhere in Peter, James, Jude, or Revelation. Frequent in John’s Gospel and Epistles, and in the latter, uniformly. ^{fb60}

3. The regular course of the sentence, broken by ver. 2, is now resumed, by the repetition of *that which we have seen and heard*. Only the order is reversed: *seen and heard* instead of *heard and seen* (ver. 1), and the two elements of experience, sight and hearing, are thrown together without the

repeated relative *that which*. In ver. 1, the climax advanced from the lower evidence of hearing to that of sight. Here, in recapitulating, the process is reversed, and the higher class of evidence is put first.

Unto you also (καὶ ὑμῖν). The *also* is variously explained. According to some, referring to a special circle of Christian readers beyond those addressed at the conclusion of the Gospel. Others, again, as referring to those who had not seen and heard as contrasted with eye-witnesses. Thus Augustine on ^{<41B>}John 20:26 sqq. “He (Thomas) touched the man, and confessed the God. And the Lord, consoling us who, now that He is seated in heaven, cannot handle Him with the hand, but touch Him by faith, says, ‘Because thou hast seen thou hast believed; blessed are they who have not seen and believe.’ It is *we* that are described; *we* that are pointed out. May there therefore come to pass in us that blessedness which the Lord predicted should be: the Life itself has been manifested in the flesh, so that the thing which can be seen with the heart alone might be seen with the eyes also, that it might heal our hearts.”

Fellowship (κοινωνίαν). This word introduces us to one of the main thoughts of the Epistle. The true life in man, which *comes* through the *acceptance* of Jesus as the Son of God, consists in *fellowship* with God and with man. On the word, see on ^{<41B>}Acts 2:42; ^{<41B>}Luke 5:10. The verb κοινωνέω *to come into fellowship, to be made a partner, to be partaker of*, occurs ^{<41B>}1 Peter 4:13; 2 John 11; ^{<41B>}Hebrews 2:14, etc. The expression here, (echein koinwnian) is stronger, since it expresses *the enjoyment or realization* of fellowship, as compared with the mere *fact* of fellowship. See on ^{<41B>}John 16:22.

Our fellowship (ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα). More strictly, *the fellowship, that which is ours*, according to John’s characteristic practice of defining and emphasizing a noun by an article and possessive pronoun. See on ^{<41B>}John 10:27. *Ours* (possessive instead of personal pronoun) indicating fellowship as a *distinguishing mark* of Christians rather than as merely something enjoyed by them.

With the Father and with His Son (μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). Note the repeated preposition *μετά* *with*; distinguishing the two persons, and coordinating the fellowship with the Father, and the fellowship with the Son, thus implying the sameness of essence. The

fellowship with both contemplates both as united in the Godhead. Plato says of one who lives in unrestrained desire and robbery, “Such an one is the friend neither of God nor man, for he is incapable of *communion* (κοινωνεῖν ἀδύνατος), and he who is incapable of *communion* (κοινωνία) us also incapable of friendship” (“Gorgias,” 507). So in the “Symposium” (188), and he defines divination as “the art of *communion* (κοινωνία) between gods and men.”

4. *These things*. The whole Epistle.

Write we unto you (γράφομεν ὑμῖν). The best texts read ἡμεῖς *we*, instead of ὑμῖν *to you*. Both the verb and the pronoun are emphatic. The writer speaks with conscious authority, and his message is to be not only *announced* (ἀπαγγέλλομεν, ver. 3), but written. *We write* is emphasized by the absence of the personal object, *to you*.

Your joy (ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν). The best texts read ἡμῶν, *our*, though either reading gives a good sense.

Full (πεπληρωμένη) More correctly, *fulfilled*. Frequent in John. See ^{RB9}John 3:29; 7:8; 8:38; 15:11; 2 John 12; ^{RB1}Revelation 6:11. “The peace of reconciliation, the blessed consciousness of sonship, the happy growth in holiness, the bright prospect of future completion and glory, — all these are but simple details of that which, in all its length and breadth is embraced by one word, *Eternal Life*, the real possession of which is the immediate source of our joy. We have joy, Christ’s joy, because we are blessed, because we have life itself in Christ” (Dusterdieck, cit. by Alford). And Augustine: “For there is a joy which is not given to the ungodly, but to those who love Thee for thine own sake, whose joy Thou thyself art. And this is the happy life, to rejoice to Thee, of Thee; this is it and there is no other” (“Confessions,” 10:22). Alford is right in remarking that this verse gives an epistolary character to what follows, but it can hardly be said with him that it “fills the place of the *χαίρειν* *greeting*, lit., *rejoice*, so common in the opening of Epistles.” ^{fb61}

5. *This then is* (καὶ αὕτη ἐστίν). Rev., correctly and literally, *and this*. According to the proper reading the verb stands first in order (ἐστίν αὕτη), with emphasis, not merely as a copula, but in the sense “*there*

exists this as the message.” For a similar use of the substantive verb, see 5:16,17; 2:15; ^{<B8>}John 8:50.

Message (ἐπαγγελία). This word, however, is invariably used in the New Testament in the sense of *promise*. The best texts read ἄγγελία, *message*, which occurs only at 3:11; and the corresponding verb, ἀγγέλλω, only at ^{<B8>}John 10:18.

We have heard of Him (ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ). A form of expression not found elsewhere in John, who commonly uses παρ’ αὐτοῦ. See on ^{<B6>}John 6:46 The phrase here points to the *ultimate* and not necessarily the *immediate* source of the message. Not only John, but others in earlier times had heard this message. Compare ^{<B11>}1 Peter 1:10, 11. Ἄπό points to the *source* παρά to the *giver*. Thus, ^{<B4>}John 5:41, “I receive not honor *from* (παρά) men.” They are not the bestowers of honor upon me. Ver. 44, “How can ye believe which receive honor *from* (παρά) one another;” the honor which men have to *give*, “and seek not the honor that cometh *from* (παρά) God;” the honor which God alone *bestows*. On the other hand, ^{<B2>}1 John 3:22, “Whatsoever we ask we receive *from* (ἀπό) Him,” the ultimate source of our gifts. So ^{<B7>}Matthew 17:25: “*Of* (ἀπό) whom do the kings of the earth take custom — *of* (ἀπό) their own children or *of* (ἀπό) strangers?” What is the legitimate and ultimate source of revenue in states?

Declare (ἀναγγέλλομεν). Compare the simple verb ἀγγέλλειν *to bring tidings*, ^{<B8>}John 20:18, and only there. Ἀναγγέλλειν is to bring the tidings *up to* (ἀνά) or *back* to him who receives them. Ἀπαγγέλλειν is to announce tidings as coming *from* (ἀπό) some one, see ^{<B10>}Matthew 2:8; ^{<B9>}John 4:51. Καταγγέλλειν is to proclaim *with authority*, so as to spread the tidings *down among* (κατά) those who hear. See ^{<B12>}Acts 17:23. Found only in the Acts and in Paul.

God is Light (Θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν). A statement of the absolute nature of God. Not *a* light, nor *the* light, with reference to created beings, as *the light of men, the light of the world*, but simply and absolutely *God is light*, in His very nature. Compare God is spirit, and see on ^{<B3>}John 4:24: *God is love*, ^{<B10>}1 John 4:8, 16. The expression is not a metaphor. “All that we are accustomed to term *light* in the domain of the creature, whether with a physical or metaphysical meaning, is only an effluence of that one and

only primitive *Light* which appears in the nature of God” (Ebrard). Light is immaterial, diffusive, pure, and glorious. It is the condition of life. Physically, it represents *glory*; intellectually, *truth*; morally, *holiness*. As immaterial it corresponds to God as *spirit*; as diffusive, to God as *love*; as the condition of life, to God as *life*; as pure and illuminating, to God as *holiness* and *truth*. In the Old Testament, light is often the medium of God’s visible revelations to men. It was the first manifestation of God in creation. The burning lamp passed between the pieces of the parted victim in God’s covenant with Abraham. God went before Israel in a pillar of fire, descended in fire upon Sinai, and appeared in the luminous cloud which rested on the mercy-seat in the most holy place. In classical Greek φως *light*, is used metaphorically for *delight*, *deliverance*, *victory*, and is applied to persons as a term of admiring affection, as we say that one is *the light of our life*, or the *delight of our eyes*. So Ulysses, on seeing his son Telemachus, says, “Thou hast come, Telemachus, *sweet light* (γλυκερὸν φῶς)” (Homer, “Odyssey,” 16:23). And Electra, greeting her returning brother, Orestes, “*O dearest light* (φίλτατον φῶς)” (Sophocles, “Electra,” 1223). Occasionally, as by Euripides, of *the light of truth* (“Iphigenia at Tauris,” 1046). No modern writer has developed the idea of God as light with such power and beauty as Dante. His “Paradise” might truthfully be called a study of light. Light is the only visible expression of God. Radiating from Him, it is diffused through the universe as the principle of life. This key-note is struck at the very opening of “the Paradise.”

*“The glory of Him who moveth everything
Doth penetrate the universe, and shine
In one part more and in another less.
Within that heaven which most His light receives
Was I.” — “Paradiso,” i., 1-5.*

In the final, beatific vision, God Himself is imagined as a luminous point which pours its rays through all the spheres, upon which the spirits gazed, and in which they read the past, the present, and the future.

*“O grace abundant, by which I presumed
To fix my sight upon the Light Eternal,
So that the seeing I consumed therein!
I saw that in its depth far down is lying
Bound up with love together in one volume,
What through the universe in leaves is scattered;
Substance, and accident, and their operations,
All interfused together in such wise
That what I speak of is one simple light.”
“Paradiso,” xxxiii., 82-90.*

*“In presence of that light one such becomes,
That to withdraw therefrom for other prospect
It is impossible he e’er consent;
Because the good, which object of will,
Is gathered all in this, and out of it
That is defective which is perfect there.”
“Paradiso,” xxxiii., 100-105.*

*“O Light eterne, sole in thyself that dwellest,
Sole knowest thyself, and, know unto thyself
And knowing, lovest and smilest on thyself!
“Paradiso xxxiii., 124-126.*

Light enkindles love.

*“If in the heat of love I flame upon thee
Beyond the measure that on earth is seen,
So that the valor of thine eyes I vanquish,
Marvel thou not thereat; for this proceeds
From perfect sight, which, as it apprehends,
To the good apprehended moves its feet.
Well I perceive how is already shining
Into thine intellect the eternal Light,
That only seen enkindles always love.”
“Paradiso,” v., 1-9*

See also “Paradiso,” cantos 30, 31.

In Him is no darkness at all (καὶ σκοτία οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐδεμία). It is characteristic of John to express the same idea positively and negatively. See ^{<RB>}John 1:7, 8, 20; 3:15, 17, 20; 4:42; 5:24; 8:35; 10:28; ^{<RB>}1 John 1:6, 8; 2:4, 27; 5:12. According to the Greek order, the rendering is: “And darkness there is not in Him, no, not in any way.” For a similar addition of οὐδεὶς *not one*, to a complete sentence, see ^{<RB>}John 6:63; 11:19; 19:11. On σκοτία *darkness*, see on ^{<RB>}John 1:5.

6. If we say (ἐὰν εἴπωμεν). The subjunctive mood puts the case as *supposed*, not as *assumed*.

Walk in the darkness. The phrase occurs only in John's Gospel and First Epistle. *Darkness* here is σκότος, instead of σκοτία (ver. 5). See on ^{<B005>}John 1:5. *Walk* (περιπατῶμεν), is, literally, *walk about*; indicating the habitual course of the life, outward and inward. The verb, with this moral sense, is common in John and Paul, and is found elsewhere only in ^{<B005>}Mark 7:5; ^{<B021>}Acts 21:21.

We lie and do not the truth. Again the combination of the positive and negative statements. See on ver. 5. The phrase *to do the truth* occurs only in John's Gospel and First Epistle. See on ^{<B021>}John 3:21. All walking in darkness is a not doing of the truth. "Right action is true thought realized. Every fragment of right done is so much truth made visible" (Westcott).

7. We walk in the light (ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν). The phrase occurs only in the First Epistle. *Walk*, as above. *In the light*, having our life in God, who is light.

He is in the light. God *is* forever and unchangeable in perfect light. Compare Psalms 104:2; ^{<B066>}1 Timothy 6:16. We *walk*, advancing in the light and by means of the light to more light. "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day" (^{<B018>}Proverbs 4:18).

One with another (μετ' ἀλλήλων). Not, *we with God and God with us*, but with *our brethren*. Fellowship with God exhibits and proves itself by fellowship with Christians. See 4:7, 12; 3:11, 23.

Of Jesus Christ His Son. Omit *Christ*. The *human* name, *Jesus*, shows that His blood is available for man. The *divine* name, *His Son*, shows that it is efficacious. I shall be rendering a service to students of John's Epistles by giving, in a condensed form, Canon Westcott's note, classifying the several names of our Lord and their uses in the Epistles.

The name in John, as in the Bible elsewhere, has two distinct, but closely connected meanings.

1. The Revelation of the Divine Being by a special title.

2. The whole sum of the manifold revelations gathered up so as to form one supreme revelation.

The latter sense is illustrated in 3 John 7, where “the name” absolutely includes the essential elements of the Christian creed, the complete revelation of Christ’s work in relation to God and man. Compare ^{418B}John 20:31; ^{415B}Acts 5:41.

In 2:12, the term is more limited, referring to Christ as He lived on earth and gave Himself for “the brethren.” In 3:23; 5:13, the exact sense is defined by what follows.

ACTUAL NAMES USED.

(I.) *His Son Jesus Christ.* 1:3; 3:23; 5:20. The divine antecedent is differently described in each case, and the difference colors the phrase. In 1:23, the *Father* (compare John 3). In 3:23, *God*. In 5:20, *He that is true*. Thus the sonship of Christ is regarded in relation to God as Father, as God, and as satisfying the divine ideal which man is able to form. The whole phrase, *His Son Jesus Christ*, includes the two elements of the confessions which John makes prominent.

1. Jesus is the Son of God (4:15; 5:5).
2. Jesus is the Christ (2:22; 5:1).

The constituents of the compressed phrase are all used separately by John.

- (1.) *Jesus.* 2:22; 5:1; 4:3 (where the correct reading omits Christ). The thought is that of the Lord in His perfect historic humanity.
- (2.) *Christ.* 2 John 9. Pointing to the preparation made under the old covenant.
- (3.) *Jesus Christ.* 2:1; 5:6; 2 John 7. Combining the ideas of true humanity and messianic position.

In 4:15, the reading is doubtful: *Jesus or Jesus Christ*.

On 4:2, see note.

(4.) *The Son*. 2:22, 23, 24; 4:14; 5:12. The absolute relation of Sonship to Fatherhood.

(5.) *The Son of God*. 3:8; 5:10, 12, 13, 20. Compare *His Son* (4:10; 5:9), where the immediate antecedent is ὁ Θεός *God*; and 5:18, *He that was begotten of God*. Combination of the ideas of Christ's divine dignity and divine sonship.

(6.) *Jesus His (God's) Son*. 1:7. Two truths. The blood of Christ is *available* and *efficacious*.

(7.) *His (God's) Son, His only Son*. 4:9. The uniqueness of the gift is the manifestation of love.

The Son in various forms is eminently characteristic of the First and Second Epistles, in which it occurs more times than in all Paul's Epistles.

Κύριος *Lord*, is not found in the Epistles (omit from 2 John 3), but occurs in the Gospel, and often in Revelation.

The expression, *the blood of Jesus His Son*, is chosen with a profound insight. Though Ignatius uses the phrase *blood of God* yet the word *blood* is inappropriate to the Son conceived in *His divine* nature. The word *Jesus* brings out His *human* nature, in which He assumed a *real* body of flesh and blood, which blood was shed for us.

Cleanseth (καθαρίζει). See on ^{<4075>}Mark 7:19. Not only *forgives* but *removes*. Compare ^{<5024>}Titus 2:14; ^{<5025>}Hebrews 9:13 sq.; 22 sq.; ^{<4085>}Ephesians 5:26 sq.; ^{<4086>}Matthew 5:8; ^{<4087>}1 John 3:3. Compare also ver. 9, where, *forgive* (ἀφῆ) and *cleanse* (καθαρίση) occur, with an obvious difference of meaning. Note the present tense *cleanseth*. The cleansing is *present* and *continuous*. Alexander (Bishop of Derry) cites a striking passage from Victor Hugo ("Le Parricide"). The usurper Canute, who has had a share in his father's death, expiring after a virtuous and glorious reign, walks towards the light of heaven. But first he cuts with his sword a shroud of snow from the top of Mt. Savo. As he advances towards heaven, a cloud forms, and drop by drop his shroud is soaked with a rain of blood.

All sin (πάσης ἀμαρτίας). *The principle* of sin in all its forms and manifestations; not the separate manifestations. Compare *all joy* (James).

1:2); *all patience* (⁴⁰²2 Corinthians 7:12); *all wisdom* (Ephesians. 1:8); *all diligence* (⁶⁰⁰2 Peter 1:5).

8. *That we have no sin.* “Ὅτι *that*, may be taken merely as a mark of quotation: “If we say, *sin we have not.*” On the phrase *to have sin*, see on ⁶¹⁰John 16:22, and compare *have fellowship*, ver. 3. *Sin* (ἁμαρτία) is not to be understood of *original sin*, or of *sin before conversion*, but *generally*. “It is obvious that this ἔχειν ἁμαρτίαν (*to have sin*), is infinitely diversified, according to the successive measure of the purification and development of the new man. Even the apostle John does not exclude himself from the universal *if we say*” (Ebrard).

Heathen authors say very little about sin, and classic paganism had little or no conception of sin in the Gospel sense. The nearest approach to it was by Plato, from whose works a tolerably complete doctrinal statement might be gathered of the origin, nature, and effects of sin. The fundamental idea of ἁμαρτία (*sin*) among the Greeks is *physical; the missing of a mark* (see on ⁴⁰²Matthew 1:21; 6:14); from which it develops into a *metaphysical meaning, to wander in the understanding*. This assumes *knowledge* as the basis of goodness; and sin, therefore, is, primarily, *ignorance*. In the Platonic conception of sin, *intellectual error* is the prominent element. Thus: “What then, I said, is the result of all this? Is not this the result — that other things are indifferent, and that wisdom is the only good, and ignorance the only evil?” (“Euthydemus,” 281). “The business of the founders of the state will be to compel the best minds to attain that knowledge which has been already declared by us to be the greatest of all — they must continue to rise until they arrive at the good” (“Republic,” 7, 519). Plato represents sin as the dominance of the lower impulses of the soul, which is opposed to nature and to God (see “Laws,” 9, 863. “Republic,” 1, 351). Or again, as an inward want of harmony. “May we not regard every living being as a puppet of the gods, either their plaything only or created with a purpose — which of the two we cannot certainly know? But this we know, that these affections in us are like cords and strings which pull us different and opposite ways, and to opposite actions; and herein lies the difference between virtue and vice” (“Laws,” 1, 644). He traces most sins to the influence of the body on the soul. “In this present life, I reckon that we make the nearest approach to knowledge when we have the least possible communion or fellowship with

the body, and are not infected with the bodily nature, but remain pure until the hour when God himself is pleased to release us. And then the foolishness of the body will be cleared away, and we shall be pure, and hold converse with other pure souls, and know of ourselves the clear light everywhere, which is no other than the light of truth” (“Phedo,” 67).^{fb62}

We find in the classical writers, however, the occasional sense of the universal faultiness of mankind, though even Plato furnishes scarcely any traces of accepting the doctrine of innate depravity. Thus Theognis: “The sun beholds no wholly good and virtuous man among those who are now living” (615). “But having become good, to remain in a good state and be good, is not possible, and is not granted to man. God only has this blessing; but man cannot help being bad when the force of circumstances overpowers him” (Plato, “Protagoras,” 344). “How, then: is it possible to be sinless? It is impossible; but *this* is possible, to strive not to sin” (“Epictetus,” 4, 12, 19).

We deceive ourselves (ἐαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν). Lit., *we lead ourselves astray*. See on ^{<402>}Mark 7:24; ^{<426>}Matthew 27:63, 64; Jude 13. Not only do we err, we are responsible for it. The phrase only here in the New Testament. For the verb as applied to *deceivers* of various kinds, see ^{<124>}Matthew 24:4; ^{<121>}Revelation 2:20; 8:14; 19:20; 8:9; 20:3. Compare *πλάνοι* *deceivers* (2 John 7); *πλάνη* *error* (Jude 11; ^{<446>}1 John 4:6).

The truth. The whole Gospel. All reality is in God. He is the only *true* God (ἀληθινός ^{<373>}John 17:3; see on ^{<400>}John 1:9). This reality is incarnated in Christ, the Word of God, “the very image of His substance,” and in His message to men. This message is *the truth*, a title not found in the Synoptists, Acts, or Revelation, but in the Catholic Epistles (^{<359>}James 5:19; ^{<402>}1 Peter 1:22; ^{<400>}2 Peter 2:2), and in Paul (^{<408>}2 Corinthians 8:8; ^{<403>}Ephesians 1:13, etc.). It is especially characteristic of the Gospel and Epistles of John.

The truth is represented by John objectively and subjectively.

1. Objectively. In the person of Christ. He is *the Truth*, the perfect revelation of God (^{<408>}John 1:18; 14:6). His manhood is true to the absolute law of right, which is the law of love, and is, therefore, our perfect pattern of manhood.

Truth, absolutely existing in and identified with God, was also, in some measure, diffused in the world. The Word was in the world, before as after the incarnation (^{<B10>}John 1:10. See on ^{<B4>}John 1:4, 5). Christ often treats the truth as something to which He came to bear witness, and which it was His mission to develop into clearer recognition and expression (^{<B37>}John 18:37). This He did through the embodiment of truth in His own person (^{<B14>}John 1:14, 17; 14:6), and by His teaching (^{<B80>}John 8:40; 17:17); and His work is carried out by the Spirit of Truth (^{<B13>}John 16:13), sent by God and by Christ himself (^{<B6>}John 14:26; 16:7). Hence the Spirit, even as Christ, is *the Truth* (^{<B1>}1 John 5:6). The whole sum of the knowledge of Christ and of the Spirit, is the Truth (^{<B21>}1 John 2:21; 2 John 1).

This truth can be recognized, apprehended, and appropriated by man, and can be also rejected by him (^{<B32>}John 8:32; ^{<B21>}1 John 2:21; ^{<B44>}John 8:44).

2. Subjectively. The truth is lodged in man by the Spirit, and communicated to his spirit (^{<B47>}John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13). It dwells in man (^{<B18>}1 John 1:8; 2:4; 2 John 2), as revelation, comfort, guidance, enlightenment, conviction, impulse, inspiration, knowledge. It is *the spirit* of truth as opposed to the *spirit of error* (^{<B11>}1 John 4:6). It translates itself into act. God's true children *do the truth* (^{<B21>}John 3:21; ^{<B11>}1 John 1:6). It brings sanctification and freedom (^{<B32>}John 8:32; 17:17). See on ^{<B46>}John 14:6, 17.

9. Confess (ὁμολογῶμεν). From ὁμός, *one and the same*, and λέγω, to say. Hence, primarily, *to say the same thing as another*, and, therefore, *to admit the truth of an accusation*. Compare Psalms 51:4. The exact phrase, ὁμολογεῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας *confess the sins*, does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Compare ἐξομολογεῖσθαι ἁμαρτίας (παραπτώματα) ^{<B16>}Matthew 3:6; ^{<B16>}Mark 1:5; ^{<B16>}James 5:16. See on ^{<B16>}Matthew 3:6; 11:25; ^{<B27>}Luke 22:6; ^{<B18>}Acts 19:18; ^{<B16>}James 5:16.

Sins. Note the plural, as compared with the singular, *sin*, in the previous verse. See note. The plural indicates that the confession is to be *specific* as well as *general*. Augustine's words are exactly to the point, but his play upon *pardon* and *confess* cannot be reproduced in English. "Vis ut ille ignoscat? Tu agnosce." *Do you wish Him to forgive? Do you confess.*

Faithful (πιστός). True to His own nature and promises; keeping faith with Himself and with man. The word is applied to God as fulfilling His

own promises (^{<502>}Hebrews 10:23; 11:11); as fulfilling the purpose for which He has called men (^{<512>}1 Thessalonians 5:24; ^{<400>}1 Corinthians 1:9); as responding with guardianship to the trust reposed in Him by men (^{<403>}1 Corinthians 10:13; ^{<409>}1 Peter 4:19). “He abideth faithful. He cannot deny Himself” (^{<513>}2 Timothy 2:13). The same term is applied to Christ (^{<512>}2 Thessalonians 3:3; ^{<512>}Hebrews 3:2; 2:17). God’s faithfulness is here spoken of not only as essential to His own being, but as faithfulness toward us; “fidelity to that nature of truth and light, related to His own essence, which rules in us as far as we confess our sins” (Ebrard). The essence of the message of life is fellowship with God and with His children (ver. 3). God is *light* (ver. 5). Walking in the light we have *fellowship*, and the blood of Jesus is constantly applied to cleanse us from sin, which is *darkness* and which interrupts fellowship. If we walk in darkness we do not the truth. If we deny our sin the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, “God, by whom we were called *unto the fellowship* of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, is *faithful*” (^{<400>}1 Corinthians 1:9) to forgive our sins, to cleanse us from all unrighteousness, and thus to restore and maintain the interrupted fellowship.

Just (δικαίος). Rev., *righteous*. From *δίκη* *right*. The term is applied both to God and to Christ. See ^{<404>}Revelation 16:5; ^{<412>}John 17:25; ^{<401>}1 John 2:1; 3:7; ^{<418>}1 Peter 3:18. The two words, *faithful* and *righteous*, imply each other. They unite in a true conception of God’s character. God, who is absolute *rightness*, must be *faithful* to His own nature, and His righteous dealing with men who partake of that nature and walk in fellowship with Him, is simply fidelity to Himself. “Righteousness is truth passing into action” (Westcott).

To forgive (ἵνα ἀφῆ). See ^{<402>}John 20:23; ^{<402>}1 John 2:12. Primarily the word means to *send away*, *dismiss*; hence of sins, to *remit*, as a debt. *Cleansing* (ver. 7) contemplates *the personal character* of the sinner; *remission*, his *acts*. See on ^{<402>}Matthew 6:12; ^{<505>}James 5:15. *To forgive* is, literally, *that he may forgive*. On John’s use of ἵνα *in order that*, see on ^{<453>}John 15:13; 14:31. Forgiveness answers to the essential *purpose* of His faithful and righteous being.

Our sins (τὰς ἀμαρτίας). Sin is defined by John as *ἀνομία*, *lawlessness*. Compare ^{<409>}Romans 6:19. A.V., *transgression of the law* (^{<401>}1 John 3:4). It

may be regarded either as *condition* or as *act*; either with reference to the normal, divine ideal of manhood, or to an external law imposed upon man by God. Any departure from the normal ideal of man as created in God's image puts man out of true relation and harmony with his true self, and therefore with God and with his fellowman. He thus comes into false, abnormal relation with right, love, truth, and light. He walks in darkness and forfeits fellowship with God. Lawlessness is darkness, lovelessness, selfishness. This false *principle* takes shape in *act*. He *doeth* (ποιεῖ) or *committeth* sin. He *doeth lawlessness* (τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ; ^{<A1>}1 John 3:4, 8). He transgresses the *words* (ῥήματα, ^{<A1>}John 17:8) of God, and His *commandments* (ἐντολαί, ^{<A1>}1 John 2:3) as included and expressed in His one *word* or *message* (λόγος, ^{<A1>}1 John 2:7, 14). Similarly the verb ἁμαρτάνειν, *to sin*, may signify either *to be sinful* (^{<A1>}1 John 3:6), or *to commit sin* (^{<A1>}1 John 1:10). Sin, regarded both as principle and act, is designated by John by the term ἁμαρτία. The principle expressed in the specific acts is ἡ ἁμαρτία (^{<A1>}John 1:29), which occurs in this sense in Paul, but not in the Synoptists, nor in Acts. Many of the terms used for *sin* by other New Testament writers are wanting in John; as ἀσέβεια *ungodliness* (see on Jude 14); ἀσεβεῖν *to be ungodly* (^{<A1>}2 Peter 2:6); παραβαίνειν *to transgress*; παράβασις *transgression*; παραβάτης *transgressor* (see on ^{<A1>}Matthew 6:14; ^{<A1>}James 2:11); παρανομεῖν *to act contrary to the law*; παρανομία *breach of law* (see on ^{<A1>}Acts 23:3; ^{<A1>}2 Peter 2:16); παράπτωμα *trespass* (see on ^{<A1>}Matthew 6:14).

To cleanse. See on ver. 7.

Unrighteousness (ἀδικία). With reference to δίκαιος *righteous*. The righteous One who calls us into fellowship with Himself, purges away the unrighteousness which is contrary to His nature, and which renders fellowship impossible. The word occurs in John's writings only at ^{<A1>}John 7:18; ^{<A1>}1 John 5:17.

10. *We have not sinned* (οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν). Committed sins. Sin regarded as an *act*. The *state* is expressed by ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν *we have no* (or not) *sin* (ver. 8).

We make Him (ποιοῦμεν αὐτὸν). A phrase characteristic of John. See ^{<A1>}John 5:18; 8:53; 10:33; 19:7, 12.

His word (ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ). Not the personal Word, as ^{<B001>}John 1:1, but the divine message of the Gospel. See ^{<A011>}Luke 5:1; 8:11; ^{<A061>}Acts 4:31; 6:2, 7, etc. Compare “*the truth* is not in us” (ver. 8). The *truth* is the substance of the word. The word carries the truth. The word both *moves* the man (^{<B031>}John 8:31, 32) and *abides in him* (^{<A033>}John 5:38; 8:37). The man also abides in the word (^{<B031>}John 8:31).

CHAPTER 2

1. *My little children* (τεκνία μου). Τεκνίον, *little child*, diminutive of τέκνον *child*, occurs in ^{<483>}John 8:33; ^{<492>}1 John 2:12, 28; 3:7, 18; 4:4; 5:21. This particular phrase is found only here (best texts omit *my* in ^{<491>}1 John 3:18). Used as a term of affection, or possibly with reference to the writer's advanced age. Compare Christ's word, παιδία *children* (^{<495>}John 21:5) which John also uses (^{<493>}1 John 2:13, 18). In the familiar story of John and the young convert who became a robber, it is related that the aged apostle repaired to the robber's haunt, and that the young man, on seeing him, took to flight. John, forgetful of his age, ran after him, crying: "O my son why dost thou fly from me thy father? Thou, an armed man, — I, an old, defenseless one! Have pity upon me! My son, do not fear! There is still hope of life for thee. I wish myself to take the burden of all before Christ. If it is necessary, I will die for thee, as Christ died for us. Stop! Believe! It is Christ who sends me." ^{fb63}

I write. More personal than *we write* (1:4), and thus better suiting the form of address, *my little children*.

If any man sin, we have. The change from the indefinite third person, *any man*, to the first person, *we have*, is significant. By the *we have*, John assumes the possibility of sinful acts on the part of Christians, and of himself in common with them, and their common need of the intervention of the divine Advocate. So Augustine: "He said, not 'ye have,' nor 'ye have me,' nor 'ye have Christ himself;' but he put *Christ*, not *himself*, and said 'we have,' and not 'ye have.' He preferred to place himself in the number of sinners, so that he might have Christ for his advocate, rather than to put himself as the advocate instead of Christ, and to be found among the proud who are destined to condemnation."

An advocate (παράκλητον). See on ^{<446>}John 14:16.

With the Father (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα). See on *with God*, ^{<400>}John 1:1. An active relation is indicated. On the terms *the Father* and *my Father*, see on ^{<401>}John 4:21.

The righteous. Compare righteous, 1:9. There is no article in the Greek. Jesus Christ righteous. See on 1:9.

2. *And He* (καὶ αὐτὸς). The *He* is emphatic: *that same Jesus: He himself.*

The propitiation (ἰλασμός). Only here and 4:10. From ἰλάσκομαι *to appease, to conciliate to one's self*, which occurs Luke 28:13; ^{<507>}Hebrews 2:17. The noun means originally *an appeasing or propitiating*, and passes, through Alexandrine usage, into the sense of *the means of appeasing*, as here. The construction is to be particularly noted; *for, in the matter of* (περὶ) *our sins*; the genitive case of that *for which* propitiation is made. In ^{<507>}Hebrews 2:17, the accusative case, also of *the sins* to be propitiated. In classical usage, on the other hand, the habitual construction is the accusative (direct objective case), of *the person* propitiated. So in Homer, of the gods. Θεὸν ἰλάσκεσθαι *is to make a God propitious to one*. See “Iliad,” 1, 386, 472. Of men whom one wishes to conciliate by divine honors after death. So Herodotus, of Philip of Crotona. “His beauty gained him honors at the hands of the Eggestaeans which they never accorded to any one else; for they raised a hero-temple over his grave, and they still *propitiate him* (αὐτὸν ἰλάσκονται) with sacrifices” (5:47). Again, “The Parians, having *propitiated Themistocles* (Θεμιστοκλέα ἰλασάμενοι) with gifts, escaped the visits of the army” (8:112). The change from this construction shows, to quote Canon Westcott, “that the scriptural conception of the verb is not that of appeasing one who is angry, with a personal feeling, against the offender; but of altering the character of that which, from without, occasions a necessary alienation, and interposes an inevitable obstacle to fellowship. Such phrases as ‘propitiating God,’ and God ‘being reconciled’ are foreign to the language of the New Testament. *Man* is reconciled (^{<475>}2 Corinthians 5:18 sq.; ^{<480>}Romans 5:10 sq.). There is a propitiation in the matter of *the sin* or of *the sinner*.”

For the sins of the whole world (περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου). *The sins of* (A.V., italicized) should be omitted; as in Revelation, *for the whole world*. Compare ^{<404>}1 John 4:14; ^{<404>}John 4:42; 7:32. “The propitiation is as wide as the sin” (Bengel). If men do not experience its benefit, the fault is not in its efficacy. Dusterdieck (cited by Huther) says, “The propitiation has its real efficacy for the whole world; to believers it brings life, to unbelievers

death.” Luther: “It is a patent fact that thou too art a part of the whole world; so that thine heart cannot deceive itself, and think, the Lord died for Peter and Paul, but not for me.” On **κόσμου** see on ^{<400>}John 1:9.

3. Hereby (**ἐν τούτῳ**). Lit., *in this*. Characteristic of John. See ^{<488>}John 8:35; 15:8; 16:30; ^{<415>}1 John 2:5; 3:24; 4:13; 5:2; 3:16; 3:19; 4:2. The expression points to what follows, “if we keep His commandments,” yet with a covert reference to that idea as generally implied in the previous words concerning fellowship with God and walking in the light.

We know (**γινώσκωμεν**). Or, *perceive*. By experience, from day to day; distinguished from **οἶδαμεν** *we know*, expressing absolute, immediate knowledge of a fact once for all. Compare ^{<489>}1 John 3:2.

That we know (**ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν**). Or, more literally, *have come to know*. John does not use the compound forms **ἐπιγινώσκειν** and **ἐπίγνωσις** (see on ^{<417>}Matthew 7:16. See ^{<410>}Luke 1:4; ^{<413>}Acts 4:13; ^{<412>}Romans 1:28; ^{<417>}Ephesians 1:17, etc.), nor the kindred word **γνώσις** *knowledge* (^{<417>}Luke 1:77; ^{<412>}Romans 2:20, etc.).

We keep His commandments (**τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν**). A phrase peculiar to John and occurring elsewhere only ^{<407>}Matthew 19:17; ^{<504>}1 Timothy 6:14. In ^{<419>}1 Corinthians 7:19, we find **τήρησις ἐντολῶν** *the keeping of the commandments*. On **τηρέω** *to keep*, see on ^{<405>}1 Peter 1:5.

4. A liar. Compare *we lie*, 1:6.

In him (**ἐν τούτῳ**). Emphatic. Lit., *in this one the truth is not*. See on 1:8.

Keepeth His word (**τηρῆ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον**). Note the changed phrase: *word for commandments*. The *word* is the revelation regarded as a whole, which includes all the separate *commandments* or *injunctions*. See the use of **λόγος** *word*, and **ἐντολή** *precept*, in ^{<412>}John 14:21-24.

Is the love of God perfected (**ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται**). Rev., rendering the perfect tense more closely, *hath the love of God been perfected*. The change in the form of this antithetic clause is striking. He who claims to know God, yet lives in disobedience, is a liar. We should expect as an offset to this: He that keepeth His commandments *is of the truth*; or, *the truth is in him*. Instead we have, “In him has the love of God been perfected.” In other words, the obedient child of God is

characterized, not by any representative trait or quality of his own personality, but merely as the subject of the work of divine love: as the sphere in which that love accomplishes its perfect work.

The phrase ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ the love of God, may mean either *the love which God shows*, or *the love of which God is the object*, or *the love which is characteristic of God* whether manifested by Himself or by His obedient child through His Spirit. John's usage is not decisive like Paul's, according to which *the love of God* habitually means the love which proceeds from and is manifested by God. The exact phrase, *the love of God* or *the love of the Father*, is found in 3:16; 4:9, in the undoubted sense of *the love of God to men*. The same sense is intended in 3:1, 9, 16, though differently expressed. The sense is doubtful in 2:5; 3:17; 4:12. *Men's love to God* is clearly meant in 2:15; 5:3. The phrase occurs only twice in the Gospels (^{416C}Luke 6:42; ^{416C}John 5:42), and in both cases the sense is doubtful. Some, as Ebrard, combine the two, and explain the *love of God* as *the mutual relation of love between God and men*.

It is not possible to settle the point decisively, but I incline to the view that the fundamental idea of the love of God as expounded by John is *the love which God has made known and which answers to His nature*. In favor of this is the general usage of ἀγάπη love, in the New Testament, with the subjective genitive. ^{fb64} The object is more commonly expressed by εἰς towards, or to. See ^{416D}1 Thessalonians 3:12; ^{416D}Colossians 1:4; ^{416D}1 Peter 4:8. Still stronger is John's treatment of the subject in ch. 4. Here we have, ver. 9, the *manifestation* of the love of God in us (ἐν ἡμῖν) By our life in Christ and our love to God we are a manifestation of God's love. Directly following this is a definition of the essential nature of love. "In this is love; i.e., *herein consists love: not that we have loved God*, but *that He loved us*" (ver. 10). Our mutual love is a proof that God dwells in us. God dwelling in us, His love is perfected in us (ver. 12). The latter clause, it would seem, must be explained according to ver. 10. Then (ver. 16), "We have known and believed the love that God *hath in us*" (see on ^{416E}John 16:22, on the phrase *have love*). "God is love;" that is His nature, and He imparts this nature to be the *sphere* in which His children dwell. "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God." Finally, our love is engendered by His love to us. "We love Him because He first loved us" (ver. 19).

In harmony with this is ^{<B19>}John 15:9. “As the Father loved me, I also loved you. Continue ye *in my love*.” *My love* must be explained by *I loved you*. This is the same idea of divine love as the *sphere* or *element* of renewed being; and this idea is placed, as in the passage we are considering, in direct connection with the keeping of the divine commandments. “If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love.”

This interpretation does not exclude man’s love to God. On the contrary, it includes it. The love which God has, is revealed *as the love of God* in the love of His children towards Him, no less than in His manifestations of love to them. The idea of divine love is thus complex. Love, in its very essence, is reciprocal. Its perfect ideal requires two parties. It is not enough to tell us, as a bare, abstract truth, that God is love. The truth must be rounded and filled out for us by the appreciable exertion of divine love upon an object, and by the response of the object. The love of God is *perfected* or *completed* by the perfect establishment of the relation of love between God and man. When man loves perfectly, his love is the love of God shed abroad in his heart. His love owes both its origin and its nature to the love of God.

The word *verily* (ἀληθῶς) is never used by John as a mere formula of affirmation, but has the meaning of a qualitative adverb, expressing not merely the *actual existence* of a thing, but its existence in a manner most absolutely corresponding to ἀλήθεια *truth*. Compare ^{<B18>}John 1:48; 8:31. *Hath been perfected*. John is presenting the *ideal* of life in God. “This is the love of God that we keep His commandments.” Therefore whosoever keepeth God’s *word*, His message in its entirety, realizes the perfect relation of love.

We are in Him. Compare ^{<H72>}Acts 17:28. See note on 2:15.

6. *He abideth in Him* (ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν). To *abide in God* is a more common expression with John than *to be in God*, and marks an advance in thought. The phrase is a favorite one with John. See ^{<B14>}John 15:4 sqq.; 6:56; ^{<B12>}1 John 2:24, 27, 28; 3:6, 24; 4:12 sq.; 15 sq. Bengel notes the gradation in the three phrases “*to know Him, to be in Him, to abide in Him*; knowledge, fellowship, constancy.”

Ought (ὀφείλει). An obligation, put as a *debt*. See Luke 27:10, and on *debts*, ^{<4112>}Matthew 6:12. The word expresses a special, personal obligation, and not as *δεῖ* *must*, an obligation in the nature of things. See ^{<4119>}John 20:9, and compare ^{<4116>}1 John 3:16; 4:11; 3 John 8.

He (ἐκεῖνος). Always of Christ in the Epistles of John. See *ἐκεῖνης*, referring to ἁμαρτία *sin*, ^{<4116>}1 John 5:16.

7. *Brethren* (ἀδελφοὶ). The correct reading is ἀγαπηοὶ *beloved*. The first occurrence of this title, which is suggested by the previous words concerning the relation of love.

No new commandment (οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν). The Rev., properly, places these words first in the sentence as emphatic, the point of the verse lying in the antithesis between the new and the old. On *new*, see on ^{<4119>}Matthew 26:29.

Old (παλαιὸν). Four words are used in the New Testament for *old* or *elder*. Of these γέρον and πρεσβύτερος refer merely to the age of men, or, the latter, to official position based primarily upon age. Hence the official term *elder*. Between the two others, ἀρχαῖος and παλαιός, the distinction is not sharply maintained. Ἀρχαῖος emphasizes the reaching back to a *beginning* (ἀρχή). Thus Satan is “that *old* (ἀρχαῖος) serpent,” whose evil work was coeval with the beginning of time (^{<4119>}Revelation 7:9; 20:2). The world before the flood is “the *old* (ἀρχαῖος) world” (^{<4116>}2 Peter 2:5). Mnason was “an *old* (ἀρχαῖος) disciple;” not *aged*, but having been a disciple from the beginning (^{<4116>}Acts 21:16). Sophocles, in “Trachiniae,” 555, gives both words. “I had an old (παλαιὸν) gift,” *i.e.*, received long ago, “from the *old* (ἀρχαίου) Centaur.” The Centaur is conceived as an old-world creature, belonging to a state of things which has passed away. It carries, therefore, the idea of *old fashioned*: peculiar to an obsolete state of things.

Παλαιός carries the sense of *worn out* by time, injury, sorrow, or other causes. Thus the *old* garment (^{<4116>}Matthew 9:16) is παλαιόν. So the *old* wine-skins (^{<4117>}Matthew 9:17). The old men of a living generation compared with the young of the same generation are παλαιοί. In παλαιός the simple conception of *time* dominates. In ἀρχαῖος there is often a suggestion of a *character* answering to the remote age.

The commandment is here called *old* because it belonged to the first stage of the Christian church. Believers had had it from the beginning of their Christian faith.

Commandment. The commandment of love. Compare ^{<BES>}John 13:34. This commandment is fulfilled in walking as Christ walked. Compare ^{<BES>}Ephesians 5:1, 2.

8. New commandment. The commandment of love is both *old* and *new*. *Old*, because John's readers have had it from the beginning of their Christian experience. *New*, because, in the unfolding of Christian experience, it has developed new power, meaning, and obligation, and closer correspondence "with the facts of Christ's life, with the crowning mystery of His passion, and with the facts of the Christian life."

Which thing is true (ὃ ἔστιν ἀληθές). The expression *which thing*, or *that which*, refers either to *the commandment of love*, or to the fact stated, viz., *that the old commandment is new*. The fact that the old commandment is new is true in Him and in us. On the whole I prefer this.

In Him and in us. For *us*, read *you*. The fact that the old commandment is new, is true *in Him* (Christ), since He gave it as a new commandment, and illustrated it by His word and example. It is true in *you*, since you did not receive it until Christ gave it, and since the person and life of Christ are appealing to you in new lights and with fresh power as your Christian life develops. *In Him*, points back to as *He walked*.

Because. Explaining the apparent paradox.

The darkness (ἡ σκοτία). See on ^{<BES>}John 1:5. God is *light*; and whatever is not in fellowship with God is therefore *darkness*. In all cases where the word is not used of physical darkness, it means moral insensibility to the divine light; moral blindness or obtuseness. Compare ^{<BES>}John 8:12; 12:35, 46; 1 ^{<BES>}John 2:9, 11.

Is past (παράγεται). Wrong. The *passing* is not represented as *accomplished*, but as *in progress*. Rev., rightly rendering the present tense, *is passing away*.

The true light (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν). Lit., *the light, the true* (light). See on *that eternal life* (1:2). *True*, not as distinguished from false, but as

answering to the true ideal. See on ^{<400>}John 1:9. The *true light* is the revelation of God in Christ. See on ^{<400>}1 John 1:5.

Shineth (φαίνειν). See on ^{<400>}John 1:5. Compare ^{<400>}Revelation 1:16; 8:12; 21:23; ^{<400>}2 Peter 1:19. See also ^{<400>}Romans 13:11 sqq.; ^{<400>}Titus 2:11; 3:4.

9. *Hateth* (μισῶν). The sharp issue is maintained here as in Christ's words, "He that is not with me is against me" (^{<400>}Luke 11:23). Men fall into two classes, those who are in fellowship with God, and therefore walk in light and love, and those who are not in fellowship with God, and therefore walk in darkness and hatred. "A direct opposition," says Bengel; where love is not, there is hatred. "The heart is not empty." See ^{<400>}John 3:20; 7:7; 15:18 sqq.; 17:14. The word *hate* is opposed both to the love of natural affection (φιλεῖν), and to the more discriminating sentiment — love founded on a just estimate (ἀγαπᾶν). For the former see ^{<400>}John 12:25; 15:18, 19; compare ^{<400>}Luke 14:26. For the latter, ^{<400>}1 John 3:14, 15; 4:20; ^{<400>}Matthew 5:43; 6:24; ^{<400>}Ephesians 5:28, 29. "In the former case, *hatred*, which may become a moral duty, involves the subjection of an instinct. In the latter case it expresses a general determination of character" (Westcott).

His brother (τὸν ἀδελφόν). His fellow-Christian. The singular, *brother*, is characteristic of this Epistle. See vv. 10, 11; 3:10, 15, 17; 4:20, 21; 5:16. Christians are called in the New Testament, *Christians* (^{<400>}Acts 11:26; 26:28; ^{<400>}1 Peter 4:16), mainly by those outside of the Christian circle. *Disciples*, applied to all followers of Christ (^{<400>}John 2:11; 6:61) and strictly to the twelve (^{<400>}John 13:5 sqq.). In ^{<400>}Acts 19:1, to those who had received only John's baptism. Not found in John's Epistles nor in Revelation. *Brethren*. The first title given to the body of believers after the Ascension (^{<400>}Acts 1:15, where the true reading is ἀδελφῶν *brethren*, for μαθητῶν *disciples*). See ^{<400>}Acts 9:30; 10:23; 11:29; ^{<400>}1 Thessalonians 4:10; 5:26; ^{<400>}1 John 3:14; 3 John 5, 10; ^{<400>}John 21:23. Peter has ἡ ἀδελφότης *the brotherhood* (^{<400>}1 Peter 2:17; 5:9). The *believers*. Under three forms: The *believers* (οἱ πιστοί; ^{<400>}Acts 10:45; ^{<400>}1 Timothy 4:12); *they that believe* (οἱ πιστεύοντες; ^{<400>}1 Peter 2:7; ^{<400>}1 Thessalonians 1:7; ^{<400>}Ephesians 1:19); *they that believed* (οἱ πιστεύσαντες; ^{<400>}Acts 2:44; 4:32; ^{<400>}Hebrews 4:3). The *saints* (οἱ ἅγιοι); characteristic of Paul and Revelation. Four times in the Acts (9:13, 32, 41; 26:10), and once in Jude

(3). Also ^{<360>}Hebrews 6:10; 13:24. In Paul, ^{<401>}1 Corinthians 6:1; 14:33; ^{<400>}Ephesians 1:1, 15, etc. In ^{<408>}Revelation 5:8; 8:3, 4; 11:18, etc.

Until now (ἕως ἄρτι). Though the light has been increasing, and though he may claim that he has been in the light from the first. The phrase occurs in ^{<400>}John 2:10; 5:17; 26:24; and is used by Paul, ^{<403>}1 Corinthians 4:13; 8:7; 25:6.

10. *Abideth* (μένει). See on ver. 6. Compare ver. 9, *is in*.

Occasion of stumbling (σκάνδαλον). See on *offend*, ^{<452>}Matthew 5:29. For the image in John, see ^{<416>}John 6:61; 11:9; 16:1; ^{<414>}Revelation 2:14. The meaning is not that he gives no occasion of stumbling to others, but that there is none in his own way. See ^{<410>}John 11:9, 10.

11. *Is — walketh — whither*. The condition of him who hates is viewed as related to *being, action, and tendency*.

He goeth (ὑπάγει). Or, *is going*. See on ^{<421>}John 6:21; 8:21.

Hath blinded (ἐτύφλωσεν). For the image see ^{<310>}Isaiah 6:10. See on *closed*, ^{<415>}Matthew 13:15. Compare ^{<405>}John 1:5, and see note on **κατέλαβεν**, *overtook*; ^{<415>}John 11:35, 40. The aorist tense, *blinded*, indicates a past, definite, decisive act. When the darkness overtook, it blinded. The blindness is no new state into which he has come.

12. *Little children*. See on ver. 1, and ^{<412>}John 1:12. Not children in age, but addressed to the readers generally.

Name. See on ^{<412>}John 1:12; 2:23.

13. *Fathers*. Indicating age and authority.

Have known (ἐγνώκατε) Rev., correctly, *ye know*. Knowledge is the characteristic of *fathers*; knowledge as the fruit of experience. *Ye have perceived*, therefore *ye know*.

Have overcome (νενικήκατε). Compare ^{<463>}John 16:33. The image is characteristic of Revelation and First Epistle. See ^{<417>}Revelation 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 12:11; 21:7; ^{<414>}1 John 2:14; 4:4; 5:4, 5.

The evil one (τὸν πονηρόν). See on wickedness, ^{<4072>}Mark 7:22; evils, ^{<4189>}Luke 3:19; *evil spirits*, ^{<4121>}Luke 7:21. The prince of darkness is styled by John ὁ διάβολος *the false accuser* (^{<4184>}John 8:44; 13:2; ^{<4183>}1 John 3:8, 10. See on ^{<4141>}Matthew 4:1): ὁ Σατανᾶς *Satan, the adversary* (^{<4137>}John 13:27; compare ὁ κατήγωρ *the accuser*, properly, in court, ^{<6120>}Revelation 12:10): ὁ πονηρός *the evil one* (^{<4175>}John 17:15; ^{<4123>}1 John 2:13, 14; 3:12; 5:18, 19): ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου *the ruler of this world* (^{<41231>}John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). Note the abrupt introduction of the word here, as indicating something familiar.

I have written (ἔγραψα). Or, strictly, *I wrote*. Compare *I write* (vv. 12, 13), and note the change of tense. The past tense, *I wrote*, does not refer to some previous writing, as the Gospel, but, like the present, to this Epistle. The present, *I write*, refers to the immediate act of writing: the aorist is the *epistolary aorist*, by which the writer places himself at the reader's stand-point, regarding the writing as past. See on ^{<4182>}1 Peter 5:12. *I write*, therefore, refers to the Apostle's immediate act of writing; *I have written*, or *I wrote*, to the reader's act of reading the completed writing.

Little children (παιδία). Compare *τεκνία little children* (ver. 1), which emphasizes the idea of *kinship*, while this word emphasizes the idea of *subordination* and consequent *discipline*. Hence it is the more appropriate word when spoken from the stand-point of *authority* rather than of *affection*.

Ye have known (ἐγνώκατε). Rev., correctly, *ye known*.

The Father. In His rightful authority, as a Father over little children.

14. *Him that is from the beginning*. The eternal, pre-existent Christ, who was from the beginning (^{<4100>}John 1:1). The eternal Son, through whom men are brought into the relation of children of God, and learn to know the Father. The knowledge of God involves, on the part of both *fathers* and *children*, the knowledge of Christ.

Strong (ἰσχυροί). See on *was not able*, ^{<4147>}Luke 14:30; *I cannot*, ^{<4143>}Luke 16:3.

15. *The world* (τὸν κόσμον). See on ^{<4109>}John 1:9.

The love of the Father (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς). The phrase occurs only here in the New Testament. It means love *towards* the Father, yet as generated by the Father's love to man. Compare ^{<4081>}1 John 3:1. See on *love of God*, ver. 5.

Is not in him. This means more than that he does not love God: rather that the love of God does not dwell in him as the ruling principle of his life. Westcott cites a parallel from Philo: "It is impossible for love to the world to coexist with love to God, as it is impossible for light and darkness to coexist." Compare Plato. "Evils, Theodorus, can never pass away; for there must always remain something which is antagonist to good. Having no place among the gods in heaven, of necessity they hover around the earthly nature, and this mortal sphere. Wherefore we ought to fly away from earth to heaven as quickly as we can; and to fly away is to become like God, as far as this is possible; and to become like Him is to become holy and just and wise" ("Theaetetus," 176).

16. *All* (πᾶν). Not *all things* severally, but *all that is in the world collectively*, regarded as a unit.

The lust (ἡ ἐπιθυμία). See on ^{<4049>}Mark 4:19.

Of the flesh. Sensual appetite. The desire which *resides in the flesh*, not the desire *for* the flesh. For this subjective usage of the genitive with *lust*, see ^{<4184>}John 8:44; ^{<4102>}Romans 1:24; ^{<4184>}Revelation 18:14. Compare ^{<4021>}1 Peter 2:11; ^{<4022>}Titus 2:12. The lust of the flesh involves the appropriation of the desired object. On *the flesh*, see on ^{<4114>}John 1:14.

The lust of the eyes. This is included in the lust of the flesh, as a specific manifestation. All merely sensual desires belong to the economy which "is not of the Father." *The desire of the eyes* does not involve appropriation. It is satisfied with *contemplating*. It represents a higher type of desire than *the desire of the flesh*, in that it seeks *mental* pleasure where the other seeks *physical* gratification. There is thus a significant hint in this passage that even high artistic gratification may have no fellowship with God.

The pride of life (ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου). Rev., *vainglory*. The word occurs only here and ^{<4046>}James 4:16, on which see note. It means, originally, *empty, braggart talk or display; swagger*; and thence an insolent and vain assurance in one's own resources, or in the stability of earthly

things, which issues in a contempt of divine laws. The *vainglory of life* is the vainglory which belongs to the present life. On βίος *life*, as distinguished from ζῶν. *life*, see on ^{<4004>}John 1:4.

Of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός). Do not spring forth *from* the Father. On the expression εἶναι ἐκ *to be of*, see on ^{<4046>}John 1:46. “He, therefore, who is always occupied with the cravings of desire and ambition, and is eagerly striving after them, must have all his opinions mortal, and, as far as man can be, must be all of him mortal, because he has cherished his mortal part. But he who has been earnest in the love of knowledge and true wisdom, and has been trained to think that these are the immortal and divine things of a man, if he attain truth, must of necessity, as far as human nature is capable of attaining immortality, be all immortal, for he is ever attending on the divine power, and having the divinity within him in perfect order, he has a life perfect and divine” (Plato, “Timsaeus,” 90).

17. Forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). The only form in which αἰῶν *age, life*, occurs in the Gospel and Epistles of John, except ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος *since the world began* (^{<4082>}John 9:32). Some old versions add, “as God abideth forever.”

18. Little children (παιδία). See on ver. 13.

The last hour (ἐσχάτη ὥρα). The phrase only here in the New Testament. On John’s use of ὥρα *hour*, as marking a *critical* season, see ^{<4004>}John 2:4; 4:21, 23; 5:25, 28; 7:30; 8:20; 11:23, 27; 16:2, 4, 25, 32. The dominant sense of the expression *last days*, in the New Testament, is that of a period of suffering and struggle preceding a divine victory. See ^{<4027>}Acts 2:17; ^{<4082>}James 5:3; ^{<4001>}1 Peter 1:20. Hence the phrase here does not refer to the end of the world, but to the period preceding a crisis in the advance of Christ’s kingdom, a changeful and troublous period, marked by the appearance of “many antichrists.”

Antichrist. Peculiar to John in the New Testament. The absence of the article shows its currency as a proper name. It may mean one who stands *against* Christ, or one who stands *instead* of Christ; just as ἀντιστράτηγος may mean either one who stands in the place of a στρατηγός *praetor*, a *propraetor* (see Introd. to Luke, vol. 1, p. 246, and note on ^{<4020>}Acts 16:20), or *an opposing general*. John never uses the word

ψευδόχριστος *false Christ* (^{<1824>}Matthew 24:24; ^{<132>}Mark 13:22). While the *false Christ* is merely a pretender to the Messianic office, the *Antichrist* “assails Christ by proposing to do or to preserve what he did, while denying Him.” Antichrist, then, is *one who opposes Christ in the guise of Christ*. Westcott’s remark is very important, that John’s sense of Antichrist is determined by *the full Christian conception of Christ*, and not by *the Jewish conception of the promised Savior*.

Cometh (ἔρχεται). The prophetic present, equivalent to *is about to come*. The same term is used of Christ (^{<645>}John 14:3; 21:22; ^{<221>}Revelation 22:20).

Are there (γεγόνασιν). Rev., more correctly, *have there arisen*.

Whereby (ὅθεν). Lit., *whence*. Only here in John. It is found in Matthew and Luke, and frequently in Hebrews, and not elsewhere.

19. They went out from us (ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξήλθαν). The phrase *went out from*, may mean either *removal* (Revelation 28:4; ^{<189>}John 8:59) or *origin* (^{<100>}Revelation 9:3; 14:13, 15, 17; 19:5, 21). Here the latter, as appears from the following clause. Compare ^{<400>}Acts 20:30.

Were not of. See on ^{<145>}John 1:46.

No doubt. A needless addition of the A.V.

With us (μεθ’ ἡμῶν). Ἐν ἡμῖν, *among us*, would be more according to John’s ordinary usage; but his thought rests here rather on *fellowship* than on the *unity* of believers as one body.

They might be made manifest (φανερῶσιν). See on ^{<201>}John 21:1.

They were not all (οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες). Rev., more correctly, *they all are not*.^{fb65}

20. An unction (χρίσμα). The word means that with which the anointing is performed — the *unguent* or *ointment*. In the New Testament only here and ver. 27. Rev., an *anointing*. The root of this word and of **Χριστός**, *Christ*, is the same. See on ^{<101>}Matthew 1:1. the *anointing* is from the *Anointed*.

The Holy One. Christ. See ^{<66>}John 6:69; ^{<184>}Acts 3:14; 4:27, 30; ^{<601>}Revelation 3:7.

Ye know all things (οἶδατε πα.ντα). The best texts read πάντες, *ye all know*; in which case the connection is with the following clause: “I have not written unto you because *ye know not the truth*, but *because ye know it*.”

21. *I have not written* (οὐκ ἔγραψα). Or, *I wrote not*. See on ver. 13.

22. *A liar* (ὁ ψεύστης). Rev., correctly, “*the liar*.” For a similar interrogative phrase see ch. 5:5. It marks the lively feeling with which the apostle writes. By the definite article, *the liar*, the lie is set forth in its concrete personality: the one who impersonates all that is false, as *antichrist* represents every form of hostility and opposition to Christ. The denial that Jesus is the Christ is the representative falsehood. He that denies is the representative liar.

He that denieth (ὁ ἀρνούμενος). The article with the participle denotes the *habitual* denial. Lit., *the one denying*, the one who habitually represents this attitude towards Christ. The words are aimed at the heresy of Cerinthus, a man of Jewish decent and educated at Alexandria. He denied the miraculous conception of Jesus, and taught that, after His baptism, the Christ descended upon Him in the form of a dove, and that He then announced the unknown Father and wrought miracles; but that, towards the end of His ministry, the Christ departed again from Jesus, and Jesus suffered and rose from the dead, while the Christ remained impassible (incapable of suffering) as a spiritual being.

The Father. The title *the Father* occurs always in its simple form in the Epistle. Never *his* or *our* Father, or *the Father in heaven*.

23. *Hath not the Father* (οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει). Properly, “*hath not even the Father*,” though he professes to reverence the Father while rejecting the Son. Compare ^{488D}John 8:42.

24. *As for you* (ὁμείψ). This is the rendering of the Rev. The force of the emphatic *you* at the beginning of the sentence is utterly lost in the A.V., which takes the pronoun simply as nominative to *ye have heard*. *You* is emphatic by way of contrast with the false teachers (ver. 22).

From the beginning. See on 1:1. Notice the change in the order of the repeated sentence, *that which ye heard from the beginning*: ὃ ἠκούσατε

ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, that which *ye heard*; the emphasis being on their *reception* of the message: ὃ ἀπ ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε, that which ye heard *from the beginning*; emphasizing the *time* of the reception as coincident with the origin of their faith.

In the Son and in the Father. Compare the reverse order in ver. 22. “Here the thought is that of rising through the confession of the Son to the knowledge of the Father; there the thought is of the issue of denial culminating in the denial of the Father” (Westcott).

25. The promise (ἡ ἐπαγγελία). See on ^{<401>}Acts 1:4.

Eternal life (τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον). Lit., *the life, the eternal (life).*

26. Seduce (πλανώντων). See on 1:8. Rev., *lead astray.*

27. As for you (ὕμεῖς). Emphatic, as in ver. 24.

Of Him (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ). See on 1:5.

The same anointing (τὸ αὐτὸ χρίσμα). The best texts read αὐτοῦ, *His anointing.*

Is truth, and is no lie. The characteristic combination of positive and negative statement. See on 1:5.

Ye shall abide (μενεῖτε). Wrong. The best texts read μένετε, which may be taken either as *imperative, abide ye*, or as *indicative, ye abide*. The indicative is preferable, as answering to μένει *abideth*.

In Him. Christ.

28. When He shall appear (ὅταν φανερωθῆ). The best texts read ἐὰν *if*, for *when*. So Rev., which gives also the proper passive force of φανερωθῆ, *if He shall be manifested*. Not expressing a doubt of the *fact*, but uncertainty as to the circumstances. On φανερόω *to make manifest*, see on ^{<401>}John 21:1. John never uses ἀποκαλύπτω *to reveal*, of the revelation of Christ. Indeed, neither the verb nor the kindred noun, ἀποκάλυψις, occurs in his writings except in ^{<6128>}John 12:38, which is a citation from Isaiah, and in ^{<600>}Revelation 1:1.

We may have. Thus identifying himself with his children in the faith. Teacher and pupil must alike abide in Him.

We may have confidence (σχῶμεν παρρησίαν). Rev., boldness. For the phrase *have boldness*, see 3:21; 4:17; 5:14; ³⁸⁰⁶Hebrews 3:6; 10:19; Philemon 8. For the word παρρησία *boldness*, see on ⁴⁰¹³John 7:13; ⁴⁰²⁹Acts 2:29. It is opposed, as here, to αἰσχύνομαι *to be ashamed*, in ⁴⁰³⁵Proverbs 13:5, where the Septuagint reads “a wicked man *is ashamed* (αἰσχύνεται) and shall not have *boldness* (παρρησίαν). Also in ⁴⁰⁴²Philippians 1:20. Compare ⁴⁰⁵²2 Corinthians 3:12. The idea of free, open speech lies at the bottom of the word: coming before God’s bar with nothing to conceal. The thought is embodied in the general confession of the Book of Common Prayer: “That we should not dissemble nor cloke them before the face of Almighty God our Heavenly Father, but confess them.” So John Wesley’s Hymn:

*“Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness
 My beauty are, my glorious dress:
 ‘Midst flaming worlds, in these arrayed,
 With joy shall I lift up my head.
 Bold shall I stand in Thy great day,
 For who aught to my charge shall lay?
 Fully absolved through these I am, —
 From sin and fear, from guilt and shame.”*

Be ashamed before Him (αἰσχυνθῶμεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ). The expression is peculiar. Lit., “be ashamed *from* Him.” The fundamental thought is that of *separation* and *shrinking* from God through the shame of conscious guilt. The same construction is found in the Septuagint. ⁴⁰⁶²Isaiah 1:29, “They shall be ashamed *from* their idols.” ⁴⁰⁷⁵Jeremiah 2:36, “Thou shalt be ashamed of (from) Egypt, as thou wast ashamed of (from) Assyria.” ⁴⁰⁸³Jeremiah 12:13.

Coming (παρουσία). Lit., *presence*. So ⁴¹⁰⁰2 Corinthians 10:10. Hence, the presence of one *coming*, and so *coming*, especially in the New Testament, of the future, visible return of our Lord to raise the dead, judge the world, and finally establish the kingdom of God. The word does not occur elsewhere in John, nor does he use ἐπιφάνεια, which is Paul’s word for the same event.

29. If ye know — ye know (ἐὰν εἰδῆτε — γινώσκετε). If ye *know absolutely* that He is righteous, ye *perceive* that every one, etc. See on ^{<4024>}John 2:24. Ye *perceive* may be taken as imperative: *perceive* or *know ye*.

Is born of Him (ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται). The interpreters differ as to the reference of *Him*; some referring it to *God*, and others to *Christ*. Against the latter is the fact that men are not said to be *born of Christ*, but *of God*; and that *to be born of God* is a characteristic phrase of John, while *to be born of Christ* is a phrase which occurs nowhere. On the other hand, the undoubted reference to Christ in ver. 28, would seem to demand a similar reference here. Men are said to *abide* in Christ as well as in God, and to be born of the Spirit. Westcott's remark is pertinent. "When John thinks of God in relation to men, he never thinks of Him apart from Christ (see ^{<4010>}1 John 5:20); and again, he never thinks of Christ in His human nature without adding the thought of His divine nature. Thus a rapid transition is possible from the one aspect of the Lord's divine-human person to the other."

Righteous (δίκαιος). Used by John both of God and of Christ. Of God, ^{<4009>}1 John 1:9; ^{<4025>}John 17:25; ^{<4005>}Revelation 16:5; of Christ, ^{<4010>}1 John 2:1; 3:7. Compare ^{<4084>}Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14.

Is born of Him (ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται). Rev., *begotten*. The first occurrence of the phrase in the Epistle.

CHAPTER 3

1. *Behold* (ἴδετε). Lit., *behold ye*. The plural is peculiar. The usual form is the singular ἴδε or ἰδοῦ. See ^{<B12>}John 1:29; 11:3, etc.; 4:35; 19:26, 27. Elsewhere the plural is used of something actually visible (^{<B11>}Galatians 6:11).

What manner of (ποταπήν). The word is of infrequent occurrence in the New Testament, but is found in all the Synoptists and in ^{<B12>}2 Peter 3:11. Only here in John's writings. Originally it means *from what country or race*; then, *of what sort or quality*. It is used of the quality of both persons and things.

Hath bestowed (δέδωκεν). Emphasizing the *endowment of the receiver*. Compare χαρίζομαι, from χάρις *grace, favor*, which emphasizes the goodwill of the giver. See ^{<B13>}Galatians 3:18; ^{<B11>}Philippians 2:9; 1:29.

That (ἵνα). See on John 25:13.

We should be called (κληθῶμεν). Or, *named*. As ^{<B12>}Matthew 2:23; 21:13; ^{<B13>}Luke 1:13, 31, etc. The verb is never used by John of the divine call. In ^{<B13>}John 10:3, for καλεῖ *calleth*, read φωνεῖ.

The sons (τέκνα). Rev., better, *children*. See on ^{<B12>}John 1:12.

And such we are (καὶ ἔσμεν). Lit., *and we are*. Added by Rev., according to the best texts. A parenthetical, reflective comment, characteristic of John. See on 1 1:2.

2. *Beloved*. See 2:7.

Now are we and, etc. The two thoughts of the present and the future condition of God's children are placed side by side with the simple copula, *and*, as parts of one thought. Christian condition, now and eternally, centers in the fact of being children of God. In that fact lies the germ of all the possibilities of eternal life.

It doth not yet appear (οὐπω ἐφανερώθη). Rev., more correctly, *it is not yet made manifest*. See on ^{<B11>}John 21:1. The force of the aorist tense is, *was never manifested on any occasion*.

What we shall be (τί ἐσόμεθα). “This *what* suggests something unspeakable, contained in the likeness of God” (Bengel).

But we know. Omit *but*.

When He shall appear (ἐὼν φανερωθῆ). Rev., correctly, if He (or *it*) shall be manifested. We may render either “if *it* shall be manifested,” that is *what we shall be*; or, “if *He*,” etc. The preceding ἐφανερώθη *it is* (not yet) *made manifest*, must, I think, decide us in favor of the rendering *it*. We are now children of God. It has not been revealed what we shall be, and therefore we do not know. In the absence of such revelation, we know (through our consciousness of childship, through His promise that we shall behold His glory), that if *what we shall be* were manifested, the essential fact of the glorified condition thus revealed will be likeness to the Lord. This fact we *know* now as a promise, as a general truth of our future state. The condition of *realizing* the fact

is the *manifestation* of that glorified state, the revealing of the τί ἐσόμεθα *what we shall be*; for that manifestation will bring with it the *open vision* of the Lord. When the *what we shall be* shall be manifest, it will bring us face to face with Him, and we shall be like Him *because* we shall see Him as He is.

As He is (καθὼς ἔστιν). Strictly, *just as*. Rev., *even as*.

*“As long as the festivity
 Of Paradise shall be, so long our love
 Shall radiate round about us such a vesture.
 Its brightness is proportioned to the ardor,
 The ardor to the vision; and the vision
 Equals what grace it has above its worth.
 Dante, “Paradiso,” iv., 37-42.*

8. *Every man that hath* (πᾶς ὁ ἔχων). A characteristic form of expression with John, containing “a reference to some who had questioned the application of a general principle in particular cases.” Here to some persons who had denied the practical obligation to moral purity involved in their hope. See vv. 4, 6, 9, 10, 15, 23, 29; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; 2 John 9.

Hope. John’s only reference to Christian hope. The phrase used here, *to have the hope upon one*, is unique in the New Testament. Compare ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν “on Him shall the Gentiles hope” (<615D> Romans

15:12): ἠλπικαμεν ἐπὶ Θεῷ ζῶντι “we have hoped *on* the living God” (⁵⁰⁴⁰1 Timothy 4:10). On the force of ἔχων, see on John 26:22.

In Him (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ). Ambiguous. Better, as Rev., *set on Him*.

Purifieth himself (ἀγνίζει ἑαυτόν). On the verb, see on ⁴⁰¹²1 Peter 1:22; ⁵⁰⁰⁸James 4:8. In the Septuagint used only of ceremonial purification, and so four out of the seven instances in which it occurs in the New Testament (⁴⁸¹⁵John 11:55; ⁴⁰²⁴Acts 21:24, 26; 24:18). In the remaining cases, of purifying *the heart and the soul* (⁵⁰⁰⁸James 4:8; ⁴⁰¹²1 Peter 1:22). The kindred adjective ἀγνός *pure*, has a moral signification in every case, as has the noun ἀγότης *pureness* (only ⁴⁰⁰⁶2 Corinthians 6:6). Ἀγνισμός *purification* (only ⁴⁰²⁴Acts 21:26), ceremonial.

He (ἐκεῖνος). Christ, as always in the Epistle.

Pure (ἀγνός). See above. Though marking moral and spiritual purity, and that of a very high grade, since it is applied to Christ here, yet it admits the thought of possible temptation or pollution, thus differing from ἅγιος, which means *absolutely holy*. Hence ἀγνός cannot properly be applied to God, who is ἅγιος; but both may be used of Christ, the latter in virtue of His *human* perfection.

4. *Whosoever committeth sin* (πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν). Rev., better, *every one that doeth sin*. See on ver. 3, *every man that hath*, and note the frequent repetition of this form of expression in the present chapter. Compare πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων *whosoever sinneth* (ver. 6). The phrase *to do sin* regards sin as something actually realized in its completeness. He that *does sin* realizes in action *the sin* (note the article τὴν) that which includes and represents the complete ideal of sin. Compare *do righteousness*, 2:29.

Transgresseth also the law (καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ). Rev., more accurately, *doeth also lawlessness*. Compare ⁴¹³⁴Matthew 13:41, and the phrase οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν *ye that work iniquity* (⁴⁰²²Matthew 7:23).

For (καὶ). Rev., correctly, *and*. This and the preceding clause are coordinated after John’s manner.

Is the transgression of the law (ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία). Rev., correctly, *is lawlessness*. Sin is the violation of the law of our being, the law which

includes our threefold relation to God, to the men and things around us, and to ourselves. Compare ^{<B14>}James 1:14; 4:17.

5. *Ye know.* John's characteristic appeal to Christian knowledge. Compare 2:20, 21; 4:2, 14, 16; 5:15, 18; 3 John 12.

He (ἐκεῖνος). Christ, as always in this Epistle. See on ^{<B18>}John 1:18.

Was manifested. See on ^{<B11>}John 21:1. Including Christ's whole life on earth and its consequences. The idea of manifestation here assumes the fact of a previous being. John various terms to describe the incarnation. He conceives it with reference to *the Father*, as *a sending, a mission*. Hence ὁ πέμψας με *He that sent me* (^{<B6>}John 4:34; 6:38; 9:4; 12:44, etc.): ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ *the Father that sent me* (^{<B7>}John 5:37; 8:18; 12:49, etc.): with the verb ἀποστέλλω *to send as an envoy, with a commission*; God sent (ἀπέστειλεν) His Son (^{<B7>}John 3:17; 10:36; ^{<B10>}1 John 4:10; compare ^{<B5>}John 6:57; 7:29; 17:18). With reference to *the Son*, as *a coming*, regarded as a *historic fact* and as an *abiding fact*. As *a historic event*, *He came* (ἦλθεν, ^{<B11>}John 1:11); *this is He that came* (ὁ ἐλθὼν, ^{<B16>}1 John 5:6). *Came forth* (ἐξῆλθον; ^{<B2>}John 8:42; 16:27, 28; 27:8). As *something abiding in its effects*, *am come, hath come, is come*, marked by the perfect tense: *Light is come* (ἐλήλυθεν, ^{<B9>}John 3:19). *Jesus Christ is come* (ἐληλυθότα, ^{<B12>}1 John 4:2). Compare ^{<B5>}John 5:43; 12:46; 18:37). In two instances with ἦκω *I am come*, ^{<B2>}John 8:42; ^{<B10>}1 John 5:20. Or with the present tense, as describing a coming realized at the moment: whence *I come* (ἔρχομαι, ^{<B4>}John 8:14); compare ^{<B4>}John 14:3, 18, 28; also *Jesus Christ coming* (ἐρχόμενον, 2 John 7). With reference to *the form: in flesh* (σα.ρξ). See ^{<B14>}John 1:14; ^{<B12>}1 John 4:2; 2 John 7. With reference to *men*, *Christ was manifested* (^{<B10>}1 John 1:2; 3:5, 8; ^{<B13>}John 1:31; 21:1, 14). ^{fb66}

To take away (ἵνα ἄρη). See on ^{<B12>}John 1:29.

Our sins (τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν). Omit ἡμῶν *our*. Compare ^{<B12>}John 1:29, τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, the *sin*. The plural here regards all that is contained in the inclusive term *the sin*: all manifestations or realizations of sin.

In Him is no sin (ἀμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν). Lit., *in Him sin is not*. He is *essentially and forever* without sin. Compare ^{<B18>}John 7:18.

6. *Abideth.* Compare ^{<4804>}John 15:4-10. To *abide* in Christ is more than to *be* in Him, since it represents a condition maintained by communion with God and by the habitual doing of His will. See on 2:6.

Sinneth not. John does not teach that believers do not sin, but is speaking of a *character*, a *habit*. Throughout the Epistle he deals with the *ideal reality* of life in God, in which the love of God and sin exclude each other as light and darkness.

Seen — known. The vision of Christ and the appropriation of what is seen. Rev., correctly, *knoweth*.

7. *Little children.* See on 2:1.

***Deceive* (πλανῶτω).** Rev., better, *lead astray*. See on 1:8.

Doeth righteousness. See on ver. 4, and compare 2:29. Note the article τὴν, the righteousness, in its completeness and unity. Not merely doing righteous acts. “In his relation to other men he will do what is just; and in his relation to the gods he will do what is holy; and he who does what is just and holy cannot be other than just and holy” (Plato, “Gorgias,” 507).

8. *The Devil.* See on 2:13. Compare ^{<4884>}John 8:44. “The devil made no one, he begot no one, he created no one; but whosoever imitates the devil, is, as it were, a child of the devil, through imitating, not through being born of him” (Augustine).

Sinneth. The present tense indicates continuousness. He sinned *in* the beginning, and has never ceased to sin *from* the beginning, and still sinneth.

The Son of God. For the first time in the Epistle. Hitherto the title has been *the Son*, or *His Son*. See on 1:7.

***Might destroy* (λύσῃ).** Lit., *dissolve*, *loosen*. Compare ^{<4074>}Acts 27:41; 13:43. “The works of the devil are represented as having a certain consistency and coherence. They show a kind of solid front. But Christ, by His coming, has revealed them in their complete unsubstantiality. He has ‘undone’ the seeming bonds by which they were held together” (Westcott).

9. *Whosoever is born* (πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος). On the form of expression, see on ver. 4. Rev., *begotten*. The perfect participle indicates a condition

remaining from the first: he who hath been begotten and remains God's child.

His seed. The divine principle of life.

Cannot. See on ver. 6. Conceived as a perfect ideal, life in God excludes the possibility of sin. Compare Romans 4 throughout.

10. In this (ἐν τούτῳ). See on 2:3.

Children of the devil (τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου). The only occurrence of the phrase. Compare ^{<4130>}Acts 13:10, and see ^{<4134>}John 8:44.

Righteousness. Here the article is wanting, compare ver. 7. Righteousness is regarded, not in its completeness, but as bearing a particular character. It will be interesting to follow out the same distinction between the following words with and without the article: ἁμαρτία *sin*; ἀγάπη *love*; ζωή *life*; ἀλήθεια *truth*.

11. From the beginning. See on 1:1.

That (ἵνα). The *purport* and *aim* of the message. See on ^{<4135>}John 15:13.

12. Cain who was (Κάιν ἦν). *Who* is not in the Greek. The construction is irregular. Lit., as Rev., *not as Cain was of the evil one*.

Slew (ἔσφαξεν). The verb occurs only in John, and only here outside of Revelation. Originally, to slay by cutting the throat; so in Homer, of cattle:

*“the suitor train who slay (σφάζουσι)
His flocks and slow-paced beeves with crooked horns.”
“Odyssey,” i., 92.*

To slaughter victims for sacrifice:

*“Backward they turned the necks of the fat beeves,
And cut their throats (ἔσφαζαν), and flayed the carcasses.”
“Iliad,” i., 459.*

Thence, generally, to *slay* or *kill*.

Wherefore (χάριν τίνος). Lit., *on account of what*. Χάριν *for the sake of, on account of*, is elsewhere placed after the genitive. See ^{<4136>}Ephesians 3:1, 14; ^{<4137>}1 Timothy 5:14; ^{<4138>}Galatians 3:19.

13. Brethren (ἀδελφοί). The only occurrence of this mode of address in the Epistle.

Hate (μισεῖ). Indicative mood, pointing to the fact as existing: if the world hate you, *as it does*.

14. We know. Emphatic; we as distinguished from the world.

Have passed (μεατβεβήκαμεν). Lit., *have passed over*.

From death (ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου). Lit., *out of the death*. The article marks it as one of the two spheres in which men must be; *death or life*. *The death, the life*, present one of those sharp oppositions which are characteristic of the Epistle; as *love, hatred; darkness, light; truth, a lie*. Ὁ θάνατος *the death*, occurs in John's Epistles only here and in the next clause. In the Gospel, only 5:24. Personified in Revelation 1:18; 6:8; 9:6; 20:13.

Unto life (εἰς τὴν ζωὴν). Rev., better, *into*. Compare *enter into the life*, Matthew 28:8; 19:17.

Because. The *sign* of having passed into life; not the *ground*.

We love the brethren (ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς). The only occurrence of the phrase. Elsewhere, *love one another*, or *love his brother*. See on 2:9.

His brother. Omit.

15. Murderer (ἄθροποκτόνος). Manslayer. Only here and John 8:44, *of the devil*.

Hath eternal life, etc. The contrast is suggestive between the sentiment embodied in this statement and that of Pagan antiquity respecting murder, in the Homeric age, for instance. "With regard to the practice of homicide, the ordinary Greek morality was extremely loose.... Among the Greeks, to have killed a man was considered in the light of misfortune, or, at most, a prudential error, when the perpetrator of the act had come among strangers as a fugitive for protection and hospitality. On the spot, therefore, where the crime occurred, it could stand only as in the nature of a private and civil wrong, and the fine payable was regarded, not (which it might have been) as a mode, however defective, of marking any guilt in the culprit, but as, on the whole, an equitable satisfaction to the wounded feelings of the relatives and friends, or as an actual compensation for the lost services of

the dead man. The religion of the age takes no notice of the act whatever” (Gladstone “Homer and the Homeric Age,” 2, 436).

16. Hereby (ἐν τοίτῳ). See on 2:3.

Perceive (ἐγνώκαμεν). Rev., correctly, *know*.

The love. Omit the italics of A.V., *of God*, and render as Rev., *hereby know we love*.

Laid down His life (τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν). See on ⁴⁸¹¹John 10:11.

We ought (ὀφείλομεν). See on 2:6.

17. This world's good (τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου). Rev., *the worlds goods*. **Βίος** means that by which life is sustained, resources, wealth.

Seeth (θεωρῆ). Deliberately contemplates. See on ⁴⁸¹⁸John 1:18. Rev., *beholdeth*. The only occurrence of the verb in John's Epistles.

Have need (χρειαὶν ἔχοντα). Lit., *having need*. Rev., *in need*.

Bowels of compassion (τὰ σπλάγχνα). See on *pitiful*, ⁴⁸¹⁸1 Peter 3:8. Rev., much better, *his compassion*. The word only here in John.

19. Shall assure (πείσομεν). Two renderings are possible; the primitive meaning *persuade* (⁴⁸²⁶Acts 19:26; 17:4; ⁴⁸¹⁵2 Corinthians 5:11); or the secondary and consequent sense, *assure, quiet, conciliate* (⁴⁸³⁴Matthew 28:14). Render as A.V., and Rev. *as sure*. See critical note at the end of the commentary on this Epistle.

Before Him (ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ). Emphatic, the order being, *before Him we shall assure our heart*. These words are to be kept in mind as the key-note of what follows.

20. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater, etc. A very difficult passage. See critical note as above. Render, as Rev., *shall assure our heart before Him whereinsoever our heart condemn us, because God is greater than our heart*.

For (ὅτι). To be rendered not as a conjunction (*for, because*) but as a relative, in *whatsoever* or *whereinsoever*.

Condemn (καταγινώσκη). The word occurs only three times in the New Testament; here, ver. 21, and ^{κπι}Galatians 2:11. It signifies

(1.) *To note accurately*, usually in a bad sense. Hence to *detect* (^{κπι}Proverbs 28:11); compare Aristophanes: “Having *observed* (καταγνούς) the foibles of the old man” (“Knights,” 46). *To form an unfavorable prejudice against*. So Herodotus. Datis says to the Delians, “Why are ye fled, O holy men, having *judged me* (καταγνόντες κατ’ ἐμεῦ) in so unfriendly a way?” (6:97).

(2.) *To note judicially: to accuse: to accuse one’s self*. So Thucydides: “No one, when venturing on a perilous enterprise, ever yet *passed a sentence of failure on himself*” (καταγνούς ἑαυτοῦ μὴ περιέσεσθαι; 3:45). *To give sentence, or condemn. To condemn to death*. “Those who had fled they condemned to death” (θάνατον καταγνόντες; Thucydides, 6, 60). *To decide a suit against one*. So Aristophanes: “You judges have no maintenance if you will not *decide against* (καταγνώσεσθε) this suit” (“Knights,” 1360). In ^{κπι}Galatians 2:11, it is said of Peter that, because of his concessions to the Jewish ritualists, **κατεγνωσμένος ἦν** *he stood condemned or self-condemned* (not as A.V., *he was to be blamed*). His conduct was its own condemnation. This is the sense in this passage, *the internal judgment of conscience*.

Because (ὅτι). This second ὅτι does not appear in the A.V. It is a conjunction.

Greater (μείζων). Is this superior greatness to be regarded as related to God’s *judgment*, or to His *compassion*? If to His *judgment*, the sense is: God who is greater than our heart and knows all things, must not only *endorse* but *emphasize* our self-accusation. If *our heart* condemn, how much more *God*, who is greater than our heart. If to His *compassion*, the sense is: when our heart condemns us we shall quiet it with the assurance that we are in the hands of a God who is greater than our heart — who surpasses man in love and compassion no less than in knowledge. This latter sense better suits the whole drift of the discussion. See critical note. There is a play of the words γινώσκει *knoweth*, and καταγινώσκη *condemneth*, which is untranslatable.

21. *Beloved.* The affectionate address is suggested by the preceding thought of tormenting self-accusation.

Confidence (παρρησίαν). Rev., boldness. See on 2:28.

22. *We ask* (αἰτῶμεν). See on ^{<210>}Luke 11:9.

We receive of Him (λαμβάνομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) On the form of expression, see on 1:5. For the thought, compare ^{<437>}John 15:7.

We keep (τηροῦμεν). See on ^{<405>}1 Peter 1:5. Note the combination of *keep* and *do*. Watchful discernment and habitual practice. Compare Psalms 123:2. The same combination occurs 5:2, 3, where instead of the first τηρῶμεν *keep*, read ποιῶμεν *do*.

Pleasing (ἀρεστά). See ^{<483>}John 8:29.

In His sight (ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ). Compare ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ *before Him*, or *in His presence* (ver. 19). *In His sight* “accentuates the thought of the divine regard. Compare ^{<457>}John 7:37 and 20:30” (Westcott).

23. *Believe on the name* (πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι). See on ^{<412>}John 1:12; ^{<407>}1 John 1:7.

24. *Abideth in Him and He in Him.* “Therefore let God be a home to thee, and be thou the home of God: abide in God, and let God abide in thee” (Bede).

Spirit. The first mention of the Spirit in the Epistle. Never found with *Holy* in the Epistles or Revelation.

CHAPTER 4

1. *Beloved*. Again the recognition of danger from false spirits prompts this affectionate address. Compare 3:21.

Try (δοκιμάζετε). Better, as Rev., *prove*. See on ^{<400>}1 Peter 1:7; ^{<405>}Luke 12:55. Compare the phrase *discerning of spirits*, ^{<420>}1 Corinthians 12:10.

Of God (ἐκ). *Out of: proceeding from*.

False prophets (ψευδοπροφήται). The term is applied in the New Testament to rivals of true prophets under the old dispensation (^{<416>}Luke 6:26; ^{<411>}2 Peter 2:1), and to rivals of the apostles under the gospel economy (^{<407>}Matthew 7:15; 24:11, 24; ^{<413>}Mark 13:22). In Revelation to “the embodied power of spiritual falsehood” (16:13; 19:20; 20:10). The false prophet supports his claims by signs and portents (^{<414>}Matthew 24:24; ^{<416>}Acts 13:6; ^{<411>}Revelation 19:20) and is thus distinguished from the false *teacher*. See ^{<411>}2 Peter 2:1, where the two terms occur together.

Are gone out (ἐξαληλύθασιν). The perfect tense indicates that the influence of their going out on their false mission is in operation at the present.

2. *Hereby* (ἐν τούτῳ). See on 2:3.

Know ye (γινώσκετε). *Perceive*. See on ^{<401>}John 2:24.

Confesseth (ὁμολογεῖ). See on ^{<402>}Matthew 7:23; 10:32.

That Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα). Lit., Jesus Christ *having come*, etc. The whole phrase forms the direct object of the verb *confesseth*.

Of God. Compare ^{<411>}1 Corinthians 12:3.

3. *Is come in the flesh*. Omit. Render, *confesseth not Jesus*. So Rev. An ancient reading is *λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν annulleth or destroyeth Jesus*.” The simple *Jesus* emphasizes the humanity of our Lord considered in itself. See ^{<412>}Romans 3:26; 10:9; ^{<410>}2 Corinthians 11:4; ^{<400>}Ephesians 4:21; ^{<411>}Hebrews 2:9.

This (τοῦτο). Not this *spirit*, but this *non-confession*, summed up in all its manifestations.

Cometh. See on 2:18.

4. *Have overcome*. See on 2:13.

Greater. Compare 3:20.

In you. The Christian society. Compare ^{<BIB>}John 6:56; 14:20; 15:4-10; 17:23, 26; ^{<BIB>}Galatians 2:20 (of the individual).

He that is in the world. In 5:19, the world is said to be *in the evil one*. Compare ^{<BIB>}Ephesians 2:2.

5. *Of the world* (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου). *Proceeding from*, as their source (ἐκ). Different from ἐκ τῆς γῆς *from the earth* (^{<BIB>}John 3:31), as marking the whole worldly economy morally considered.

Speak they of the world (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλοῦσιν) An ambiguous rendering, which might readily be interpreted “they speak *concerning* the world.” Literally it is: “they speak *out of* the world; *i.e.*, the character of their utterances corresponds to their origin. Rev., “speak they *as of* the world.” The position *of the world* in the sentence is emphatic: “it is *out of the world* that they speak.”

6. *He that knoweth* (ὁ γινώσκων). Lit., *the one knowing*: he who is habitually and ever more clearly perceiving and recognizing God as his Christian life unfolds. The knowledge is regarded as *progressive* and not complete. Compare ^{<BIB>}Philippians 3:12, and *He who is calling* (ὁ καλῶν, ^{<BIB>}1 Thessalonians 5:24) also ὁ ἀγαπῶν *he that loves* (ver. 7).

Hereby (ἐκ τούτου). Not the same as the common ἐν τούτῳ (ver. 2). It occurs only here in the Epistle. Ἐν τούτῳ is *in this*: ἐκ τούτου *from this*. The former marks the *residing* or *consisting* of the essence or truth of a thing in something the apprehension of which conveys to us the essential nature of the thing itself. The latter marks the *inference* or *deduction* of the truth from something, as contrasted with its immediate perception in that something. Rev., *by this*.

The spirit of error (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης). The phrase occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. Compare πνεύμασι πλάνοις *misleading spirits*, ^{<801>}1 Timothy 4:1.

7. *Of God* (ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Flows from God.

8. *Knoweth not* (οὐκ ἔγνω). The aorist tense: *did not know*, from the beginning. He *never* knew.

Is love (ἀγάπη ἐστι.ν). See on *God is light* (1:5), and *the truth* (1:6); also *God is spirit* (^{<801>}John 4:24). *Spirit* and *light* are expressions of God's *essential nature*. *Love* is the expression of His *personality* corresponding to His nature. See on *love of God* (2:5). Truth and love stand related to each other. Loving is the condition of knowing.

9. *Was manifested*. See on ^{<801>}John 21:1; ^{<805>}1 John 3:5.

Toward us (ἐν ἡμῖν). Wrong. Not “*among us*,” as ^{<814>}John 1:14, nor “*in us*,” but as Rev., in margin, *in our case*.^{fb67}

Sent (ἀπέσταλκεν). John describes the incarnation as a *sending*, more frequently than in any other way. Ἀποστέλλω is *to send under commission, as an envoy*. The perfect tense, *hath sent*, points to the abiding results of the sending. See on 3:5.

His only-begotten Son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ). Lit., *His Son, the only-begotten* (Son). A mode of expression common in John, enlarging upon the meaning of a noun by the addition of an adjective or a participle with the article. See 1:2; 2:7, 8, 25; 5:4; ^{<854>}John 6:41, 44, 50, 51; 15:1, etc. On *only-begotten*, see on ^{<814>}John 1:14.

10. *Propitiation*. See on 2:2.

11. *So* (οὕτως). Emphatic.

We ought. See on 2:6.

12. *God*. Beginning the sentence emphatically, and without the article: God as God. “*God hath no man ever yet seen*.” Compare ^{<818>}John 1:18.

His love. Not our love to Him, nor His love to us, but the love which is peculiarly His; which answers to His nature.

14. *We have seen* (πεθεάμεθα). Have deliberately and steadfastly contemplated. Compare 1:1, and see on ^{<B014>}John 1:14.

Do testify (μαρτυροῦμεν). Rev., *bear witness*. See on ^{<B007>}John 1:7.

Sent. See on ver. 9.

The Savior of the world. See the same phrase, ^{<B042>}John 4:42, and compare ^{<B017>}John 3:17. Σωτηρ *Savior*, occurs in John only here and ^{<B042>}John 4:42. Elsewhere it is applied both to *God* (1 Timothy. 1:1; 2:3; ^{<S001>}Titus 1:3; 2:10; 3:4; Jude 25), and to *Christ* (^{<B011>}Luke 2:11; ^{<A051>}Acts 5:31; 13:23; ^{<S010>}2 Timothy 1:10; ^{<S001>}Titus 1:4, etc.). The title is found in Paul's Epistles of the Captivity (^{<B052>}Ephesians 5:23; ^{<B053>}Philippians 3:20), and in the Pastorals (see above), but not in Corinthians, Romans, Galatians, or Thessalonians. In classical writings the term is applied to many deities, especially to Zeus (Jupiter); also to Hermes (Mercury), Apollo, Hercules, and even to female deities, as Fortune and Aphrodite (Venus). "Zeus Soter" (Zeus Savior) was used as a formula in drinking at banquets. The third cup was dedicated to him. Compare Plato: "Then, by way of a third libation to the savior Zeus, let us sum up and reassert what has been said" ("Philebus," 66). The drinking of this cup was a symbol of good fortune, and the third time came to mean the lucky time. "Twice then has the just man overthrown the unjust; and now comes the third trial, which, after Olympic fashion, is sacred to Zeus the savior,... and surely this will prove the greatest and most decisive of falls" (Plato, "Republic," 583). Hence the proverb, τὸ τρίτον τῷ σωτήρι, lit., *the third to the savior*, i.e., the third or lucky time. The name was also given later to princes or public benefactors. The kindred noun σωτηρία *salvation*, does not occur in John's Epistles, and appears only once in the Gospel (4:22). It is found thrice in Revelation (7:10; 12:10; 19:1). Σώζειν *to save* occurs six times in John's Gospel, and once in Revelation (21:24). It does not appear in the Epistles.

15. *Whosoever* (ὅς ἐάν). Lit., *who if there be any*.

Shall confess. See on 1:9.

Son of God. See on 1:7.

16. *The love which God hath*. On this use of ἔχειν *to have*, see on ^{<B022>}John 16:22. Compare ^{<B035>}John 8:35.

To us (ἐν ἡμῖν). Rev., in us. Compare *God abideth in Him*.

Dwelleth in love, etc. See ^{<619>}John 15:9, 10. Rev., *abideth*.

17. *Herein* (ἐν τούτῳ). To what does this refer? Two explanations are given.

(1.) To the following *that we may have boldness*. So Huther, who argues thus on the ground that ver. 18 shows that the drift of the writer's thought is toward *the fearlessness of love*. According to this, therefore, love has its fulfillment in freeing us from fear, and inspiring us with boldness even in view of the final judgment.

(2.) To what precedes, viz., *our dwelling in God and He in us*. So Westcott: "The fellowship of God with man and of man with God, carries with it the consummation of love." I prefer the latter, principally on the ground that in such phrases as ἐν τούτῳ *in this*, διὰ τοῦτο *on this account, therefore*, the pronoun usually refers to something preceding, though more fully developed in what follows. See ^{<619>}John 5:16, 18; 6:65; 8:47; 10:17; 12:18; 16:15.

Our love (ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν). The A.V. construes μεθ' ἡμῶν *with us*, with *love*, making *with us* equivalent to *our*. In that case it might mean either *the love which is between Christians*, or *the love which is between God and Christians*. The Rev. construes *with us* with the verb: *love is made perfect with us*. The latter is preferable. I do not think it would be easy to point out a parallel in the New Testament to the expression ἀγάπη μεθ' *love that with us = our love*. The true idea is that love is perfected in fellowship. The love of God is perfected *with us*, in communion with us, through our abiding in Him and He in us. "Love is not simply perfected *in* man, but in fulfilling this issue God works *with* man" (Westcott). Compare 2 John 3, "grace shall be *with us*" (true reading); and ^{<620>}Acts 25:4, "what things God had done *with them*." See also ^{<612>}Matthew 1:23; 1 Corinthians 26:24; ^{<618>}Galatians 6:18. Μετά *with*, is used constantly in the New Testament of ethical relations. See ^{<610>}Matthew 20:2; 2:3; ^{<621>}Luke 23:12; ^{<610>}Acts 7:9; ^{<612>}Romans 12:15; ^{<616>}1 John 1:6.

Boldness (παρρησίαν). See on 2:28.

The day of judgment (τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως). Lit., *the day of judgment*. The exact phrase occurs here only. Ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως *day of judgment*, without the articles, is found ^{<4005>}Matthew 10:15; 11:22, 24; 12:36; ^{<4012>}2 Peter 2:9; 3:7. The day is called *the great day of their wrath* (^{<4017>}Revelation 6:17); *the day of wrath and of revelation of the righteous judgement of God* (^{<4018>}Romans 2:5); *the day of visitation* (^{<4022>}1 Peter 2:12); *the last day* (^{<4069>}John 6:39, 40, 44, 54); *that day* (^{<4072>}Matthew 7:22; ^{<4063>}Luke 6:23; 10:12). *The judgment* is found ^{<4024>}Matthew 12:41, 42; ^{<4014>}Luke 10:14; 11:31, 32.

Because. Likeness to Christ is the ground of boldness.

As (καθὼς). Not absolutely, but according to our measure, as men *in this world*.

He is. The present tense is very significant. Compare 3:7, “is righteous even as He *is* righteous.” The essence of out being as He is lies in perfected love; and Christ is *eternally* love. “He that abideth in love abideth in God and God in him.” Compare 3:2.

In this world. This present economy, physical and moral. The phrase limits the conception of likeness.

18. There is no fear in love (φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ). Lit., *fear is not*. It has no existence. The *fear* is that spoken of in ^{<4017>}1 Peter 1:17; ^{<4028>}Hebrews 12:28; *godly fear*; *filial reverence*; not *slavish* fear, as ^{<4018>}Romans 8:15. *In love*, lit., *the love*, that perfected love of which John has been speaking.

Perfect (τελεία). Not *perfected*, as ver. 17 but *perfect* as the result of having been perfected. Compare ^{<4054>}Hebrews 5:14; ^{<4001>}James 1:4; 3:2.

Casteth out (ἔξω βάλλει). A strong expression: *turneth out of doors*. Fear is cast out of the sphere of the fellowship of love. See the phrase in ^{<4067>}John 6:37; 9:34, 35; 12:31; 15:6.

Hath torment (κόλασιν ἔχει). *Torment* is a faulty translation. The word means *punishment*, *penalty*. It occurs in the New Testament only here and ^{<4056>}Matthew 25:46. The kindred verb, *κολάζομαι* *to punish*, is found ^{<4001>}Acts 4:21; ^{<4019>}2 Peter 2:9. Note the present tense, *hath*. The punishment is *present*. Fear by anticipating punishment has it even now. The phrase *hath punishment* (see on ^{<4022>}John 16:22) indicates that the punishment is

inherent in the fear. Fear carries its own punishment. Augustine, commenting on the expulsion of fear by love, says: “As in sewing, we see the thread passed through by the needle. The needle is first pushed in, but the thread cannot be introduced until the needle is brought out. So fear first occupies the mind, but does not remain permanently, because it entered for the purpose of introducing love.” The words *because fear hath punishment* are parenthetical.

He that feareth The A.V. omits *and* (δέ), which is important as closely connecting this clause with *there is no fear in love*, etc. That is an abstract statement; this is personal; two modes of stating the same truth. Rev. “*and* he that feareth.”

Is not made perfect. “Men’s condition is varied; without fear and love; with fear without love; with fear and love; without fear with love” (Bengel).

19. *We love Him* (ἡμεῖς ἀγαπῶμεν αὐτόν). The best texts omit *Him*. Some render *let us love*, as ver. 7. The statement is general, relating to the entire operation of the principle of love. All human love is preceded and generated by the love of God.

20. *He that loveth not his brother*, etc. Note the striking inversion of the clauses: *He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, God whom he hath not seen cannot love*.

How. The best tests omit, and give the direct statement *cannot love*. So Rev.

21. That (ὅτι). Not defining the *contents* of the commandment, but expressing *intent*. Compare ^{463B} John 13:34, and see on ^{465C} John 15:13.

His brother. “To the persecutor Saul, Christ said, ‘Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me? I have ascended into heaven, yet still I lie upon earth. Here I sit at the right hand of the Father; there I still hunger, thirst, and am a stranger’” (Augustine).

CHAPTER 5

1. *Whosoever believeth* (πάς ὁ πιστεύων). Lit., every one that believeth. For the characteristic form of expression see on 3:3.

The Christ. See on ^{<400>}Matthew 1:1, and ^{<400>}1 John 1:7.

2. *By this* (ἐν τούτῳ). Not *by* this or *from* this, as *an inference* (see on 4:6), but *in* the very exercise of the sentiment toward God, we *perceive*.

When (γrov). More strictly, *whenever*. Our perception of the existence of love to our brethren is developed *on every occasion* when we exercise love and obedience toward God.

Keep (τηρῶμεν). Read ποιῶμεν *do*. So Rev. See on ^{<402>}John 3:21; ^{<400>}1 John 3:4. The exact phrase ποιεῖν τὰς ἐντολὰς *to do* the commandments, occurs only here. See on ^{<624>}Revelation 22:14.

3. *Grievous* (βαρεῖαι). Lit., *heavy*. The word occurs six times in the New Testament. ^{<402>}Acts 20:29, *violent, rapacious*; “*grievous wolves*”: ^{<400>}2 Corinthians 10:10, *weighty, impressive*, of Paul’s letters: ^{<402>}Matthew 23:23; ^{<402>}Acts 25:7, *important, serious*; the *weightier* matters of the law; *serious* charges against Paul.

4. *Overcometh* (νικῶ). See on 2:13.

The victory (ἡ νίκη). Only here in the New Testament.

That overcometh (ἡ νικήσασα). The aorist tense, *overcame*. On the cumulative form of expression, *the victory, that which overcame*, see on 4:9. The aorist is to be held here to its strict sense. The victory over the world *was*, potentially, won when we believed in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. We overcome the world by being brought into union with Christ. On becoming as He is (3:17) we become partakers of His victory (^{<402>}John 16:33). “Greater is He that is in you than He that is in the world” (4:4).

Our faith (πίστις ἡμῶν). Πίστις *faith*, only here in John’s Epistles and not in the Gospel. *Our faith* is embraced in the confession that Jesus is the

Christ, the Son of God. On the question of the subjective and objective use of *the faith*, see on ^{<407>}Acts 6:7.

5. *He that overcometh* (ὁ νικῶν). The article with the participle denoting what is *habitual*; one who leads a life of victory over the world.

6. *This*. Jesus.

He that came (ὁ ἐλθὼν). Referring to the historic fact. See ^{<410>}Matthew 11:3; ^{<409>}Luke 7:19; ^{<415>}John 1:15, 27. Compare, for the form of expression, ^{<413>}John 1:33; 3:13.

By water and blood (δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος). Διὰ *by*, must be taken with ὁ ἐλθὼν *He that came*. It has not mere]y the sense of *accompaniment*, but also of *instrumentality*, i.e., *by, through, by means of*. *Water and blood* are thus the *media* through which Jesus the Mediator wrought, and which especially characterized the *coming*. See especially ^{<302>}Hebrews 9:12: “Christ being *come*... neither *by the blood* (δι' αἵματος) of goats and calves, but *by His own blood* (διὰ δε τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος).” Compare “we walk *by faith not by sight* (διὰ πίστεως οὐ διὰ εἶδους,” ^{<410>}2 Corinthians 5:7): we wait *with* (lit., *through*) *patience* (δι' ὑπομονῆς,” ^{<413>}Romans 8:25).

Water refers to Christ's baptism at the beginning of His Messianic work, through which He declared His purpose to fulfill all righteousness (^{<415>}Matthew 3:15). *Blood* refers to His bloody death upon the cross for the sin of the world.

Other explanations are substituted for this or combined with it. Some refer the words *water and blood* to the incident in ^{<408>}John 19:34. To this it is justly objected that these words are evidently chosen to describe something characteristic of Christ's Messianic office, which could not be said of the incident in question. Nevertheless, as Alford justly remarks, “to deny all such allusion seems against probability. The apostle could hardly, both here and in that place, lay such evident stress on the water and the blood together, without having in his mind some link connecting this place and that.” The readers of the Epistle must have been familiar with the incident, from oral or from written teaching.

Others refer the words to the Christian sacraments. These, however, as Huther observes, are only *the means for the appropriation of Christ's atonement*; whereas the subject here is *the accomplishment of the atonement itself*. Αἷμα *blood*, standing by itself, never signifies the Lord's Supper in the New Testament.

The true principle of interpretation appears to be laid down in the two canons of Dusterdieck.

- (1.) *Water and blood* must point both to some purely historical facts in the life of our Lord on earth, and to some still present witnesses for Christ.
- (2.) They must not be interpreted symbolically, but understood of something so real and powerful, as that by them God's testimony is given to believers, and eternal life assured to them.

Thus the sacramental reference, though secondary, need not be excluded. Canon Westcott finds "an extension of the meaning" of *water and blood* in the following words: "Not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood," followed by the reference to the *present* witness of the Spirit. He argues that the change of the prepositions (*ἐν in*, for *διὰ by*), the use of the article (τῷ), and the stress laid on actual experience (it *is* the Spirit that *witnesseth*), these, together with the fact that that which was spoken of in its unity (*by water and blood*) is now spoken of in its separate parts (*in the water and in the blood*) — "all show that St. John is speaking of a *continuation* of the first *coming* under some new but analogous form. The first proof of the Messiahship of Jesus lay in His complete historical fulfillment of Messiah's work once for all, in bringing purification and salvation; that proof is continued in the experience of the Church in its two separate parts." Thus we are led to the ideas underlying the two sacraments.

The subject opened by the word *blood* is too large for discussion within these limits. The student is referred to Dr. Patrick Fairbairn's "Typology of Scripture; "Andrew Jukes, "The Law of the Offerings;" Professor William Milligan, "The Resurrection of our Lord," note, p. 274 sqq.; Canon Westcott's "Additional Note" on ^{GOLD}1 John 1:7, in his

“Commentary on John’s Epistles;” and Henry Clay Trumbull, “The Blood Covenant.”

Not by water only (οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον). Lit., not *in the water only* Rev., *with*. The preposition ἐν *in*, marks the *sphere* or *element* in which; διὰ *by*, the *medium* through which. For the interchange of ἐν and διὰ see ^{<400>}2 Corinthians 6:7. The words are probably directed against the teaching of Cerinthus. See on 2:22. John asserts that Jesus *is* the Christ, and that He came by *blood* as well as by *water*.

And it is the Spirit that beareth witness (καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν). Lit., *and the Spirit is that which is bearing witness*. Note the present tense, *beareth witness*, and compare ver. 9, *hath born witness*. The witness is present and continuous in the Church, in the sacraments for instance, *in water* and *in blood*. Witnessing is the peculiar office of the Spirit. See ^{<400>}John 14:26; 15:26; 16:8 sqq. See on ^{<400>}John 1:7.

Because (ὅτι). Some render *that*, as presenting the *substance* of the testimony, which is absurd: *the Spirit witnesseth that the Spirit is the truth*. The Spirit is the *Holy Ghost*, not the *spiritual life in man*.

The truth (ἡ ἀλήθεια). Just as Christ is the truth (^{<400>}John 14:6).

7. *There are three that bear record* (τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες). Lit., *three are the witnessing ones*.

The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. These words are rejected by the general verdict of critical authorities. For the details of the memorable controversy on the passage, the student may consult Frederick Henry Scrivener, “Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament;” Samuel P. Tregelles, “An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament;” John Selby Watson, “The Life of Richard Porson, M.A.,” Professor Ezra Abbot, “Orme’s Memoir of the Controversy on ^{<400>}1 John 5:7;” Charles Foster, “A New Plea for the Authenticity of the Text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses,” or “Porson’s Letters to Travis Eclectically Examined,” Cambridge, 1867. On the last-named work, Scrivener remarks, “I would fain call it a success if I could with truth. To rebut much of Porson’s insolent sophistry was easy, to maintain the genuineness of this passage is simply impossible.” Tregelles gives a list of more than fifty volumes, pamphlets, or critical

notices on this question. Porson, in the conclusion of his letters to Travis, says: “In short, if this verse be really genuine, notwithstanding its absence from all the visible Greek manuscripts except two (that of Dublin and the forged one found at Berlin), one of which awkwardly translates the verse from the Latin, and the other transcribes it from a printed book; notwithstanding its absence from all the versions except the Vulgate, even from many of the best and oldest manuscripts of the Vulgate; notwithstanding the deep and dead silence of all the Greek writers down to the thirteenth, and of most of the Latins down to the middle of the eighth century; if, in spite of all these objections, it be still genuine, no part of Scripture whatsoever can be proved either spurious or genuine; and Satan has been permitted for many centuries miraculously to banish the ‘finest passage in the New Testament,’ as Martin calls it, from the eyes and memories of almost all the Christian authors, translators, and transcribers.”

8. Agree in one (εἰς τὸ ἓν εἶσιν). Lit., *are for the one*. They converge upon the one truth, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, come in the flesh.

9. If we receive (εἰ λαμβάνομεν). The indicative mood, assuming such reception as a fact. If we receive, *as we do*. On the verb *receive*, see on ^{<R12>}John 3:32.

The witness of God is greater. Supply mentally, *and therefore we should receive that*.

For (ὅτι). Not explaining *why it is greater*, but why the principle of the superior greatness of divine testimony should apply and be appealed to in this case. Supply mentally, *and this applies in the case before us, for, etc.*

This is the witness of God *which* (ἣν). The best texts read ὅτι *that* or *because*. Render *that*. *This is the witness of God, even the fact that, etc.*

10. On the Son of God. Faith in the *person* of Christ, not merely in *the fact* that Jesus is the Son of God.

God. Also personal. To believe God, is to believe the message which comes from Him. See on ^{<R12>}John 1:12.

Hath made — hath believed (πρπόιηκεν — πεπίστευκεν). The perfect tense marks the two results expressed by the verbs as connected with a

past act. The act perpetuates itself in the present condition of the unbeliever.

Believed on the witness (πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν). The phrase occurs only here. See on ^{<A112>}John 1:12. In one other case *to believe on* is used with an object not directly personal, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς; but the reference is clearly to the personal Christ as *the Light of the World* (^{<A112>}John 8:12).

11. Hath given (ἔδωκεν). The aorist tense, *gave*. So Rev. The reference is to the historic fact of the gift. So ^{<A112>}1 John 3:23: “We should love one another as *He gave* (ἔδωκεν) us commandment.” Ver. 24: “We know that He abideth in us by the Spirit which He *gave* (ἔδωκεν) us.” On the other hand, ^{<A111>}1 John 3:1: “Behold what manner of love the Father *hath bestowed* (δέδωκεν) upon us.” The gift of love abides in the fact that we *are now* children of God (ver. 2).

Eternal life (ζωὴν αἰώνιον). Compare the phrase τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον *the life, the eternal life* (1:2), and ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ *the eternal life* (^{<A112>}John 17:3). For the distinction between the phrases see on 1:2. The phrase here, without either article, merely defines the character of the life.

12. Hath life (ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν). More strictly, as Rev., *the life; i.e., the life which God gave* (ver. 11). See on ^{<A112>}John 16:22. Compare *Christ who is our life* (^{<A111>}Colossians 3:4).

The Son of God. Hath *the Son*, hath not the *Son of God*, pointing back to God as the giver of life in His Son. Bengel observes: “The verse has two clauses: in the former, *of God* is not added, because believers know *the Son*; in the other it is added, that unbelievers may know at length how serious it is not to have Him.”

Hath not life. Note the inversion “He that hath the Son *hath the life*. He that hath not the Son of God, *the life hath he not*.”

13. Have I written (ἔγραψα). Lit., *I wrote*. John speaks as looking back over his Epistle and recalling the aim with which he wrote. See on 2:13.

May know (εἰδῆτε). Not *perceive* (γινώσκειν), but know with settled and absolute knowledge. See on ^{<A112>}John 2:24.

Ye have eternal life (ζὼν ἔχετε αἰώνιον). The Greek order is peculiar, “ye may know that *life ye have eternal*.” The adjective *eternal* is added as an after-thought. So Westcott: “that ye have life — yes, eternal life.”

Unto you that believe. In the A.V., these words follow *have I written*. The Rev. follows the Greek order. The words, like *eternal*, above, are added as an after-thought, defining the character of the persons addressed.

On the name (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα). See on ^{<4123>}John 2:23; 1:12.

14. Confidence (παρρησία). Rev., *boldness*. See on 2:28; ^{<4173>}John 7:13. On *have boldness*, see on ^{<4162>}John 16:22.

We ask (αἰτούμεθα). With a possible reference in the middle voice to asking *for ourselves*.

According to His will (κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ). For the phrase compare ^{<4049>}1 Peter 4:19; ^{<4104>}Galatians 1:4; ^{<4105>}Ephesians 1:5, 11.

He heareth us (ἀκούει ἡμῶν). Compare ^{<4181>}John 9:31; 11:41, 42. *Hear* is used in this sense by John only.

15. Whatsoever we ask. The whole phrase is governed by the verb *hear*. If we know that He heareth our every petition.

16. If any man see (ἐάν τις ἴδῃ). A supposed case.

His brother. Christian brother.

Sin a sin (ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν). Lit., as Rev., *sinning a sin*. There is no exact parallel to the phrase in the New Testament. Compare *the promise which He promised*, 2:25.

Not unto death (μὴ πρὸς θάνατον). Describing the nature of the sin. The preposition *unto*, signifies *tendency toward*, not necessarily *involving death*. See on ver. 17.

He shall ask (αἰτήσει). In prayer. The future tense expresses not merely *permission* (it shall be permitted him to ask), but the certainty that, as a Christian brother, he will ask. An *injunction* to that effect is implied.

He shall give. *He* may refer either to *God* or to *the petitioner*, as being the means of bestowing life through his intercession, as in ^{<S181>}James 5:20. The former explanation is the more natural. So Rev.

Him (αὐτῷ). The brother for whom intercession is made.

For them that sin (τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν). In apposition with αὐτῷ *to him*. God shall give life unto him (the erring brother), *even unto them that sin*. The plural generalizes the particular case described by ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν *sinning a sin*.

There is a sin (ἔστιν ἁμαρτία). Rev., margin, better, *sin*. A sin would express a specific act as such. *Sin* describes the character of a class of acts.

Unto death. The difficulty of the passage lies in the explanation of these words. It is impossible to determine their exact meaning with certainty. Some of the many explanations are as follows: Such sin as God punishes with deadly sickness or sudden death. All those sins punished with excommunication (so the older Catholic theologians). An unrepented sin. Envy. A sinful state or condition. The sin by which the Christian falls back from Christian life into death. The anti-Christian denial that Jesus is the Christ.

The phrase λαβεῖν ἁμαρτίαν θανατοφόρον *to incur a death-bearing sin* (A. V., *bear sin and die*), occurs ^{<G1822>}Numbers 18:22, Sept., and the distinction between sins unto death and sins not unto death is common in Rabbinic writings. However John's expression may have been *suggested* by these, it cannot be assumed that they determine the sense in which he uses it.

Life and death in the passage must correspond. *Bodily* death and *spiritual* life cannot be meant. The passage must be interpreted in the light of John's utterances elsewhere concerning life and death. In ver. 12, he says: *He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life*. In 3:14, 15, he says that *he that loveth not abideth in death: that he that hateth his brother is a manslayer, and that no manslayer hath eternal life abiding in him*. These canons of interpretation point to the explanation, in which some of the best authorities agree, that the sin unto death does not refer to *a specific act*, but to a *class* or *species* of sins, the tendency of which is to cut the bond of fellowship with Christ. Hence the

passage is in the key-note of *fellowship* which pervades the Epistle. Whatever breaks the fellowship between the soul and Christ, and, by consequence, between the individual and the body of believers, is *unto death*, for there is no life apart from Christ. It is indeed true that this tendency inheres in *all* sin. Sin is essentially death. But a distinction is to be made, as Canon Westcott observes, between sins which flow from human imperfection and infirmity, and sins which are open manifestations of a character alien from God. “*All unrighteousness is sin, and there is a sin not unto death.*” It must be carefully born in mind in the study of the passage, that John is speaking of sinful acts as *revelations of character*, and not simply in themselves. So Huther: “Such sinning as is characterized, not by the object with which it is connected, but by the disposition from which it proceeds.” ^{fb68}

I do not say that he shall pray for it (οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ). Lit., *not concerning this do I say that he should make request*. So Rev. Prayer even for this sin unto death is not *forbidden*, but John says that he does not enjoin it. Note the sharp distinctness with which *that* terrible sin is thrown out by the pronoun of remote reference and its emphatic position in the sentence. Note also the words *make request* (ἐρωτήσῃ), and compare αἰτήσῃ *he shall ask*. On the distinction, see on ^{<2119>}Luke 11:9. Αἰτέω *to ask*, is used of the petition of an inferior, and is never used of Christ’s own requests to God. Hence it is properly used here of the humble and affectionate petition of a Christian to God on behalf of a sinning brother. Ἐρωτάω is used of the request of an equal, or of one who asks on equal terms. Hence it may mark a request based upon fellowship with God through Christ, or it may hint at an element of presumption in a prayer for a sin unto death. Westcott cites a very early inscription in the Roman Catacombs as an illustration of the use of ἐρωτᾶν in the sense of Christian prayer for Christians: ἐρωτᾶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν *pray for us*.

17. Unrighteousness (ἀδικία). This is the character of every offense against that which is right. Every breach of duty is a manifestation of sin. Compare 3:4, where sin is defined as ἀνομία *lawlessness*, and lawlessness as sin. See ^{<2119>}Romans 6:13.

18. We know (οἶδαμεν). John uses this appeal to knowledge in two forms: *we know* (3:2, 14; 5:18, 19, 20); *ye know* (2:20; 3:5, 15).

He that is begotten of God (ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Lit., *was begotten*. This exact phrase does not occur elsewhere. Some refer it to *the man* who is born of God, making it parallel with ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, he that *is begotten* of God. Others to *Christ*, the only-begotten of God. The later is preferable.

That wicked one (ὁ πονηρὸς). See on 2:13. Rev., *the evil one*.

Toucheth (ἅπτεται). See on ^{<807>}John 20:17, the only other passage in John's writings where the verb occurs. Both this verb and **θιγγάνω** (^{<821>}Colossians 2:21; ^{<812>}Hebrews 11:28; 12:20) express a touch which exerts a modifying influence upon the object, though **θιγγάνω** indicates rather a superficial touch. On **ψηλαφάω** (^{<477>}Acts 27:27; ^{<828>}Hebrews 12:18; ^{<801>}1 John 1:1), see on ^{<23>}Luke 24:39. Compare ^{<821>}Colossians 2:21. The idea here is *layeth not hold of him*.

19. We are of God (ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσμὲν). For the phrase εἶναι ἐκ *to be from*, see on ^{<816>}John 1:46. For ἐσμὲν *we are*, see on 3:1. John expresses the relation of believers to God by the following phrases: *To be born or begotten of God*, γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ (v. 1; 2:29; 4:7): denoting the initial communication of the new life. *To be of God*, εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ (^{<808>}John 8:47; ^{<801>}1 John 3:10; 4:6): denoting the essential connection in virtue of the new life. *Child of God*, τέκνον Θεοῦ (^{<802>}John 1:12; ^{<801>}1 John 3:1, 10): denoting the relation established by the new life.

World (κόσμος). See on ^{<809>}John 1:9.

Lieth (κεῖται). The word is stronger than ἐστι *is*, indicating the passive, unprogressive state in the sphere of Satan's influence. "While we are *from God*, implying a birth and a proceeding forth, and a change of state, the **κόσμος** *the world*, all the rest of mankind, remains in the hand of the evil one" (Alford).

In wickedness (ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ). Rev., better, *in the evil one*. The expression *to lie in* has a parallel in Sophocles' "Anti-gone:"

ἐν ὑμῖν γὰρ ὡς Θεῷ
κείμεθα τλάμονες

“Wretched we lie in you as in a God” (247).

20. An understanding (διάνοιαν). Only here in John’s writings. The faculty of understanding. See on ^{}Luke 1:51. Westcott remarks that nouns which express intellectual powers are rare in the writings of John.

We may know (γινώσκωμεν). Apprehend progressively. Compare ^{}John 17:3.

Him that is true (τὸν ἀληθινόν). Compare ^{}Revelation 3:7, 14; 6:10. On *true*, see on ^{}John 1:9. “God very strangely condescends indeed in making things plain to me, actually assuming for the time the form of a man, that I at my poor level may better see Him. This is my opportunity to know Him. This incarnation is God making Himself accessible to human thought — God opening to man the possibility of correspondence through Jesus Christ. And this correspondence and this environment are those I seek. He Himself assures me, ‘This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.’ Do I not now discern the deeper meaning in *Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent*? Do I not better understand with what vision and rapture the profoundest of the disciples exclaims, ‘The Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we might know Him that is true?’” (Drummond, “Natural Law in the Spiritual World”).

This. God the Father. Many, however, refer it to the Son.

Eternal life. See on 1:2. ^{fb69}

21. Keep yourselves (φυλάξατε ἑαυτὰ). The exact phrase is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. See ^{}2 Peter 3:17. Rev., rightly, *guard*. See on ^{}1 Peter 1:4.

Idols (εἰδώλων). Strictly, *images*. The command, however, has apparently the wider Pauline sense, to guard against everything which occupies the place due to God.

CRITICAL NOTE ON 1 JOHN 3:19-22.

The second great division of John’s First Epistle treats of the conflict of truth and falsehood. This section extends from ch. 2:18. to ch. 4:6, and is subdivided under the following topics:

1. *The revelation of falsehood and truth* (2:18-29).
2. *The children of God and the children of the devil* (3:1-12).
3. *Brotherhood in Christ and the hatred of the world* (3:13-24).
4. *The Rival Spirits of Truth and Error* (4:1-6).

This passage lies within the third of these subdivisions; but the line of thought runs up into the second subdivision, which begins with this chapter, — *the children of God and the children of the Devil*.

Let us first briefly review the contents of this chapter down to the point of our text.

God shows His wonderful love in calling us *children* of God (τέκνα); as expressing *community of nature*, rather than υἱοί (*sons*), which expresses *the position of privilege*.

The world, therefore, does not know us, even as it did not know Him.

We *are* children of God; and in this fact lies enfolded our future, the essence of which will be likeness to God, coming through unveiled and transfiguring vision.

The result of such a relation and hope is *persistent effort after moral purity*. “Every one that hath this hope in Him, purifieth himself, even as He is pure.”

This attempt to purify corresponds with the fulfillment of our true destiny which Christ has made possible. Sin is irreconcilable with a right relation to God, for Christianity emphasizes the law of God, and “sin is lawlessness.” The object of Christ’s manifestation was to “take away sin;” therefore, “everyone that abideth in Him sinneth not.” “He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous.” “He that committeth sin is of the devil;” but the Son of God was manifested in order to destroy the works of the devil. The divine seed — the divine principle of growth — the germ of the new life is in the true believer; and the ideas of divine sonship and sin are mutually exclusive.

The being a child of God will manifest itself not only in doing righteousness, but in *love* — the love to God, taking shape in love and

ministry to the brethren. This is the highest expression of righteousness. The whole aim of the Gospel is the creation and strengthening of love; and the type of life in God through Christ is therefore the direct opposite of Cain, who being of the evil one, slew his brother.

Over against this love is the world's hatred. This is bound up, as love is, with the question of origin. God's children share God's nature, which is love. The children of the world are the children of the evil one, whose nature is lawlessness and hatred. Love is the outgrowth of life; hatred, of death. He that loveth not, abideth in death. For ourselves, children of God, we know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren.

Christ is the perfect type and revelation of love, since He gave His life for us. We, likewise, ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. The practical test of our brotherly love is ministry. The love of God does not dwell in us if we refuse to relieve our brother's need.

The fruit of love is *confidence*. "In *this*, we perceive that we are of the truth; and, perceiving this, we shall assure our hearts in the presence of God, in whom we live and move and have our being. It is of the very essence of Christian life that it is lived and tested before God. No assurance or confidence is possible except from being in right relation to God.

Through the consciousness of love, then, which is of God, and which marks the children of God, we perceive that we are children of God — of the truth; and in this knowledge we find assurance and confidence before the very highest tribunal. "We shall assure our heart before Him."

This brings us to the heart of our passage. What is *the specific character and direction* of our assurance? Of what are we confident? Here we strike the differences in the exposition of the passage. The questions resolve themselves into three:

1. What is the meaning of **πείσομεν** (*we shall assure or persuade*)?
2. How are the **ὅτις** (*that or because*) to be explained?
3. What is the meaning of **μείζω** (*greater*)?

Πείσομεν may be taken either according to its primitive meaning, *persuade, induce, prevail upon* (^{<4426>}Acts 19:26; 18:4; ^{<4426>}2 Corinthians 5:11), or in its secondary and consequent sense, *to assure, quiet, appease* (^{<4234>}Matthew 28:14).

1. If we render *persuade*, two courses are possible.

(a.) Either we may use it absolutely, and mentally supply something as the substance of the persuasion. “Hereby know we that we are of the truth, and shall persuade our hearts before Him.” The mind might then supply:

We shall persuade our heart to be confident in asking anything from God. Objection. This would anticipate ver. 21. “If our heart condemn us not, then have we boldness toward God, and whatsoever we ask of Him we receive,” etc.; or,

We shall persuade our heart to show love in life and act. Objection. This does not suit the connection; for we recognize ourselves by our love as children of faith, and do not need first to move our hearts to love which already dwells there; or,

We shall persuade our heart that we are of the truth. Objection. This is tautological. We know or perceive that we are of the truth, by the fact of our love. We therefore reject the absolute use of **πείσομεν**.

(b.) Still rendering *persuade*, we may attempt to find the substance of the persuasion in the following clauses. Here we run into the second of our three questions, the double **ὄτι**, for **ὄτι** becomes the sign of definition of **πείσομεν**. The different combinations and translations proposed center in two possible renderings for **ὄτι**: *because* or *that*.

If we render *because*, it leaves us with the absolute **πείσομεν** which we have rejected. We have then to render — “Hereby perceive we that we are of the truth, and shall persuade our heart before Him: *because*, if our heart condemn us, *because*, I say (second **ὄτι**), God is greater than our heart,” etc.

All the other renderings, like this, involve what is called the *epanaleptic* use of **ὄτι**; the second taking up and carrying forward the sense of the first. This is very objectionable here, because

1. There is no reason for it. This use of ὅτι or similar words is appropriate only in passages where the course of thought is broken by a long, interjected sentence or parenthesis, and where the conjunction takes up again the thread of discourse. It is entirely out of place here after the interjection of only a few words.
2. There is no parallel to it in the writings of John, nor elsewhere in the New Testament, so far as I know (but see ^{CRB}1 John 5:9).

The case is no better if we translate ὅτι *that*. Here indeed we get rid of the absolute πείσομεν, but we are compelled to hold by the resumptive ὅτι. For instance,

“We shall persuade ourselves *that*, if our heart condemn us, *that*, I say, God is greater than our heart.”

Moreover, some of these explanations at least, commit the apostle to misstatement. Suppose, for example, we read: “We shall persuade our heart that God is greater than our heart:” we make the apostle say that the consciousness of brotherly love, and of our consequent being “of the truth,” is the basis of our conviction of the sovereign greatness of God. Thus: “Herein (in our brotherly love) do we perceive that we are of the truth, and herein we shall persuade ourselves that God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.”

The case is not improved if we render the first ὅτι as pronominal, and read as follows: “We shall persuade ourselves *in whatever* our heart condemn us, *that* God is greater than our heart.” The object of persuasion, then, is the greatness of God. The sense of condemnation is the occasion of our persuading ourselves: the foundation of our persuasion of God’s greatness is our consciousness of being of the truth.

We conclude therefore,

1. That we must reject all renderings founded on the absolute use of πείσομεν.
- (a.) Because it leaves the mind to supply something which the text leads us to expect that it will supply.

(b.) Because the conception of persuasion or assurance takes its character from the idea of condemning or accusing (καταγινώσκη), and becomes vague if we separate it from that.

2. We must reject explanations founded on the epanaleptic use of ὅτι for the reasons already given.

We turn now to the rendering adopted by the New Testament Revisers.

This rendering takes the first ὅτι with ἐὰν as *relative pronominal*, and the second as *casual*; and is as follows:

“Herein do we know (or, more properly, *perceive*) that we are of the truth; and shall assure (or quiet) our heart before Him *in whatsoever* our heart may condemn (or accuse) us; *because* God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things.”

The only grammatical objection to this rendering, which is entitled to any weight, is that the exact pronominal phrase ὅτι ἐὰν does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; but this is little better than a quibble, since we have really the same combination under another form, viz., ^{<487>}Galatians 5:10, ὅστις ἐὰν (so Lach., West. and H., Tisch., Lightfoot), and possibly in ^{<482>}Acts 3:23, where Tisch. reads ἥτις ἐὰν. In ^{<517>}Colossians 3:17, West. and H., Lightfoot, and Ellicott, read ὅτι ἐὰν (“*whatsoever* ye do in word or deed”). Moreover, it is born out by the frequent use of ἐὰν for ἄν after relatives (^{<415>}Matthew 5:19; 8:19; 10:42; 11:27; ^{<631>}John 15:7). See Moulton’s “Winer,” 2nd ed., p. 390.

This rendering introduces the third question: *What is the meaning of μείζων?* Shall we take it as indicating *judgment* or *compassion* on the part of God? *i.e.*:

1st. Shall we allay the accusation of heart by saying: “God is greater than our heart, His judgment is therefore stricter than ours; and so, apart from fellowship with Him we can have no hope;” or, as Meyer puts it,

“Only in conscious brotherly love shall we calm our hearts, for, if we do not love, our heart condemns us, and God is greater than our heart, and there is no peace for the accusing conscience;” or, again, as it is popularly interpreted:

“If our heart condemn us, then God, who is greater than our hearts, and knows all things, must not only endorse, but emphasize our self-accusation.”

If *our heart* condemn, how much more God?

Or, 2nd. Shall we take *μείζων* as the expression of *God’s compassionate love*, and say, “when our heart condemns us, we shall quiet it with the assurance that we are the proved children of God, and therefore, in fellowship with a God who is greater than our heart, greater in love and compassion no less than in knowledge?”

The choice between these must be largely determined by the drift of the whole discussion, and here, therefore, we leave the textual and grammatical side of the question, and proceed to the homiletical aspect of the passage.

Generally, we may observe that the whole drift of the chapter is consolatory and assuring. The chapter is introduced with a burst of affectionate enthusiasm. “Behold what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us that we should be called the children of God, and such we are.” The darker shades — the origin and nature of sin; the truth that sinners are of the evil one; the hatred of the world, springing out of this radical opposition between the origin and motive of children of God and children of the evil one — are thrown in to heighten and emphasize the position and privilege of God’s children. They are to be left in no doubt as to their relation to God. They are thrown for decisive testimony upon the supreme fact of love. If God the Father is love, and they are His children, they must share His nature; and they prove that they do by loving Him and His children. Hence, John elsewhere says (4:7 sq.), “Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and every one that loveth hath been born of God (or begotten) and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knew not God, for God is love.... If we love one another, God abideth in us, and His love is perfected in us. In this we perceive that we abide in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit.... We have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love, and he that abideth in love, abideth in God, and God in him.”

And again, in this chapter, “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.”

This testimony of love all tends to the assurance of the heart. All comes to a head in this 19th verse. "Herein," — in the fact and consciousness of love, — "herein, perceive we that we are of the truth, and shall assure our heart before Him, in whatsoever our heart condemn us." In striking parallelism with this is the fourth chapter of this Epistle just alluded to, especially the way in which, as in this chapter, the evidence of love makes for assurance. Look at the verses from the 7th to the 16th — the burden of which is, as we have seen, that love is the evidence of our dwelling in God; and then note how this evidence runs into assurance in the 17th and 18th verses. "Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness (compare 'shall assure our heart') in the day of judgment (compare 'before Him'), because as He is so are we in this world (like Christ). There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment."

Now there was a very good and obvious reason for emphasizing this thought of assurance. John knew the misgivings of the Christian heart; and he knew, moreover, how they would be awakened by the high standard of Christian character which he set up in this chapter. Look at these statements: "Every one that hath this hope in Him, purifieth himself, even as He is pure." "Every one that abideth in Him sinneth not. Every one that sinneth hath not even seen Him nor known Him." "He that committeth sin is of the devil." "He that is born of God doth not commit sin." It is not difficult to conceive the effect of such statements upon a sensitive conscience. Let us bring ourselves to these tests. Shall we not need to assure our hearts? In the consciousness of infirmity, with the remembrance of error, under the pressure and thrust of daily temptation, is it strange if the heart accuses? Is it strange if the question is raised, "Am I indeed a child of God? Do not these errors and lapses prove me to be a child of the devil?"

Now I think we should all be led to anticipate, in view of this fact, and as the natural sequence of the former part of the chapter, a thought, not of severe criticism and judgment, based upon God's infinite knowledge, but of fatherly compassion and assurance dealing with our self-accusations, and quieting our misgivings.

The Christian consciousness exercises a judicial office in us, accusing or approving. Our heart passes judgment. But what we especially need to

remember, and what, as it seems to me, is the very core of the teaching of this passage, is *that the decrees of the heart are not final, but must be carried up to a higher tribunal for ratification*. Even our renewed heart is ignorant and blind. God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things. Whatever power of discernment conscience has, it receives from God. Hence, in the interpretation of the passage more stress should be laid than is commonly done upon the words “before Him.” “If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater” (1 John 5:14. Compare Hebrews 4:16). It is, as already hinted, essential to the idea of Christian life that it is lived in the very sight of God. The true child of God sets the Lord always before his face. The prime regulator of his life is the sense of God’s presence. God’s manifestation in Christ’s perfect obedience is his pattern: God’s law imparts to his conscience its tone of rebuke or of commendation. This is a natural and necessary result of the relation assumed in the passage — *children of God*. As children of God, in our Father’s house, life is regulated by the perpetual consciousness of our Father’s presence and scrutiny. No assurance or confidence is possible which does not grow out of a right relation to Him.

John, then, does not mean to say that a child of God is sinless by virtue of his relation as a child; and that his self-accusation is quieted by being pronounced groundless.

He does not mean to say that the heart may not accuse him justly. God’s judgment may confirm that of the heart.

He does mean to say that the heart is not the supreme and final arbiter.

The ordinary interpretation presents a radical defect in this; — that it assumes the infallibility of the heart, and brings in God to confirm and emphasize its decision. If your heart condemn you, then God, who is greater than your heart, condemns you more severely, because He sees your sin in the light of His omniscience. Further, it makes our confidence toward God depend primarily on the testimony of our hearts. If our heart condemn us not, then we may go before God with confidence and ask what we will, because God, being greater than our heart, confirms its testimony. The voice of the heart, in short, on this construction, is the voice of God. As I read it, John’s teaching is the direct opposite of this. It is only God who knoweth all things. No assurance, no accusation is to be

received as final until it has passed before Him. We must look outside of self for the highest tests of self. It is not before ourselves that we are either to assure or to condemn ourselves. Self-condemnation will not be allayed by self-communion. We need, not to be *self-assured*, but to be assured *by Him*.

It is almost needless to say, but it should be kept in mind, that these words are addressed to Christians; and this opens another and interesting question, — that of sin in Christians. The heart sometimes condemns unjustly, or unduly. The conscience is sometimes diseased and morbidly exacting, and the heart is distressed with accusations which are as fanciful as they are painful. But the heart's condemnation is, as has been already said, often just. This, however, as well as the other cases, is covered by the apostle's words: "We shall assure our heart before Him, whereinsoever our heart condemn us." It may well be asked then, how, when God endorses the conviction of the heart, we are to assure our heart before Him? What, when the apostle himself has just told us that "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin? — that he cannot sin, because he is born of God? — that whosoever sinneth hath not seen or known God? These utterances, by themselves, are terrible. They destroy all hope of assurance. They make sinlessness the test of being in Christ. How shall we assure our heart?

Here we must be particular to note that all through this chapter, and it might be said, throughout the Epistle, John is dealing with something broader than specific errors or good deeds. He is dealing with the question of a Christian's relation to God. Note the sharp and broad classifications of this chapter to this effect, indicating the order or economy to which the man belongs rather than his specific acts.

He that doeth righteousness.

He that doeth sin; where sin as a whole answers to righteousness as a whole.

He is righteous even as He is righteous. He is of the devil: where, in each case, the man's character is shown to be a reflection of his spiritual master.

So, too, the phrases, "children of God;" "of the truth;" "passed from death unto life." And in chapter 1, "in darkness;" "in the light." Again, in

chapter 4, “dwelleth in God;” “of the world;” “of God.” And, once more, the fact that the entire Epistle turns on a question of relation between man and God. Its key-note is *fellowship* — “That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us; yea, and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.”

This being true, the tests applied are directed at this relation. “Hereby we perceive that we are of the truth:” that is our sphere, our genesis, our economy. And accordingly specific acts are treated in the light of this general relation. No man goes sinless before God. This is treated in the first chapter with reference to certain actual delusions in this matter. Those who maintain that sin is an accident and not a principle, a transient phenomenon which leaves no abiding issues, are met with “if we say that we have no sin (ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν), we lead ourselves astray and the truth is not in us.” Those who deny that, personally, they have sinned, are met with “if we say that we have not sinned (οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν), we make of Him a liar, and His word is not in us.” So that, I repeat, the test here contemplated is a test of relation and not of specific act. As Westcott truthfully says: “As long as the relationship with God is real” (if a man is truly born of God) “sinful acts are but accidents. They do not touch the essence of the man’s being.” (Compare also Westcott on ⁶¹⁸1 John 5:16.) Consequently, when our heart condemns us of sin, and we appear before God, our assurance or quieting of heart comes through God’s throwing us back upon this relation to Him, and its accompanying proof, love for the brethren. God teaches the heart to meet its self-accusation with the fact and evidence of sonship. Hereby we shall assure our heart before Him.

It is noteworthy how John exalts and emphasizes the sufficiency and decisiveness of this test. “He that abideth in love abideth in God, and God in him.” “We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren.” And in the fourth chapter he is even more emphatic; asserting (ver. 12) that love to the brethren is the only possible proof of love to God; for “God hath no man ever beheld. If we love one another, God abideth in us, and His love is perfected in us.”

So, then, the man takes his justly accusing heart before Him, and God says, “It is true, you have sinned. But you are my child, proven to be such by your love. Shall not I, your Father, forgive your sin? Do you fear to

bring it to me? ‘If any man sin, he hath an advocate with me, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for his sins.’ If you confess your sin, I am faithful and just to forgive you your sin and to cleanse you from all unrighteousness.”

If he goes under the accusation of imperfect love, he is met with the assurance that his relation to God is not determined nor perpetuated by the scant measure of the purest human love. “Herein is love; not that we have loved (*ἠγαπήκαμεν*) God, but that He loved us (*ἠγάπησεν*, associating His love with a definite act) and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.”

If the self-accusation is morbid and unfounded, a freak of a diseased religious fancy, rather than a truthful verdict of a healthy conscience, the complex and confused witness of our ignorant heart is resolved into the simple testimony of love. I am God’s child. At my Father’s hand I shall meet with no encouragement to continue in sin, but with pardon for my sin; with tonics for my morbid conditions; with allowance for my infirmity. Only by that perfect wisdom will the error be duly weighed; only by that perfect love will it be forgiven; only by that perfect strength will the soul be energized to renew the life-long fight with sin. If we are trembling lest the things of which our heart accuses us be the warrant for disinheriting us of our position and privilege, we are pointed past our individual lapses and errors to the great, dominant sentiment of our relation to God. We love Him, we love the brethren, therefore we are His children; erring children no doubt, but still His. Will He disinherit His child?

Observe again, how John finds comfort in the fact of omniscience. We shall assure our heart *because God knoweth all things*. The natural instinct of imperfection is to evade the contact and scrutiny of perfection. But that instinct is false and misleading. The Gospel creates a contrary instinct, in creating a filial consciousness. If God’s holiness shames our sinfulness, and God’s perfect wisdom dwarfs our folly, nevertheless, perfection is the only safe refuge for the imperfect. No man wants to be tried before an ignorant or a corrupt judge. If that omniscient knowledge sees deeper into our sin than we do, it also sees deeper into our weakness. If it weighs the act in more nicely-poised scales, it weighs the circumstances in the same

scales. If it knows our secret faults, it knows likewise our frame and our frailty. If it discerns aggravations, it equally discerns palliations. If infinite knowledge compasses the sin, so does infinite love. There mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other.

So we shall assure our heart before Him in whatsoever our heart condemn us. Not with the conceited assurance of self-righteousness; not with a drugged and dulled perception of the vileness of sin; not with an elixir which shall relax our spiritual fiber and moderate our enthusiasm for spiritual victory; but with the thought that we are God's children, loving, though erring, in our Father's hand; with our elder brother Christ interceding for us; with the knowledge that the judicial element in our Christian experience is transferred from our own heart to God; with the knowledge that, being His, "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." As I read this passage I wonder if John, as he penned it, had not in mind that interview of Christ and Peter at the lake after the resurrection. There was Peter with a heart stung with self-accusation, as well it might be: Peter who had denied and forsaken his Lord: and yet Christ meets all this self-accusation with the words "Loveth thou Me?" And Peter's reply is in the very vein of our passage. "God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things:" "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love Thee."

On this interpretation, the remainder of the passage follows simply and naturally. Once assured that we are children of God, we have boldness toward God. That assurance, carrying with it the assurance of pardon and sympathy, is the only means by which the heart's condemnation is legitimately allayed. If, by which the heart's condemnation is legitimately allayed. If, under that assurance, our heart ceases to condemn us, "then have we confidence toward God." It is noteworthy how the line of thought coincides with that in the latter part of the fourth of Hebrews. There too we see the Divine omniscience emphasized — the discernment of the living word, "quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight, but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." Then comes the

priesthood and the sympathy of Jesus, the Great High-Priest, “touched with the feeling of our infirmities;” and then the same conclusion: “Let us therefore come *boldly* unto the throne of grace.”

This latter part of the passage must therefore be interpreted by the former. That the heart feels no sense of condemnation is not, of itself, a legitimate nor a safe ground of boldness toward God. There is a boldness which is born of presumption, of spiritual obtuseness, of ignorance of the character and claims of God, of false and superficial conceptions of sin. A valid absence of condemnation must have a definite and valid fact, a substantial evidence behind it; and that it has, according to the interpretation we have given: “We shall assure our heart before Him in whatsoever our heart condemn us, by *this*; namely that the all-knowing God is our forgiving Father, that Christ is our Propitiator and Savior, and that the Spirit of love in our hearts, and the loving ministry of our lives testify that we are children of God. Note at this point how John answers to Paul. Look first at the fourth chapter of this Epistle. “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and His love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit.” Now turn to the eighth chapter of Romans. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death. Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness unto our spirit that we are children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.” And, in like manner, “the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity; the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and He that searcheth the hearts (being greater than our heart and knowing all things) knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God” — for the saints that love God, foreordained, called, justified, glorified. “What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who is against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s

elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Even as it is written,

*‘For Thy sake we are killed all the day long;
We were accounted as sheep for the slaughter.’*

Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

Finally, the whole passage carries a protest and an antidote against an introverted, morbidly subjective and self-scrutinizing type of piety, which habitually studies self for the evidence of right spiritual relation and condition: which tests growth in grace by tension of feeling, and reckons spiritual latitude and longitude by spiritual moods. Feeling, religious sensibility, has its place, and a high and sacred place it is; but its place is not the judgment-seat; and right feelings in Christian experience is always based upon right relation to the facts of the plan of redemption. The Christian consciousness give no valid testimony, save as it reflects the great objective verities of the Christian faith. If our spirit witnesses *with* the Spirit, the Spirit must first bear witness *to* our spirit that we are children of God.

VOLUME 2

- ftb1** That he names himself in the Apocalypse, and not in the Gospel, is sufficiently explained by the fact that the Gospel is historical, intended to bring Christ into prominence and to keep the writer out of view. The Apocalypse, on the other hand, is prophetic, and the name of the author is required as a voucher for the revelations granted him. Compare ²¹⁷⁵ Daniel 7:15; 8:27.
- ftb2** I follow the general arrangement of Westcott.
- ftb3** For a list of these coincidences see Westcott's Introduction to his Commentary on the Gospel, in the Speaker's Commentary.
- ftb4** Cerinthus taught that the world was not made by the supreme God, but by another and remote power which is over the universe. Jesus was not born of the Virgin by miraculous conception, but was the Son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation, though specially endowed with justice and wisdom. After the baptism of Jesus the Christ descended upon Him in the form of a dove, from that sovereign power which is over all things. He then announced the unknown Father and wrought miracles; but toward the end of His ministry the Christ departed from Jesus, and Jesus suffered and rose from the dead, while the Christ remained impassable as a spiritual being.
- ftb5** The Docetes held that the body of our Lord was an immaterial phantom. Their name is derived from *δοκέω* (dokeo) *to seem*.
- ftb6** It is, of course, foreign to the scope of this work to discuss this, with other Johannine questions, critically. Such a discussion must assume the reader's acquaintance with Greek. The discussion concerning the differences in language will be found in Professor Milligan's excellent *Lectures on the Revelation of St. John*, Appendix 2:
- ftb7** I give the arrangement of the Prologue according to Godet.
- ftb8** Of course not anticipating the criticism which has eliminated this passage from text.
- ftb9** Austin used the Latin *vox*, and of course has in mind the secondary meaning as a *word* or *saying*.

- ftb10** The word *hypostasis* is equivalent to *substance*. In theological language it is used in the sense of *person* as distinguished from *essence*. Hence the adverb *hypostatically* signifies *personally* in the theological sense, which recognized three *persons* in the Godhead with one *essence*.
- ftb11** So the Rev., but not consistently throughout. A.V. *by*. See my article on the Revised New Testament. *Presbyterian Review*, October, 1881.
- ftb12** This reading is very earnestly defended by Canon Westcott, and is adopted in Westcott and Hort's text, and supported by Milligan and Moulton. It is rejected by Tischendorf and by the Revisers; also by Alford, DeWette, Meyer, and Godet. Grammatical considerations seem to be against it (see Alford on the passage), but Canon Westcott's defense is most ingenious and plausible.
- ftb13** *i.e.*, attributing human form and human modes of activity to God, as when we speak of the *hand*, the *face*, the *eye* of God, or of God *begetting* as here.
- ftb14** I follow Meyer and Godet. De Wette, Alford, Milligan and Moulton adopt the other interpretation, referring ἔμπροσθεν, to *rank* or *dignity*. So Westcott, who, however, does not state the issue between the two explanations with his usual sharpness.
- ftb15** It is hardly necessary to refer the critical student to the admirable note of Bishop Lightfoot, in his *Commentary on Colossians*, p. 323 sq.
- ftb16** Dr. Scrivener, "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament." remarks: "Those who will resort to ancient evidence exclusively for the recension of the text, may well be perplexed in dealing with this passage. The oldest manuscripts, versions, and writers are hopelessly divided." He decides, however, for the reading υἱὸς. So Tischendorf's text, and of commentators, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Godet, Schaff (in Lange). Westcott and Hort's text gives Θεὸς, with ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς in margin. So Westcott (*Commentary*), Milligan and Moulton, and Tregelles. See Schaff's note on the passage in Lange; Scrivener, p. 525; and "Two Dissertations," by F. J. A. Hort, Cambridge, 1877.
- ftb17** I take this division from Westcott.
- ftb18** The student should by all means read Canon Westcott's admirable summary in the Introduction to his *Commentary on John's Gospel*.

- ftb19** It is not easy to adjust all the references to the hour of the day in John's Gospel to either of the two methods. Thus 19:14 places the crucifixion at the *sixth* hour, or *noon*, reckoning by the Jewish mode, while Mark (15: ^{ftb25} names the *third* hour, or between 8 and 9 A. M. The two passages in chapter 4, 6, 52, afford little help, especially the latter. Perhaps, after all, the passage most nearly decisive is 11:9. There are strong authorities on both sides. For the Roman method, Tholuck, Ebrard, Ewald, Wescott; for the Jewish, Lucke, De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Lange, Godet.
- ftb20** In ^{<RB>} John 9:35, where Jesus himself formulates a confession, the reading is disputed; three of the leading MSS. reading *Son of man*. See on that passage.
- ftb21** I do not raise the question whether the narratives of John and of the Synoptists refer to the same event.
- ftb22** Or, according to some high authorities, "ye all know."
- ftb23** This view, however, is opposed by Meyer, Lange, De Wette, Alford, and Godet.
- ftb24** Condensed from Dr. Thomson's "Central Palestine and Phoenicia," in "The Land and the Book." An interesting description of the excavations made on the summit of Gerizim, by Lieutenant Anderson, will be found in the same volume, pp. 126-128.
- ftb25** In ^{<UB>} Matthew 13:57, Tischendorf reads as her, *ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι*, *in his own country*. Westcott and Hort, *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ*.
- ftb26** I have given what seems, on the whole, the most simple and natural explanation, though against a host of high authorities. The various interpretations form a bewildering jungle. All of them are open to objection. One of the most clear and simple discussions of the passage may be found in Schaff's Popular Commentary on the Gospel of John, edited by Professors Milligan and Moulton, where this explanation is adopted, though Professor Schaff in Lange calls it "far-fetched." This is also the view of Canon Westcott. Other explanations are: Galilee generally; Nazareth; Lower Galilee, in which Nazareth was situated, as distinguished from Upper Galilee, in which was Capernaum.
- ftb27** Bishop Lightfoot (Commentary on ^{<RB>} Galatians 3: ^{ftb22} urges with much force that this is *invariably* its meaning. The passage cited in

opposition to this view by Professor Thayer (Lexicon of the New Testament), ^{<RB>}John 7:38; 10:35; ^{<RB>}Romans 4:3; ^{<RB>}Galatians 3:22; 4:30; ^{<RB>}James 2:8; ^{<RB>}1 Peter 2:6; ^{<RB>}2 Peter 1:20, do not appear to me to be conclusive; on the contrary, several of them seem to make rather for Bishop Lightfoot's view.

ftb28 The correct reading in ^{<RB>}Matthew 11:16 is **παιδίους**.

ftb29 Edersheim ("Life of Jesus") says that the Talmud names certain kinds of fish, specially designated as *small fishes*, which might be eaten without cooking: that small fishes were recommended for health, and that the lake of Galilee was particularly rich in these, the salting and pickling of which was a special industry among the fishermen.

ftb30 For a full description see the article "Feast of Tabernacles," in McClintock and Crooks' Cyclopaedia, vol. 10, and Edersheim, "The Temple," ch. 14.

ftb31 I am inclined, however, to think that the distinction between these two, and also between these and **πορεύομαι**, which Canon Westcott claims is observed by John, will not bear too strict pressing. See his commentary on John 7, 33.

ftb32 I am aware of the objection to this rendering based on the canon that **τὴν ἀρχὴν** has this meaning only in negative sentences, an objection which is certainly not parried by Godet's attempt to explain this passage as *essentially* negative. But this rule is not absolutely universal (see Thayer's Lexicon, **ἀρχή**, 1, b.), and this explanation seems to me, on the whole, to fall in better than any other with the general sense of the passage as I understand it. I always differ from Canon Westcott with reluctance; but without going so far as to say, with Alford, that his interpretation is ungrammatical, I must confess that it seems to me artificial and forced, as also does Meyer's rendering, which is open besides to serious criticism on grammatical grounds. The student will find the different interpretations well summed up and classified in Schaff's Lange, and also more briefly in Westcott's additional note to ch. 8. See also Meyer.

ftb33 I adopt this rendering, though with some hesitation, as best representing what seems to me the line of thought in the whole passage, and as avoiding most of the grammatical difficulties. 1, though

grammatically defensible, necessitates the awkwardness of rendering **αὐτοῦ** as neuter, by inference or derivation from the masculine **ψεύστης**. It is much more natural to take it as masculine. Both 1 and 2 require **ὁ πατήρ** to be taken as the *predicate*, whereas, having the article, it would naturally be expected to be the subject. The main objection to 3, is the omission of the subject with **λαλή**, which is harsh. Professor Kendrick (American edition of Meyer) cites as a parallel **φησί** in ^{<4700>}2 Corinthians 10:10, and very justly observes that “if any objection may lie against this construction, it does not approach in harshness to that which makes **πατήρ αὐτοῦ** a predicate in the sense ordinarily assigned to it. It is adopted by Westcott, and Milligan and Moulton.

ftb34 Huther on ^{<4801>}1 John 3:1, claims that this sense would be admissible only in the event of the phrase being used invariably with **ὑπερ τινος**, *on behalf of one*.

ftb35 Rev., *God*, with *the judges* in margin.

ftb36 Trench (Synonyms) appears to overlook the exception in 2 Corinthians, though he cites the passage. He says that **χρίειν** is *absolutely restricted* to the anointing of the Son by the Father, p. 131.

ftb37 Perhaps the nearest approach to such a sentiment in Homer is the case of Thetis, weeping for and with her son Achilles (“Iliad,” 1:360; 51, 66).

ftb38 As by Fra Angelico (Florence), Bonifazio (Louvre), and the superb picture by Sebastian del Piombo in the National Gallery, London.

ftb39 The meaning to *take* or *bear away* is claimed by some for ^{<4187>}Matthew 8:17 and ^{<4105>}John 20:25 (so Thayer, N. T. Lexicon). The former I think more than doubtful. Meyer declares it “contrary to the sense;” De Wette and Lange both render *bore*. Canon Cook says. “The words chosen by St. Matthew preclude the supposition that he refers the prophet’s words, contrary to the sense of the original, to the mere removal of diseases by healing them.” The words in Matthew are a citation from ^{<2510>}Isaiah 53:4, which Cheyne (“Prophecies of Isaiah”) renders, “surely our sicknesses he bore, and our pains he carried them.” Septuagint: “This man carries our sins and is pained for us.” Symmachus: “Surely he took up our sins and endured our labors.”

Edersheim remarks that “the words as given by St. Matthew are most truly a New Testament targum of the original.” Delitzsch, who thinks that the meaning *took away* is included in the sense of the Hebrew *nasa*, admits that its primary meaning is, *He took up, bore*. The meaning in ⁴³¹⁵John 20:25 may be explained as in ⁴³¹⁶John 12:6, as determined by the context, though it may be rendered if *thou hast taken him up*. Field (“Otium Norvicense”) cites a passage from Diogenes Laertius, 4:59, where it is said that Lacydes, whenever he took anything out of his store-room, was accustomed, after sealing it up, to throw the seal or ring through the hole, so that it might never be taken from his finger, and any of the stores be *stolen* (βασταχθείη).

ftb40 Field (“Otium Norvicense”), who holds by **τετήρηκεν**, observes that “the conjecture that the ointment may have been reserved from that used at the burying of Lazarus, is not fanciful, but an excellent example of undesigned coincidence, since we should never have perceived the propriety of the *might have been sold* of the first two Gospels, if John had not helped us out with his **τετήρηκεν**, *she hath kept*.”

ftb41 Meyer acutely remarks that this rendering “yields the result of an actual prayer interwoven into a reflective monologue, and is therefore less suitable to a frame of mind so deeply moved.”

ftb42 Godet, with his well-known aversion to departures from the Rec., holds by the reading **γενομένου**, and explains **γινόμενου** by *when the repast as a repast began*; adding that the correction was made in order to place the foot-washing at the beginning of the repast, the customary time for it. But the performance of the act during the course of the meal, is indicated by the words in ver. 4, *He riseth from (ἐκ) the supper*.

ftb43 I am surprised to find it adopted by Milligan and Moulton.

ftb44 Godet’s affection for the “received reading” carries him rather beyond bounds, when it leads him to say that **ἀναπεσὼν**” seems absurd.”

ftb45 Directed to an *end* (**τέλος**), and therefore marking a *purpose*.

ftb46 The explanation given by Milligan and Moulton is, that the Father’s house includes earth as well as heaven that it is, in short, the universe, over which the Father rules, having many apartments, some on this side, others beyond the grave. When, therefore, Jesus goes away, it is

only to another chamber of the one house of the Father. The main thought is that wherever Jesus is wherever we are, we are all in the Father's house, and therefore there can be no real separation between Jesus and His disciples. This is very beautiful, and, in itself, true, but, as an explanation of this passage, is not warranted by anything in it, but is rather read into it.

- ftb47** W. Aldis Wright ("Bible Word-Book") is wrong in calling this "the primary meaning" of the word. No authorities for the use of *mansio* in this sense are quoted earlier than Pliny and Suetonius, and none for this use of **μονή** earlier than Pausanias (A.D. 180). Canon Westcott's interpretation is effectively demolished (usually no easy thing to do) by J. Sterling Berry, in *The Expositor*, 2nd series, vol. iii., p. 397.
- ftb48** The student will find the whole question discussed by Bishop Lightfoot ("On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament," p. 58 sqq.); Julius Charles Hare ("Mission of the Comforter," p. 348); and Canon Westcott (Introduction to the Commentary on John's Gospel, Speaker's Commentary, p. 211). See also his note on **1 John 2:1**, in his Commentary on the Epistles of John.
- ftb49** This does not, as Godet says, turn the promise into "a moral precept." It is a hortatory encouragement. But then the reading occurs in God. A.!
- ftb50** The technical terms are **τελικῶς** (*telicos*), *of the design and end*, and **ἐκβατικῶς** (*ekbatikos*), *of the result*.
- ftb51** Godet says that this expression "is nowhere else found in the mouth of Jesus." But see **Matthew 8:3**; **Mark 14:36**; **John 21:22**.
- ftb52** Mr. Field's remark ("Otium Norvicense") that it is improbable that the word would continue to be used in the older sense (*rod*) after it had acquired the later meaning (*hand*), can hardly be called conclusive.
- ftb53** Mr. Field ("Otium Norvicense") claims that **λύσσω**, is the milder word, and cites a curious illustration from Plutarch ("Life of Cleomenes"). Cleomenes and his party escape from prison, and endeavor to raise the town and to get possession of the citadel. Failing in this, they resolve upon suicide. It is arranged that one of the number is not to kill himself until he shall be assured that all the rest are dead. When all are stretched on the ground, the survivor goes round and *tries*

each with his dagger (τῷ ξιφιδίῳ παραπτόμενος). When he comes to Cleomenes, he *pricks* (νύξας) him on the ankle (παρὰ τὸ σφυρόν), and goes him contract his face.

- ftb54** See William Stroud, “Physical Theory of the Death of Christ.”
- ftb55** ἔχεις τι, *have you anything*, is the usual question addressed by a bystander to those employed in fishing or bird-catching. Equivalent to *have you had any sport?* See Aristophanes, “Clouds,” 731.
- ftb56** About A.D. 550, generally believed to have been a Bishop. The author of a work “De Partibus Divinae Legis,” a kind of introduction to the sacred writings.
- ftb57** This is the view of Alford and Westcott. Ebrard and Huther maintain the personal sense.
- ftb58** So Alford, Huther, Ebrard.
- ftb59** The student should consult, on John’s use of the term *Life*, Canon Westcott’s “additional note” on ^{<GR5>}1 John 5:20. “Commentary on the Epistles of John,” p. 204.
- ftb60** Let the student by all means consult Canon Westcott’s “additional note” on p. 27, of his “Commentary on the Epistles of John.”
- ftb61** But not New Testament epistles. Χαίρειν *greeting*, occurs in *no* address on Apostolic epistle, except in that of James. See on James. 1:1.
- ftb62** The student may profitably consult on Plato’s view of sin, Ackermann, “The Christian Element in Plato,” p. 57, sq.
- ftb63** The story may be found at length in Godet’s “Commentary on John,” vol. 1, p. 58.
- ftb64** *i.e.*, the genitive case, *of God, of the Father*, represents God as the *subject* of the emotion.
- ftb65** Because the verb separates *not* from *all*. In such cases, according to New Testament usage, the negation is universal. The A.V. *not all* makes it partial. See, for instance, ^{<GR5>}1 John 3:15; ^{<AB2>}Matthew 24:22.
- ftb66** I am indebted for the substance of this note to Canon Westcott.
- ftb67** So Alford and Huther, agt. Westcott. Westcott rightly observes that the preposition ἐν *in*, is constantly used in the context to express the

presence of God in the Christian body; but it is most commonly joined there **μένει** *abideth*, vv. 12, 13, 15, 16, and the objective statement, *God sent*, etc., defining the manifestation of God's love, does not adjust itself naturally to the subjective sense implied in *in us*.

- ftb68** An interesting paper on "The sin unto Death," by the Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D., may be found in "The Expositor," 2nd series, vol. 1, p. 416. He holds to Bengel's view of a *sinful state or condition*.
- ftb69** The student will do well to study Canon Westcott's "Additional Note" on this phrase, "Commentary on the Epistles of John," p. 204 sqq.
- ftb70** Lightfoot renders **χαίρετε** *farewell* in ^{<SIB1>}Philippians 3:1; and describes it as a *parting benediction* in 4:4; but, in both cases, says that it includes an exhortation to *rejoice*. The *farewell* is needless in both instances.
- ftb71** For fuller details, see article *Papyrus* in "Encyclopaedia Britannica," 9th edition, vol. xviii.
- ftb72** See Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," 2, 270.
- ftb73** Canon Westcott says "no parallel is quoted for" the Rev. rendering, but ^{<G15>}Revelation 21:5, can hardly be esteemed a parallel to *his* rendering "thou makest sure."
- ftb74** The ordinary usage of **συνεργός** with the genitive of the person co-operated with (^{<SIC1>}Romans 16:21; ^{<SIB1>}1 Corinthians 3: seems against the second explanation; but against the former is the fact that the thing *for which*, or *on behalf of which*, one is a fellow-worker, is also used in the genitive (^{<G124>}2 Corinthians 1: or with **εἰς** *unto* (^{<SIB1>}Colossians 4:11; ^{<G83>}2 Corinthians 8:23). There is no instance of the *davious commodi* (so Alford, Huther), *dative of reference*. On the other hand the kindred verb **συνεργέω** occurs with the dative of the thing co-operated with in ^{<G122>}James 2:22: **ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις**, *faith wrought with his works* (see Huther's note). I agree with Canon Westcott that this construction is sufficient to support the Rev. rendering. Huther, Alford, and Ebrard all adopt the other explanation.
- ftb75** "Die Heimlich Offenbarung Johannis:" published in 1498

- ftb76** See Bishop Lightfoot's Essay on the Christian Ministry, in his "Commentary on Philippians."
- ftb77** This is the explanation of Trench, Plumptre, Düsterdieck, and Alford, and seems on the whole, to be the preferable one. Professor Milligan argues at length for the second explanation, which is Bengel's.
- ftb78** The literature of hymnology is very rich in hymns depicting the glory of the heavenly city. In Latin there are *Jerusalem luminosa* which reappears in *Jerusalem my happy home*, and *O Mother dear Jerusalem: Urbs beata Jerusalem*, which reappears in *Blessed city, heavenly Salem: Urbs Sion Aurea*, in *Jerusalem the golden* and *Jerusalem the glorious*. Of this *O bona patria*, translated in *To thee, O dear, dear Country*, is a portion. Also Bernard's *Me receptet Sion, Illa*. In English may be noted, besides the translations just referred to, *Sweet place, sweet place alone; Hear what God the Lord hath spoken; Jerusalem, my happy home, when shall I come to thee?* In German, Meyfart's *Jerusalem du hochgebaute stadt*, and Hiller's *O Jerusalem du Schone*. Of Meyfart's hymn there are two English translations, one by Miss Winkworth, *Jerusalem, thou city fair and high*, and the other by Bishop Whittingham of Maryland, *Jerusalem, high tower thy glorious walls*.
- ftb79** So Professor Milligan, who thinks that the whole scene is founded on Isaiah 6., which, he remarks, is always justly regarded as one of the greatest adumbrations of the Trinity contained in the Old Testament.
- ftb80** I.e., the halo round the moon.
- ftb81** Dante's reference is to ~~2301~~ Isaiah 61:7, where, however, there is no reference to garments, but merely to a double compensation.
- ftb82** John.
- ftb83** This cubical plan, applied not only to the Tabernacle, but to the Ark of the Flood, the Temple of Solomon and the "Kings House," is minutely worked out in "The Holy Houses" by Dr. Timothy Otis Paine; a book full of curious erudition. in which the Tabernacle, the Ark of Noah, the Temple, and the Capitol or King's House, are treated as developments from a common type; but which proceeds on the utterly untenable hypothesis that the temple of Ezekiel's vision was Solomon's; and that, accordingly, from the two books of Kings and the

prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel all the data are furnished for a complete restoration of the Temple; the prophetic vision of Ezekiel supplying the details omitted in the historic record of Kings.