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Columbus, Ohio
...αυτά τις άρχες, δ' άκολουθον, δ' εισαχθείσης των ἀρχαίων, δ' ἑκατοντάκι

1. ὡς τε ἐγείρεσιν, ὡς ἀκολουθεὶ τῆς ἐποίησις ἡμῶν, δ' ἑκατοντάκι

1. οὕτως δηλοῦ, ὡς ἐγείρθησι τῆς ἐποίησις ἡμῶν, ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ

1. τοῖς ἔτοιμοι τοῖς εὐφήμοις:...

2. ἐκεῖνοι ἐξαρχήσομεν. 1.2. ἐν αὕτῳ

2. ἐκεῖνοι ἐξαρχήσομεν. 1.2. ἐν αὕτῳ

2. πρῶτος τοῖς εὐφήμοις

3. καὶ τοῖς εὐφήμοις

4. καὶ τοῖς εὐφήμοις...
Grammar and Lexical.

1. John introduces the Logos with the definite article, as we would expect. In contrast, with ἐν χρόνοις, the reference is rather to the manifestations of the Logos to the world than to the person itself and is expressed in ἐν χρόνοις. ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου ἐν χρόνοις, the reference being rather to the manifestations of the Logos to the world than to the person itself, is expressed in ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

2. ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἐν ἀνθρώποις, and ἐν ἀνθρώποις are perfects, while ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου and ἐπιλειτούργων are aorists. In this climax the perfects have a profound significance: "we have loved and have loved with our eyes - therefore - we know." The knowing and the seeing were completed acts. But man as things thus were not sufficient; he added by the aorist how he had continued, continuous in the most direct way for the purpose of confirming the reality and nature of the Logos.

3. ἐπιλειτούργων is intensified by the addition of ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου ἐν χρόνοις, and ἐπιλειτούργων ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου τοίας ὥρας. He would naturally have expected the accusation here an affront in what we have just discussed. This is perfected, continuous, and thus con...
...section is designed against a possible confounding
of what is told concerning (ἐκ) the λόγος with the λόγος
itself, i.e. of limiting the content of ὁ λόγος to the
uttered (spoken) statements of the Gospel.

The word ὁ λόγος — i.e. as a term that was understood
by the people as John used it — of the O.T. reference. By
John ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο πρὸς τὸν ἱστόριον, λόγον, and we
find ὁ λόγος used, but without the article, while John
always speaks of it as ὁ λόγος. Swete then explains

>This sense is distinct and qualifies ἐν λόγον.

Ver. 2. He introduced the parenthesis as an explanation and
may be translated — indeed — or — or as we have it in
Eng.

For ὁ γενέτευρ ἐν δόξαν as the subject of the three verbs —
ἐμπαθάσκων — ἀναμορφών — ἀναζητῶν, rather than to
supply the pronoun ἐκ, after ἐμπαθάσκων and ἀναμορ
şσεων as the subject only of ἀναζητῶν, as in 1 E.V.

This is more correct. We have ὁ γενέτευρ instead of
the simple relation ἐκ, and the German renders it — as
which the eternal life is made with the Father.

The use of ὁ γενέτευρ instead of ὁ γενάω seems to have the
idea of direction towards — as longing for rather
than a position merely alongside of.

Ver. 3. ἐμπαθάσκων ἐν ἀναμορφών. Here he again takes up the thought
of the beginning, respecting the ἐμπαθάσκων and ἀναμορ
φών as an invited order from the former verse.
— Τά χαί συναφές γι' αυτόν, ἵνα φανερωθῇ ἡ ἐγνωσθείσα τῷ θεριστῷ ἐν τῇ διαπερατώσει τῆς χείλεως. ἐκάθεν ἐκ τῆς τιμής τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ θεριστοῦ ἐπεστῆσαι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἑορτῆς, ὡς ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ διαπερατώσει τῆς χείλεως. 

Ver. 4. Τά χαί συναφές γι' αυτόν. Again we have the plural "καὶ συναφές" instead of "καὶ συναφεῖ." 

The "cursory" of S. T. is lacking in this text. 

— Τά χαί συναφές γι' αυτόν. We have καὶσυναφές in the text, but some MSS. have καὶσυναφεῖ. By referring to John 16:24, we find the identical language with καὶσυναφεῖ in the text of al. S. T. 13:19, 12:23 on parallel passages. 

The reading καὶσυναφεῖ would mean the joy of the Apostles over the Church. οὐκ αὐτόν, that their work was being 

fulfilled on the land of their brethren. 

Or again: the joy found completeness in telling 

this to others.
Exegetical

Ver. 1. "What made 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 recognizes especially the divinity of Jesus. He says 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 Hebraic, 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 cites 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 Hebraic. But a more satisfactory explanation is in the fact that John's conception of the "Word" was not a complete one, and emerging his description of this character would only be a partial one. He saw that which we have heard and seen—gazed upon and handled (Concerning the
Word of life. As that in setting forth His char-
acter so truly and partial may He would naturally
and the Monster.

"What we have heard, what we have seen with
our eyes, what we have gazed upon, and our hands
have handled." The act of giving gratitude and
forth the certainty of the Apostles' announcement
of begins with hearing the lowest degree of the
climax and advancement step by step concluding
that nearest and most direct into our hands
and our hands. John does not announce any-
thing that he himself was uncertain. He had
had a personal relation with the "Word" and
was therefore capable of setting them forth to
others.

Concerning the word of life. This is the con-
clusion of the "what" on the preceding clauses.
He is not only "the Word" but also "the word of the
life." He not only had "the words of eternal life"
but He is Himself "the word of life." He had the
eternal principle of life in Himself, and through
them it is conveyed to us. "Ye must not come
to me in order that ye might have life." John
8:11, 16. And, "I am come that they might have life,
and that they might have it more abundantly." 
John 10:10.
Verse 2. "For the life was manifested." This recalls to our minds
John 1:4,"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

And we have seen, and have witnessed, and announced
to you that eternal life. Here John reaffirms the
certainty of the announcement. He was not content
merely "having seen," but at once "bear testimony" and
"announced" to others that which had become familiar
to him.

"Which was with the Father and was manifested to us".
The seal of this life was put on the Father. John, along
with the other disciples of our Lord was qualified to bring this
message to us.

Verse 3. "What we have seen and heard." He now goes back and
takes up the thought of the beginning, and again states
that he 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 core disciples
had had a similar experience, and he adds their
testimony to his own and witness "we." And not only
that, but he recognized in that the saving form of
humanity, and at man is impelled to carry the
message to others, not this as the purpose. —
that ye also may have fellowship with me. He
said on this the way to his own highest joy and
peace. This is the missionary spirit that will
carry this message to the world. That, 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 He would come and take
up their abode with the disciples.
Very, "And these things we write that our joy may
be completed." He had set forth his design in
writing this Epistle. If we take the reading
"our" as it is in that text we can infer
that John felt that he had to do all that he
could to empower 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 without which
there can be no true joy. Their life and
joy in Christ was not dependent 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 this to be removed, as that he wrote, "my
work shall be completed." Our joy; it takes it that he included
himself and all the disciples in all ages in it;
that comes 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 in
stantly, but as a continual struggle of the one
though a long series of successive and defeated
joys and sorrows, until it stands justified in
the realm of eternal light.
General Discussions.

8. 6 ως.

He here in the introduction to this Epistle (ix. 1) at threefold view of the Ο. 6: 1. His pre-existent a. His earth-life. 3. His glorified state. The first is set forth in the personal, ὅν ὁ ἀπρόσαρατος καὶ ὁ παρὰ τὸν Πατέρα ἐκείνος, the second in ἑγεραποίητος and emphasized by ἐκ τῆς κοσμού ἐν σώματι, ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐκ τῶν χερσίν ἐν δύναμιν ὑπο καθιερωμένου, ἐκ τῆς φύσεως καὶ ἐκ τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ θεοῦ. The novel made audible, visible and tangible to the children of men, and the third in the form 6 ως αὐτὸν ὰν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν.

This Bible does not deal very much with His pre-existent, nor with the process by which He emptied Himself. It states them simply and factually. It had to do with them as it found human conditions, and with the process of the glorification in three human conditions, by which humanity was brought into harmony with being.

John deals with the humanity of Jesus, but not in the same way that the other Evangelists do. He saw the Divine in the human and viewed especial emphasis to that. He enters into the very essence of this being, and sets it forth not in abstract form, but in a living character. John was able to be this treasure of the m
imate personal relations that he sustained to the Logos. He learned in his Master's brain, not only at the "lack
pupit", 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 un
converted teacher, but that of one in whom Christ
had been formed. Hence it was for producing
He set forth as the perfected man—the ideal
for humanity. He makes us feel the power of divine
love set forth in Jesus teaching that we are made
that we might become what He is— in this becoming
partakers of our nature, in order that we might become
partakers of the divine nature.
He acced in the Logos the fulness of God's message
to mankind—the man of God to reach humanity
and lift it up to Himself. There can be no higher
or revelation than this, because there can be no
greater encouragement. We will be constantly learning
of God and the Logos, not because they will
descend to us, but because they will lift us
up to them. This process of lifting up is going
on now and will continue until it is consummated.
The Logos was not 8 θεος. The Logos was θεος
to 8 θεος, and 8 θεος for 8 θεος. All of 8 θεος is con-
tained in 8 θεος, but not all of 8 θεος is expressed in
8 θεος. Jesus himself says, "My Father is greater than I" (Jn. 14:28.)
A work is the embodiment of an idea or thought; and, as thought is an emanation from the individual, He and told in Heb. 1:1-3, that God spake the world. And it was 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. οὐκ ἦν ἄρα ὀνείρων ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἡ Χαρά ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἁγιοις αὐτοῦ, in the being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His substance. 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 fulness of all that God could say to man. God had expressed Himself in Creation, but "the world through wisdom knew not God," then "it pleased God to reveal God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," 1 Cor. 1:21olt. 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. Lyman Abbott). And this way God will reach man and lift him up so that he shall partake of the Divine nature.
5. ὡς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἡγεμονίᾳ ἢ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἢ ἀναγγείλλων
οὖν, ὡς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ἢ ἀναγγείλλων ἢ ἡγεμόνας

6. ἡ ἡγεμονία ἤ τὸ χριστιανόν ἢ ἐκκλησία ἢ ἀναγγείλλων, ἢ

7. ἡ ἡγεμονία ἢ τὸ χριστιανόν ἢ ἐκκλησία ἢ ἀναγγείλλων
καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἦν αὐτῶν ἐκδικήσεις ἢ τὰ σωτηρία.
Grammarical and Lexical

Verse 5. More free in d'Orsi for emphasis. Some may have some following d'Orsi.

ἀνāρθτον, refers to the ἄλαξις of the preceding verse.
ἀραγγίλησεν, instead of ἀραγγίλησεν as in verset 2 and 3. It had the idea of repetition. He had made the announcement to them before and now he makes it again (ἀναφέρεται).
Also, he not only had heard it, but at once announced it again.

Ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις, introduces the message and need not be translated, translated 'that'.

Ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις, ματαιοῦσαί εἰη ἑαυτῷ ἔλεγεν. The ἑαυτῷ is the message (ἀγγελία).

Luther translator. Gott ein Licht ich.

Verse 6. ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, in the darkness. He had just referred to ἕμερα in the preceding verse and now he refers to the (in)formation, ἄλαξις and ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, and as inward article.

ἀποστρεφώντων refers to all the actions, both inward and outward, of our life.

ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ, is a stronger expression than ἀνθρώπῳ. ὡς ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ, ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. The idea here is something more than speaking the truth. It must be heard.

The clause ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ is equivalent to the preceding clause ἐν τῷ ἥμερα, ματαιοῦσαί εἰη. Verse 7. It marks an antithesis with v. 6.
translate "since" rather than "as" as in G. See under Exegetical for the reason.

her 'allhênòv. The Latin Cod. has \textit{a\'llo\'hênòv} evidently chang
ed from the latter authenticated reading \textit{allhênòv} as 
ast to conform to \textit{allhênòv} in v. 6. The reading \textit{allhênòv} 
gives us an additional thought, and we should naturally
expect this.

to \
\textit{\textup{Io\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\n
— Exegetical. —

Verse 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 leaving wholly declared this message 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 do not have any record of Jesus making this statement to the disciples in their word. On the other hand, he declared: 'I am the light of the world.' John 8:12. Think as the Word of God is "the brightness of his glory and the exact image of his selfessence." Heb. 1:3.

Also John 1:14 "And we behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Or again, "The word was God." Jesus revealed God to man. What John and the others saw and heard of Jesus, led them to the conclusion that "God is light." This statement reminisced of the parallel statement in Cap. 4: 4, 16 that "God is love." These are the only definitions of God's character that
we have. It will not do to say as Luther does, "God
is in light"—God is a light. That would at once imply that there are other lights independent of God, 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 addition,
which is a negation of a clause John emphasizes the former statement. Light and darkness are here brought into
contrast as setting forth the character of the two worlds
of light and the world of darkness. 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. No philosophy had been able to make
such a revelation. This figure is unique and at
once quite the idea of humanity, 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 has
not come from Him. Jesus as the express image of
God's own person had revealed God's real character
to man, and in the light of this character He has
ever revealed man to man and man to himself. He
has filled the world with a new life and is fulfilling it and making it beautiful. It is no worse
that John made 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." This is no darkness in them 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 made this claim, but whom literal said they walked in darkness, and John is here going to refute that idea. It is hypocrisy. He 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 these 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.

Tell lie. We do not the truth." John makes his statements in few words, but always to the
thick. 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 be the truth when we walk in the light. Thus we can not have fellowship with him who is light. Light with no fellowship with darkness, darkness with no fellowship with light. 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 refuse to submit our hearts to the truth.

"Since he is in the light." "Since," rather than "as," gives the reason why we have fellowship with each other. He is in the same kind of light. Here is but one kind of light, but there are many degrees of that light. He is not "walking in the light to the extent that he is in the light." But neither shall we 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, i.e. this is a process of growth. When God said to Solomon, "And if thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have com-
command thee, and thou keep my statutes and my judg-
ments, thou wilt establish the throne of thy king-
dom upon David's sons forever." He simply said to him,
"Walk in the light." David's integrity of heart manifested
in his unswerving loyalty to the true God. The trend
of his life was toward God. He seemed to say that sin
was not the trend of his life; it was a side
stance.
— We have fellowship one with another." We have
in this verse the true basis of fellowship subject.
There can possibly be no other than that given
here. Walking in the light and having fellowship
one with another are synonymous.
"And the blood of Jesus his Son cleansed me
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 "had cleansed",
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
washing out but by removing all impurity of
disease—e.g., leprosy. It means to cleanse by
driving out sin. See Matt. 8:2-4.
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 His 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 has 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 form and theory while the virtues of all the others are but polished vices. 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, unapostolic, 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. And 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 us. We are apt to read it over very lightly, and regard it very superficially, so that it loses its force upon us. Let us look at it again. 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? Are there not many things in it that are hard to understand? Take, for example, this passage that we are considering. You have your conception of it, and I have mine. Do they agree? If not, who is right, or is either right? Do I have the means of knowing which is right, or what the Bible really teaches? We will let the Bible answer. "If any one wills to be my servant, 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. 3:13,16, after having set forth his own position, says, "But if in any thing ye think otherwise, God shall reveal even this unto you, nevertheless (on condition that) unto what we have already attained, to walk in the same." And what do these
Scriptural way to you? Is it that say that when I am convinced of being God's will (and that means doing right always) He will make it clear to me what His will is, and that revelation will increase in proportion as I advance in the light that I already have. Is it that when John says, "walk in the light," He means that I shall live up to my highest convictions of right. If I believe in a certain thing is right and refuse to do it for any reason whatsoever, I am walking in darkness and not in the light. It also includes a teachable spirit so that I am ready always to receive light and truth from reliable sources it may come from, 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. Communism says it must be something that we have in common. Now let us all be God's light and see Him as 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 degrees with different persons. The least degree that we may have and still have fellowship is that we purpose 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 purity. But unless there is something in common between men there is no power in ecclesiasticism that can make them companionable.
I. The Blood of Jesus.

"And the blood of Jesus, his Son, cleansed us from all sin." This passage of Scripture needs to be studied again. It has been perverted, and by making it to the heathen idea of "appeasement of 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, "He lies a sacrifice than the death of the Son of God was required to propitiate the offended justice of God for sin; and no blood is prized than this blood, to ransom us from the bondage of Satan, to which we were reduced by sin." How can any intelligent being who has carefully studied the character of God as he is revealed to us think any such baseless notions! 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 on our study of the Bible, regardless of the logical consequences of the conclusions. We must learn not
He and surely then to inquire what their sentiments mean. Of course, so far as words and their meanings are concerned, it cannot mean the physical blood of Jesus which flowed on the cross, but then we must ask how this can cleanse us from all sin? There must be some way in which the blood of Jesus comes in contact with sin. In Rev. 19:3, we have the promise, having our hearts sprinkled from an unclean spirit, and in them any possible way by which the physical blood of Jesus can be applied to our conscience? It is absurd to talk about it. We must then seek some other explanation.

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

1. FLESH literally means flesh as distinguished (a) from blood. Flesh and blood (Mark 16:17) hath not revealed it unto you. Matt. 16:17; (b) from bones. Handle me and see that a spirit doth not have flesh and bones (Luke 24:39), thus, or (c) to cut or loose (Luke 20:46) do ye see me and know. Luke 24:36.

FLESH also has an ethical meaning, a designation of the tendency to lead an sinful life. Thus, Christ gives him favor over all flesh (1Timothy). Eph. 5:10; and, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh (Romans)."
but after that he died"; and, "for they that are after the flesh (katá tò saktikà) do mind the things of the flesh (tò tò saktikà)." Acts 5:2, 5, R. V. R. V.,

"And I say, On this (tó oúv) do not come near: and, "except you eat the flesh (tò saktikà) of the Son of man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in yourselves." R. V. R. V.

3. Saktikà literally means the fleshly bodily organ. It is better for this that one of thy members should perish, and not the whole body (tò saktikà tò oríon) be cast into hell. Matt. 5:28, 30; and, "The light of the body (tò saktikà tò oríon) is the eye." Matt. 6:22, R. V. R. V.

Saktikà also has a higher, spiritual meaning:— At the last Supper with His disciples, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and gave it to His disciples saying, "This is my body (tò saktikà tò oríon)" Matt. 26:26; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. Paul speaks of the Church as "the body" (tò saktikà) of Christ. 1 Cor. 12:26, R. V. R. V., Eph. 5:28; 1 Cor. 12:26, R. V. R. V., and Paul also says, "There is a natural body (tò saktikà tò oríon) and there is a spiritual (tò saktikà tò oríon) 1 Cor. 15:44.

5. Oúv, literally means bread. If this be the Son of God, command that these stones become...
To interpret any passages of Scripture as at to contradict the revealed character of God.

It is easy to inquire what this sentence means. Of course we have words and their meanings and concepts at hand to mean the physical blood of Jesus, which was shed on the cross, but then we have to ask how this can "cleanse us from sin?"

Then must be some way in which the blood of Jesus came in contact with sin. Heb. 10:22 we have the "peace, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience."

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 will have to seek some other explanation.

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

1. 

Ox: literally mean flesh as distinguished from blood. Flesh and blood (Gen 2:38, 5:2), dare not reveal it unto you. Matt. 16:17, 16:18; 16:19; from bone. Handle me and see that a spirit does not have flesh and bone (Luke 24:39, 24:20). oxen. oxen have. Deu. 24:39.

Ox also has an ethical meaning - a designation of the tendency to lead an sinful life. Thus had given him from one and all flesh (Apok. 12:7, 12:8, 12:12; and, therefor, that some condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, whom also not after the flesh (Rom 12:2).
but after the Spirit"; and, "for they that are after the flesh (Kata tou' sarka) do mind the things of the flesh (tou' tov sarkis)." Rom. 8:5, 6. v. 40, v. 6.

سوق also has a still different and higher meaning in Jesus' words to his disciples in John 6:48-59.

"And the bread that I will give is my flesh (سوق oun iou' eiv), "and except ye eat the flesh (سوق tou' sarka) of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," v. 53, v. 54.

Sou also literally means the fleshly bodily organs. It is better for the sake of the members which the

Spirit, and not this whole body (سوق tou' sarkis) let

cast into hell." Matt. 5:29, 30; and, "The light of the

body (سوق oideon) is the eye." Matt. 6:22, v. 23.

سوق also has a higher, spiritual meaning.

At the last supper with his disciples, Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, he

broke it and gave it to his disciples saying, "This is my body (سوق tou' sarka)" Matt. 26:26; Luke

22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24. Paul speaks of the Church as "the body" (سوق tou' sarka) of Christ. 1 Cor. 12:13, 13:12, 15:44, 45. Eph. 22, 22, 45; 4:12, v. 13. And Paul also says, "There is a natural body (سوق prokoiv) and there is a spiritual (سوق proskeriv)" 1 Cor. 15:44, 45.

سوق literally means "bread." If then be the

Son of God, command that these stones become
bread (ἀρτον), "and man shall not live by bread (κηρυκτείν) only." Matt. 4:3, 4. But Jesus in John 6:31-59 calls himself "the bread of life" (ἐν σώματι τής ζωῆς). 

4. ἀρτον literally means "bread," but there is also a higher spiritual meaning given to it. See Jas. 4:14.

5. μυαλόν literally means "mind." The mind is "the life-blood of the immortal" (μὴ ἄν νοῦς ἄνθρωπον, John 5:26). It is not making the mind the "man." This word (μυαλόν) in such passages as Matt. 15:15; 12:5; 16:3; 17:1-9; 18:26; 19:12-14; 20:21-22; 21:36, 37; 25:11-30; 26:13-14 must be translated "mind," not "spirit." It is the Holy Spirit for it is clearly spoken of as a living personality.

Why then may not we have a meaning beyond the material? Why should we always think of the physical blood when the word is used? There is just as much reason for always translating μυαλόν "mind," Holy mind— as to always translate ἀρτον 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 (ζωῆς) of the flesh is the blood (κηρυκτείν)." [For the life (ζωῆς) of the flesh is in the blood] and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for (αἴτηται) your souls; for it is the blood (κηρυκτείν) that maketh an atonement for (αἴτηται)
the soul: "For the life (םוֹדֵי - מְד) of all flesh is its blood (דּוֹדֶה - דּוֹדֶה)." Lev. 17:11-14. The physical blood is the medium of the physical life. The soul 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 (דָּוֹדֶה - דְּוֹדֶה) ye do not have life in yourselves; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood (דָּוֹדֶה - דְּוֹדֶה) is drink indeed." Jno. 6:53, 55. "For by one Spirit (רוֹאָה - רָוָה) are we all baptized into one body, and have all drunk one Spirit (רוֹאָה - רָוָה)." 1 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! that we are one body.

The physical blood purifies our body, through it the healing procress is carried on. Man and man are grafted one, and by means of the circulating medium they are kept alive and good. "Are ye the body of Christ, and members in particular?" Rom. 12:4. 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 all flesh is the blood." Lev. 17:11-14. "It is the spirit that quickeneth (Greek: σπíρτος)" John 6:63. "The letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive (τὸ γράμμα καταραίη τὴν καρδίαν)" 2 Cor. 3:6. "For the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1:7. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by (εἰς) his own help, and removing both of the Holy Spirit, which he prepared afore time richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Titus 3:4,6. So why may we not conclude that the Holy Spirit is the living blood of the spiritual body? It comes into the body of Christ, and through the regenerating and sanctifying influence 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 a right to ask why John did not say Holy Spirit and instead of "blood" (Greek: σπίρτος)? It would answer by saying that the figure used is by far more suggestive than 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 figure 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 His wrath and causeth Him to shut his eyes upon sin, and say that a man is not a sinner when he knows that he is. He must not forget that this passage says "cleanse" and not "overlook." He cannot finish it to say anything else. It is a thorough cleansing, and nothing less will satisfy it.
8. ἤδε ἡμῶν ὅτι διαπραύον ὡς ἰδεῖται, ἔστως προσέχοντως καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία
ὡς ἄνευ ἐν ὑμῖν. 9. ἢδε διαλεγόμεν ὡς διαπραύον ἰδεῖται, πιστῶ
τοι ἡμῖν καὶ ἐγκαίρως, ἵνα ἢν ἰδεῖ τὰς διαπραύας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ
ὅτι ἤδε ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξίσουσθαι. 10. ἢδε ἡμῶν ὅτι διαπραύας εὑρήσατε,
μὴ ὑπὲρ πεποίητον αὐτῶν, καὶ ὡς λέγοις ἀνώτερ ὡς ἰδεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν.

--- Parallel Passages ---

1st Epistle.

10. ὡς λέγεις ἀνώτερ ὡς ἰδεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν. 5:13. ὡς λέγεις ἀνώτερ ὡς ἰδεῖται
ἐν ὑμῖν ὑψώτατο.

--- Grammatical and Lexical ---

Ver. 8. διαπραύας ὡς ἱδεῖται. in this verse ὡς is contrasted with διαπραύας ὡς ἱδεῖται in Ver. 10. The former denotes a state or condition, while the latter denotes activity. The latter is the stronger expression.

Ἐν τούτῳ ἐνδεικνύει. ἐνδεικνύει ἐν τῷ ἀντίθεμα. rather than the participle and so emphasizes the self-activity, and gives more prominence to the guilt in oneself.

This verb is parallel to ὁ ὑψώτατος ὡς Ver. 6.

καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ὡς ἰδεῖται ὡς ἰδεῖται parallel to καὶ ὡς ἡμῶν ὃ ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς Ver. 6.

Ver. 9. διαπραύρειν. from δια and πραύειν and therefore means-
to say the same thing (as another) — to agree with;

"τητοτές" — δικαιο. Their adjectival right to justify rather than to God.

"τητοτές" — faithful; and is applied to persons who have shown themselves faithful in the discharge of duties. As applied to Jesus here it means that He had proved His fidelity.

δικαιον — righteousness — righteous. Right and rightness are synonymous e.g. the right tool is the one that is fitted to do the work required — the right tool is the proper or fit tool. We can summarily view the fundamental idea of the work. As we may translate: He is faithful for He has shown Himself as during this earth-life and as fitted for that right) Περί αυτόν τον τοπολογίαν και παραπέτωσιν δουκός και μόνης δόξης.

"Περί — in order to" 15. He has the fitness which enables Him to put away our sin. 

Περί αυτόν τον τοπολογίαν και παραπέτωσιν δουκός και μόνης δόξης and parallel expressions. And used together they express this thought of that work done. Ἰμπρίζ ν δουκός τουρισμὸν the same thing, 

κ. θάνατον δικαιόν ἀμαρτία δογματίζων. 

κ. ν. 10. διαφορά κανονίν. 

κ. ν. 11. διαφόρα κανονίν. 

ο. διαφόρα κανονίν. 

ο. διαφόρα κανονίν. 

ο. διαφόρα κανονίν.
— Exegetical —

Ver. 8. "If one say that we have no sin." Here evidently some were misapplying 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 power 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 here 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 Lord 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 belong ourselves": Self-deception is very common. We can so easily be mistaken about ourselves. Pride is at the bottom of this self-esteem, and that leads to blindness and deception, and as instead of being freed from sin we add further 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 sinned."
"And the truth is not in us". This is a stronger expression than "we do not the truth" in v. 6. It refers to its manifestation to others, which might be done in an formal way - "having a form 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 \( \sin us \) that inflicts make the truth clear we could not receive it.

v.9. If we confess our sins, He must look upon us as God does, and say the same things about us that He does, and as judge, ourself. He must not to try to make us look less. How does He regard us? His standard must be our. This is absolutely essential in order that we may be friends from sin. The language of our hearts 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)". Those adjectives point to the character of Jesus. Can 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 He who is to cleanse us 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 on this 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 sins. He saved Himself and He saves us.

This passage does not mean what it has been said to mean—that God faithful and just when He promissed that who walk in darkness, and blesses that who walk in the light. He neither promises that who walk in the darkness, and blesses that who walk in the light because He is righteous. He cannot imagine God being anything else but right, merciful and just.

Nor again it has been said that the can forgive (verbooke) 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 love as revealed to us in Jesus.

"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 read in v.7, "if we walk in the light, surely we

in the light we have fellowship one with another,
And the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin. What is said here must be in harmony with that. We must be "in Christ" as that His blood (the Holy Spirit) can cleanse us. Now through 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 "cleanse," and cannot be made to say "overlook" or "deprive." if we will study these passages as we might we will get much help on "The Forgiveness of Sin." If we say that not have not sinned," this teaches us that not 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. —

"He makes them a liar." Jesus came to save this people from their sins," and if not say that not have not sinned and "do not have sin," we make them a liar. He came to save us, but not say we don't need to be
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 this man is not mine." A man who is not conscious of sin still mine, is not conscious of the true nature of life's purpose until "He show us what is in Him before the foundation of the world, that we 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, "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Col. Rom. 7:17-24.

Just as men may remember the word 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 proportions, 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 overt acts, then forgiveness can mean only the removing of the penalty, or a wiping out of the account.

This makes God too formal—as a taskmaster with a rod 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. Sin is as bad as the other.

2. If we accept the doctrine that sin is simply a lack of development—a lack connected with immaturity—e.g. a green apple is not good because it is not mature, still sin is no consequence, and needs nothing but time to remove it. This view denies the need of atonement at all, and they who hold it are guilty of making them a lie.

3. But if we accept the Bible doctrine that sin is the disorder of the soul, produced by a lack of conformity to God’s will, then the removal of it meant the healing of the disease, and bringing the mind into complete harmony with the Divine will.

John 3:16: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This is translated in R.S.V. " sin is lawlessact." This is translated in A.V. "sin is the transgression of the law." A.V. does not mean "transgressing of law," but "lawlessness," "inherent law." Compare, e.g., Rom. 5:19. (For a fuller treatment of ἁρωία see note on cap. 3:4.)

Sin is the result of development away from God toward self, or ἡμᾶς and it is self-centered. The "root act" is only the finish of the condition of the soul. Each of the abominations of the heart is moralplit with a good man out of the good treasure of the heart.
brings forth good things; and an evil mind out of the evil treasure brings forth evil things." Matt. 12:34, 35. "For the works (fruit) of the flesh are manifest, which are: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, idleness, envenomous mind, strife, false witness, hatred,嫉恨, despite, filthy speech. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, etc. Gal. 5:19-23. These and but the manifestation of certain condition of soul. For a proof of this let us notice the Rabbinitic explanation of it in the sermon on the Mount. Matt. 5:21-45. The ancients made murder the worst act of killing. Jesus makes the act of it in anger; the ancients make adultery the worst act; Jesus makes it in lust; the ancients make murder— not doing wrong to any one; Jesus makes it loving and doing good to all, even to our enemies. Etc.

Paul also placed sin in the heart. When he says, "I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known good except the law had said, Thou shalt not commit." Rom. 7:7. Paul did not mean by this that he would not have known anything about wrong doing, and its necessary remembrance, 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 commit,
but it ended with that, showing that Cain is in the deed. And Comments. "Thou shalt not kill;" and "Thou shalt not steal," is not revealed as real as those. "Thou shalt not covet." We would know that it is wrong to kill even if the laws did not say so, but we could not know this as well.

And if Cain is a descendent of the earth, the remedy must be applied to the descendent, and forgiven. Now - at putting away of sin from the soul, and thoroughly cleansing it from all sin and uncleanness. As John says, "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth 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 ἐξολοθρεῖν - "put away" - "remov"- instead of "forgive." Then we would not be as much troubled to explain this. There is another word in the New Testament that we transliterated "forgive" and it conveys the exact idea that we always put into the English word, "forgive." That word is ἐξολοθρεῖν and its modification. It means "to show oneself to" "to grant favor to" "to have charity to." This verb is used twenty-three times in the New Testament, but it is only twelve times translated "forgive."
The eleven times where it is not translated "forgiven" in the Revised Version are Luke 7:21; Acts 13:14; 25:11,16; 27:24; Rom. 6:32; I Cor. 3:12; Gal. 3:16; Phil. 1:17; 2:9; Phil. 2:23. Let us note its use in the twelve instances where it is translated "forgiven":

A certain lender had two debtors; the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty. When they had nothing extenuated to say, the forgiving (ἐλεημονεία) both. Which of them therefore will love him most? Simon answered and said, He, I suppose, whose he forgave (ἐλεημονεία) the most." Luke 7:40-43.

"For what is there wherein ye may make in-firmity to the rest of the Church, except it be that I myself was not furthermore to you? Forgive me (ξαπίσασθε) this wrong." I Cor. 12:13.

"Sufficient to such an one is the punishment which was inflicted by the many; as that contra-giving ye should rather forgive (ξαπίσασθε) him and comfort him, lest by any means such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow." I Cor. 2:6,7.

"But to whom ye forgive (ξαπίσασθε) anything, I also; for what I also have forgiven (καὶ ἐλεημονεία) anything, it is for your sakes." I Cor. 2:10.

"And ye being dealt through your trespasses"
and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you did turn together with him, having forgiven (Xapio\(\iota\)on\(\iota\)v) us all our trespasses. Col. 2:13. Note in this that favor was shown 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 ou\(\iota\)\(\alpha\)\(\iota\)\(\kappa\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\epsilon\)\(\nu\).\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\nu\).

"But on the other hand, as God's char, holy and beloved, as heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving (Xapio\(\iota\)on\(\iota\)v\(\iota\)v) one another, if any man have a complaint against any; even as Christ forgave (\(\iota\)\(\chi\)\(\alpha\)\(\pi\)\(\iota\)\(o\)\(\iota\)\(\alpha\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\nu\)) you, so 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 hearted, forgiving (Xapio\(\iota\)on\(\iota\)v\(\iota\)v) each other even as Christ forgave (\(\iota\)\(\chi\)\(\alpha\)\(\pi\)\(\iota\)\(o\)\(\iota\)\(\alpha\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(\nu\)) you." Eph. 4:31, 32.

And let us compare some of the uses of "\(\phi\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\iota\)\(v\)" and see the differences.

"And forgive, (\(\alpha\)\(\phi\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\iota\)\(v\)) we our debts as we forgive (\(\alpha\)\(\phi\)\(i\)\(n\)\(\kappa\)\(\iota\)\(\kappa\)\(\iota\)\(\iota\)\(v\)) our debtors." Matt. 6:12.

"For if ye forgive (\(\alpha\)\(\phi\)\(i\)\(n\)\(v\)) one another their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive (\(\alpha\)\(\phi\)\(i\)\(n\)\(v\)) you." Matt. 6:14. of v.13. This word means more than
having charity toward. It means an actual removal of the wrong. We must help the man to get rid of that condition of heart that makes him do a wrong to us. This is what God is doing for us. In order to do this we
will have to have charity or grace toward the man, even as God does for us.

And Jesus, being their faith, said unto
the sick of the palsy, Arise, be of good cheer;
thy sins are forgiven (Matt. 9:2)." Matt. 9:2. See Vs. 5, 6. Also Mark 2:5, 6; Luke 5:22, 23.

"All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be
how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive (Mark 11:20) him?" Matt. 18:21.

That saying they may hear, and not pervert;
and hearing, they may learn and not understand;
but at any time they should learn and it be
13:14, 15; "and I should heal (Mark 1:41) them". And
Matt. we have a quotation from Isa. 6:9, 10.
But Jesus in Mark 4:12 interprets it (ver. 16) by
Matt. 13:14-15. This is significant.

Therefor I say unto thee, because thou had
and many are forgiven (Mark 11:20) her,
because she loved much, to whom little is forgiven (a φιλότιμος) he loved much. And he said to her, thy sins are forgiven (a φιλότιμος) he loved much. But he said to her, thy sins are forgiven (a φιλότιμος) he loved much.

23:34. And he meant much more than that God should close his eyes to their sinful condition, and say they must not sin more. Jesus' real prayer is that God should lead them out of their real condition, turn from it, and become good men. If the text meant only "how much to," the words here need Xαρίσκω.

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

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

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

From these scriptures, 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 bro-
pronouncing the guilty not guilty. It means the complete removal of all sin and its results from the soul - as through cleansing of the soul and giving it new and life - the cure of the soul. Often in all of these passages is transposed 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 even living in the soul, the forgiven [taking away] must also take place there. As long as the soul's disorder remains, as pronouncing of sin forgiven can do any good, and it would be as lie, as the pronouncing 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 com-
stantly to bring us back to him. He has many
means of grace which, if not used, but used, we
would make more rapid progress in the process
of our purification. Shall we fail in this work
then would sin be more powerful than good. No.
the cannot fail, but will accomplish that which
He desired—viz. To bring together n all things
in Christ, both which are on the heaven and
which are on earth, even in him. Eph 1:10.
— Αφ. 2: 1, 2. —

1. Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράψω ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ ἀμέντητε. Καὶ εὰν τῆς ἁμαρτίας, παράκλητον ἔχουν πρὸς τὸν πατήρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δικαιοῦν. 2. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδίως ἐστὶν πρὸς τὸν ἀμαρτήτων ἡμᾶς, ὥστε πρὸς τὰν κυρίαν διὰ μίν εἰς καὶ πρὸς ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.

— Parallel Passages —

1. Παράκλητον ἔχουν... 14:16. Ὁσαν παράκλητον ἔστω ὑμῖν.
2. Πρὸς τὸν πατήρα 14:28. ὁ δὲ πάντων τῶν ἀμαρτίων τοῦ κόσμου.
3. Πρὸς ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου 4:42. ὁ δὲ παντὶ τὸν κόσμου.
4. Πρὸς τὸν πατήρα 11:9, 32. Ἐπροφθαμον δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναστήσας ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔνθισεν διὰ ὅλου τοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τέλη τοῦ θανάτου τὰ διακριτοκρατίαν ουγιάς ἄνεντος.
Grammatical and Lexical.

Ver. 1. Tekhia = the diminution of Tekvai, and is a tender and affectionate appellation. In the New Testament this word is always used in the plural.

ταύτα γὰρ τοὺς λαοὺς τῶν οίκων τοῦ θεοῦ. The last word John's first use of the singular - "I write," of Cap. 1:4. "I write." It was un ἄναπτον, denotes his perfunctory writing.

μακάκενος. The article is not used with this word here. Cf. Jno. 14:16. ὁ λόγος μακάκενος. Why should this word be translated "Advocate" here, and in Jno. 16:7, "translated "Comforter"? ἡμεῖς ἢν ἐπάλληλον "called to one's side." hence the idea of help, "an helper" - an assistant.

τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς. We have here the same expression as in Cap. 1:3. Cf. Jno. 1:1, 7. τοῖς ἐκ 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. 1:3. - I prefer the purely local idea here. Our Helper is in the very center of power for love with God.

Aíkast. On notes on Cap. 1:9-3:34.

Ver. 2. Ἐκ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἑορτάσαι. of Cap. 4:10. These are the only two places in the New Testament where this word is used. Yet have the word ἐκ προσωπικός used in Luke 18:13. ὁ ὄργανος, ἐκ προσωπικός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; and in Hab. 2:17. ὃ ὁ ὄργανος καὶ τῶν πατέρων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ τῶν ἐκ τῶν γένεσιν καὶ τῶν ἀρχαιῶν τὰ ἡ ἡμέρας.
τὸν θρόνον, τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν ἔλεγχον τῆς ἀναρρίστης τοῦ θεοῦ.
And we have ἵλερηθρὸν καὶ τῷ Ἱν. 3:15. ὂν ἐπεβλέπετο δῷ τὸν ἱλατήριον δᾶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀληθείας, καὶ μὲν Ἰσ. 4:16. ὑπάρχει δὲ διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ δόγματα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀναρρίστης τῆς ἱλατήριον.

See Numb. 5:1. τὸν τοῦ θρόνον τοῦ ἱλατήριον [ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς ἱλατήριον, τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ], δὲ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (7:3) τὴν (7:3) καθ' ἀυτὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ θεοῦ; And Ezekiel 44:3. προσφέρεται θεοῦν (44:3). And Proverbs 10:17. ἱλατήριον translated in K. J. "Κατασκευάζεται", etc. etc.

πρὸ τοῦ ἀναρρίστης ἀὑρίων. If this passage were to mean what it is said to mean—

"appearing God" we should have to have three ἡμετέρων τοῦ θρόνου; instead of this we have πρὸ τοῦ θρόνου, instead of this we have ἀπειρών εἰς τοὺς ἁμαρτίαν, and shall with ἀναρρίστης ἀὑρίων and not with ἀπειρών. This is significant.

οὐκ ἔστιν τὸν ἁμαρτίαν εἰς τετραγωνίαν. How we have the same idea of the parallel passage of

Jno. 11:51, 52.
Exegetical

Rev. 1. "My little children." John used the spiritual faith of their personal and to take a special interest in their welfare. On this account he writes to them that he may help them.

"these things I write to you." We have in this chapter a change from the plural "we" to the singular "I". He came 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 Marknight suggests—"either their not sinning habitually, or their not sinning misfully." The time must come when we will live without sin. That time had 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 needed sin and sin needs: "And if any one does sin we have an Helper with the Father—Jesus Christ the justified one."
This is translated in K. G. "We have an Advocate."

The idea that is read into this passage is that we have an advocate (lawyer) who is willing
to change the decision of the Father in reference
to man's guilt. What do we mean by "advocate"?
The lawyer had been made an advocate between
all persons. "Helper" is the last word I had
because it does not designate the kind of
work that the lord. But which the lord
must be in harmony with this character.

Either one of these things is necessary:

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

2. To get us free from sin.

This letter teaches us to be free from sin, and
we have "an Helper" to this end, in the seat
of all power, wisdom, and goodness. What do
we have many helpers here in this world, but
how make they are as compared to him. He
can only help us to do what is right. Would
he be right for him to try to get God to look
with pleasure on sin? Does God need to be
pleased with us in order that He may do the right
thing by us? "Shall not the judge graciously
the earth do right?" Imagine God as a judge
sitting on the bench, and think as a lawyer.
pleading the case, trying to make the true God give a verdict of "not guilty" on 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 us in sin, and so nothing is left but that Jesus is helping us to get free from sin. Jesus is "God's Helper," and yet the Bible tells us that the will send "another helper." The Scriptures do not separate the Spirit—Jesus and God as we sometimes think. They are all working together for the salvation of all the creatures. Jesus is fitted and had the right to help us get free from sin. De Ritis on cap. 1:9.

"What we need to get rid of sin is not a lawyer but a physician."—Peter Voge. A lawyer couldn'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 us all cured or not with sin. Even though God would take us to a city with "golden streets and purely gates" in that condition we could not be happy. Sin and misery and inescapably connected, and so virtue
And happiness. And happiness in sin is an absolute impossibility.

Ver. 2. And this is that which is making separation concerning our souls. The maim which is here translated - that which is making separation, and here and else in Eph. 5:10, had in it the idea of brightness, hence "united" or "separation" is a good translation of it. It is not the actor - the who - but rather the means - that united. It makes good or修复 the wrong that sin has done, and this, if known, must take place within us.

The leading idea was that the gods in their normal condition are not favorable to mans, hence man had to appease them. He have as referred to this in Gen. 3:1. When they had sent to the house of the god, things and Argum 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 1 Sam. 13:11, 12. When Saul feared an attack of the Philistines, and he seemed troubled to cause he had not entreated the face of the Lord.
That Saul says about this law ns influenced 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, 31-17, is doubtfull in meaning, perhaps it meant it smote the face.

Nagelbach says, that the heathens always followed this verb with the definite. A heathen would not talk of sin being appeased. They had no such conception. Jesus then is the meanst thing which God is pleased with not with us in sin, but through them 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 ours only, but also concerning (that) of the whole world. It is difficult for some now to believe this. 'It is an easy thing for God to be merciful to me and to my friends, but I can't see how the same act to the man I don't like' is the language of the flesh.
— Καπ. 2: 3-6. —

3. Ἐν τῶν γενώσκων ὅτι ἴσωκαμιν αὑτῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐντελεῖς αὐτῶν τηρήσων. 4. ὃ λέγων ὅτι ἴσωκα αὑτῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐντελεῖς αὐτῶν ἐν τηρήσω, γεύσομαι ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἢ ἀλήτως ἢ ἐκ τῶν. 5. ὃς ἐδὲ ἐν τηρήσω αὑτῶ τὸν λόγον, ἄλλως ἐν τούτῳ ἢ ἐγκαθέν τὸν ἑαυτῷ τινιδείην ται. Ἐν τούτῳ γενώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῶ ἐστίν. 6. ὃ λέγων ἐν αὐτῶ ἑλευθέρω, ὃς ἔχεις ἐκεῖνος περιπατεῖν καὶ αὐτῶς ὅτι εἰς τριστερὰ.
Grammatical and Lexical.

Verse 3. év trónov refers to what follows - év tás évkánov - perfect. λογίον known.
- év trónov refers to James.
- év tás évkánov ékko ἑπάνων. The Cod. Sin. has ἑπάνων here instead of ἑπάνων. John always used ἑπάνων not ἑπάνων except in Cap. 5:2 we have ἑπάνων and τάς ἑπάνων ἑπάνων, and times when the verb ἑστήκαν is used, he used the verb ἐπέστηκαν. See Jcs. 14:21, 15:14. ἑπάνων = to observe carefully. It had in it the idea of care - and refined particularly to the extent of the ἑπάνων, while ἑπάνων meant rather to make. It had in it the idea of attention. ἑπάνων is better. ἑπάνων has nearly the same idea - that of guarding.

Verse 4. ὅ λογίον ὅ εὐθύνη ἑυκάριον ἑυκάριον, καὶ ἐν τήν ὤν ἐν Ἑβραίῳ ἀκρότητα.
- ἑυκάριον ἑυκάριον is stronger than ἑυκάριον ἐν Ἑβραίῳ καὶ ἐν τήν ὤν ἐν Ἑβραίῳ ἀκρότητα. ἑυκάριον shows the emphatic idea. This character.

Verse 5. ὅ λόγον = all the expression of God in Israel.
- ἐν τήν = note its emphatic position.
- ἑν τήν ὄνομα - is completed. perfect tense.
- ἐν τήν refers back and is connected with the ἐν τήν των ὃς.


év avrò ἐν θεῷ in the same mind thought as
tó πάντα ἐν δύναμιν ἐν θεῷ

ἐν δύναμιν refers to Christ. Whereas it can
and đoue refers to God too - for "all in Christ"
and Christ is God."

Ver 6. ὑπέρ ἐν ἐν θεῷ ἐν πᾶσιν ὑπόστασις
denotes an obligation. ὑπόστασις in direct
discourse for all and also in v. 9. John usually
had ὑπόστασις in direct discourse. See Cap. 1:6, 8, 10,

ὁ λόγος - T.H. omit. but is wanting in the A.B.
Vulgate. Stephenson makes the thought complete.
κ. 1
Exegetical.

Vers. 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 writing. It was a living reality to him, and it may be to us also.

"That we shall know Him." The verb know is perfect "we have known." He knows anything only when it has 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 experienced. After Paul had served Him for years, and had preached Him to many, yet his desire was, "Not that I knew Him, but the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death; that I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3:10, 11.

Jesus is the object of the knowing, but the mind becomes as part of the one knowing. He must realize Him working in us and fulfill Him lifting us up day by day. A moral passage.
real knowledge will not be here at all. It must be vital. Jesus' life must flow into ours. Then we know him. To teach this we must travel the same road that He did. He is "the way." This way leads through death—"he is 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 'commandment' in the sense of a law. It cannot be if Paul was right when he said, 'We are not under law.' One command would be this law. But if we take it as 'instruction,' then it points Jesus as the teacher and we His disciples. learned He is always we have to do. We are in motion. He also as in us. He has our life from Him. If we are in Him, completely, He has our life from Him. If we are in Him, we will keep His instruction. This basis of this relation is love. If we were perfectly assimilated to Him, we would keep His instruction perfectly. If we were perfectly assimilated to Him, we would keep His instruction perfectly. If we were perfectly assimilated to Him, we would keep His instruction perfectly. This is a marvelous relation.
Ver. 4. This one saying that I have known him, and not keeping this instruction, is a liar.

It does not make any difference what our pretentious may be about knowing him, if we fail to keep this instruction. It is evident that we do not know him. This can only be true unless 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 was 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 emptiness and hypocrisy.

Ver. 5. "But those kept of him the word." "The word" 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 reference to us at least. And we have Jesus teaching and
doing something not in harmony with His nature, or something not necessary to us. He is the way 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 love. If one did not have love for God, which means the love of God’s character, he would not pay any attention to the Word. God is seeking to create in us

or love for Him in order that that may lead us to keep this instruction and come back to Him. The Holy Spirit of Counsel is before all of this. “This 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,” 1:1. By keeping this Word, “that we are in Him” less takes the place of “that we had known Him” in v.3 and is equivalent to
that expression. It brings out the relationship more clearly, and there is less danger of superficial reading and thinking.

Ver. 6. "He who says that he remains in him, ought likewise also to walk, as that one walked." Think aloud to the outward what the mind by His daily walk, as if we are in Him and the mind, we must also show that by our walk. This is the mind and we are to remain in Him at the condition of knowing fruit. Deut. 12:1-5.

Of course we are in God too. for Jesus is in harmony with God. Thus we do not walk as Jesus did we are departing from them. We can not be in them and away from them at the same time. As that is not make a profession of being in them or are obligated 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 nicety of thought and can change 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 and translators of the New Testament. The aim of this discussion is to show the use of ἔρθεν. According to Ammonius Synonyms, the words meaning "command" in the Greek are ἔρθεν, ἔφασκεν, ἐφώμονος, ἐξοίκεσεν and its compounds.

ἔρθεν - to command - designates royal orders emanating from a superior; ἔφασκεν - to charge - is the order of a military commander, which is passed along the line of
that expression. It brings out the relationship more
clearly, and then there is less danger for superfici-
ial reading and thinking.
Verse 6. "This I say, not that we remain in him,
ought himself also as to walk, as that we walked."
This shewed to the world what the word by
his daily walk, and if we are in him and
his word, we must also shew that by our
walk. He is "the vine," and we are to remain
in him, as the branches of training fruit. De-
Jer. 15:1-16. Of course we are in God too, for
Jesus is in him walking with God. Thus we do
not walk as Jesus did, but are departing
from Him. We can not be in Him and away
from Him at the same time. So that if we
make a profession of being in Him we are
obligated by the very nature of the case to walk
just as He walked. This, of course, means
that not "walk in the light."
The exact meaning of words plays an important part in exegesis. It exposes nicety of thought and can differ 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. In 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 ἔρθων. According to Smith's Greek Synonymal the words meaning "command" in the Greek are ἔρθω, ἐκβάλλω, ἐκθέλω, ἔτειλα, ἱππότης, and its compounds.

ἔρθω - to command - designates verbal orders emanating from an authority; ἐκβάλλω - to charge - is the order of a military commander, which is passed along the line of
had authorized; evangel—was employed by those whose office or position invested them with rights and driven to the content of the command like our word "instruct"; ταὐτον—"the same"; part—is suggested, not in connected with the "part." Both ταὐτον and ταὐτοί are different from ταὐτόν in denoting fixed obligations rather than specific instructions.

With me turn to the New Testament and find that there are distinctives and marks. ταὐτόν occurs almost twenty-five times; ταὐτόν, twenty-seven times; ταὐτον and its compounds, twenty-six times; and ταὐτόν, twenty times. I give a few proof of the first three simply to show their use.

Acts 1:8. "And when Jesus said, 'Go and teach all nations—commanded (πορεύωσιν) them to go and out of the council, they conferred among themselves.'

Acts 4:16. "Then, twelve men and gathered and commanded (παραγγέλας) them (charged them) saying "Go! Matt 10:5. "And then mightest charge (παραγγέλας) some that why teach no other doctrines." I Tim. 1:3. 4:12.

ταὐτόν. "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had
for Paul and Barnabas had no small dis-

remission and disputations with them, they ac-

signed (ἐποίησεν) Paul and Barnabas and certain
others of them to go up to the Apostles and

elders at Jerusalem, about this question:"

Acts 15:2.

And compare with this a few refined
scriptural phrase of John 14:21. "For God com-
manded (ἐποίησεν) saying, Honor thy father

and thy mother." Matt. 15:4. "And he command-

(ἐποίησεν) the Apostles to watch." Matt. 13:34.
But that the world may know that I loved
the Father; and as the Father gave me com-
mmandment (ἐποίησεν) even so I do." John
14:31. "For as God the Lord commanded (ἐποίη-

σεν) me saying, I have set the Son to be a
light to the Gentiles, that they should bear
good-samaritan unto the ends of the earth." 

Acts 13:47.

The word ἐποίησεν, derived from the verb
of ἐποίησα, occurs more than fifty
times, being found in all parts of the
New Testament. In some places ἐποίησεν
signifies a command like ἐποίησεν σοι ἢ
ἐποίησεν, 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 (333) I give you, that ye love one another.” John 13:34. Do love subject to Command? John 15:10,12. If “333 Command” can be singular and plural be used in different? Act. 17:15. The relation of the partie forbids Command. Eph. 2:15. “Instruct us in the fear of Command.” Col. 4:10. The relation of the partie against forbid Command. 1 Tim. 6:14. If Commandment, what is it? 1 Cor. 14:37. The Apostle stated that he was writing the Lord’s instruction - 333. In false Peter 3:12 the reader is exhorted to “call to mind the instruction of our apostles.” 2 Peter 2:21. Which Commandment? Peter 3:14. 14. The Commandment is based on Daniel 3:7. And other passages that might be added. Also we clearly that this word was used in the same sense that was new “instruction” and should be so translated.

The Old Testament is a book of Commandments and that shall not in the doing of which one should live, but the New Command is instruction. Here is no must arrangement and it is at personal will. Our life is in
Christian. He is our Teacher—our Guide. Man is out of touch with Him today, but tomorrow he is drawn by His instruction and regard toward 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 could he keep the New? If they are lower, the New was more perfect than the Old, and we are retrograding instead of progressing. Paul says: "Ye are not under laws but under grace." This does not mean that we are not under the Mosaic law as a rule; teach, but it means that we are not under any law. How many commands does it take to make a law? Do not our commandments? Perhaps some may ask the 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. We violate as higher relations.

How we think of the relation of Jesus.
so we— as teacher— no the learner— it is a hotter relation than it otherwise could be. He tells us all because we are no longer servants, but "friens"— i.e. from his standpoint, from our human, after we have done all, we shall still say, "am not unprofitable servant." Oh how much we need teachin'! As many dark, perplexing 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 teachin' us how to live— and it will become a new book to us. ——
Αισθητά, εκείνη της καινής γράφας έναν, έσκισε τον ξανά
αυτόν. Εγώ, ο διδάσκων, είχα δει έναν εκείνην, της πάλι, την ακριβέστερη.
II. Να μας γίνει ένας εκείνης, της πάλι, την ακριβέστερη, εκείνην, την ακριβέστερη.
III. Εμείς οι γραφείς, της πάλι, την ακριβέστερη, εκείνην, την ακριβέστερη.
IV. Λόγω της ακριβεστερής εκείνης, της πάλι, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
V. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
VI. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
VII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
VIII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
IX. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
X. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XI. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XIII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XIV. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XV. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XVI. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XVII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XVIII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XIX. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XX. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXI. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXIII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXIV. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXV. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXVI. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXVII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXVIII. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXIX. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
XXX. Εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή, εκείνην, την ακριβεστερή.
Stammatical and Lexical.


Ἐρωτά προκειμένου instruction here, ἐρωτά ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐρωτά ὃς ἡ λέγει.

Some texts insert ἀπὸ τοῦ at the close of the same but the best authorities omit it.

Thus John used the masculine word λέγει instead of the neuter as in Cap. 11.1.

Ver. 8. ἐκεῖνος, on the other hand, again: belongs to ἐννοεῖν.

ὃς refers, not to ἐκεῖνος, for that is feminine, but to the contents of the ἐρωτά ὡς καί σὺν. "Which thing is true!"

καὶ οὐκ ἦν χειρὶ ὑμῶν ἑκατὸν λίραν, and some texts have it, but it had less authority than ἐκεῖνος. He would have expected John to include himself in this.

Ὄροι, a particle used merely to introduce the context of the ἐρωτά ὡς καί σὺν, equivalent to our "viz." or "namely." Some make it causal here but there is no ground for it.

ἐπάγω ὡς - "pursuant time - is passing away."

ἀλλὰ ὡς "also time - is shining."

ὥστε "already" and not ὡς "as if, as."

The Vulgate falsely renders ὡς καί σὺν ἐπάγω: trans. "et sic invenit." And Luther translated it - die Finnerniss ist Vorgang. He found almost all mankind lost retained. This is a continuum.
forced and that is commonly expressed by the present tense.

Ver. 9. ὁ λῦσιν — see Vs. 4, 6.

Ver. 10. ἀγαπᾶν is connected with ὅσως as ἀγαπᾶν is with ὀκορᾶ.

οὐκ ἐσθίειν — a purely Biblical word-occurring some twenty-five times in the Greek O.T. and fifteen quotations included in the N.T. It is the LXX for עִיְּנֵה (a noun-ascendant) and שֹׁאָר. It properly means או "taste" or "eat" any un-cleaned food, as the same word sometimes used in the N.T. (1 Tim. 4:3). Our word "scandal" is a transliteration of the word.

Ver. 11. ἐν τῇ ὄκορῇ ποτίσῃ is a strengthening by the addition clauses to ἐν τῇ ὄκορῇ ποτίσῃ, and ὡς ὤφης καὶ ὀφηγήσῃ.

ὁτί — ἵνα is causal "because".
Exegetical

Ver. 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 had in his child.

"I do not write to you new instruction." This cannot be "commandment" here. There is no sign of a commandment in this Epistle, but it abounds in much beautiful instruction. What he writes is not new in that he had 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 have 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 in 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. "What is profitable to instruct" as in v. 2 is represented 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 in whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without (the speaking)?" He must hear Jesus himself in order to know him. He can otherwise only know about him. He can "know him" in order that he 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 that which they already had heard— the Logos which was from the beginning. He had heard the voice— "from the beginning" at the close of the verse. 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 he had given in the Gospel, yet he has given us here
new inner development of that outward teaching which is new, and will always continue to be new, and to this he called their attention, "which is true in him and in you." The relation which regard here to the context of the "new instruction." The content of this new teaching is true in him and in us. We would have expected John to have said "us" instead of "you." The content 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 closed, 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?

Think of his own life passed through this same process of development that we do. He "knew," he "grew," he "increased," and such phrases indicate this clearly.

For is this all a thing of the past? Paul says that he was "filled" with that which is lacking of the affliction which is 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. As it is "true in Him."

This does not mean that God had not sent any light to men before this time. He had always been doing as in Adam's creation, and as soon as God began to send light, darkness began to fade away. It has been a slow process, but it is best in work. The trouble with us is that we "love darkness rather than light," and "will not come to the light." Whenever real light came it brought not a higher revelation, or 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 own life? "I am the one making all things new." He becomes a "new man" and yet we are the same individual that we were before. This is the great mystery.

Rev. 1:3. The one saying, "He is on the light and
"Hating his brother is in darkness until now." This is the deduction that John draws from the preceding statements. It must manifest itself in the life. One cannot be in the light and hate his brother at the same time. Where hate enters the heart, darkness enters with it and light departs.

Ver. 10: "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and abasceit is not in him." Light and love and peace together. Do not confound all three is in love. Love is the light of life. Yet 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 one can trust him. If it were "kindness" it would be easier for me can appear kind when there is no real affection, but with love that would be difficult.

Ver. 11: "He that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and doeth not know wherein he goeth, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes." He not only is in the darkness but he walketh in it—i.e. he does the things which belong to the realm of darkness. He does not know wherein he goeth, because the darkness hath 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 darkened hath blinded his eyes," while Paul in II Thess. 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.