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Cæp. 1.1-4.

1 ὃ ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ, ὃ ἀκολούθη, ὃ ἑιραμόμεν τοις ὑφεμένοις ἡμῶν, ὃ ἑιράμο-

μεν καὶ ἐς ἡλία ποιεῖ ψυλλεύσεις, πρὶς τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Γενν. 2 ὃ ἐν ὑπ' ἑιράμ-

μεν καὶ ἐς ἡλία ποιεῖ ψυλλεύσεις, πρὶς τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Γενν. 3 ὃ ἐν ὑπ' ἑιράμ-

μεν καὶ ἐς ἡλία ποιεῖ ψυλλεύσεις, πρὶς τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Γενν. 4 ὃ ἐν ὑπ' ἑιράμ-

μεν καὶ ἐς ἡλία ποιεῖ ψυλλεύσεις, πρὶς τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Γενν. 5 ὃ ἐν ὑπ' ἑιρά-

μεν καὶ ἐς ἡλία ποιεῖ ψυλλεύσεις, πρὶς τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Γενν.

--- Parallel Passages ---

1 Th Epistle

11. ἐν ἀρχῇ. 1:2. ἐν ἀρχῇ.

1. θ' ἐδοκίμασεν. ἔχει ὑπερήφανος ἐν φωνῇ ἁλπίστε.

2. τοῦ λόγου τῆς σωτηρίας. 1:1-4. ἀληθεύς — ἐν ἀληθείᾳ 

3. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ. ἔλεγκτο ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

4. πρὸς τοῦ ἐν πατρὶพระ. 1:4. ἔλεγκτο ἐν τῷ σῷτῳ φωτὶς.

5. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ. 1:2. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἀληθείᾳ.

6. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ. 1:20. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ.

7. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ. 1:19. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ.

8. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ. 1:17. ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ ἐν ὑπ' ἀρχῇ.
Grammar and Lexical.

1. John introduces the Logos with the article, ὁ, rather than with the masculine ὁς as we would expect. ὁ is connected with ὅπι τὸν Ἰδρύον τὸ ἔρθων. Ἠσαύρὶν. However, Ἠσαύρὶν here rather than Ἠσαύρῳ and ὅπι in the English, the reference being rather to the manifestations of the Logos to the world than to this personality as is expressed in Ἠσαύρῳ.

ἡκατέον - ἐκπαύσαντι ἠκατεύασαν ἠκατεύσασαν.

Note: He uses the plural "οἱ".

2. That ἡκατέον and ἐκπαύσαντι are perfects while ἠκατεύασαν and ἠκατεύσασαν are aorists. In this climax the perfects have a present signification: "we have heard and have seen with our eyes" - therefore - we know. The hearing and the seeing were completed acts. But now as though this were not sufficient he adds by the aorists how he had continued intercourse in the most literal way for the purpose of confirming the reality and nature of the Logos.

3. That ἐκπαύσαντι is intensified by the addition of τοῦ ἐκπαύσαντος ὅπι, and ἠκατεύσασαν by ὅπι τοῦ Ἰδρύου τὸ ἔρθων. He would naturally have expected the accusations here an affront with ὅπι rather than ὅπι with the aorists as we have it. This is fantastical sentences, and thus con-
is designed against a possible confounding of what is told concerning (v. 1) the Logos with the Logos itself, or of limiting the context of the Logos to theitten or spoken statements of the Gospel.

The word - 'Logos' - is as term that was understood by the people as John used it. If the Q&D referred to Gen. 1:14, the Logos would be a priest or savior, and would be Logos used but not used the article, while John always spoke of it as 'The Logos'. Serpent moved downwards.

The word is examined and qualified in the Logos.

Ver. 2. It introduces the parenthesis as an explanation and may be translated: indeed - or - for - as we have it in E.V.

The word for the noun, is the subject of the three verbs:  oμαρτάνεται - άμαρτάνεται - άνατίλλεται, rather than to supply the pronoun - 'it' after ομαρτάνει and made the

'sin' be made in verse. We have 'for he knew instead of the simple relative, it', and the German renders it: 'as which is eternal life, it was with the Father'.

The use of 'this' instead of 'it' seems to have the idea of direction towards - a longing for rather than a position merely alongside of.

Ver. 3. 'ενεπάνων ου' - Here the again takes up the thought of the beginning - repeating the ομαρτάνει and άμαρτάνειν in an inverted order from the former verse.
— Ver. 3. Kai in the present is used for the purpose of the Apostles' communication. Kai = "also."

Ver. 4. Kai raína yópárao ónatai. Again we have the plural "plcnts" instead of "plcnts."

The "enthrony" of S. W. is lacking in this text.

— Ver. 5. Xapó vérity. The text has vérity in the text, but some MSS. have vérity. By referring to John 16:24, we find the identical language with vérity in the text of also Jer. 15:11-13 in parallel passages.

The reading vérity would mean the joy of the Apostles over the Christian reign, that their work was being fulfilled in the land of their ancestors.

Or again, their joy found completion in telling this to others.
Exegesis

Verse 1. "What now from the beginning." The author goes back to the beginning. This reminds us of the opening sentence in the Gospel of John—"In the beginning was the Word," and also Genesis 1:1. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." "From the beginning" refers to the beginning of His manifestation to the world, while "in the beginning" refers clearly to His preexistence. John recognized especially the divinity of Jesus. He said nothing here nor in the Gospel concerning His parents. It was all embraced in the one sentence—"And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." He reached down more deeply into the spiritual.

"What?" It seems strange that John should introduce the personal "Word" by the Father rather than by the Masculine. It may be accounted for by the fact that all through this Epistle, as in all his other writings, John site forth the "Word" not only as a living individual, but also as "the life" or the life principle. With this abstract idea, he could consistently use the Father. But a more satisfactory explanation lies in the fact that John's concept of the "Word" was not a complete one, and emerging his description of this character would only be a partial one. It was that which we have heard and seen. Gazed upon and handled. (Concerning the
Word of life. As that in setting forth His char-
acter in only as partial may he would naturally
and the master.
What we have heard, what we have seen with
our eyes, what we have gazed upon, and our hands
have handled.” The word arising quotation and
with forth the certainty of the apostle’s announcement
of begins with hearing the lowest degree of the
alimex and advanced step by step concluding not
that nearest and most direct into our hand
and our hands. John does not announce any-
things that to him real and uncertainty. He had
had a personal relation with the “word” and
was therefore capable of setting him forth to
others.
Concerning the word of life.” This is the com-
pletion of the “what” in the preceding clause.
He is not only “the word” but also “the word of the
life.” He not only has the words of eternal life
but He is himself “the word of life.” He has the
eternal principle of life in Himself, and through
Him it is conveyed to us. “He spake not con-
to me in order that ye might have life” Jn. 8:16.
And, “I am come that they might have life,
and that they might have it more abundantly.”
Jn. 10:10.
"For the life was manifested." This recalls to our minds Jno. 1:14, "And the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in the darkness." The life appeared unto us in human form. The word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," Jno. 1:14.

"And we have seen and bear witness and announced to you that eternal life." Here John reaffirms the certainty of the announcement. He had not contented himself with saying, "I have seen" but at once "bears testimony" and "announced" to others that which had become precious to him.

"Which was with the Father and was manifested to us." The seal of this life was that the Father, Jesus, alone of the other disciples of our Lord was qualified to bring this message to men.

"What we have seen and heard," He now goes back and takes up the thought of the beginning, and again states that it had been seen and heard by them.

"we declare to you also." John recognized that he did not stand alone in this, but the rest of the early disciples had had a similar experience, and he adds their testimony to his own and invites "you". And not only that, but he recognized in that the saving power of humanity, and at man is impelled to carry the
message to others, and this is the purpose:—
that ye also may have fellowship with me. He
said in this the way to his own highest joy and
peace. This is the missionary spirit that will
carry this message to the world. But, in order
to show them that this was no mean thing,
he adds the basis of their fellowship:
"And our fellowship is with the Father, and
with his Son Jesus Christ." John at this time
had realized the person of Jesus in John 14:23,
that the Father and the Son would come and take
up their abode with the disciples.
Vers. 14. "And these things we write, that our joy may
be completed." He has set forth his design in
writing this Epistle. If we take the reading
"our" as it is in the Old Testament we can infer
that John felt that he had to be all that he
could to maintain the spiritual life of others
in order that he himself might realize complete
joy. Of course he realized that it would bring
joy to the readers because it would help
them to derive life from Christ—to reach
that condition of soul, health with which
they can be true joy. Their life and
joy in Christ must not depend upon this
message. They had the seed of that joy.
in themselves, and perfected to the extent to which they had yielded themselves to God, but it was not yet completed. They had much yet to learn, as much of sins to be removed, as that he wrote, "may be completed." Our joy is that he included himself and all the disciples in all ages to see that come as a means of lifting them up into a higher and holier relation to God. John does not think of this perfection as taking place instantly, but as a continual struggle of the soul, though a long series of successive and durable joys and sorrows, until it stands purified in the realm of eternal light.
General Discussions.


He has in the introduction to this Epistle (1:1-4) at threefold view of the Logos: 1. His pre-existence. 2. His earth-life. 3. His glorified state. The first is set forth in the phrase, ὁ ἐν ἀπεξερχόμενος, οὐχ ἐν ἀπεξερχόμενος: ὁ ἐν ἀπεξερχόμενος ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρώτῳ ἐν ἀπεξερχόμενος, ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρώτῳ ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῳ ἐμφανίσθη ἐν πρῶτῷ. The Bible does not deal very much with this pre-existence, nor with the process by which He emptied Himself. It states them simply as facts. It had to do with them as it had in human conditions, and with the process of His glorification in their human conditions, by which humanity was brought into harmony with deity. John dealt with the humanity of Jesus, but not in the same way that the other Evangelists did. He saw the Divine in the human and gave especial emphasis to that. He enters into the very essence of this being, and into it forth and in abstruse forms, but as living humanity. John was able to do this because of the m-
imate personal relations that he sustained to the Logos. He learned of His Master's Board, not only at the "last supper," but continuously throughout His whole life, and he allowed His life to flow into Him and become His life, so that His testimony is not that of an unconverted teacher, but that of one whom Christ had first formed. Hence it was just producing His soul forth as the perfected man—the ideal for humanity. He made us feel the power of divine love set forth in Jesus. Knowing that we are made that we might become what He is—is this becoming partaker of our nature in order that we might become partakers of the divine nature.

He said in the Logos, the fullness of God, meaning to mankind—the man of God to reach humanity and lift it up to Himself. There is said to be no higher revelation than this, because there is said to be no greater condescension. It will be constantly coming most of God and the Logos, not because they will condescend to us, but because they will lift us up to them. This process of lifting us is going on now and will continue until it is consummated.

The Logos was not o Θεός. The Logos was Θεός for Θεός, and Θεός for Θεός. All of Θεός is contained in Θεός, but not all of o Θεός is expressed in o Θεός. Jesus himself says, "My Father is greater than I." (Jn. 14:28.)
A Word is the embodiment of an idea or thought; and as thought is an emanation from the individual, He and told in Heb. 1:3 that God 
spoke the Word. And it is necessary, in order 
that God may communicate with a being who 
is in a material body and in a material 
world, that He embody His thought in form. 

The Logos is an emanation from the Divine of 
Heb.1:3. δὲ ὁ λόγος ἐξ ἐμφάνειας τὸς λόγος ἐκ Χαρακίου 
τῶν θεότητος αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τὴν ἰσχύν 
of his glory and the express image (character) of 
is self-revealed." Jesus is the Word of God to 
man. God had expressed Himself to man in 
the Logos as that man could comprehend Him. He 
is the fullness of all that God would say to 
man. God had expressed Himself in creation 
but "the world though wisdom knew not God. So 
they in pleased God by the foolishness of preach 
ing to save them that believe," 1 Cor. 1:21. He 
came into a man and filled that man 
with Himself and made him stand out in 
human life as a revelation and disclosure 
of Himself "(Dr. Symon Abbott). And this way 
God will reach man and lift him up so 
that He shall partake of the Divine nature.
καὶ ὅτι ἐστίν αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία ἡ ἀνακάλυψις ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποφθέγματιν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἔστω πᾶς ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐν αὐτῷ ὅπως ἔστω σοφία.

καὶ ὥσπερ ἄλλοι τοιαῦτα ἔστω καὶ ὁ διάδοχος τοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῇ σκέπῃ προσκεκλήθη ἡ προσκεκλημένη καὶ ἐν τῷ θόρυβῳ προσκεκλημένη ἢ αὐτὸς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ, ἢ, καθότι τῆς προσκλήσεως καὶ τῆς Παρθένου τῶν ημῶν αὐτῶς καθορίσει γινεῖται ὑπὸ πάνω διαφορά.

Parallel passages

1 Thess. 2:10ff, 2 Thess. 3:1ff

5. ὅτε ἐστιν ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία

10. ἐστί σοι πάντες ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

8:12. ἐστιν σοι πάντες ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ.

9:8. ἐστιν σοι πάντες ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ.

6. ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τῆς σοφίας

10:1ff, 11:1ff. ὡς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ.

6. ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τῆς σοφίας

10:1ff, 11:1ff. ὡς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ.

10:1ff, 11:1ff. ὡς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ, ὡς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ, ὡς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ.
Grammatical and Lexical

Wvs. 4-5. Some previous inquiry for emphasis. Some may have been following inquiry.
- ἀνωτέρω, refers to the higher of the preceding verses.
- ἀμανίτευσιν, instead of ἀμανίτευσαν as in verses 2 and 3. It has the idea of repetitions. He had made the announcement to them before; and now he makes it again (ἀνωτέρω). Also, he not only had heard it, but almost announced it again.
- ἐστιν introduces the message and need not be translated at all—or translated as translating that.
- ὡς μεταίχθης may occur in various ways; it occurs variously in the message (ἔχεις).
- Luther translates. Gott ist Licht ich.

Wv. 6. ἐν τῷ οὐχόν, in the darkness. He had just referred to οὐχόν in the preceding verses and now he refers to the information of darkness, and as such the article.
- μακροθυμεῖν refers to all the actions, both inward and outward, of our life.
- ἀμανίτευσαν τῷ ἄντρον, is a stronger expression than ἀμανίτευσαν. ὡς ἀμανίτευσαν τῷ ἄντρον, ὡς ἐγέρσαμαι ἐφ 6:16.
- The idea here is something more than speaking the truth. It must be heard.
- The clause ὡς προσευχήσατε τῷ ἄντρον is equivalent to the preceding clauses ἐν τῷ οὐχόν μακροθυμεῖς.
Wv. 7. ἦν marks an antithetical with v. 6.
We translate "since" rather than "as" as in Col. 6.27
under Exegetical for this reason —


er' ἀξιόνων. The Latin Cod. has ἐρ' ἀξιόνων — evidently changed from the latter authenticated reading ἀξιό
ων ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰν ὰ
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10
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10
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10
**Exceptional.**

VSS. 5. "And this is the message which we have heard from him: Not only what he told them by word, but also what they learned from him in his daily life with them."

"And announce again to you." Here again we have the thought of others—It was not enough that they should hear the message, but they must tell it again. Or having orally declared this message to them, he now takes this opportunity to bring it before them again.

In that God is light—this is the substance of the message. He does not have any record of Jesus making this statement to the disciples in their words. But the other hand, the declaration, "I am the light of the world." John 8:12. Think of God as the Lord of God is "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his substance." Heb. 1:3. Also John 1:14: "And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Or again, "The Word was God." John reveals God to man.

That John, and the others saw and heard of God, led them to the conclusion that "God is light." This statement reminds us of the parallel statement in Cap. 4: 5, 16 that "God is love." These are the only definitions of God's character that
not have. It will not do to say as Luther does "God is light"—God is a light. That would at once imply that there are other lights independent of Him. God is the author of all light. "The Father of lights" as James puts it; and not only that His very being is light.

"And in Him is no darkness at all." By this additional negative clause John emphasizes the former statement. Light and darkness are here brought into contrast as setting forth the character of the two worlds—the world of light and the world of darkness. Of the former are all things pure and bright and good; of the latter all things evil. The former is the realm of life and the latter the realm of death.

Before Jesus came we had no such conception of God's character. As philosophy had been able to make such a revelation, this figure is unique and at once quickened the ideas ofCharms, of purity of body and of life. God is the centre and source of all of these. There is no life, no beauty, no purity that does not come from Him. Jesus as the express image of God's essence had revealed God's real character to man, and in the light of this character He had revealed man to man and man to Himself. He had filled the world with a new life and is touching it and making it beautiful. It is no more
that John makes this the substance of his message.

Ver. 6. If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness". The author now begins to make some inference from the message, the first of which is concerning the true fellowship. "God is light"—there is no darkness in Him at all, so that if we would have fellowship with Him we must walk in the light. It is not enough to say, "I have fellowship with Him." There were those in John's day who make this claim, but what literal said they walked in darkness, and John is here going to refute that idea. It is hypocrisy. We may say this not only by our words, but even by the observance of certain forms which would lead others to think that we are what we are not. A good illustration of this is found in Acts 19:1-7. Paul found certain disciples at Ephesus. He recognized them as disciples by certain forms—e.g. "breaking of bread"; but he evidently also recognized in them things not in harmony with the character of the disciples of Jesus, hence his question, "Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed?" And they replied, "We have not so much as heard that there be any Holy Spirit."

"He lies and doth not the truth". John makes his statements in few words, but always to the
join. If we pretend to be something when we are not, we lie. Our life is as lie both to us and to the world. We can only be true and “in the truth” when we walk in the light. Then we can have fellowship with Him who is light. Light has no fellowship with darkness. Darkness has no fellowship with evil. God hath no fellowship with Satan.

Ver. 7. “But if we walk in the light.” This is a very simple statement. What do we mean by walking in the light? “Walking in the light” is here contrasted with “walking in darkness” in the preceding verse. We walk in the light when we live up to our highest convictions of light, and we walk in darkness when we refuse to think, or when we accept our hearts to the truth.

“Since He is in the light.” “Since” rather than “as” is given the reason why we have fellowship with each other. Likewise it is the same kind of light. Here is but one kind of light, but there are many degrees of that light. We do not walk in the light to the extent that He is in the light. But until we walk absolutely in the light, and as there would be no sin in us from which to be cleansed. There is a “walking in the light” before the cleansing is complete, or this is a process of growth. When God said to Solomon, “Let of them with walk before me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have com-
rounded thee, and did keep my statutes and my judgments; thou didst establish the throne of thy kingdom after the days of Samuel forever." He simply said to him, "Walk in the light." David's integrity of heart consisted in his unvarying loyalty to the true God. The trend of his life was toward God. He seemed led that way, not the trend of his life. It was a will issue.

"We have fellowship one with another." We have in this verse the true basis of fellowship with God. There can possibly be no other than that grows here. Walking in the light and having fellowship one with another are synonymous.

"And the blood of Jesus his love cleansed us from all sin." This is a correlative statement with "we have fellowship one with another," and like it, is the result of our walking in the light. Note that it is not "has cleansed," nor "will cleanse," but "cleansed." This verb is in the present tense.

The meaning of the verb is also important. It means "to cleanse," to make clean, not by removing only the outer part of the evil, but by removing all impurity of disease. In, e.g., leprosy it means to cleanse by curing (Lev. 14:2-4).

Since sin is the disease of the soul, the cleansing here has in it the idea of healing.
The "Blood of Jesus" is the medium through which the cleansing takes place. As the blood in its circulation in our body cleanses it from impurities and heals its wounds, so the "Blood of Jesus" circulating in this body cleanses it from impurities and furnishes the material for building it up. For a fuller treatment of this see under General Discussion "The Blood of Jesus".
General Discussion

1. The Basis of Our Fellowship.

"If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth. But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another." He have in this brief passage the solution to all the problems that are perplexing the Church today. Fellowship with God is the centre and foundation of the Christian life. The Church has been divided into narrow sects, each claiming that its own devotion and faith and holy while the virtues of all the others are but polished riddles. They have made belief in certain dogmas, or the observance of certain forms, the basis of fellowship, and would unchristianize and exclude from that fellowship all who do not accept the same. This is unchristian, ugly, unpardonable, and last but not least, unchristian, and it has wrought great injury to the Church. What is the remedy for all of this? It is here: That we not only say that we have fellowship with Him, while in reality we are walking in darkness, and do therefore lie and do
not the truth; but that we really and truly "walk in the light." This is a very simple statement, yet its very simplicity may mislead me. We are apt to read it over very lightly, and regard it very superficially, so that it loses its force upon me. Let us look at it anew. What can it mean? How can I walk in the light? There must be light in order that I may walk in it. John says, "God is light." And do I have that light revealed to me? One says, "Yes, we have the Bible." Very good, but does not the Bible admit of interpretation? And there are not many things in it that are hard to understand? Take, for example, this passage: "You have your conception of it, and I have mine. Do they agree? If not, which is right, or is either right? Do I have the means of knowing which is right, or what the Bible really taught? We will let the Bible answer. "If any one wills to do my will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." John 7: 17; or as Paul in Phil. 3: 13. 14, after having set forth his own position, says, "But if in anything ye do disagree, let it be so submitted as not to be an obstacle to the others."

John 7: 17; Phil. 3: 13, 14.
Scriptures say to you? Is not this say that when I am deceived if I do not walk (and that means doing right always) He will make it clear to me what this will is, and that that revelation will increase in proportion as I advance in the light that I already have. Is that what John says, "walk in the light" He means that I shall live up to my highest convictions of right. If I believe in certain things is right and refuse to do it, for any means whatsoever, I am walking in darkness and not in the light. It also includes a teachable spirit so that I can always receive light and truth from whatever source it may come. Time, knowing that all truth and light are from God. This I hold to be the only way to Christian fellowship.

Fellowship means joint participation - community. Community. It must be something that we have in common. How let us all God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. If I walk in the light I have fellowship with God. If another walks in the light, he too has fellowship with God and we must necessarily have fellowship one with another,
for we are alike (since companionable) to the extent that we have the same degree of light. There is but one kind of light, but it differs in degree with different persons. The least degree that we may have and still have fellowship is that we purport to do right. If two persons have this degree they have that much in common, though they may differ in everything else. As we advance toward God we have more in common, and as our fellowship is deeper our lives. But unless there is something in common between men there is no power in eclecticism that can make them companionable.
And the blood of Jesus, this God cleansed us from all sin. This passage of Scripture must be studied again. It has been perverted, and by reading into it the wanted idea of "appeasing the wrath of God," the theology of almost the entire Christian world has been corrupted. This is the result of a superficial reading and a literal interpretation. Dr. Lange's Commentary on his notes on this passage he says it means, the blood shed on the cross, the bloody death of Jesus on the cross, and quotes Wordsworth saying, "My heart a sacrifice than the death of the Son of God was a sacrifice to propitiate the offended justice of God from and no less a priest than this Lord, to save some soul from the bondage of Satan, this which we must redeem by sin." How can any intelligent being who has carefully studied the character of God as He is revealed to us in think such blasphemous things! What kind of a being is God if this language is true! But it is not true. We are too apt to jump at conclusions in our study of the Bible, regardless of the logical consequences of the conclusions. We must learn not
to interpret any passage of Scripture as not to contradict the revealed Character of God.

He and ready then to inquire what this sentence awakens. Of course as far as words and their meanings are concerned it can mean the physical blood of Jesus which He shed on the cross, but then we have to ask how this can "cleanse us from all sin?"

Then must be some way in which the blood of Jesus comes in contact with sin. In Heb. 10:22 we have the clause, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an unclean conscience."

Now is there any possible way in which the physical blood of Jesus can be applied to an conscience? It is absurd to talk about it. Then we must look for some other explanation.

Many words in the New Testament have a meaning beyond the material:

1. blood: literally means flesh as distinguished (a) from blood. Flesh and blood (ὤμοιος καὶ σαρκί) hath not revealed it unto you. Matt. 16:17; (b) from bones. Handle me and see that no spirit does not have flesh and bones (ὄμοιος καὶ σάρκι) as you see me here." Luke 24:39.

2. blood also has an ethical meaning — a designation of the tendency to lead a sinful life. "Thus hath given him favor over all flesh (σάρκι τῶν)." Gen. 17:13, and, "Thus is therefore now no condemnation to them which walk in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh (καὶ σάρκις)."
but, **after this shoot**; and, **for they that are after the flesh (Kéntω σαρκα) do mind the things of the flesh (tò των σαρκών).** Rom. 8:5, 6. *Revised Version.*

**ταύτα** also bear a still different and higher meaning in Jesus' words to His disciples in John 6:48-59.

"And the bread that I will give it my flesh (τά ταύτα τοῦ ιδίου), and **except ye eat the flesh (τὸ ταύτα τοῦ σαρκά) of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye shall not have life in yourselves." *Revised Version.*

1. *Tauta* literally means the fleshly bodily organism. It is better for us that one of Thy members should finish, and not the whole body (τὸ τῶν σώμatum) be cast into hell. Matt. 18:27, 28. And, "The light of the body (τὸ τῶν ἁλαμάκων) is the eye." *Revised Version.*

**ταύτα** also bear a higher, spiritual meaning:—

At the last supper with His disciples, Jesus took bread, and, **when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples saying,** "This is my body (τὸ ταύτα τοῦ ιδίου)" Matt. 26:26; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. Paul speaks of the Church as the body (τὸ τῶν σώμatum) of Christ. 1 Cor. 12:12-31, Eph. 1:22, 23; 4:12. *Revised Version.* And Paul also says, "There is a natural body (σωματικόν ποιμανόντος) and there is a spiritual (πνευματικόν ποιμανόντος) 1 Cor. 15:44.

3. *Tauta* literally means bread; it is thus the Son of God. Command that these stones become
He is really there to inquire what these sentences are to mean. Of course we gather words and their meanings and conclude it can mean the physical blood of Jesus which He shed on the cross, but then we have to ask how this can "cleanse us from sin?"

How must it come in which the blood of Jesus comes in contact with sin. At Heb. 10:22 we have the bringing the blood from sprinkled from an uncleanness. And is there any possible way by which the physical blood of Jesus can be applied to our conscience? It is absurd to talk about it. Then we must have some other explanations.

Many words in the New Testament have at meaning beyond the material:

1. 0apga - literally mean flesh as distinguished from blood. Flesh and blood (0apga kai diad) lack not revealed in unto you. Matt. 16:17; (b) from bone. Handle and see that a sparrow does not have flesh and bone (0apga kai diad). As you see and have? Luke 24:39.

0apga also has an ethical meaning - a designation of the tendency to lead a sinful life. Then led given him from one all flesh (0apga). Gen. 17:12; and, there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but in

but after the spirit"; and. "For they that are after the flesh (Kata Vapkai) do mind the things of the flesh (Tò Tòs Vapkís)." Rom. 8:5, 6, 8, 9. 10.

-- Vapkai also have a still different and higher meaning in Jesus' words to His disciples in Jno. 6:53-59. "And the bread that I will give is my flesh (i.e. Vapkai tour éviv), "And except ye eat the flesh (i.e. Vapkai) of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye do not have life in yourselves," etc. etc.

3. Òuva, literally means the fleshly bodily organism. It is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body (i.e. Òuva) be cast into hell. Matt. 5:29, 30; and, "The height of the body (Òuva odhárás) is the eye." Matt. 6:22, 23, etc.

-- Òuva also have a higher, spiritual meaning: At the last supper with His disciples, Jesus took bread, and after He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples saying, "This is my body (Òuva Óuva)" Matt. 26:26; Luke 22:19; I Cor. 11:24. Paul speaks of the church as "the body" (Òuva óuva) of Christ. I Cor. 12:13, 18, 27; Eph. 1:22, 23; 4:12, etc. And Paul also says, "There is a spiritual body (Òuva Òuva) and there is a spiritual (Òuva Òuva)" I Cor. 15:44.

3. Ópov literally means bread. "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones become..."
bread (ἄρτος)." And, "Man shall not live by bread (ἄρτος) only." Matt. 4:3, 4. But Jesus in John 6:31-59 called himself "the bread of life" (ἄρτος ἀνέπιπτός) (John 6:63).

4. ὧδὲ is literally meant water, but there is also a higher spiritual meaning given to it. See John 4:1-14.


Why then may not we have a meaning beyond the material? Why should we always think of the physical blood when this word is used? There is just as much reason for always translating ἀλλήλος—mind—Holy mind—as to always translate ὧδὲ the literal, animal blood. It seems never to have occurred to any one till recently that it could have any other meaning. Let us see.

"For the life (ζωής) of the flesh is in the blood (ἀίματα). [The life (ζωής) of the flesh is in the blood.] And I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for (ἀμαρτίας) your sins; for it is the blood (ἀίματα) that makes an atonement for (ἀμαρτίας)"
the soul." "For the life (יוֹתִ֡ל) of all flesh is its blood (דִּוִּ֣יָּהּ) in its blood (דִּוִּ֣יָּהּ) Lev. 17:11-14. The physical blood is the stream of the physical life. The source of the spiritual life is not the physical blood but the spiritual blood. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood (דִּוִּ֣יָּהּ) ye shall not have life in yourselves;" for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood (דִּוִּ֣יָּהּ) is drink indeed." Jno. 6:53, 56. "For by one Spirit (רוֹקֵ֣עַ) we are all baptized into one body, and are all made to drink one Spirit (רוֹקֵעַ)." Cor. 12:13. From these Scriptures it is very evident that both Jesus and Paul had the same thing in mind, and that it was something more than physical blood. And I believe that John had the same thing in mind when he wrote this passage.

The physical blood purifies our body, though in the sealing process and couplage on, man is not grafted on, and by means of the circulating medium, thy and kept alive and good. "Are ye the body of Christ, and are members of his particular," Cor. 12:27, 31. What is our life? What is the circulating medium (blood) of this body?
That which is attributed to the blood is also attributed to the Holy Spirit. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood," Lev. 17:11-14. "It is the spirit that quickeneth," (Ew. 17:10, 11) Acts 6:6. The letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive (7:5) Rom. 8:6. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin," (Eph. 1:7). It is by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by (5:6) a regenerating and renewing faith of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.

Acts 3:16. Do you mean not conclude that the Holy Spirit is the living Blood of the Spiritual Body? He came into the body of Christ, and through the regenerating and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit we are cleansed. There is no life outside of Him. We must abide in Him as the branch in the vine.

And then this life becomes our life.

We have no right to ask why John did not say Holy Spirit and instead of "Lord" (Eph. 5)? It would answer by saying that the figure used is too moral suggestive there. If he had said the Holy Spirit He had in mind the fact that we are the body of Christ, and He was writing to Christians who would suppose to understand that, as that term was used in reference to this is very suggestive. If a man does not believe that he is in the body of Christ.
you cannot explain this to him, or convince him that there is a spiritual blood. To me this is plain and reasonable as compared to the monstrous doctrine that the animal blood of Jesus which was shed on the cross, had some effect upon God—appearing this world, and causing Him to shut His eyes into sin, and say that a man is not a sinner unless he knows that He is. He must not forget that this passage says 'cleansing' and not 'overlook.' He cannot think it to say anything else. It is a thorough cleansing, and nothing less will satisfy it.
8. ἢ ρητῶς ὅτι διαπρίσκω ὅπως εἰκονώ, ἵνα μνημέω καὶ στήνειν ὅπως ἐκεῖν ἦν ἐκείνω. 9. ἢ ρητῶς ὅτι διαπρίσκω ὅπως καὶ εἰκονώ, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἑαυτὸ τὸ σύμφωνον καὶ καταράκτην ἄλλω ἡμῶν ἁπετέλεσι. 10. ἢ ρητῶς ὅτι διαπρίσκω, ἵνα μνημέω ἐκεῖ, καὶ δ λόγος αὐτῶς ὅπως ἐκείνω ἐκεῖνι ἦν εἰκονώ.

-- Parallel passages --
1. Eph. 6: 19. 
10. δ λόγος αὐτῶς ὅπως ἐκείνω ἐκείνι. 5: 16. ὅπως αὐτῶς ὅπως ἐκείνω ἐκείνι ἐκείνω ἐκείνω.

--- Grammatical and lexical ---
Ver. 8. diapriav ὅπως ἐκείνω: In this verse is contrasted with ὅπως ἐκείνω καὶ εἰκονώ in ver. 10. The former denotes a state or condition, while the latter denotes activity. The latter is the stronger expression.

Ἐναρκτικῶς ἀληθινοῦ: ἀληθινοῦ ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἄλλῳ ἐστι, ὅτι ἐπηφάνεια καὶ ἐνθυμίζει τὴν αὐτὴν ἀλήθειά, ἠλένθη ἁμένου ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἁγιώτητι τῆς ἁγίου πνεύματος. 

This verb is parallel to ἔχει τὰ ὄνομα νῦν τῆς ἀληθείας μοι ἔχει ἔχει ἔχει...

καὶ ἂν ἠδοκησέν ὅπως ἐκείνω ἐκείνῳ: parallel to καὶ ἂν ἠδοκησέν τὰ ἀδικεῖσθαι σε ἐκείνων ἔχει, ἔχει...

ἐναρκτικῶς ἀληθινοῦ: from διαπρίσκω and λόγος and therefore means...
is say the same thing (as another) - *to agree with* 

πιστός - *sikaios*. Their adjectival sense is *unto* rather 

than *to*. 

πιστός - *faithful*, and is applied to persons who 
have shown themselves faithful in the discharge 
of duties. As applied to Jews here it means that 
they had known His fidelity. 

Sikaios - *righteous*, *right* - *God*. Right and fitness 
are synonymous. E.g. the right tool in the one thing 
is fitted to do the work required - the right tool 
is the proper or right tool (w.e.v. *sinoce* in 
the fundamental idea of the work). As we may 
translate. He is faithful (or He has proven himself 
as during this earth-life) and is fitted (or has the 
right) πατέρα ἰδεῖν τάς ἀμπειρίες καὶ καταπίπτ 
φρονιμεν ῥήματες ἀπίστευτα.

νυν - "in order to" 1s. προς τος *the fitness which enables him 
to put away our sin." vs.

νυν ἰδεῖν τάς ἀμπειρίες καὶ καταπίπτ φρονιμεν ῥήματες ἀπίστευτα 

and parallel expressions, and used together they express the thoroughness 

of this work done. ἀμπειρία καὶ καταπίπτ φρονιμαν the same thing. 

See Eph. 5:17. ἰδεῖν ἀμπειρία ἀμπειρία ἰδεῖν.

καί 10. ἵνα προσκαλεσθήν, ὑπάτους ὑπάτους.

καί 10. προσκαλεσθήν, ὑπάτους ὑπάτους.

- ἵνα 10. προσκαλεσθήν, ὑπάτους ὑπάτους.
Exegetical

Ver. 8. "If we say that we have no sin." Here evidently mind some who were saying this, and John wanted to correct the error. He does not mean by this that we are "walking in darkness," but that we are not yet free from the guilt and consequences of sin. Neither does he say here or elsewhere that it is not possible to reach a condition of absolute freedom from sin. On the other hand he does teach us that there must come a time when we shall not have sin. If we have turned from our sin or have come out of darkness into the light, we are no longer in sin, but we still have sin in us. If we are "walking in the light," the blood of Jesus is cleansing us from sin. It is not yet an accomplished fact, and the degree of the cleansing differs in proportion to the degree that we walk in the light. John recognizes that this is a process of growth, and we will have sin in us until we are in complete harmony with God's will.

"We desire unveiled." Self-deception is very common. We can so easily be mistaken about ourselves. Pride is at the bottom of this self-deception, and that leads to blindness and deception, and as instead of being freed from sin we and led farther into it. We must turn away from self to God, and then our language will be, "God be merciful to me a sinner" rather than "I have sin."
"And the truth is not in us." This is a stronger expression than "we do not the truth" in V. 6. That refers to its manifestation to others, which might be done in a formal way - "having no forms of godliness, but denying the power thereof;" this refers to the existence of the divine truth as the principle of life within us. This is that in us that impels us to the truth, else we could not receive it.

Vers. 7. If we confess our sins, He must look upon our sins as God does, and say the same things about us that He does, and as judge pardoned. He and not to try to make sin look less. How does this regard sin? This standard must be ours. This is absolutely essential in order that we may be friends with sin. The language of our heart must be, "God, I am guilty before Thee, cleanse Thou me and make me pure." God knows this and we can't deceive Him.

"He is faithful and just (or has the right)!" These adjectives point to the character of Jesus. Just like we imagine John saying that Jesus will be "faithful and just?" Could He be otherwise? He is talking here about rights which He has, and which He has required. He is showing that the sins is to cleanse me from all sin.
is one who is fitted to do that. He did not need this fitness before He "was made perfect through suffering." Heb. 2:10.

Jesus is faithful. He proved His fidelity in His earth-life—faithful even unto death. And He stands as the first example of completed faith. Because of this fidelity, He is fitted to put away our sin. He saved Himself and the came saved us.

This passage does not mean that He has been required to mean, that God faithful and just when the fulfills that who walk in darkness, and blessed that who walk in the light. He rather fulfills that who walk in the darkness, and blessed that who walk in the light because this is rightness. He cannot imagine God being anything else but right

removed and justified.

Again it has been said that the can forgive (overlook) our sins, and still be just because of the sacrifices of which. Such a doctrine is horrible and not at all in harmony with God's character of

in order that He may put away our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." His character is fitted for the work He had to do. How does He do this?

He said in 2:7, "if we walk in the light, know we

in the light and have fellowship one with another,
And the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin. What is said here must be taken seriously. We must be sinners as that His blood (the Holy Spirit) can cleanse us. How though is this cleansing to be? It must be absolutely. We have not yet reached that condition, so that we cannot say, "there is sin." This passage also speaks of "putting away" and "cleaning," and cannot be made to say "overlook" or "disregard." If we will study these passages as we might we will get much help on "The Forgiveness of Sin." For a fuller discussion of this see under General Discussion on "Sin and Its Forgiveness." Ver. 10. "If we say that we have not sinned." This teaches us that we are not only to confess that there is yet sin within us, but also to confess that we have actually sinned. It represents an active state while we have no sin represents the passive condition. Paul says: "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Rom 5:21.
David, someone is mistaken. Who is it? I rather think with John that "we deceive ourselves" if we say that we do not have sin. Jesus must not have come and have done all that He has done if we had not needed this help. Therefore let us confess our sins and let them help us to get rid of them.

"And his mind is not on us." A man who is not conscious of sin still has sin, is not conscious of the true nature of God's purpose. Why chose us out in Him before the foundation of the world, that not should be holy and without blame before Him in love? Eph. 1:4; He has not yet reached the ambition that Paul had when he cried out, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" (Rom. 7:24.

Just men may remember the words of God; they may learn it by heart, but that word is not in them the principle of life by which they are daily and hourly guided; it has not yet entered into their heart.
General Discussion —

Sin and Its Forgiveness —

In order that we may understand forgiveness it is absolutely essential that we understand what sin is. The removal of anything depends altogether on what it is. The greater it is the more time and energy it takes to remove it. If sin is only a slight matter, forgiveness likewise is of no great consequence; but if sin is something of vast proportion, then its removal means much more. The following are the principal views of sin that have been formulated:

1. If we accept the doctrine of Pelagius that sin and virtue are just the exact acts, then forgiveness can mean only the removing of the penalty, or a nothing out of the account. This makes God too formal—a taskmaster with no heart in his hand. And yet this is the view of sin held by a large part of the people of today. This is the view of sin that is possible as long as they hold to the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. This view of sin was taken to refute the doctrine of Total Depravity.
1. I nu. ~.~.~.c-v<J;d ~.

2. If we accept the doctrine that sin is simply a lack of development—i.e., not in the first instance an evil, but merely due to lack of maturity, e.g., a green apple is not good because it is not mature, still sin is in no consequent sense nothing but taint to be removed. This view denies the need of atonement at all, and in the words of our text: "The man that is guiltier of making them a leer." 

3. But if we accept the Bible doctrine that sin as an order of the soul, produced by a lack of conformity to God's will, then the removal of it means the healing of the disorder, and bringing the will into complete harmony with the Divine will.

John vii. 48 of this Epistle says: "an uprise forth aaron. "sin is lawlessness." This is translated in N. T. I. "in is the transgression of the law." Dauia does not mean "transgression of law," but "lawlessness—mishand law." Compare 1 Thess. iv. 4, 7: Let every soul esteem and value our sins; or Epp. 2:20. (For a fuller treatment of Dauia see note on cap. 6:4.)

Sin is the result of development away from God toward self; or in a word it is selfishness. The "cruest act" is only the fruit of the condition of the soul. Out of the abatement of the heart the moral uprightness, a good man out of the good treasure of the heart.
brings forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure brings forth evil things." Matt. 12:34, 35. "For the mouth of the fool is the flesh and manifest, which are: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, robbery. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, etc. Gal. 5:19-23. These are but the manifestations of certain conditions of soul. For a proof of this let us notice the Rabbis' explanation of it in the Sermon on the Mount: Matt. 5:21-48. The Rabbis make murder the worst act of killing. Jesus makes the act of it in anger; the Rabbis made adultery the worst act, Jesus makes it in lust; the Rabbis made murder—not doing wrong to any one; Jesus makes it—hating and doing good to all, even to our enemies, etc.

Paul also placed sin in the heart when he said, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known sin except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. Paul did not mean by this that he would not have known anything about wrong doing and its necessary results, but by the law; but that the law revealed to him what he had not yet learned of the sinfulness of sin. The law does not begin with, " Thou shalt not covet,"
but it ended not with that, showing that Cain is in the dust. The Comment. "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal," do not reveal any to us as does "Thou shalt not covet." We would know that it is wrong to kill even if the land did not say so, but we could not know this as well.

And if Cain is a hierarch of the soul, the remedy must be applied to the discourse, and forgiveness must be put away of Cain from the soul, and the words of Jesus his Lord cleansed us from all sin; and "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just (or has the right) to put away our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

It is unfortunate that our translators did not always translate דַּקְנָא - "put away" - "remove" - instead of "forgive." There would then not be as much trouble to explain this. There is another word in the New Testament that is translated "forgive," and it conveys the exact idea that we always put into the English word, "forgive." That word is ἔμκατοι and its modification, it means "to show grace to," "to grant favor to," "to have charity to." This word is used twenty-three times in the New Testament, but it is only twelve times translated "forgive."
This is an excerpt from a text discussing the importance of forgiveness in the context of Christian teachings. It references passages from various books of the Bible to emphasize the importance of forgiving others. The text is reflective and devotional, likely intended to inspire thoughts on spiritual matters.

The full context and source of this text would be necessary to provide a comprehensive understanding. However, the key points highlighted are the need to forgive others as they would forgive you, and the importance of empathy and compassion in Christian ethics.

---

For instance, the text might be discussing the parable of the two debtors mentioned in Luke 7:11-13. The context suggests a moral lesson on the importance of mercy and compassion, which is a central theme in Christian teachings.

---

The full text includes several references to Bible passages, such as:

- Luke 7:11-13
- Acts 3:14-25
- Romans 6:3-11
- 1 Corinthians 2:12
- Galatians 3:16
- Philippians 2:9

These references are used to reinforce the message of forgiveness and mercy, emphasizing the need for Christians to emulate God's forgiveness towards one another.

---

The text also includes a reference to the Corinthians' letter, as seen in 1 Corinthians 2:6, where the emphasis is on the spiritual wisdom and understanding that comes from God's grace and forgiveness.

---

The final part of the text suggests continued reflection on forgiveness and its role in personal and communal life. It encourages the reader to think deeply about the implications of forgiving others, especially in situations where it might be difficult.
and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you did be
quickened together with him, having forgiven (Katpio
1:13) us all our trespasses. Col. 2:13. Note in this
that favor must be in order that we might make us alive, and had it not been we could not have
been made alive. The main verb in this passage
is our forgiveness.

"Put on therefore, as Belshazzar, holy and beloved, as
heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long
suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving (Kat-pi-
1:14, 15) one another, if any man have a complaint
against any; even as Christ forgave (Katpioare) your
as also do ye." Col. 3:12, 13.

"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and
 clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with
all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender
heartsed, forgiving (Katpioare) each other even
as Christ also in Christ forgave (Katpioare) you." Eph.
4:31, 32.

And let us compare some of the uses of
Katpioare and see the differences.

"And forgive (Katpioare) as our debts as we forgive
(Katpioare) our debtors." Matt. 6:12.

"For if ye forgive (Katpioare) men their trespasses
you heavenly Father will also forgive (Katpioare) you." Matt. 6:14. of v. 18. This word means more than
having charity toward. It means an actual removal of the wrong. He must help the man to get rid of that condition of heart that made him do the wrong to us. This is what God is doing for us. In order to do this we must have the charity or grace toward the man, even as God does for us.

"And Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto them of the parable, "Here is of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven (Mark 2:11)." Matt. 9:2. See v. 676. Also Mark 2:15:9; Luke 5:24, 25.

"All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven (Mark 6:6) unto them. Matt. 12:32.

"Thus came Peter to him and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?" Matt. 18:21.

"That mercy may abound, and not partiality, and charity, they may hear and not understand, but at any time they should turn and be forgiven (Mark 4:12) to them." Mark 12:14. Cf. Matt. 18:14, 15, and I should heal (Mark 6:13) them. But Matt. 12:29 have a quotation from Isa. 6:9, 10. But Jesus in Mark 8:12 interprets Isaiah 6:10 by ἄφεςεν. This is significant.

"Wherefore say unto thee, Because thou hast and many sins forgiven (Mark 2:11) her,
because she loved much; to whom little is forgiven (ἀφίξαντα) he loved little. And he said to her thy sins are forgiven (ἀφίσσαι)." Luke 7:47, 48. Of the two verses and their use of ἀφίσσαι and the use of ἀφίξομαι in verses 41-43 of the same chapter.

And Jesus said, Father, forgive (ἀφίςσε) them. Luke 23:34. And he meant much more than that God should close his eyes to their sinful condition, and say they were not sinner. Jesus real prayer is that God should lead them must to all their real condition, turn from it, and become good men. If the Lord meant only "shun money to" the world, how need ἀφίξομαι.

"Repent therefore from this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord, if perchance the thought of thy heart may be forgiven (ἀφίσσεθαι) thee." Acts 8:22.

"And if he hath committed sins, they shall be forgiven (ἀφίσσεθαι) him." James 5:16.

"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just (or has the right) to forgive (ἀφίςσε) our sins and to cleanse (παραπλάνησαι) us from all unrighteousness." 1 John 1:9.

From these quotations, and from many others that might be added, it is plain that when sins are spoken of as being "forgiven" it means much more than being "charitable towards," or a fro.
announcing the guilty will "not guilty." It means the complete removal of all sin and its results from the soul—through cleansing of the soul and filling it with new life—the curse of the soul. Often on all of these passages is transferred the grace of God, that He could never bring us into salvation. But let us not mistake the grace thus shown, for the real cleansing of the soul that is constantly going on in those who are walking in the light. We must bear in mind also, that sin being in the soul, the forgiveness (taking away) must also take place there. So long as the soul disorder remains, no forgiveness of sin forgiven can do any good, and it would be as wise to the forgiveness done by God or man.

The lesson to be learned from all this is that this work cannot be accomplished in a short space of time, but it will take time in proportion to the magnitude of the work. Surely we must feel like Paul and exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things? No one but our Almighty God is able to do such a work." He has all the means in the universe at His disposal, and He is using them em-
stantly to bring us back to Him. It has many means of grace which, if we would but use, we would make more rapid progress in the process of our purification. Shall we fail in this noble work? Shall we be in a more powerful than good? No. He cannot fail, but will accomplish that which He desires—viz. To bring together in one all things in heaven, both which are in the heaven and which are on earth, even in Him. Eph. 1:10.


— Ἀπ. 2: 1, 2. —

1. Παράκλητος, τάσον γεράς ὑμῖν ἦν ὑμῖν ἀμαρτητῷ. Καὶ εἷς τὸ ἀμαρτητῷ, παράκλητον ἔχοντες πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον ἐστιν πρὸς τὸν ἀμαρτητῷ ὑμῖν, ὦ πρός τὰν ἀνθρώπων δι' αὐτῶν ἄλλα καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς τῶν κόσμων.

— Parallel Passages —

1. Παράκλητος ἔχοντες... 14:16. ὠλάιν γεράς ὑμῖν ἀμαρτητῷ.
2. πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. 1:2. πρὸς τὸν θεῷ.
3. πρὸς ὑμᾶς τῶν κόσμων. 1:25. ἵνα ἄμερη ἐν τοῖς ἀμαρτητῶν τῶν κόσμων.
4:42. οὕτω δύνασθαι ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸν κόσμον.
5. Παράκλητος ἔχοντες... 11:51, 52. ἐκφράσθησαν δι' αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἂν ἐπάθητε ὑμεῖς ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἤταν καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῇ κρίσει, ἢ δικαιοποιοῦντος ὑμᾶς τὰς ἀνθρώπους τοῖς κόσμοις.
Grammatical and Lexical.

Vers. 1. Tekvía = the diminution of tekvá, and is a tenue and affectionate appellation. In the New Testament this word is always used in the plural.

τάύτα γὰρ τούτων. 5ον hard word. John's first word of the singular - "I write" of Cap. 1:1-4. "I write." 1

τά του αὐτοῦ προστάτου. denotes his personal in writing.

ταπακτήνευ. the article is not used with this word here. Cf. Jno. 14:16. ἅλλον ταπακτήνευ. Why should this word be translated "advocate" here, and in Jno. 14:16 be translated "Comforter"?

ταπακτήνευ = "called to mediæval." Next the idea of help, "an helper," "an assistant." 1

πῶς τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς. 5ον have used the same expression as in Cap. 1:1. Cf. Jno. 1:1, 2. πῶς τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς. It may have: 1. A purely local idea. 2. The idea of direction towards: - "a longing for," as suggested in notes on Cap. 1:1-3. - 2. for the purely local idea here. Our Helper is in the very center of each men's love with God.

writers. En notes on Cap. 1:7-8. 34.

Vers. 2. Kai ἀπὸ τῶν ἱλαται τῶν. of Cap. 4:10. There are the only two places in the New Testament where this word is used. We have the verb ἱλάτωσα used in Luke 18:13. ὁ ἤλατ, ἰλάτωσα ὕπ' ὀρθοπρύσω; and in Hab. 2:17. ὁ ἤλατ ὑπέστην καὶ ἐνέπεσα τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς ὦλης, ὑπέπεσαν ἦλαταν ἦλαταν ἦλαταν μοι ἄρχηκες ἔν ὁ ἤλατ
εἰς τὸ Ἰδοὺ ὁ Θεός ἔσται τὰς ἀναπρασίας τῷ λαῷ.

And we have Ἰδοὺ προφέτην ὡς β. Rom. 3:25. Ἔκ προ-

φέτερα ὅ τι θέσι Ἰδοὺ προφέτην δίκη πνεύμα, ἔτοι ἐνυπ
dιάκονος; And in Heb. 9:8. ὑπάρχει διὰ ἐνυπερ-

θεία δόξης καθαρισμοῦ τοῦ Ἰδοὺ προφέτην.

See Num. 5:1. πέντε τῶν κηρύ τοῦ θανάτου [εἰσ]igmatι-

σιμ], 51 ὡς ἐν ἁμαρτία ([right] προὶ (τάσι) ἐνυπερ ἐν

ἀνυποτό; And Ezekiel 44:27. προφέτην Ἰδοὺ προφέ-

τήν (ἴσης ἐκ προφήτης); 3 And John 15:17. Ἰδοὺ προφέ-

τήν translated in τ. g. οἰκονόμος. τ. o. n.

ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναπρασίας ἑκάστης. Of this passage

univ. to mean what it is said to mean—

ἀποτελοῦντας ἐνυπέρ "appearing God" we would have to hav else-

ὲς τῶν δικαίων; instead of this we have ἐπὶ with

the genitive, and that with ἀναπρασίας ἑκάστης and

not with τῷ δικαίῳ. This is significant.

ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναπρασίας ἑκάστης. These was

have the same idea. Of the parallel passage of

Jno. 11:51, 52.
Exegetical

Rev. 1. "My little children." John used the spiritual father-ly love of Christ personal and he had a special interest in their welfare. On this account he writes to them that he may help them.

"these things I write to you." He had in this chapter a change from the plural "we" to the singular "I". He comes close to them by this personal message.

"that ye sin not." This is the purpose of his writing. While he had just said, "if we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us", and, "if we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us", yet the ideal which John holds out before us is a life of sinlessness, and we ought to be striving to live without sinning. By this he means more than Moberly suggests—"either they not sinning habitually, or their not sinning mitsfully." The time must come when we will live without sin. That time has not yet come to most of us. It is possible for us to live without sinning if we will use the means of help that God has so graciously given to us. This is what John desired in all of them, yet he knew they would sin unless he added:

"And if any one does sin we have an Helper with the Father—Jesus Christ the righteons one;"
This is translated in K. J. "We have an Advocate."

The idea that is read into this passage is that we have an advocate (lawyer) who is working to change the decision of the Father in reference to man's guilt. What do we mean by "Advocate?"

The lawyer has been made an advocate between all professionals. "Helper" is the last word used because it does not designate the kind of work that the Lord did which the Lord must do in harmony with His character.

Either one of two things is necessary:

1. To try to get God to be pleased with our aim.

2. To get us free from sin.

This latter teaches us to be free from sin, and we have "an Helper" to this end, in the seat of all power, wisdom, and goodness. But how many helpers have we in this world, but how many can they ever compare to Him. He can only help us to do what is right. Would it not be right for Him to try to get God to be pleased with pleasure in sin? Does God need to be pleased with us in order that He may do the right thing by us? "Shall not the judge at all the earth do right?" Imagine God as a judge sitting on the bench, and think of a lawyer
pleading the case, trying to make the true God give a verdict of "not guilty" in a guilty man,—a man who is known to be guilty by both God and Christ! A most monstrous thing cannot be imagined! That would be as easy of God denying himself, which is impossible. The help is needed on man's part and Jesus certainly is helping us. God cannot accept and sin, and as nothing is left but that Jesus is helping us to get free from sin. Jesus is "the Helper," and yet this tells us that the will send "another Helper." The Scriptures do not separate the Father, Jesus, and God as we sometimes think. They are all working together for us and the salvation of all their creatures. Jesus is fitted and had the right to help us get free from sin. De Polis on Cap. 1:9.

"What we need to get rid of sin is not a lawyer but a Physician."—Peter Vogel. A lawyer can't help us in this case. Sin is a disease and the disease must be cured by applying the remedy to it, and not by trying to get God to accept and all enroll over with sin. Even though God would take us to a city with "golden streets and pearly gates" in that condition we would not only what is moral we could not be happy. Sin and misery and inextricably connected, and as virtue
and happiness. And happiness in sin is an absolute impossibility.

VII. That which is making separation concerning our sins. The mind which is here translated—'that which is making separation,' word here and also in Cap. 4:10, had in it the idea of brightness, hence 'lewdly' or 'separation' is a good translation of it. It is not the actor—the who—but rather the means—that which makes good or repairs the wrong that sin has done, and this, of course, must take place without us.

The leading idea was that the gods in their normal condition are not favorable to man, hence man had to appease them. He had to refer to this in Gen. 9:2. Then they had sent to the house of the gods, things, and Agam, the king and his men, to entreat the face of the Lord. There can be no question but that the Jews were influenced more or less by this idea; at least we have an intimation of it in I Thes. 13:11,12. When Paul feared an attack of the Philistines, he seemed troubled because he had not entreated the face of the Lord.
What Paul says about this has no influence on us, only to show us his idea of it. There is no mention in the Bible proper of God being appeased except it be in the case of Moses (Ex. 32:7-14). But this word 'atone' is doubtfull in meaning. Perhaps its moral is amends the fault.

Fazlallah says, that the heathens always followed this word with the exception. A heathen would not talk of sin being appeased. They had no such conception. Jesus then is the moral thing which God is pleased with us— not with us in sin, but through Him we can be freed from sin. There is no change produced in God. It is unchangeable. All that this passage says is, "You cannot get rid of sin, or be saved, without Jesus."

And not concerning our only, but also concerning (that) of the whole world. It is difficult for some minds to believe this. "It is an easy thing for God to be merciful to me and to my friends. but I cannot say how the same led to the same. I don't like" is the language of the flesh.
3. καὶ ἐν τῷ ὁμόσωμαν ὅτι ἔγνωκαμεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ
tὰς ἐνταξὶς αὐτῶν τηροῦμεν. 4. οἱ λέγων ὅτι ἔγνωκα αὐτοῖς,
cαὶ τὰς ἐνταξὶς αὐτῶν ὅτι τηρῶν, γεώτερος ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν
tούτῳ ἐὰν ἄλλοις καὶ οὗτοι. 5. οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρω τῶν
λόγων, ἐπιθυμοῦν ἐν τῷ ὁμόσωμα ἐν τῷ τῷ τεκινιστη
ται ἐν τῷ ὁμόσωμαν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῶ μινεῖ. 6. οἱ λέγων ἐν αὐτῶ μινεῖ ἔστε οἴκοι ἐκεῖνοι προ
τότοις καὶ αὐτῶς οἷς προκαταλέγονται.

——Parallel Passages——

1st Epistle

Ἀπόκρυφος Β' 16:14–16

3. ἀν τοῖς ἐνταξίης αὐτῶν τηροῦμεν. 16:10. καὶ τῶν ἐνταξίων ὅτι
ἔγνωκαμεν αὐτοῖς.

16:12. οἱ λέγων τῶν ἐνταξίων, καὶ τηροῦντες ἐμὲτε ἐντε ὅζαμων
καὶ

5. οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρω τῶν λόγων. 16:18. καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐμὲ, καὶ ἐν
λόγων ὅτι τηροῦμεν.

6. οἱ λέγων ἐκεῖνοι προκατάλεις τῇ 16:16. ἐν πᾶσας ἐκδόθη ἐντε ἐντε
προκατάλεις καὶ αὐτῶς οἷς ἐμὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι προκαταλέγονται.
Grammatical and Lexical.

Ver. 3. ἐν τοῖς ἑν τούτῳ αὐτῷ ἔγινεν. What follows ἐν τοῖς ἑν τούτῳ αὐτῷ ἐγένετο.

ἐγένετο. perfect. Land known.

ἀνόιν ἐν τῷ Ἴηοιμα. And ἵνα ἴηοιμα.

ἐν τῷ ἱεροίῳ ἔγινεν ἡ πρώτη. The Cod. Sin. has ἡ πρώτη ἔγινεν instead of ἡ πρώτη ἔγινεν. John always used ἡ πρώτη ἔγινεν ἡ πρώτη—except in chap. 5:12 where he used ἡ πρώτη ἔγινεν ἡ πρώτη, and times when the verb ἐγένετο is used. He used the verb ἐγένειν. See Jas. 1:14; 3:15; 16; 14. ἐγένετο is to observe carefully. It had in it the idea of care—and refers particularly to the extent of the ἐγένετο, while ἐγένετο meant rather to make. It had in it the idea of authority. ἐγένετο is better. ἔγινεν ἔγινεν has nearly the same idea—that of guarded.

Ver. 4. ὁ λόγος ὁ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο. ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο. ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο. ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο.


Ver. 5. τὸν λόγον = all the expression of God in Jesus.

ἀνόιν. note its emphatic position.

ἐγένετο. perfect tense.

ἐν τῷ ἱεροίῳ. refers back and is connected with the ἐν τῷ ἱεροίῳ of v. 3.
In every country is the same mind thought and
thus every one religiously.
In every country the same mind thought that can
and does refer to God too— for "all in Christ"
end Christ is God".

Ver. 6. ὡ δὴ γὰρ ἐν ἐναντίον ὅπῃς, δε
is a direct discourse. It is a direct discourse and does not in 8:9. John usually
had ὡ ἔτη in direct discourse. See 1:6, 8:10;
2:4; 14:28.

ὁ λόγος— Ὁ ὅμως. It is wanting in the 16.
Vulgate. The former makes the thought emphatic.
— ὡ.
Exegetical.

Verse 3. "And by this we know": This is not something that is uncertain, but that which may be experienced by each one. There are no uncertainties in Scriptural writings. It was a living reality to him, and it may be to us also.

"That we have known him": The verb loved is perfect "we have known". He knew anything only when it had been assimilated by us. The gaining of knowledge is a process of assimilation—a process of growth. If a man is not assimilated to Jesus he does not know him, and how he works in our lives. He may know external facts about him, but he does not know the inward experiences. After Paul had served him for years, and had preached him to many, yet his desire was, "Not I may know him, but the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." (Phil. 3:10,11).

Jesus is the object of the knowing, but he must become a part of the real knowing. He must realize him working in us, and fulfill him, lifting us up day by day. A moral thirst—
real knowledge will not be here at all. It
must be vital. Jesus' life must flow into
ours. Then we know Him. To teach that
we must travel the same road that He
did. He is "the way." This way leads through
death — "they made conformable unto his death."
"It is a faithful saying that if we die with
Him we shall also live with Him."
— "if we keep his instruction." This is not
"commandments" in the sense of a law. It
cannot be. if Paul was right when he
said "We are not under law." Our command
would be as a law. But if we take it as
"instruction," then it proceeds Jesus as
the teacher and not His disciple - human.
He is always we have to do. He and in
Him. He also is immoral. He has our life
from Him. If we are assimilated to
Him we will keep this instruction. The
basis of this relation is love. If we
were perfectly assimilated to Him we
would keep His instruction perfectly. If
we would follow this instruction per-
fectly we would soon become assimilated
to Him perfectly. — we know Him perfectly.
This is a wonderful relation.
Ver. 4. "This one saying that I have known him, and not keeping his instruction, is a liar."

It does not make any difference what our pretensions may be about knowing him, if we fail to keep his instruction. It is evident that we do not know him. This can only be true when we take the knowing him to mean our assimilation to him. It is a fact that we all know many persons who have much knowledge in regard to the facts of Jewish life, and yet they do not keep this teaching. We could not say that this man need not be a liar if he professed to have this knowledge about Jesus. But if we take it to mean our assimilation to him based on love, and they do not follow this teaching we lie. "And in this one the truth is not." This gives emphasis to the fact of his entrenching and hypocrisy.

Ver. 5. "But who keeps of him the word." "He who" is all the expression of God in Jesus. He is the "Word of God." "Word" and "instruction" are not synonymous in general, yet the "instruction" of Jesus, including both precept and example, include "the Word" as far as it had referred to us at least, shall we have Jesus teaching and
doing something not in harmony with the nature, or something not necessary to us. He is the one not in any technical sense, but in reality. His life is the way that will lead us back to God. His life is His instruction. So that it is essential to us that we keep "His Word".

"Truly in this one is the love of God perfected." The "love of God" is objective here. If one did not love God for God, which means the love of God's character, he would not pay any attention to "His Word." God is seeking to create in us a love for Him in order that that may lead us to keep His instruction and it comes back to Him. The Holy Spirit of Counsel is before all of this. "His love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which He has given unto us." Rom. 5:5. The degree of the perfection of the love is in proportion to the keeping of the Word and vice versa.

"By this we know that we are in Him":"I. e. by keeping His Word." "That we are in Him" has taken the place of "that we had known Him" in v. 3. and is equivalent to
that expression. It brings out the relationship more closely, and then there is less danger of superficial reading and thinking.

Ver. 6. "He that said "I remain in Him, ought himself also as to walk, as that one walked." Think aloud to the words what He means by His daily walk, and if we are in Him and the world, we must also show that by our walk. This is the mind and we and to remain in Him as the condition of being fruitful. Deut. 8:14. Of course we are in Christ too. for Jesus is in harmony with God. Thus we do not walk as Gentiles did nor and departing from them. Yet can not be in them and away from them at the same time. As that if not make a profession of being within us and oblige by the very nature of the case to walk just as He walked. This, of course, means that we "walk in the light."
The exact meaning of words plays an important part in exegesis. It expresses the exactness of thought and may change from a variety of so-called synonymous. But while we do as we must keep in mind that the precise meaning of these synonymous may not the age of their use, the kind of discourse employed, and often with the character of the subject matter treated. In the Greek language our word "command" in its several shades of meaning is expressed very compactly. This fact has, it seems, been almost entirely overlooked by commentators on and translators of the New Testament. The aim of this discussion is to show the use of ἐντολή. According to Aristotelian Greek synonymous, the words meaning "command" in the Greek and ἐντολή, ἱπποβολή, ἱππίκες, ἱράκλειδες, τάξις, and its compounds.

ἐντολή: to command - designates verbal orders emanating from an emperor; ἱπποβολή - to change - is the order of a military commander, which is passed along the line.
that expression. It brings out the relationship more clearly, and then there is least danger of superficial reading and thinking.

Ver. 6. "He that saith that he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, as he that walketh, beholding the word, and if we are in him and he in us, we must also show that by our walk. He is the vine, and we are to remain in him, as the branches of the olive tree." John 15:7-10. Of course we are in God too, for Jesus is in harmony with God. We must do not walk as Jesus did nor depart from him. We cannot be in him and away from him at the same time. So that if we make a profession of being within him and obligated by the very nature of the case to walk just as Jesus walked. This, of course, means that we "walk in the light."
The exact meaning of words plays an important part in exegesis. To express nicety of thought was ever done from a variety of so-called synonyms. But while we do so, we must keep in mind that the precise meaning of these synonyms may vary with the age of their use, the kind of discourse employed, and often with the character of the subject matter treated. But the Greek language our word "command" in its several shades of meaning is expressed very concisely. This fact has, it seems, been almost entirely overlooked by commentators on and translators of the New Testament. The aim of this discussion is to show the use of ἔργον. According to Smith's Greek Synonyms, the words meaning 'command' in the Greek are καταχωρίζω, ἀπαγγέλλω, ἐπι τίμονα, τάσκις, and its compounds.

καταχωρίζω - to command - designated write orders emanating from the emperor; ἀπαγγέλλω - to declare - is the order of a military commander, which is passed along the line;
his subordinate; ἐξονομεῖν - to reserve - is em-
ployed by those whose office or position invests them
with claims and implied to the context of the Com-
mmand like our word "instruct"; ἀδείον - to re-
sign or part - suggests active connected with
the "part." ἐπισκέπτομαι and προσκέπτομαι differ from
ἐκκλησίαι in denoting fixed obligations rather
than specific instructions.

While we turn to the New Testament we find
that there are distinctive and marked differences,
facultal about twenty-five times, ἦπισκέπτομαι, twenty
seven times, ἀδείον and its compounds, twenty-six times,
and ἐκκλησίαι, twenty times. I give a few refer-
of the first three simply to show their use:

Heb. 3:1. "Now when Jesus saw great multitude
about him, he commanded [ἐκκλησίαι] to depart
unto the other side." Matt. 8:18. "And when they
had commanded [ἐκκλησίαι] them to go and
out of the council, they conferred among themselves."

forth and commanded [ἦπισκέπτομαι] them (charged
them) saying "εἰς [ἦπισκέπτομαι] then (charged
them) saying "εἰς [ἦπισκέπτομαι] them that [ἦπισκέπτομαι]
shall teach no other

τάχως. "Then the eleven disciples went away
into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had
appointed (ἐνέπλεξεν) them. Matt. 28:16. "Then they
for Paul and Barnabas had no small dis-
ension and disputations with them, they as-
signed (ἐπέδωκαν) Paul and Barnabas and cer-
tain others of them to go up to the Apostles and
elders at Jerusalem, about this question:" Ac.
15: 2.

And compare with that a few similar
phrases elsewhere: "For God com-
mmanded (ἐπέδωκαν) saying, Honor thy father
and thy mother." Matt. 15:4. "And he com-
mmanded (ἐπέδωκαν) the Apostles to watch." Mark 13:34. "But that the world may know that I loved
the Father; and as the Father gave me com-
mmandment (ἐνέπλεξεν) even as I did." John.
14:31. "For as I have received of the Father,
saying, I have set thee to be a light to the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be
for salvation unto the ends of the earth." Ac.
13:47.

The noun ἐπέδωκαν, derived from the verb
ἐπέδωκαν, occurs more than fifty
times, being found in all parts of the
New Testament. In some places ἐπέδωκαν
signifies a command like ἐπέδωκαν or
ἐπέδωκαν, but again in many places it
Cannot have such meaning, but should be translated "instruction." This is clear from a careful study of the following passages:

A New Commandment (I Yrokhv) I give you, that ye love one another. John 13:34. Do loves subject its command? John 15:10, 12. If I Yrokhv = Command could the singular and plural be used in differently? Acts 17:15. The relation of the Parthic forbid command. Eph. 2:15 = instruction in the form of commandments. Col. 4:10. The relation of the Parthic again forbid command. I Tim. 6:14. If commandment, what is it? I Cor. 14:37. The Apostle states that he was writing the Lord's instruction - I Yrokhv. In II Peter 3:12 the reader is exhorted to "call to mind the instruction (I Yrokhv) of our apostles." II Peter 2:21. Which commandment? For Rev. 22:14 All Revised Versions based on Bischendorff text. There are other passages that might be added show us clearly that this word was used in the same sense that we use "instruct" and should be so translated.

The Old Testament is a book of commandments which shall and thou shalt not, in the doing of which we should live, and the New Testaments in instruction. Here is a mess arrangement and it is at personal will. Our life is in
Christ. He is our Teacher—our Guide. Man is out of touch with Him today, but tomorrow He is drawn by His instruction and by the Father. Liberty is the genius of progress, and education. If the New Arrangement contained laws wherein is it better than the Old? Are the laws higher or lower? If they are higher and man could not keep the Old, how can he keep the New? If they are lower, the Old must most perfectly than the New, and we are retrograding instead of progressing. Paul says: "Ye are not under law, but under grace." This does not mean that we are not under the Mosaic law as a rule to teach, but it means that we are not under any law. How many commands does it take to make a law? Do not one command a law? Was Paul mistaken? Perhaps some may ask this question of old, "Shall we sin because we are not under laws?" God forbid. He is just as guilty who disregards instruction—or more so—than he who breaks a law. He violates as higher relations.

How may think of the relation of Jews
To use—see Teacher—we the learners—it is a
holier relation than it otherwise could be. He
tells us all because we are no longer "servants"
but "friends"—for His standpoint, from men
knowing, after we have done all, we shall still
say, "I am an unprofitable servant." Oh how
much we need teaching! As many dark, per-
plexing questions confront us every day! Jesus
will lead us into the truth. Let us therefore
study the Bible as our guide book to truth— in
it He is teaching us how to live—and it
will become a new book to us.
Αποκτάς, αφέντες και για πάντα γράφω δικό, αλλά ενταφίζω υπέρ
και δείχνω όπου οδεύει η πράσινη φύση. 

1:12. Ενταφίζω και γράφω δικό,
αλλά ενταφίζω υπέρ
και δείχνω όπου οδεύει η πράσινη φύση.

1:13. Ενταφίζω και γράφω δικό,
αλλά ενταφίζω υπέρ
και δείχνω όπου οδεύει η πράσινη φύση.
Stammatical and Lexical.

Vell. 7. Agor. 63. so in Cap. 2:1, 21; 4:1, 7, 11. Behagh! - an epithet of tender address, of this use of reviacion in Vell.

Kroth must mean instruction here. In Kroth is known as o logos.

Some texts insert apoxo at the close of the verse but the best authorities omit it.

Sr. Thus John and the masculine word logos instead of the neuter as in Cap. 11.

Vell. 8. tairos - on the other hand - again. klup to ypeon.

So refers, not to ev thor, for that is feminine, but to the context of the ev thor kairon. Which thing is true to.

But he would rather expect their love, and some texts have it, but it has less authority than evtho. He would expect John to include himself in this.

Sr. A particle used merely to introduce the context of the ev thor kairon. Equi. client to our viz. that. or "namely." Some make it causal here but there is no ground for it.

Patag ovo - forever time - is passing away.

Pairei - also forever - is shining.

KIn. "already" and not "now" as in E.J.

The Vulgate falsely renders o xora in parag. 22. The editor, Graeven. And Luther translated it - die Genesis ist Vergangen. The term almost by all means had retained. This is a continuum.
Verse 9: ὃ δέχατον - See Vs. 4, 6.
Verse 10: ὅγαριῦν is connected with δῖσα as ὅμοιον is with ὄκοριον.

ὀκορίον = a freely Biblical word occurring some thirty-five times in the Greek O.T. and fifteen quotations included - in 267 V.T. It is the LXX for ὑπόλαον (a non-exan) and ὑπόκολον. It properly means a "trip" or "snare" - any stumbling block in the way causing me to stumble - hence "stumbling block". Our word "Scandal" is a transliteration of the Greek.

Verse 11: ἵνα ἤκοριον ἵσσιν is a strengthening of the additional clauses. Kαί ἵνα ἤκοριον ἄρπασιν, and ὅτι ὅς ἐστιν ὅς ὤπειρεν.

ὅτι - ἦν is causal "because".
V. 7. "Beloved." John began this chapter with "my little children," and now he calls them "Beloved."
He is very tender toward them. He had the same interest in them that a father has in his child.
"I do not write to your need instruction." This cannot be "commandment" here. There is no sign of a commandment in this Epistle, but it abounds in much beautiful instruction. What which he writes is not more in that he has added any outward teaching to what he had written in the Gospel, or to what he had preached to them.

"But old instruction, which ye had from the beginning." All of the facts about Jesus' life had been given to them, so that as regards history there was nothing more to give.

"The old instruction is the Logos (Word) whom ye have heard." The Logos cannot be commandment on the sense of law, but He is the embodiment of God's instruction to us. God had in the Logos taught us how to live as to be happy. And they had heard him. "John" is preferable to "which" as in v. 8. J. represents a personal relation. This is similar to what Paul says in Rom. 10:14. How shall
they call upon him into whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without (the) speaking?

It must hear Jesus himself in order to know Him. He can otherwise only know about Him. He can "know Him" in order that not may have eternal life; for "eternal life is to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John could add nothing to the Logos, as he could truly say that what he was writing was what they already had heard - the Logos which was from the beginning. He, therefore, said the former: "from the beginning at the edge of the waters. They had not heard the Logos from the beginning, but as in Cap. 1:1. What was from the beginning." 17. The Logos, they had heard.

Ver. 8. "Again (or on the other hand) I write unto you new instruction." Does John here contradict what he had said in the preceding verse? Not at all. While it is true that he had not added any outward teaching in this letter to what had gone in the Gospel, yet he had given us this
new inner development of that outward teaching which is new, and will always continue to be new, and to this he calls this attention, "which is true in him and in you." The relation "which" refers here to the context of the "new instruction." The context of this new teaching is true in him and in us. We would have expected John to have said "us" instead of "you." The context of this "new instruction" is:

"Darkness is passing away and the true light is already appearing." The present tense indicates a continuous process. Not that light appeared at one time and then ceased, but that it is shining continuously, and expelling the darkness. It is this that John says is true in him and in you. This is a remarkable statement. How is it true in him? Throughout his own life passed through the same process of development that we do. He "came," he "shone," he "increased," and such like phrases indicate this clearly.

For is this all a thing of the past? Paul says that the "was filled up to that which is lacking of the affliction of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the Church." Col. 1:24. His sufferings then are not all past. He
and in him, and there is an intimate relation between Christ and us. "Ye are the body of Christ" and that body is not yet perfected. Do it "in and in him".

This does not mean that God had not sent any light to man before this time. He had always been doing so as man's creation, and as soon as God began to send light, darkness began to fade away. It had been slow process, but it is God's work. The trouble with us is that we "love darkness rather than light," and "will not come to the light". Whenever new light came it brought not a higher revelation, but a deeper insight into the logos, so that this is "new instruction". And many things in the Bible which are new to us, though we have read over the words many times. Have you thought that darkness is passing out of your soul? "I am the one making all things new." He becomes a "new man" and yet one and the same individual that was more before. This is the great mystery.

1 Cor. 9. The one saying, he is in the light. And
hating his brother, is in darkness until now."
This is the dedication that John drew from the
preaching statements. It must manifest itself
in the life. One cannot be in the light and
hate his brother at the same time. True light
enters the heart, darkness enters with it and
darkness departs.
Ver. 10. "He that loving his brother remaineth in the
light, and scandal is not in him." Light and
love are joined together. Do we confound all
these is in love? Love is the law of life. We
have many false notions about love. Genuine
love is to desire the highest good for a person.
There is no chance for deception with such
a trust and real love binds. If it were "kindness"
it would be easier, for we can appear kind
when there is no real affection, but with love
that would be difficult.
Ver. 11. "He that loving his brother is in darkness and
walked in darkness, and knew not where
he goeth, because the darkness had blinded his
eyes." He not only is in the darkness but he
walked in it - he did the things which be-
long to the realm of darkness. He does not
know where he goeth, because the darkness
had blinded his eyes. He may think he is
alright. "Eyes" are used here not for the physical organ of sight, but rather for that power of soul to discern the right from the wrong. Here it is said that "the darkness hath blinded his eyes," while Paul in II Thes. 2:8-12, represents God as sending strong delusions in order that they should believe a lie, and be condemned, who will not believe the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness."