

I JOHN

Book note for 1 John

First John was written to counter the gnostics who were a very early heresy, so early, in fact, that modernists think it was the original Christianity.

Chapter note for 1 John 1

1 He describeth the person of Christ, in whom we have eternal life, by a communion with God: 5 to which we must adjoin holiness of life, to testify the truth of that our communion and profession of faith, as also to assure us of the forgiveness of our sins by Christ's death.

1 Jn 1:2

“Manifest” implies the existence of a list.

1 Jn 1:6

The first of seven tests of righteousness. Next ones are v. 8; 2:4, 6, 9, 15, 29.

1 Jn 1:8

The second of seven tests of righteousness. Others are at v.6; 2:4, 6, 9, 15, 29. Pertaining to the flesh, the “old nature.” Contrast 5:18.

1 Jn 1:9

See 2 Cor. 2:6-11 for an example. Many modern religious leaders pretend that this only applies to lost people. That is Roman Catholicism, pure and simple. Sinning Christians are to repent of their sins (see 2 Cor. 12:20-21) and confess them (1 Cor. 11:31). Sins committed against God should be confessed only to God. Wrongs against a person should be confessed to them. Sins against the congregation should be confessed to the church (Ac. 5; Mat. 18:16-17). God's forgiveness is not a substitute for man's forgiveness, at times we may need both.

Chapter note for 1 John 2

1 He comforteth them against the sins of infirmity. 3 Rightly to know God is to keep his commandments, 9 to love our brethren, 15 and not to love the world. 18 We must beware of seducers: 20 from those deceits the godly are safe, preserved by perserverance in faith, and holiness of life.

1 Jn 2:1

Compare Rom. 8:26.

1 Jn 2:2

4:9. Contra Calvin's limited atonement.

1 Jn 2:4

The third of seven tests of righteousness. Others are at 1:6, 8; 2:6, 2:9, 15, 29.

1 Jn 2:5

Keeping the word implies preserving it, too.

1 Jn 2:6

The fourth of seven tests of righteousness. Others are at 1:6, 8; 2:4, 2:9, 2:15, 2:29.

1 Jn 2:7

2 Jn. 1:6.

1 Jn 2:8

Jn. 13:34. The critical text says "darkness is past" should be imperfect, "darkness is passing away." The problem is that the light is present and is not increasing, at least not once the Scripture is complete. Actually, the tense is the third person singular present indicative passive. The "is passing away" is actually the linear present, not the imperfect of the linear past which would be "was passing away." The verb itself is an example of a deponent Greek verb, passive in form but active in meaning.

1 Jn 2:9

The fifth of seven tests of righteousness. Others are at 1:6, 1:8; 2:4, 6, 15, 29.

1 Jn 2:10

Jn. 8:2.

1 Jn 2:13

Jn. 15:27.

1 Jn 2:15

The sixth of seven tests of righteousness. Others are at 1:6, 1:8; 2:4, 2:6, 2:9, 2:29.
Mat. 6:24; Lu. 16:13; Jas. 4:4; Jn. 15:19.

1 Jn 2:16

Parallels Pr. 4:23-27. Satan's trinity of temptation, see Mat. 4:1 v.f., Lam. 3:51, and Gen. 3:6. Satan hinders, accuses, slanders, casts doubt, and tempts using these three tactics.

-- lust of the flesh = consuming passion to do

Answer with deny self. (Mat 16:24).

-- lust of the eyes = compelling urge to have

Answer with take up one's cross. (Mat. 16:24).

-- pride of life = constant thrust to be

Answer with "follow Christ." (Mat. 16:24).

1 Jn 2:18

Antichrist is one who is against Christ. The definition is in 2:22 and 4:3. Antichrist is mentioned five times in four verses; (2 Jn. 1:7 is last).

1 Jn 2:19

Believers abide in the Lord; they abide in the truth, even the words of God. Those who leave believe the Bible has errors or is translated wrongly.

1 Jn 2:22

That is, the office of Christ, the one anointed to be high priest and king. Further definition in 4:3, previous (and first) mention in 2:18.

1 Jn 2:23

A note on the use of the italics in the Authorized Holy Bible. Contrary to modern mythology, the italicized words cannot be ignored or removed without damage to the text. The translators included them precisely to *clarify the meaning in the original*. In other words, so that there'd be no chance of a misunderstanding. This is the exact opposite of what is taught today. True enough, there may be no corresponding word in the original, but such is the nature of translation. When the translators disagreed, the reading with less merit was placed in the margin, not added in italics.

Likewise there are times when a word should not be translated from the original. For example, in Greek, the word "that" quite often has the definite article before it. Imagine "and the peace of the God the that passeth all understanding..." for Php. 4:7.)

In this verse, the italicized clause has two words, "hath" and "also," which are present in the Greek but shown in italics. About this verse, Paul Heaton, in his booklet entitled *What About those Italicized Words?* (1995, pp. 25-26) cites Harry Ironside: "Since the New Testament was translated in 1611 many other manuscripts have been discovered, and they all contain these words." The only mistake Charles Ryrie finds with this verse is the use of the italics: "The last part of the verse is apparently a genuine part of the original text and should not be italicized (as in the AV) as if it were not genuine."

1 Jn 2:24

That is, the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, namely, the gospel of grace.

1 Jn 2:27

Isa. 54:13; Jer. 31:34; Jn. 6:45; 14:6.

The anointing is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Modern versions such as the NIV change "abide" to "remain." Abide means to wait patiently for, to dwell or sojourn; which is done by a living being. Such is not so for "remain." Furthermore, the Critical texts change "any man" to "anyone," leading to a contradiction with the next clause and the injunctions to study the scriptures. In that, we still need the Spirit, the anointing, to teach us. The new versions weaken the text further by changing "truth" to "real" and "false" to "counterfeit." Shades of Pilate's "What is truth?"

1 Jn 2:28

Jn. 15:4.

1 Jn 2:29

The seventh of seven tests of righteousness. Others are at 1:6, 1:8; 2:4, 2:6, 2:9, 2:15.
That is, there is no righteousness outside of God.

Chapter note for 1 John 3

1 He declareth the singular love of God towards us, in making us his sons: 3 who therefore ought obediently to keep his commandments, 11 as also brotherly to love one another.

1 Jn 3:2

Col. 3:3.

Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18; Psa. 17:15; Col. 3:3-4.

1 Jn 3:3

Cf. Jn. 15:3.

1 Jn 3:4

Commit means to do, to perform or perpetrate, such as “to commit murder.” It can also mean to put in charge or to entrust. These definitions have significance in v. 9.

1 Jn 3:6

Because his sins are immediately forgiven (2:1) and we only sin by not abiding in him (Col. 3:3).

1 Jn 3:7

Rom. 4:5; 5:17; 6:13, 16; 8:1.

1 Jn 3:9

V. 4. 1 Pet. 1:23. Some say “commit” should be “practice,” meaning to become proficient in, but “appointed” in Heb. 3:2 is the same Greek word; try substituting *practiced* in that context. Think more along the lines of being committed to sin.

1 Jn 3:10

Rom. 10:3.

1 Jn 3:12

Cain, the world (including unbelieving Jews), slew Abel, that is Jesus the righteous.

1 Jn 3:15

As Cain slew Abel (Gen. 4:2-8) and the Jews slew Christ. Note that hatred is equated with murder, whether or not one actually commits the act.

Jas. 4:2. See note to Jer. 17:9.

1 Jn 3:17

Pr. 21:13; Jas. 2:15.

1 Jn 3:23

Ac. 17:30. The belief is pleasing.

Chapter note for 1 John 4

1 He warneth them not to believe all teachers, who boast of the Spirit, but to try them by the rules of the catholick faith: 7 and by many reasons exhorteth to brotherly love.

1 Jn 4:2

Rom. 8:9; 1 Cor. 12:3.

Re. "come in the flesh": In modern "bible" versions, the word "begotten" is omitted in most, if not all passages where it refers to Jesus Christ. For example, the NIV cuts it out of John 1:14, 18; and 3:16, etc. as well as from v. 9 below. These do not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (i.e., begotten) and so these versions are not of God. This they do even though it leaves them with the problem, as in v. 9, for example, where the NIV says: "He sent his one and only Son into the world that we might live through him," while in Luke 3:38 they say that Adam is the son of God. How can Jesus be God's "one and only Son" if Adam, too, was his son? Yet "begotten" is rejected. Thus these versions are not of God!

If asked if it believes this, an ungodly spirit will answer "yes," but it cannot frame the admission if asked, nor will it volunteer the information. Generally speaking, he will change the tense, "Is come" implies he's still here (in the form of the Holy Ghost); "has come" does not imply that.

1 Jn 4:3

This definition of antichrist expands on the one in 2:22. 5:20 is a variant. The next and last reference is 2 Jn. 1:7, q.v.

1 Jn 4:8

3:15; Lev. 19:18. This is why Christian nations, excluding Roman Catholic nations that claim to be Christian but are pagan, give most generously to friend and even to foe.

1 Jn 4:9

Rom. 5:8.

Jn. 1:14. Modern version say "one and only son," see Jn. 3:16 for critique of that change. Also see note to v. 2.

1 Jn 4:10

2:2.

1 Jn 4:12

Perfectured by shewing his mercy; Rom. 9:23. The end is the bond of perfectness, that is, charity of Col. 3:14.

1 Jn 4:15

Compare this with the statement of 5:1.

1 Jn 4:20

1 Pet. 1:8.

Chapter note for 1 John 5

1 He that loveth God loveth his children, and keepeth his commandments: 3 which to the faithful are light, and not grievous. 9 Jesus is the Son of God, able to save us, 14 and to hear our prayers, which we make for ourselves, and for others.

1 Jn 5:1

Contrast 4:15.

Many profess that Jesus is the Christ, yet they rely on their works, or on Mary, or priests, or popes, or traditions to get them to heaven. So a straight profession is not meant in this verse. One must believe that Jesus is the Christ, *in toto*.

All the above doubters profess that Jesus is the anointed, or Christ, but they differ on what is meant by “the anointed one of God.” The first usage of anoint is found in Gen. 31:13, where we note that priests and kings are anointed. So Christ, meaning God’s anointed one, is both king (Messiah) and high priest (Heb. 8:1), that is, he is Lord of all (Ac. 10:36). Each of the above professions, in one way or another, deny the sufficiency of the Christ, though confessing Jesus is the Christ. Still others read this as Jesus *was* the Christ, as if he has delegated the office to someone else.

For first and all subsequent usages of “Messiah,” see Dan. 9:25; for first usage of “Christ,” see Mat. 1:1.

1 Jn 5:2

“Keep” signifies to retain possession of, to have as a supply, to provide with maintenance and support, to defend and preserve. See note to Gen. 2:15 for more.

1 Jn 5:3

2:7-8.

1 Jn 5:4

Jn. 16:33. If our faith be in Christ, then his faith is ours and ours is his. If we are thus grafted into that faith, we, too, will be resurrected as he was. However, if our faith be in ourselves, we have nothing but ourselves to hold on to, for Christ cannot grasp a faith that is not his; so there is no hope for eternal life in that.

1 Jn 5:6

Jn. 1:33.

1 Jn 5:7

Deu. 19:15; Job 16:19!

The Father spoke the Word, who breathed out the Holy Ghost, thus giving life to Adam and, by inspiration, the written word. The Word was begotten of the Father (Jn. 1:14) by the Holy Ghost (Mat. 1:18). The Father spoke the creation into existence.

This verse is (allegedly) not in the majority of Greek manuscripts. Nevertheless, its authenticity is confirmed by several sources to such an extent that even some Majority Text advocates change their tune and say it should be in the Bible. Martin Luther despised this verse, which is the strongest affirming the doctrine of the Trinity. He kept the verse out of his version during his lifetime but it was added to the text afterwards.

Its authenticity is said to have been doubted by Erasmus and Sir Isaac Newton. Tyndale’s Bible (1526) makes the omission most clear, since he placed the missing parts in parenthesis, “*(For there are three which bear record in heaven, the father, the word, and the holy ghost. And these three are one). For there are three which bear record (in earth:) the spirit, and water, and blood: and these three are one.*” Nevertheless, Wycliffe (ca. 1270) has it in his Latin-based translation. Here is a brief history of the evidence and controversy.

There are about 11 ancient manuscripts that testify of the verse, although only 6 have it within the main body of the text, and one of the manuscripts is now lost. These manuscripts are Erasmus’ Codex Britannicus (now missing, but its reading is preserved in Erasmus’ third edition), Codex Montfortianus (61 -- claimed, but not proven to be a forgery), Codex Regius (88), Codex Ravianus (omega 110), 221, 429, Codex Ottobonianus (629), 635, 636, 918, and 2318. It is found in all Latin manuscripts (8,000+), and in the Syriac Peshitta, a few Armenian manuscripts, and Georgian manuscripts. Tertullian (d. 220) alluded to the verse in his *Adversus Praxean*, (denied by modern scholarship), but Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) plainly quotes from the verse, as does Idacius Clarus (c. 350), Athanasius (350), and Jerome in his *Epistle to Eustochium* (450). Priscillian (d. 385) quotes it in *Liber Apolgeticus*,

as do two works by Vigilus of Thapsus (490); Cassiodorus (480-570) quotes it, as does Fulgentius of Ruspe (510) in his *Die Fide Catholica adv. Pintam*.

The ancient Latin treatise called the *Speculum* testifies that the verse was to be found in the Old Italic Bible, and it is also found in the Old Italic fragments Codex Freisingensis (q and r). The ancient creed known as *Expositio Fidei* quotes the verse as does the confession of faith drawn up by Eugenius of Carthage (484), the Council of Carthage having used the verse against Arianism in 415. The early Latin Vulgate manuscript Fuldensis (546) is one of the few Latin manuscripts which does not include 1 John 5:7 and is often cited by opponents because of this; yet it actually **quotes it in its prologue**, which begs the conclusion that Fuldensis is simply a corrupted copy of a Bible version that **did** contain the disputed passage in its main text, but the corrupters missed it in the prologue.

One of the main reasons why majority text advocates believe the verse authentic is that it would have been appallingly bad Greek for the Apostle not to have written it originally. Without verse 7, the passage ignores an important fundamental of Greek grammar -- and such terribly inferior grammar is not evidences in the rest of John's writings. Without the seventh verse, to quote R. L. Dabney, "...the masculine article, numeral, and particle ... are made to agree directly with three neuters -- an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty. But if the disputed words are allowed to stand, they agree directly with two masculines and one neuter noun ... where, according to a well-known rule of syntax, the masculines among the group control the gender over a neuter connected with them..." J. A. Moorman says of having verse 6 followed by verse 8, "If the passage is removed from the Greek text, the two loose ends will not join up grammatically."

There is a legend which relates how the verse was added into Erasmus' third edition. Supposedly Edward Lee and Diego Lopez Zuniga both attacked him for omitting this verse. Erasmus is said to have responded to the effect that if Lee could show one Greek manuscript which included the verse, he's include it in his next edition. Lee sent an Irish manuscript, Montfortianus, which Lee is now claimed to have forged.

What is on the record is different. Lee accused Erasmus of negligence for not consulting enough manuscripts regarding this verse. Erasmus replied, "Is it negligence and impiety if I did not consult manuscripts which were simply not in my reach?" He made no promise to include the verse. When he added the verse it was because he was convinced that it should be. On November 1, 1533, Juan Ginz Sepulveda wrote to Erasmus enclosing 365 readings from Codex Vaticanus which differed from Erasmus' texts, but he did not change his text for such evidence. If Erasmus was smart enough to refuse 365 readings from Vaticanus, how could he be tricked by Lee using a "monk's forgery with the ink barely dry"? By the way, Vaticanus is the foundation for all modern versions, even those such as the New King James that claim differently.

1 Jn 5:8

The capitalization of the word "spirit" arises from a disagreement between the Cambridge and Oxford editions of the Holy Bible. Cambridge capitalizes the word spirit here while Oxford does not. Scofield argues -- after deleting verse 7 in his note -- that this word is capitalized because it refers back to the Spirit of v. 6. The 1611 A.V. capitalized all three: spirit, water, and blood, so it does not resolve the matter. The case for not capitalizing spirit stems from Lu. 23:46 (which is not capitalized in any of the above versions), coupled with Jn. 19:34 (blood and water) and Rom. 8:16.

-- **SPIRIT**

This occurrence of "Spirit" should probably be lower case, even as God's Spirit bears "witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16).

1 Jn 5:9

I.e., this book is the witness of God. Thus it must be preserved by God since it is his witness.

1 Jn 5:11

I.e., the Bible.

1 Jn 5:15

Psa. 6:9.

1 Jn 5:16

Re. brother, context is believers.

"Sin unto death ..." Mat. 12:31; Mk. 3:29; Lu. 12:10. Some say this refers to physical death, e.g. 1 Cor. 11:30. Rev. 22:19.

1 Jn 5:18

Here pertaining to the new nature in contrast to 1:8.

1 Jn 5:20

“This is the true God” has Jesus Christ as its antecedent, thus the deity of Christ. Compare Isa. 9:6; also see 1 Tim. 3:16; Jn. 14:9; Psa. 2:7-8; 82:8; and Mat. 16:16-17. Especially see Jn. 10:30-33.