

Translation Guide 1
I John 1:1 - 2:18

Introduction to Koiné Greek

by Thor F. Carden

**In hopes that you, the student,
may better understand and enjoy
God's Beautiful Bible.**

Introduction to Koiné Greek

Copyright © 2007 by Thor F. Carden. All rights reserved.

All content of this training course not attributed to others is copyrighted, including questions, formatting, and explanatory text.

Scripture quotes in this work come from the **KJV** (King James Version) Public domain, unless it is marked as coming from one of these:

ASV (American Standard Version) Public Domain

Darby (Darby Translation) Public domain

DR (Douay-Rheims) 1899 American Edition - Public Domain

MSG (The Message) Scripture taken from The Message. Copyright 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 2000, 2001, 2002. Used by permission of NavPress Publishing Group.

NASB or **NASV** (New American Standard Bible) Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, Copyright © 1960,1962,1963,1968,1971,1972,1973,1975,1977,1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

NKJV (New King James Version) "Scripture taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

NLT Scripture quotations marked NLT are taken from the Holy Bible, New Living Translation, copyright 1996. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Wheaton, Illinois 60189. All rights reserved.

YLT (Young's Literal Translation) Public Domain

**This course is dedicated to
Fred Maynard
who helped me start on this road to understanding Greek.**

----- PRICE INFORMATION -----

This material is provided at no cost to those wanting to understand God's word better. If you use it in such a way that you make some money from it, please be sure to share what you can by giving it to your local Christian church or Christian School

This *Translation Guide* is made up of the notes I made as I translated I John. I translated each verse and then compared my work with the experts. I made many mistakes. I considered changing these but finally decided that it would be better not to. If I corrected all my mistakes you would simply have one more "expert" with whom you could compare your work. I did correct a few that would have been most confusing but for the most part left them here so that you could learn along with me from my errors. I also wanted you to see how much you could learn about Greek and about God's word from translating even if you do not do it perfectly. I hope this is an encouragement to you. The more you tolerate your own frustration and try to do this work before looking at the answers the more you will learn and the sooner you will learn it.

Use whichever form of the syntax sorting chart is easiest for you. I use the first one because it is easiest with a word processor. I suspect most students will use the third form.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO or PN:
Subj:		IO or PA:

IP/C	Verb	DO or PN
Subj		IO or PA

IP/C = Introductory Phrase and/or
Connector
Subj = Subject & Modifiers
Verb = Verb & Modifiers

DO = Direct Object & Modifiers
PN or PA = Predicate Nominative or Predicate
Adjective
IO = Indirect Object

--	--	--

Chapter 1 Verse 1 Ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, We always start with the verb. Write "was being" in the center box. What kind of verb is "was being?" We know from the lexicon that εἰμι is a linking verb. Once the verb is in place just start at the top and work it one word at a time. The first word is "which" and it is in the nominative or accusative case. This is a linking verb for which there can be no Direct Object so we can safely assume that in this case it is in the nominative case. Since it is the first nominative encountered we write "which" in the subject box. The next word after that is a preposition. We need to gather the whole phrase before we can sort it. The next word is a noun and is therefore the object of the preposition. The phrase then is "from beginning." Normally before we can sort a modifying phrase we need to see which other word it modifies. In this case, there are no more words in the clause. Since we must have a predicate nominative or a predicate adjective this phrase must be one of those. The predicate nominative needs a substantive phrase and the predicate adjective needs a modifying phrase so obviously the prepositional phrase must be the predicate adjective.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj: which	was being 3 rd Sng Imperfect Act Ind	PA: from beginning

So for this clause we have, "Which was being from the beginning," at least for now.

ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, The verb "are hearing" goes in the center column. "Hearing" is not a linking verb. The first word in the clause is "which" and although one possible case it has is nominative, it can not be the subject because the verb requires a first person subject and with very few exceptions only personal pronouns can have first or second person. "Which" must be the introductory conjunction. Write it in the top of the first column. Since we are now out of words in the clause, the subject must be extracted from the 1st person, plural number, of the verb. So we write "we" in the subject.

IP/C: which	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	are hearing 1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:

That gives us, "... which we are hearing ..."

ὁ ἐώρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, Write the verb "are seeing" in the middle column. The relative pronoun is in the wrong person to be the subject so write it in the top of the left hand column. The noun "the eyes" is modified by the possessive pronoun giving, "the eyes of us" or "the our eyes" neither of which sounds good in English. "Our eyes" sounds better. It is in the Dative case so it is the Indirect Object. In English that usually requires the helper word "to." Write "to our eyes" in the IO box. We are out of words in the clause and still have no subject so the subject must be extracted from the person and number of the verb. Write "we" in the subject box.

IP/C: which	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	are seeing 1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO: τῷ with our eyes

That gives us "Which we are seeing to our eyes..." which makes no sense. The other helper word in English for Indirect Object is "with." If we try that we get, "which we are seeing with our eyes..." which does make sense.

ὁ ἑθεασάμεθα The verb "looked" goes in the center column. "Look" is not a linking verb so label the DO and IO boxes. Looked is in the middle voice so we need to add a reflexive pronoun to it. It is 1st person, plural so add "ourselves" before the verb. The relative pronoun is in the wrong person to be the subject so write it in the top of the left hand column. Since we are now out of words in the clause, the subject must be extracted from the 1st person, plural number, of the verb. So we write "we" in the subject.

IP/C: which	Verb: ourselves looked saw	DO:
Subj: we	1st Plu Aorist Mid Ind	IO:

That gives us, "... which we ourselves looked ..." The verb "looked" seems to require a preposition in English -- "on which we ourselves looked" or "which we ourselves looked at." You can use either of those. I decided to look back at the range of sense rather than add words that are not there. That gave me, "... which we ourselves saw..."

καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· Write "touched" in the verb slot. It is not a linking verb so we label the right hand boxes DO and IO. "And" goes in the conjunction slot at the top left since it is introductory conjunction. We have another noun phrase in the form of article-noun-possessive. I render it "our hands." It is in the nominative case so it goes in the subject box on the lower left. Next after the verb which has already been sorted we have a preposition followed by two nouns, both with articles, and both in the genitive case. The preposition takes an object in the genitive case. Which of the nouns is the object and which is a possessive? Is it, "concerning the something said of life" or "concerning the life of something said?" To make this determination we need to look at the larger context. This book was written by John who earlier penned John 1:1, "In the beginning was the Word..." I the case of First John 1:1, therefore, I think I'll go with "concerning the Word of life." Which modifies the verb. Write it below "touched" in the center column.

IP/C: and	Verb: touched	DO:
Subj: our hands	concerning the Word of life	IO:
	3rd Plu Aorist Act Ind	

This clause then is, "and our hands touched concerning the Word of life."

So, for the verse we have "Which was being from the beginning, which we are hearing, which we are seeing with our eyes, which we ourselves saw, and our hands touched concerning the Word of life."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life;" (KJV)
- "What was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked at and touched with our hands, concerning the Word of Life--" (NASB)
- "That which was from [the] beginning, that which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes; that which we contemplated, and our hands handled, concerning the word of life;" (DARBY)
- "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life" (ASV)

- "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we did behold, and our hands did handle, concerning the Word of the Life --" (YLT)
- "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life—" (NKJV)
- "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life:" (DR)
- "The one who existed from the beginning is the one we have heard and seen. We saw him with our own eyes and touched him with our own hands. He is Jesus Christ, the Word of life." (NLT)

Most are in substantial agreement except for the NLT. It makes a complete sentence out of the verse and adds a bunch of words that are not in the Greek. The rest agree very well except for the way the verbs are expressed. They make all the verbs uniformly in past time. I'm not sure why. Our "we are hearing," vs. their "we have heard;" and our "we are seeing," vs. "we have seen" are expressed by them in past time while we show them in present time as the Greek tense of perfect would indicate. It may be a case of something I have read about called the "historical present." Even in English we sometimes say things in present tense when we mean past tense. "I went to the store yesterday and the clerk *says* to me, 'You ...'" etc. Even though it clearly happened in the past the verb "says" is in the present tense. They also vary the second "looked or saw" the first choice from the range of sense. None of them tries to show either the middle voice of this verb nor is their any attempt to express the various aspects of the verbs. This is probably just to avoid wordiness. On the other hand they may have had subtle grammatical reasons for all these choices that I am not yet able to grasp. The general uniformity of their decisions across the various versions would suggest this might be the case. Also, most of them opened the verse with "that which" instead of just "which."

Chapter 1 Verse 2 καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη, Note the verb is passive voice, past time, punctiliar aspect. Write "was made known" or "was revealed" in the verb box. It is not a linking verb. The conjunction "and" goes in the conjunction box. "The life" is in the nominative case and is therefore the subject.

IP/C:	and	Verb:		DO:	
Subj:	the life	was revealed		IO:	
		3rd Sng Aorist Pass Ind			

That yields, "and the life was revealed,"

καὶ ἐώρακαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον,
 Here the verb phrase is made up of three verbs pasted together by two καὶ.'s. The first one is the introductory conjunction for the clause. In Greek each item in a list usually gets its own conjunction but in English there is only one conjunction taking the next to last position in the list. That gives us "are seeing, are bearing witness and are telling," for the verb. "You" is dative so it is the indirect object. The noun phrase, "the eternal life," is in accusative case so it is the direct object. We are at the end of the clause and not yet found the subject so it is extracted from the verb's person and number, yielding "we."

IP/C: and	Verb: are seeing, are bearing witness and are telling 1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	DO: the eternal life
Subj: we		IO: to you

The other two verbs are single words so I substitute a single word version for the middle verb giving us, "...and we are seeing, are testifying, and are telling the eternal life to you..." which still seems a little awkward. Let's leave it for now and see if we can smooth it out a little when we have more context to work with.

ἅτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα This time we do have a linking verb. "Whoever" is the subject since it is in nominative case. The prepositional phrase "to the father" has to be the predicate adjective.

IP/C:	Verb: was 3 rd Sng Imperfect Act Ind	PN:
Subj: whoever		PA: τῷ with the father

"Whoever was to the father," makes little sense. Prepositions have such a wide range of sense that when they are involved in awkwardness they are the most likely culprit. In this case, we have a hint that lets us know we should use "with" instead..

καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν Notice the passive voice and past time of the verb. The conjunction goes in the conjunction box. The pronoun is dative, so it is the indirect object. The subject must be taken from the person and number of the verb. When it is third person singular it could be he, she or it but I usually start guessing with "he" since it usually is "he."

IP/C: and	Verb: was revealed 3rd Sng Aorist Pass Ind	DO:
Subj: he (she or it)		IO: to us

This gives us, "And the life was revealed, and we are seeing, are testifying, and are telling the eternal life to you, whoever was with the father, and he was revealed to us," which still seems a little awkward. "Telling the eternal life to you" and "whoever was with the father" both seem odd. *Ἀπαγγέλλω* can also mean inform, proclaim, report, announce, or declare. "are proclaiming eternal life ..." sounds better in English. *Ὅστις* may also mean whichever, anyone, someone, who, which, or whosoever. In this case "who" might fit better.

Now we have, "And the life was revealed, and we are seeing, testifying, and proclaiming eternal life to you, who was with the Father, and He was revealed to us,"

Comparing with the Experts

- "(and the life has been manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and report to you the eternal life, which was with the Father, and has been manifested to us:)" (DARBY)
- "(and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us);" (ASV)
- "(For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)" (KJV)
- "and the life was manifested, and we have seen and testify and proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested to us--" (NASB)
- "and the Life was manifested, and we have seen, and do testify, and declare to you the Life, the age-during, which was with the Father, and was manifested to us --" (YLT)
- "the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare to you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested to us—" (NKJV)
- "This one who is life from God was shown to us, and we have seen him. And now we testify and announce to you that he is the one who is eternal life. He was with the Father, and then he was shown to us." (NLT)

We are in substantial agreement. They handled the compound verb in various ways. Most of them used "which" instead of "who" for the relative pronoun οστις in the third clause. Even though it is just the middle of a three verse sentence in the Greek the NLT broke it into several sentences. This makes it easier to understand without changing the meaning. At some point almost all translators have to split the Greek sentences into smaller ones, especially in the writings of Paul. Such long sentences are almost beyond comprehension in English. However, in this case I agree with most of the experts that we should be able to tolerate a three verse sentence.

Chapter 1, Verse 3 ὃ ἐώρακαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, The compound verb goes in the verb box. The introductory conjunction is all that is left so the subject has to be taken from the person and number of the verbs.

IP/C:	which	Verb:		DO:	
Subj:	we		see and hear		
			1 st Per Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:	

"which we see and hear, "

ἀπαγγέλλομεν (καὶ) ὑμῖν, Nothing new here. The verb goes in the verb box and the conjunction in the conjunction box. ὑμῖν is dative so it is an indirect object with a helper word of "to." The subject must be taken from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C:	and	Verb:		DO:	
Subj:	we		declare		
			1 st Per Plu Present Act Ind	IO:	to you

"... and we declare to you.

ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν· καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. **When there are two or more noun phrases in the nominative case without a verb we have to supply a linking verb in English for it to make sense. Often, once we understand what is being said, we can later remove these, and still find a way to make it make sense in English. In this case I added an "is" twice.**

IP/C: that, and so that ... also	Verb:	DO: fellowship
Subj: you	may have 2nd Plu Present Act Subj	IO: with us

IP/C: and	Verb:	PN: not only ours
Subj: the fellowship	is (implied)	PA:

IP/C: but	Verb:	PN:
Subj: it	is (implied)	PA: with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ.

"Which we see and hear and we declare to you, so that you also may have fellowship with us, and the fellowship is not only ours, but it is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ."

Comparing with the Experts

- "That which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." (DR) *They turned the extra "is" into the subjunctive mood (may be) to match the main verb.*
- "that which we have seen and heard declare we to you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship [is] with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ;" (YLT)
- "that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ:" (ASV)
- "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." (KJV)
- "that which we have seen and heard we declare to you, that you also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." (NKJV)
- "that which we have seen and heard we report to you, that *ye* also may have fellowship with us; and our fellowship [is] indeed with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." (DARBY)
- "We are telling you about what we ourselves have actually seen and heard, so that you may have fellowship with us. And our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ." (NLT) *Actually? Where did they get actually?*
- "what we have seen and heard we proclaim to you also, so that you too may have fellowship with us; and indeed our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." (NASB)

We have substantial agreement. Most used "that" instead of "which" to open the verse. Most of them avoided using a second "is" by having "our" modify fellowship. In retrospect I agree.

Let's look at the sentence as a whole. "That which was being from the beginning, which we are hearing, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life, and the Life was revealed, and we are seeing and testifying, and proclaiming eternal life to you, which was with the Father, and He was revealed to us, that which we see and hear, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ." This is still my translation but I made a few changes based on what I learned from the experts.

Let's look at the verse in terms of	<u>aspect</u>	<u>time:</u>
"That which was being from the beginning,	Linear	Past
which we are hearing,	Combined	Present
which we are seeing with our eyes,	Combined	Present
which we have looked upon,	Punctiliar	Past
and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life,	Punctiliar	Past
and the Life was revealed,	Punctiliar	Past
and we are seeing and testifying, and proclaiming eternal life to you,	Combined	Present
which was with the Father,	Linear	Past
and He was revealed to us,	Punctiliar	Past
that which we see and hear,	Combined	Present
we declare unto you,	Linear	Present
that you also may have fellowship with us,	Linear	Present
and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ.	Linear	Present

If you think about what this sentence is talking about in terms of aspect and time it reveals something very interesting about what the author is saying. Remember this is the introduction of his book. At a point in time in the past Jesus was revealed to the apostle John as the Word of Life. He looked on Him. He touched Him. But the relationship is not over. It continues into the present. He is still hearing and seeing the truth about eternal life. What he is sharing in this letter has to do with a real person with whom John had a close relationship in the past that continues to the current time although no longer face to face, no longer in physical proximity where He might be touched. Nevertheless, John continues to hear and see our Lord. The apostle wants to share what he knows so that the reader too, can hear and see our Lord, now, in the present, and enjoy the same fellowship with Him as the apostle did and does. This is what this letter is about. I'm interested! How about you?

Chapter 1, Verse 4 καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν (ὕμῃν OR ἡμεῖς), The verb is not linking (εἶμι) and is placed in the middle box. And goes in the conjunction slot.

A chance for you to learn from my mistake: At first I put "these" as the subject because it is plural and could be nominative meaning that it could agree with the number of the verb and would be the right case. Also, "write" can be intransitive and therefore does not require a direct object. But "these" refers to the things John is talking about reporting to the them about Jesus. The things he is reporting can not write. So I used the embedded pronoun for the subject and moved these to the direct object based on it being possibly accusative as well as nominative. I also expanded "these" to "these things" because I believed it to be more clear. Later I realized that "these" can not be the subject because the verb requires a 1st person subject and these is 3rd person.

That leaves the pronoun with the textual variation. The subject is "we" either explicitly because of hmeiV or implicitly because of the person and number of the verb. The clause pretty much means the same thing whether you include the other variant. Who else would John write to besides the people doing the reading?

IP/C: and	Verb: write 1st Plu Present Act Ind	DO: these things
Subj: we (implied or explicit)		IO: (to you)

I decided to include the dative version because normally, although not always by any means, subjects come before the verb and objects afterwards. John has already emphasized "these" by his word order why would he also want to emphasize that "we" are doing the writing by adding the unnecessary pronoun in the nominative case?

"and we write these things to you"

ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ (ἡμῶν OR ὑμῶν) ᾗ πεπληρωμένη. The verb is periphrastic. **In addition to the seven tense forms, Greek can, like English, combine helper verbs with a participle to create tenses. There are several combinations of this but the one you need to be aware of for this verse is an Present tense helper verb + a Perfect tense participle = the Perfect tense. The conjunction falls easily in place. The subject is "joy" It is modified by either "our" or "your." It seems more likely that John would be writing for the joy of his listeners. It is also possible, however, that he meant "our" in an inclusive sense of both the writer and the reader. Given that he was just talking about fellowship I chose the latter possibility.**

IP/C: so that	Verb: might be complete 3rd Sng Perfect Act Subj	DO:
Subj: (your or our) joy		IO:

So we have, "And we write these things to you so that our joy might be complete."

Comparing with the experts:

Translations using the same Greek version we chose:

- "and these things we write, that our joy may be made full." (ASV)
- "These things we write, so that our joy may be made complete." (NASB)
- "We are writing these things so that our joy will be complete." (NLT)

Translations using a different Greek version:

- "And these things we write to you that your joy may be full." (NKJV)
- "And these things we write to you, that you may rejoice, and your joy may be full." (DR)
- "and these things we write to you, that your joy may be full." (YLT)
- "And these things write we to you that your joy may be full." (DARBY)
- "And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full." (KJV)

Chapter 1, Verse 5 Καὶ (αὕτη ἐστὶν OR ἐστὶν αὕτη) ἡ (ἀγγελία OR ἐπαγγελία) The verb is involved in a textual variation but it is only one of word order which is more likely to have an impact on emphasis than grammar. It is a linking verb so we are looking for two substantives in the nominative case or a substantive in the nominative with a predicate adjective. The conjunction goes in the beginning and the demonstrative pronoun furnishes the subject. That leave us with a predicate nominative or either ἀγγελία or ἐπαγγελία. There is so much overlap in the range of sense of these two nouns that it does not seem to matter a great deal. Of course, since it is the word of God we want to get it exactly right. Let's choose something that is in the range of sense of both words and see if that works. "Announcement" fits both and is the second choice of both.

IP/C: and	Verb: is	PN: the announcement
Subj: this	3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PA:

"And this is the announcement..."

ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ The verb goes in the middle. It is not a linking verb. The relative pronoun goes in the conjunction slot and signals by its proximity, case, number and gender that it is subordinating this clause to "announcement" in the previous clause. Even though it is feminine I use "which" instead of who because it is referring to a thing rather than a person. The prepositional phrase modifies the verb. Since we are now out of words in the clause we must draw the subject from the verb.

IP/C: which	Verb: are hearing from him	DO:
Subj: we	1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:

"... which we are hearing from Him," [Learning from my mistakes: On my first attempt I looked up ἣν wrong and came up with "was." I thought I was dealing with some kind of periphrastic combination as in the last verse until I realized they did not agree in person making that impossible. I backtracked and found that in this case, because of slightly different accent marks, ἣν is a form of ος.]

καὶ ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, The verb is not linking. The conjunction goes in the conjunction slot. The pronoun is an indirect object since it is dative. Being now out of words we supply the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: declare 1st Plu Present Act Ind	DO: to you
Subj: we		

"...and we declare to you,"

ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ The verb is linking so the first nominative, "God," is the subject, and the second nominative, "light," is the predicate nominative. Because the subject has an article and the predicate nominative does not it means that God has the attribute of light. It does not mean that God is equal to light or that light is equal to God.

IP/C: that	Verb: is 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PN: light
Subj: God		PA:

"...that God is light,"

καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία.

The verb is linking. The conjunction is followed by noun in the nominative case which is the subject. By proximity we know the prepositional phrase probably modifies the subject. The adverb modifies the verb. The adjective is the predicate adjective.

IP/C: and	Verb: is not 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PN: nothing
Subj: darkness in him		

This gives us the very odd sounding, "and darkness in him is not nothing." Double negatives are not considered improper in Greek. In fact, they are frequently used to emphasize the negative. If we drop the second one and just remember the emphasis for a moment we have "and darkness in him is not." Now the clause needs a predicate nominative. Since, "in him" can modify the subject just as well from the predicate nominative we can change the word order without changing the meaning to, "and darkness is not in him." To put the double negative emphasis back in we could add something like, "at all," to the end.

That leaves us with, "And this is the announcement which we are hearing from Him, and we declare to you, that God is light, and darkness is not in him at all."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." (KJV)
- "This, in essence, is the message we heard from Christ and are passing on to you: God is light, pure light; there's not a trace of darkness in him." (MSG) *Where did "in essence" and "pure light" come from? I do not see it in the Greek. "Not a trace" is apparently from the double negative.*
- "And this is the declaration which we have heard from him, and declare unto you: That God is light, and in him there is no darkness." (DR)

- "And this is the message that we have heard from Him, and announce to you, that God is light, and darkness in Him is not at all;" (YLT)
- "And this is the message which we have heard from him and announce unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." (ASV)
- "And this is the message which we have heard from him, and declare to you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." (DARBY)
- "This is the message he has given us to announce to you: God is light and there is no darkness in him at all." (NLT)
- "This is the message we have heard from Him and announce to you, that God is Light, and in Him there is no darkness at all." (NASB)

We have substantial agreement. All the experts translated the perfect tense with past time. Most of them used the *αγγελια* textual variant. The DR, like mine, chose a word that could be either.

Chapter 1, Verse 6 *ἐὰν εἴπωμεν* The verb is past time, punctiliar aspect, and subjunctive mood. It is not a linking verb. After we put in the conjunction we are out of words so the subject comes from the person and number of the verb. I used both "if" and "might" because the Greek did. The subjunctive mood by itself has an implied "if" but in this case there is also an added *εαν*. My guess is that it was for emphasis of the "if" that it was added. I believe this will make the verse awkward in English but I'm going to leave them both for now and decide which one to drop when I have more context on which to base the decision.

IP/C: if	Verb: might have said 1st Plu Aorist Act Subj	DO:
Subj: we		TO:

ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ The verb is not linking. After the conjunction is a noun in the accusative case so it goes in the direct object spot. I suppose technically in the Greek "with Him" is a prepositional phrase modifying "fellowship" and there is no Indirect Object because nothing is in the Dative case. However, by the time it gets to English is sure looks like an Indirect Object, doesn't it? There is no more words so the subject comes from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb: have 1st Plu Present Act Ind	DO: fellowship
Subj: we		TO: with him

" ... that we have fellowship with him,"

καὶ ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν, The verb is subjunctive and not linking. The prepositional phrase after the conjunction modifies the verb. That leaves us with no subject so we take it from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: might walk in the darkness 1st Plu Present Act Subj	DO: IO:
Subj: we		

"... and we might walk in the darkness,"

ψευδόμεθα The verb is not linking. It is middle voice so I add "ourselves." There are no other words in the clause so the subject is found in the number and person of the verb.

IP/C: Subj: we	Verb: ourselves lie 1st Plu Present Mid Ind	DO: IO:
--------------------------	---	----------------

I wonder if the Middle voice implies "we lie to ourselves?" I'll wait on the experts to let me know the answer to that question. For now I'll render it, "we ourselves lie."

καὶ οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν· The verb is not linking. It has a very wide range of sense but we'll start with the usual "do." The adverb modifies the verb. "The truth" is the direct object because it is in the accusative case. We take the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: do not 1st Plu Present Act Ind	DO: the truth IO:
Subj: we		

"... and we do not the truth."

That leaves me with the very awkward, "If we might have said, that we have fellowship with him, and we might walk in darkness, we ourselves lie, and we do not the truth." If you were to see someone "doing the truth" what exactly would the be doing? The "if" with the subjunctive mood verb, the "we might walk," the "ourselves," and the "do not the truth." all seem awkward to me. I'm going to drop both "might's" and the "ourselves" plus look a little deeper in the range of sense for ποιῶ to see if there is something that goes better with a direct object of "the truth."

My translation of John 1:6 is, "If we said, that we have fellowship with Him, and yet walk in darkness, we lie, and we do not practice the truth."

Comparing with the Experts:

- "if we may say -- 'we have fellowship with Him,' and in the darkness may walk -- we lie, and do not the truth;" (YLT)
- "If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth:" (ASV)
- "If we say that we have fellowship with Him and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth;" (NASB)
- "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth:" (KJV)

- "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not practise the truth." (DARBY)
- "If we say that we have fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth." (NKJV)
- "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." (DR)
- "So we are lying if we say we have fellowship with God but go on living in spiritual darkness. We are not living in the truth." (NLT)

We have substantial agreement. Some of the experts even picked the same word out of the range of sense for ποιῶ that I did, which considering what there was to choose from, I consider remarkable.

Chapter 1, Verse 7 εἰδὲ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν, The verb is subjunctive and not linking. The conjunction δε is a post-positive. That means that it is put second in the Greek word order but it is translated first into Greek. The prepositional phrase modifies the verb and we get the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: but if	Verb: might walk in the light 1st Plu Present Act Subj	DO:
Subj: we		IO:

Learning from the previous verse we just translate the subjunctiveness of the clause once instead of twice as it is expressed in Greek giving us, "But if we walk in the light..."

ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί, The verb is linking. The conjunction drops into place first. αὐτος is the subject because it is nominative case. The prepositional phrase is the predicate adjective and we are done. (Occasionally Greek word order is the same as English.)

IP/C: as	Verb: is 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PN: in the light
Subj: he		PA: in the light

"... as he is in the light."

κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων, The verb is not linking. The conjunction "then" is implied in the English just as it is in the Greek. The direct object is first in the clause making it emphasized by the writer. We know "fellowship" is the direct object because it is in the accusative case. By proximity the prepositional phrase modifies the direct object but it sure looks like an indirect object in English. We take the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C:	Verb: have 1st Plu Present Act Ind	DO: fellowship with one another
Subj: we		IO:

"... we have fellowship with one another."

καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ (Χριστοῦ) τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας.
 The verb is not linking. The conjunction goes in place. Next is a long noun phrase in the nominative that forms the subject. "The blood" is nominative making it the subject. "Jesus Christ" is a possessive modifying "The blood." "The son" is possessive forming an appositive with "Jesus" and "Christ." "His" is a possessive modifying "son." "Us" is the direct object because it is accusative. The prepositional phrase modifies the direct object or the verb depending on how you look at it. It means the same either way.

IP/C: and	Verb: cleanses 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	DO: us from all sin
Subj: the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son		IO:

"... and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son cleanses us from all sin."

So for verse 7, we have, "But if we walk in the light as he is in the light we have fellowship with one another and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son cleanses us from all sin."

Comparing with the Experts:

- "and if in the light we may walk, as He is in the light -- we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son doth cleanse us from every sin;" (YLT) *They retained both the "if" and the subjunctive mood of the first clause.*
- "But if we are living in the light of God's presence, just as Christ is, then we have fellowship with each other, and the blood of Jesus, his Son, cleanses us from every sin." (NLT) *"God's presence" is not in the Greek.*
- "But if we walk in the light as *he* is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanses us from all sin." (DARBY) *They put asterisk around the he trying to give it the emphasis the explicit αὐτος gives it in the Greek.*
- "but if we walk in the Light as He Himself is in the Light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin." (NASB) *They added "Himself" trying to give "he" the emphasis the explicit αὐτος gives it in the Greek.*
- "But if we walk in the light, as he also is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (DR)
- "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (KJV)
- "but 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." (ASV)

We have substantial agreement. See notes in italics.

Chapter 1, Verse 8 ἐὰν εἴπωμεν The verb is past time, punctiliar aspect, and subjunctive but it is not linking. After we put the conjunction in place we are out of words so we get the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: if	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	said 1st Plu Aorist Act Subj	IO:

"If we said..."

ὅτι ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, The verb is not linking. The conjunction goes in place, "Sin" is accusative making it the direct object. We want to put "no" as a modifier of "sin" but it is an adverb and is modifying the verb. The subject comes from the person and number of the verb

IP/C: that	Verb:	DO: sin
Subj: we	have no 1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

"... that we have no sin,"

ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν The verb is not linking. The reflexive pronoun is accusative so it is the direct object. The subject comes from the person and number of the verb. The subject makes the object nonsense so we change it to "ourselves."

IP/C:	Verb:	DO: themselves ourselves
Subj: we	deceive 1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

"... we deceive ourselves,"

καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν. The verb is linking. The conjunction drops in place. "Truth" is the first nominative and is therefore the subject. The adverb modifies the verb. The prepositional phrase is the predicate adjective.

IP/C: and	Verb:	PN:
Subj: the truth	is not 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PA: in us

My translation for I John 1:8 is, "If we said, that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "if we may say -- 'we have not sin,' ourselves we lead astray, and the truth is not in us;" (YLT)
- "If we say that we have no sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us." (NASB)
- "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (KJV)
- "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (ASV)
- "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (DARBY)
- "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (NKJV)
- "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (DR)
- "If we say we have no sin, we are only fooling ourselves and refusing to accept the truth." (NLT)

We have almost total agreement. They universally translated the past time verb in the first clause as present tense. In order to be grammatically correct in English either "said" has to become present tense or "deceive" and "is" have to become past tense. Apparently they decided it was better to change one verb than two. I like leaving it in the tense closest to the Greek and dealing with the dissonance in English. When you are translating for your own use or for purposes of discussing translation (as here) you can make such decisions. If we were trying to create a translation for the general public we would have to be more circumspect.

Chapter 1, Verse 9 ἔὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, The verb is not linking and in the subjunctive mood. Again we have the conjunction "if" with the subjunctive mood. The article is in the accusative so it modifies the direct object which for reasons that are over my head is in the genitive instead of the accusative as you would expect. The pronoun is a possessive modifying the direct object. There is no nominative case substantives so we draw the subject from the number and person of the verb.

IP/C:	if	Verb:		DO:	our sins
Subj:	we		might confess 1st Plu Present Act Subj	IO:	

"If we confess our sins..."

πιστός ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος, The verb is linking. There is no substantive in the nominative case so it is supplied by the person and number of the verb. Both the adjectives are nominative and there is a καὶ available to join them so they become a compound predicate adjective.

IP/C:		Verb:		PN:	
Subj:	He		is 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PA:	faithful and righteous

"... He is faithful and righteous,"

ἵνα ἀφῆ ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας The verb is not linking. It is past time, punctiliar aspect, and subjunctive mood. The conjunction goes in place. "Us" is dative and is therefore the indirect object. We supply the helper word, "to." Again we have an accusative article modifying a genitive noun so we make the phrase the direct object. Since it is genitive case I am tempted to make it "our sins" as in the first clause. Clearly the writer is referring to the same sins as above. I'll wait and see what the experts did. There is no subject so we supply one from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb: might have forgiven 3rd Sng Aorist Act Subj	DO: the sins (our sins?)
Subj: He		IO: to us

I tried to render ἀφῆ into some kind of past time subjunctive mood form in English but could not find one that made sense. "... that he might have forgiven the sins to us," makes little sense to me. We could ignore the ἵνα and the dative case and go with "if he forgave our sin." I am completely puzzled and am anxious to see how the experts handled this clause.

καὶ καθάριση ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας. The verb is not linking but like the one before is aorist tense and subjunctive mood. The conjunction goes in place. "Us" is accusative and is therefore the direct object. The prepositional phrase could be thought of as modifying either the verb or the direct object. I chose the latter.

IP/C: and	Verb: might have cleansed 3rd Sng Aorist Act Subj	DO: us from all unrighteousness
Subj: He		IO:

"... and He might have cleansed us from all unrighteousness," makes sense as it stands but when taken in context is very confusing.

I must guess something before turning to the experts so, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous. He must have forgiven our sin and cleansed us from all unrighteousness." Seems to me that is expressing some terribly shaky doctrine. I look at the experts with little expectation of being close to correct.

Comparing to the Experts:

- "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (KJV)
- "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." (DR)
- "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (ASV)
- "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us [our] sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (DARBY)
- "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (NASB)
- "if we may confess our sins, stedfast He is and righteous that He may forgive us the sins, and may cleanse us from every unrighteousness;" (YLT)

Most of the experts changed the final two clauses into two infinitive phrases. Given the almost universal decision by so many experts over such a long period of time I expect they are invoking some rule of grammar or some translation technique that I have not yet learned. In my research I have not yet been unable to discover what it is. We seem to be in agreement on the first two clauses.

Chapter 1, Verse 10 ἐὰν εἶπωμεν The verb is not linking. It is past time, punctiliar aspect and subjunctive. Besides the redundant conjunction there is nothing else so we must take the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: if	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	might have said 1st Plu Aorist Act Subj	IO:

"If we said..."

ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν, The verb is not linking. Besides the introductory conjunction and an adverb modifying the verb we have nothing so we must take the subject from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	are not sinning 1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:

"... that we are not sinning,"

ψεύστην ποιοῦμεν αὐτόν, The verb is our old friend ποιέω with the extended range of sense. The only thing remaining is a noun and pronoun both in the accusative case. There is no καί laying around loose to make it a compound direct object so it must be an appositive construction. The subject comes from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO: Him a liar
Subj: we	do make 1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

"... we do Him a liar," makes no sense so we look deeper into the range of sense of ποιέω and come up with, "... we make Him a liar."

καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν. The verb is linking. The conjunction introduces. The subject is modified by a possessive pronoun. The adverb modifies the verb. The prepositional phrase supplies the predicate adjective.

IP/C: and	Verb:	PN:
Subj: His word	is not 3rd Sng Present Act Ind	PA: in us

"... and His word is not in us."

My translation of I John 1:10 is, "If we said, that we are not sinning, we make Him a liar, and His Word is not in us."

Comparing with the Experts:

- "If we claim we have not sinned, we are calling God a liar and showing that his word has no place in our hearts." (NLT)
- "if we may say -- 'we have not sinned,' a liar we make Him, and His word is not in us." (YLT)
- "If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar and His word is not in us." (NASB)
- "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." (KJV)
- "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." (ASV)
- "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." (DARBY)
- "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." (DR)

We have agreement except they translated the perfect tense with past time. I would like it very much if all my sins were in past time.

Chapter 2 Verse 1

Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν ... Τεκνία is in the vocative case and is modified by μου, together forming an introductory phrase of address. Since ταῦτα is either nominative or accusative it could be the subject or the direct object but grammatically it makes no sense as the subject because the verb requires a first person subject. There is nothing else nominative in the clause so we must draw the subject out of the verb. Ὑμῖν is in the dative and is therefore the indirect object.

c/P	My little children	Verb:	do: these things
Subj	I	write	io: to you
		1 st Sing Present Act Ind	

... ἵνα μὴ ἀμάρτητε ... Some of the other senses of αμαρτανω might go well here but I remember the passage this way so it is hard for the other choices to sound right to me. Notice that the verb is in the subjunctive. Again we have to get the subject from the verb form. I used "in order that" instead of "that" for ἵνα because when it appears with subjunctive its most common usage is to express purpose rather than doubt.

IP/C:	in order that	Verb:	DO or PN:
Subj:	you	might not sin	TO or PA:
		2 nd Plu Aorist Act Subj	

... καὶ ἂν τις ἀμάρτη ... Some of the possibilities for τις can be eliminated by the gender and number of the form. It seems to be buried too deep in the sentence to be an interrogative but it still might be. It seems to me the ideas in the first two clauses are in opposition to the ideas in the last two clauses so I chose "but" for καὶ. I almost went with "however." Notice that the verb is subjunctive and there is also an if (εἰ) with the conjunction. This appears to be somehow emphasizing the doubtfulness of the thought but I'm not sure and, if it is, I do not know how to render such an emphasis in English.

IP/C: but if	Verb: sins	DO:
Subj: anyone	3 rd Sing Aorist Act Subj	IO:

... παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον

This clause only has a verb with an understood subject and a noun phrase in the accusative forming a complicated direct object with both modifiers and appositives. "Intercessor" might work as well as or better than "advocate" for παρακλητον but the other senses leave out the notion that we need someone to plead for us with the Father as indicated by the prepositional phrase.

IP/C:	Verb: have	DO: an advocate with the father, Jesus Christ the righteous.
Subj: we	1 st Plu Present Act Ind	IO or PA:

My Translation Compared to the Experts: (some of my questions in parentheses)

My little children, I write these things to you, in order that you might not sin, (Mine)
 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. (KJV)
 My children, these things I write to you in order that ye may not sin; (DARBY)
 My dear children, I am writing this to you so that you will not sin. (*subjunctive?*) (NLT)
 My little children, these things I write to you, so that you may not sin. (NKJV)
 My little children, these things I write to you, that you may not sin, (DR)
 My little children, these things write I unto you that ye may not sin. (ASV)
 I write this, dear children, to guide you out of sin. (*guide?*) (MSG)

but if anyone sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. (Mine)
 And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. (KJV)
 And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; (ASV)
 and if any one sin, we have a patron with the Father, Jesus Christ [the] righteous; (DARBY)
 And if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. (NKJV)
 But if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just. (DR)
 But if anyone does sin, we have a Priest-Friend in the presence of the Father: (*presence?*)
 Jesus Christ, righteous Jesus.

(MSG)

But if you do sin, there is someone to plead for you before the Father. He is Jesus Christ, the one who pleases God completely. (NLT)

It is true that τεκνιον is used as a term of endearment but doesn't it sound like one without putting the "dear" on it as NLT and MSG did? Darby leaves off the diminutive idea of τεκνιον as if he were translating τεκνον instead. Why did MSG move it to after the second clause?

Where did MSG get "Priest-Friend" and Darby get "patron" for παρακλητος? NLT describes the role but why when there are perfectly good English words to use?

The way MSG did the last phrase might be pretty close to the mark except they use the word "Jesus" too many times. How about "... we have an advocate with the father, the righteous Jesus Christ"? The NLT does have a footnote that reads "Greek - Jesus Christ, the righteous." If that is what the Greek says why publish, "pleases God completely" instead?

NLT loses the subjunctive mood of the second clause and MSG uses the verb "guide" which is not suggested by the Greek at all. "Sin" is the verb in the second clause, not "guide."

Chapter 2 Verse 2

και αυτος ιλασμος εστι περι των αμαρτιων ημων, ου περι των ημετερων δε μονον, αλλα και περι ολου του κοσμου. I put αυτος in the subject, ιλασμος in the Predicate Nominative and started stacking the modifying phrases after it. I'm not sure why John used two conjunctions (αλλα and και) instead of just one. Seems like one would be enough. Does not seem to be a way to use them both in English without it sounding odd.

IP/C: and	Verb: is	PN: the propitiation of our sins, not for ours only, but for all mankind.
Subj: he	3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	

And he is the propitiation of our sins, not for ours only, but for all mankind.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world. (ASV)
- When he served as a sacrifice for our sins, he solved the sin problem for good-not only ours, but the whole world's. (MSG)
- and he is the propitiation for our sins; but not for ours alone, but also for the whole world. (DARBY)
- and he -- he is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world, (YLT)
- and He Himself is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world. (NASB)
- And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. (KJV)
- He is the sacrifice for our sins. He takes away not only our sins but the sins of all the world. (NLT).

There seems to be substantial agreement. They almost all found a non-awkward way of dealing with the multiple conjunctions that did not occur to me. Several of them added something to show the αυτος pronoun. The pronoun was unnecessary since "he" is already implied by the form of the verb and therefore was probably added for emphasis. Several translators tried to show that emphasis by adding "himself" as well as "he" or by putting "he" twice. They were all more consistent in there translation of περι than I was. The MSG and NLT used the word "sacrifice" for ιλασμος but I see nothing in the range of sense that suggests that. While it is

true that His sacrifice is the propitiation for our sins that is not what the Greek says in this particular verse. MSG added "solved" and NLT "takes away." Based on other biblical passages I agree that the statements containing these extra verbs are true but there is nothing in the Greek in this verse remotely similar to these two words.

Chapter 2 Verse 3

καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ... The prepositional phrase ἐν τούτῳ could be "in this," "by this" or even "in him" or "by him." Since it seems to be referring to the following subordinate clause I went with "by this." The verb supplies the subject. On my first pass I made the verb "are knowing" to capture the linear aspect of the present tense but after seeing the same verb in a different tense in the next clause I changed it to "know" to show a contrast between the two.

IP/C: And by this	Verb: know	DO:
Subj: we	1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

... ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν ... Nothing new here. The pronoun is accusative so it is the direct object. The verb supplies the subject. Already mentioned the tense in first clause.

IP/C: that	Verb: are knowing	DO: Him
Subj: we	1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:

... ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν. ... Notice that the direct object is at the front of the clause for emphasis. At first I went with "if" for εἰ but upon reflection it seemed to me that if he had meant just "if" the verb being in the subjunctive mood would have been sufficient to convey that idea. I used "when" instead to make it a little stronger. I almost went with "guard" for the verb to try to convey the wider sense but decided it would be too easily misunderstood to mean something else entirely - like becoming God's policeman trying to enforce his laws.

IP/C: when	Verb: keep	DO: His commandments
Subj: we	1st Plu Present Act Subj	IO:

So, I rendered it, "And by this we know that we are knowing him, when we keep his commandments."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. (ASV)
- Now by this we know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments. (NKJV)
- Here's how we can be sure that we know God in the right way: Keep his commandments. (MSG)
- And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. (KJV)
- And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. (DARBY)
- And how can we be sure that we belong to him? By obeying his commandments. (NLT)
- and in this we know that we have known him, if his commands we may keep; (YLT)
- By this we know that we have come to know Him, if we keep His commandments. (NASB)

None of the other translations did anything to try show the εἶν beyond the "if" that would have been there anyway because of the subjunctive mood of "keep." The YLT and NASB tried to capture the different tenses of "know" by moving the second one into past time which to me makes it sound like knowing Him is something that can be accomplished without continuing the effort into the present and future. I believe the writer intended to convey the opposite idea: maintaining our relationship with God demands our constant attention. MSG and NLT dealt with the different tenses by changing the sense to "be sure" but that seems to me to bending the meaning of γινωσκω too much.

Chapter 2 Verse 4

(ὅτι) ἔγνωκα αὐτόν ... Insert the verb "know." The closest nominative is the article which appears before the preceding participle. Since the verb is in the 1st person there is no way the participle can be the subject of the verb so we have to use the one understood in the verb. The pronoun immediately following is in the accusative case so it is the direct object. Since this is followed by an "and" and another noun in the accusative case my first rendering said, "I know Him and His commandments..." It was not until I started trying to do something with the participles that I realized that καὶ was meant to join the participles, not the nouns, and "His commandments" was the object of the second one. The meaning does not seem to change whether the disputed οτι is translated or not. I put it in at first but then decided to drop it when I was writing the whole verse because it made it a little awkward.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: I	know 1 st Sing Perfect Act Ind	Him IO:

ὁ λέγων, ... καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ τηρῶν, ψεύστης ἐστί, ... Put the verb where it goes. The article ὁ announces that the pair of participles is to be taken as the subject of the clause. To accomplish this in English I added the word "one." Notice that once again "His commandments" is pushed forward in the clause to emphasize the phrase.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj: the one saying [1 st Clause] and not keeping His commandments	is 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	a liar PA:

... καὶ ἐν τούτῳ (ἢ ἀλήθεια OR ἀλήθεια OR ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ) οὐκ ἔστιν.

This clause is challenging for two reasons. First there is a textual variation. Second, the phrase ἐν τούτῳ which appears in the previous verse also appears here but apparently with a different meaning. The verb, at least, is simple and obvious along with the adverb modifying it. The conjunction also slips easily into place. "Truth" is in the nominative case so it must be the subject.

ἐν τούτῳ which is translated "by this" above would be nonsense translated the same way here. Perhaps it is wrong of me but when I see the same phrase repeated in the same passage I expect it to mean the same thing both places. But I can not justify translating the prior verse differently than I did and I can not justify translating the phrase the same way in this verse. It appears to be a predicate adjective in the form of a prepositional phrase. Remembering the second nominative before a connecting verb in the Greek is rendered in the English after the verb this clause literally says "in this is not truth," "in this is not the truth" or "in this is not truth of God" but in English it is considered poor usage to make the adjective the subject of the connecting verb so I made it the predicate adjective instead.

There is a subtle difference between ἡ ἀληθεια and ἀληθεια but I'm not astute enough to form a good argument about which is more fitting in this context. Similarly, since all truth is God's truth, I'm not anxious about whether to include "of God" or not. I left it out for simplicity.

IP/C: and	Verb: is not	PN:
Subj: the truth	3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA: in this

So I rendered it, "The one saying, 'I know Him,' and not keeping His commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in this.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him; (ASV)
- If someone claims, "I know him well!" but doesn't keep his commandments, he's obviously a liar. His life doesn't match his words. (MSG)
- He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. (KJV)
- He that says, I know him, and does not keep his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him; (DARBY)
- he who is saying, 'I have known him,' and his command is not keeping, a liar he is, and in him the truth is not; (YLT)
- If someone says, "I belong to God," but doesn't obey God's commandments, that person is a liar and does not live in the truth. (NLT)
- The one who says, "I have come to know Him," and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him; (NASB)

The "truth of God" variant was rejected by all of these translations. Most of them translated ἐν τούτῳ as "in him" and none of them translated it "in this" as I did. It is certainly proper to sometimes translate the demonstrative pronoun as a personal pronoun when the context supports it. Obviously they believed it did support it in this case but I am not sure why. It seems to me

that there is a big difference between a person being a liar because his actions do not match his words and not having truth in him. If a person was aware either that he did not really know Him or that he was being disobedient then he would have to have knowledge of the truth in him in some measure. Clearly they were taking "this" as the masculine instead of the neuter as I did.

Chapter 2 Verse 5

ὅς δ' ἂν τηρῇ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον ἀληθῶς ... I noted that the verb is subjunctive and placed it in the box. There is no ος μὲν to go with the ος δε so moving the postpositive δε to the front puts ος and αν together which is rendered "whoever." Ος is the only nominative around so I put it as the subject. "Word" is accusative so it becomes the direct object modified by a capitalized "his" because the context strongly suggests that the "word" being discussed is God's word. I am considering my choices for subjunctive. "But if whoever keeps..." seems awkward so I put in "might" for now to see how it will sound with the rest of the sentence.

IP/C: but	Verb:	DO: His word
Subj: whoever	might truly keep 3rd Sing Present Act Subj	IO:

I am not sure yet where the next clause begins so I started out trusting the punctuation in the Greek text. It seemed to me the adverb could go several different places. I tried it in the following clause and found it awkward so I put it with the one above. As you will see below I should have stayed with the punctuation.

... ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται ... The next verb is put in place noting it is perfect tense passive voice. Love is the only nearby substantive in the nominative case so we make it the subject modified by the noun in the genitive "of God." The prepositional phrase "in this" or "by this" needs to modify something but what? I decided to make "In this" an introductory phrase to this clause but I'm keeping my options open.

IP/C: in this	Verb:	DO:
Subj: the love of God	is being completed 3rd Sing Perfect Pass Ind	IO:

... ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ... The present active verb is placed in the center box. There are no nominative substantives around so the subject is drawn from the verb. The prepositional phrase becomes an introductory phrase.

IP/C: in this	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	know 1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

... ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμεν. Again the subject must come from the verb. The prepositional phrase takes the position of predicate adjective.

IP/C: that	Verb:	PN:
Subj: we	are 1st Plu Present Act Ind	PA: in Him

That yields, "But whoever might truly keep His word, in this the love of God is being completed, in this we know that we are in Him" It is very awkward and makes little or no sense. So where did I go wrong? From the doubts I had as I went along, four possible errors occur to me immediately. (1) I may have translated the subjunctive mood of the first clause incorrectly. (2 & 3) One or both of the "in this" phrases could also be translated "by this." (4) I could have misplaced the "truly." Before consulting the experts I decided to take one more stab at it. "But whoever intends to truly keep His word by this the love of God is being fulfilled, by this we know that we are in Him." Still pretty awkward but an idea is emerging that perhaps our desire or intention to keep his word is evidence we are in Him and that His love is filling us.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- But whoever keeps His word, truly the love of God is perfected in him. By this we know that we are in Him. (NKJV)
- but whoso keepeth his word, in him verily hath the love of God been perfected. Hereby we know that we are in him: (ASV)
- and whoever may keep his word, truly in him the love of God hath been perfected; in this we know that in him we are. (YLT)
- But those who obey God's word really do love him. That is the way to know whether or not we live in him. (NLT)
- but whoever keeps His word, in him the love of God has truly been perfected By this we know that we are in Him: (NASB)
- but whoever keeps his word, in him verily the love of God is perfected. Hereby we know that we are in him. (DARBY)
- But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him. (KJV)

Only YLT showed the subjunctive mood of the first verb, "keep." Most of them changed the present time of τετελειταιω to past time. (They justify this saying they are using something called proleptic perfect which is so rare you do not need to remember it.) None of them showed the combined linear and punctilinear aspect of τετελειταιω. Almost across the board the first εν τουτω becomes "in him" and the second one becomes "by this" or something similar. Although I freely admit I have not been able to render the verse into understandable English I feel that all of these translations are missing important components of the intended meaning. I believe the apostle is telling us that our desire to keep His word is evidence of God working His love into us, not evidence of some merit of our own. Nor is it saying that by our own works we can gain God's love or prove that we are in Him. All these translations seem to turn the meaning on its head making us the ones doing the action instead of God.

Chapter 2 Verse 6 λέγων ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν ὀφείλει, Drop in the verb. It is of the most common form – third person, singular number, present tense, active voice, indicative mood. There is an article opening the verse in the nominative case as is the participle itself. That makes the participle the most likely subject of the sentence. I'll go ahead and add "one" to make it a little less awkward. This followed literally with "in him to abide." "The one saying in him to abide owes," is nonsense in English so I need to do something to make it understandable. But what? The prepositional phrase "in him" does not modify "saying" because you do not "say in" someone. So it must modify the infinitive "to abide." That is better expressed in English by placing the prepositional phrase after the infinitive – to abide in him. "The one saying, 'to abide in him,' owes," is not much better. The verb is screaming for an object so I try using the infinitive as the object: "The one saying ought to abide in him" makes the predicate better but the clause as a whole still makes no sense because it leaves "the saying one" saying nothing. I decide to move on to translating the next clause and see if that throws any light on this one.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: the one saying to abide in him	owes 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησε, καὶ αὐτὸς (οὕτως) περιπατεῖν. This one has an embedded conjunction without it being obvious what is being joined. Could be tricky to translate. The verb is put in place. The subject must be the demonstrative pronoun immediately prior. The conjunction goes in the conjunction slot. That leaves us with the conjunction "and," a "he" a textual problem, and the infinitive "to walk." That yields, "The one saying to abide in him owes as that walked and he (so) to walk." What two components is the "and" joining? The "he" is the subject of the infinitive? What do I do with the possible extra "so, thus, even so, likewise..." How is the infinitive "to walk" being used in the sentence? Where is the light I was hoping the second clause would shine on the first? I was right. This one is difficult.

IP/C: as	Verb:	DO:
Subj: that	walked 3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	IO:

I'm almost ready to give up and peek at the answers but before I do I'm going to make a wild guess. "The one saying to abide in him ought to walk as he walked." I have a "that" and an "and" left over so it is probably wrong but at least it makes sense, albeit not much sense.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- he that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked. (ASV)
- He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked. (KJV)
- He that says he abides in him ought, even as *he* walked, himself also [so] to walk. (DARBY)
- He who is saying in him he doth remain, ought according as he walked also himself so to walk. (YLT)
- the one who says he abides in Him ought himself to walk in the same manner as He walked. (NASB)
- Those who say they live in God should live their lives as Christ did. (NLT)

They all changed the participle into a finite verb; "says," "saith," or "is saying." They all changed the infinitive phrase into a sentence that is a quoted, of the form, "He abides in him." Almost all of them chose to render the first verb as "ought," so I got one thing right. All but two shifted the final infinitive forward in front of the second verb making it the object of ought. Almost universally they changed the demonstrative pronoun into a personal pronoun. Most of them added "himself" even though there is no verb in the middle voice and no reflexive pronouns in the Greek. Some of them included the extra "so" and some did not but it did not seem to change the meaning. The idea seems to be, "If someone claims to be in Him, he should act like Him."

Chapter 2 Verse 7

(Ἀδελφοί OR ἀγάπητοι), οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν,

The verb, "write," goes easily into place. The verb requires a first person subject and there not being one we supply it from the verb. For the first word there are no immediate contextual clues to help to determine which of the textual variants is correct. Either way it is a form of tender address. I picked "beloved" because it seems to fit better with the "my little children" with which he addresses them elsewhere in the letter. The adverb modifies the verb. The object is "commandment" modified by "new." I add a "do" to make it less awkward and we have, "Beloved, I do not write a new commandment."

IP/C: Beloved	Verb: do not write 1st Sing Present Act Ind	DO: new commandment
Subj: I		IO:

ἀλλ' ἐντολὴν παλαιάν, I saw the conjunction ἀλλ and at first thought I was ready for a new clause. Then I noticed that the phrase, "but an old commandment" is in the accusative case. What is really going on is that the previous clause has a compound direct object. So we add the phrase yielding, "Beloved, I do not write a new commandment but an old commandment,..."

IP/C: Beloved	Verb: do not write 1st Sing Present Act Ind	DO: a new commandment but an old commandment
Subj: I		IO:

ἣν εἶχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς The next verb is placed in the center. The relative pronoun is a connector and indicates by its case, gender and number that this subordinate clause is describing the previous noun phrase, "an old commandment." The subject is taken from the verb. The prepositional phrase modifies the verb.

IP/C: which	Verb: had from the beginning 2nd Plu Imperfect Act Ind	DO:
Subj: you		IO:

Now we have, "Beloved, I do not write a new commandment but an old commandment which you had from the beginning." There is no conjunction and the next noun phrase is in nominative case indicating it is the subject of the next sentence. That probably means we are closing one sentence and starting another one.

ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιὰ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος The verb goes in the middle. The noun "commandment" the adjective "old" are both in front of a linking verb so ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιὰ ἐστὶν could be translated, "the commandment is old." There is a problem with doing that because ὁ λόγος which follows is also in the nominative case and is separated from the next clause by a relative pronoun which keeps it from being the subject of the next clause. So, "the old commandment" is the subject of this clause and "the word" is its predicate nominative.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
	is	the word
Subj:	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA:
the old commandment		

ὃν ἠκούσατε (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) The verb goes in the middle. There is no nominative around to make the subject so we draw it from the verb. The prepositional phrase, "from the beginning" is not in all the old texts. If it is there it modifies the verb. We will shortly consider whether it has an impact on the overall meaning but first there is a problem with the case of the relative pronoun. There is no noun in the accusative case nearby to serve as its antecedent. Two possibilities suggest themselves to me. (1) It may be that the Greeks used relative pronouns in the accusative case to connect to predicate nominatives. (2) The preceding clause may be a parenthetical making this clause the concluding clause to the sentence before the preceding clause. It seems to me that the textual variant "from the beginning" goes with one of these possibilities better than the other.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
which	heard	
Subj:	from the beginning	IO:
you	2nd Plu Aorist Act Ind	

In English the two possibilities look like this:

- (1) "Beloved, I do not write a new commandment but an old commandment which you had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which you heard."
 (2) "Beloved, I do not write a new commandment but an old commandment, which you had from the beginning, (The old commandment is the word), which you heard from the beginning." Let's compare them both.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- Beloved, no new commandment write I unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning: the old commandment is the word which ye heard. (ASV)
- Brethren, I write no new commandment to you, but an old commandment which you have had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which you heard from the beginning. (NKJV)
- My dear friends, I'm not writing anything new here. This is the oldest commandment in the book, and you've known it from day one. It's always been implicit in the Message you've heard. (MSG)
- Beloved, I am not writing a new commandment to you, but an old commandment which you have had from the beginning; the old commandment is the word which you have heard. (NASB)
- Beloved, I write no new commandment to you, but an old commandment, which ye have had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye heard. (DARBY)

- Brethren, a new command I write not to you, but an old command, that ye had from the beginning -- the old command is the word that ye heard from the beginning; (YLT)
- Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning. (KJV)
- Dear friends, I am not writing a new commandment, for it is an old one you have always had, right from the beginning. This commandment--to love one another--is the same message you heard before. (NLT) *While it is true that this is the commandment the apostle is addressing I do not find "to love one another" in the Greek any where in this verse.*

There does not appear to be any significant differences between either of my renderings or any of these. None of them used a parenthetical. All of them have the final subordinate clause connected to "word." Some include the second "from the beginning" and others do not but it does not seem to have much impact on the meaning since the first "from the beginning" is firmly in place either way. Some used "beloved" and others "brethren" based on which Greek text they preferred.

Chapter 2 Verse 8

πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, The verb is of a common variety. There is nothing in the nominative case and the verb is 1st person singular so the subject is "I." The adverb can not modify the noun which is next and would make little sense modifying the adjective so it is attached to the verb. The noun and its modifying adjective must be the direct object because they are in the accusative case. "You" is in the dative so it is the indirect object.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: I	write again 1st Sing Present Act Ind	new commandment IO: to you

"I write again a new commandment to you," or "Again I write a new commandment to you,"

ὃ ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, Start with the verb. It is a linking verb requiring a subject and a predicate nominative or predicate adjective. The relative pronoun provides the subject. The adjective has no noun nearby and is in the nominative case so it must be the predicate adjective. The two prepositional phrases connected by "kai" are the predicate adjective.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj: which	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	true in Him and in you PA:

"Again I write a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you,"

ὅτι ἡ σκοτία παράγεται This verb is passive so it will require some helper words. "The darkness" is in the nominative case so it provides the subject. The conjunction ὅτι is put in place and the conjunction καὶ signals the beginning of the next clause.

IP/C: that	Verb:	DO:
Subj: the darkness	is passed by 3 rd Sing Present Pass Ind	IO:

καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἤδη φαίνει. The verb's second sense seems to better contrast with "darkness" above. The noun phrase "the true light" is in the nominative and provides the subject. The adverb "now" modifies the verb.

IP/C:	and	Verb:	DO:
Subj:	the true light	now shines 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	TO:

This leaves me with, "Again I write a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you, that the darkness is passed by and the true light now shines." The first two clauses together make sense and the final two clauses together make sense but the whole thing is very difficult to understand. How are the ideas related? The relationship is expressed by the conjunction οτι so I take another look at its range of sense – "that, because, for, since, for since, the fact that." "Because", "for" and "since" all seem to work better. I settle for "because." "Again I write a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passed by and the true light shines."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- Again, a new commandment write I unto you, which thing is true in him and in you; because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth. (ASV)
- again, a new command I write to you, which thing is true in him and in you, because the darkness doth pass away, and the true light doth now shine; (YLT)
- Again, a new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in you: because the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth. (KJV)
- Again, I write a new commandment to you, which thing is true in him and in you, because the darkness is passing and the true light already shines. (DARBY)
- On the other hand, I am writing a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing away and the true Light is already shining. (NASB)
- Yet it is also new. This commandment is true in Christ and is true among you, because the darkness is disappearing and the true light is already shining. (NLT)

Most of these add the word "thing." Adding "thing" seems unnecessary and awkward to me. Looks like I made a good call on "because." The verb associated with "darkness" is less awkwardly translated in all these examples than it is in mine. I like the KJV best because it seems to best capture the passive voice by taking the action away from the darkness. The passing away of the darkness is something that is happening to it. It is not something that the darkness is doing on its own.

Chapter 2 Verse 9

λέγων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῶν, ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν ἕως ἄρτι. There is only one verb in the verse, so there is only one clause. On the other hand I learned from trying to translate verse 6 above that when there are few verbs and lots of participles and infinitives that the experts just go ahead and render these as if they were verbs. So since there are two participles and an infinitive besides the verb I am going to look for opportunities to do that. Also, building on the experience of verse 6, I am going to start out rendering the whole verse literally to see if it might be easier to sort that way. "The saying (Participle Present Act Nom Sing Masc) in the light to be (Infinitive Present Act) and the brother of him hating (Participle Present Act Nom Sing Masc) in the darkness is until now." It appears to me that the key to the puzzle is that both the participles are in the nominative case and the verb is linking. This means the first one is the subject and the second one is the predicate adjective with everything else forming modifiers to those two.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj: The one saying he is in the light	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	the brother of him hating, being in the darkness until now.
		PA:

" The one saying he is in the light is the brother of him hating being in the darkness until now."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now. (ASV)
- He who says he is in the light, and hates his brother, is in darkness until now. (NKJV)
- Anyone who claims to live in God's light and hates a brother or sister is still in the dark. (MSG) *Where did "sister" come from? No "sister" is in the Greek although doctrinally adding sister does not diminish the truth of the statement. I prefer "still" over "until now." It is the same idea less awkwardly expressed.*
- He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. (KJV)
- he who is saying, in the light he is, and his brother is hating, in the darkness he is till now; (YLT)
- He who says he is in the light, and hates his brother, is in the darkness until now. (DARBY)
- If anyone says, "I am living in the light," but hates a Christian brother or sister, that person is still living in darkness. (NLT) *I think there is no reason to narrow "brother" with the modifier Christian either linguistically or doctrinally. I believe John meant to include all the children of Adam in this statement as in "Love your neighbor" and the Parable of the Good Samaritan. I see nothing here or anywhere else to suggest that "brother" in this context should be narrowed to only our Christian brethren.*
- The one who says he is in the Light and yet hates his brother is in the darkness until now. (NASB)

Where I made my mistake was failing to notice that "brother" is in the accusative case. I said the participle was in the nominative case and then used "brother" as the Predicate Nominative instead of "hating." Brother is the object of the participle. I also ignored the και altogether which makes the two nominative participles a compound subject leaving the final prepositional phrase to be a Predicate Adjective. I should have done it like this:

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj: the one saying he is in the light and hating his brother	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA: in the darkness

"The one saying he is in the light and hating his brother is in the darkness until now." (Carden corrected and improved.)

Chapter 2 Verse 10

ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει, This one has two verbs and only one participle so I will return to my normal practice of starting with the verbs and working my way out. The participle is nominative and had a nominative article. I place it in the subject with its modifiers. In Greek the prepositional phrase is an adverbial modifying the verb.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: The one loving his brother	abides in the light 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

So we have, "The one loving his brother abides in the light,..."

καὶ σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. The verb is a linking verb so I look for a subject and Predicate Nominative or Predicate Adjective. "Stumbling stone" is the only nominative noun available so it must be the subject. Ουκ is an adverb and the only thing available for it to modify is the verb. "In him" is the only thing left so it must be the Predicate Adjective. So that gives us, "The one loving his brother abides in the light, and a stumbling stone is not in him."

IP/C: and	Verb:	
Subj: stumbling stone	is not 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA: in him

"The one loving his brother abides in the light, and a stumbling stone is not in him."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is no occasion of stumbling in him. (ASV) *Did the apostle mean to say that the loving one is not an occasion of stumbling to others, to himself, or both?*
- Anyone who loves other Christians [Greek his brother.] is living in the light and does not cause anyone to stumble. (NLT) *Again with the unnecessary and unjustified narrowing of the meaning of the word brother.*
- He that loves his brother abides in light, and there is no occasion of stumbling in him. (DARBY)

- He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. (KJV)
- he who is loving his brother, in the light he doth remain, and a stumbling-block in him there is not; (YLT)
- The one who loves his brother abides in the Light and there is no cause for stumbling in him. (NASB)

The experts made the noun and the prepositional phrase modifying it a noun phrase all in the predicate nominative. Then they created a subject out of the person and number of the verb. It certainly makes the result less awkward than mine.

Chapter 2 Verse 11

ὁ δὲ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶ

Linking verb: *is* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *but* goes in the conjunction slot

Participial phrase in the nominative case: *the one hating his brother* goes in the subject slot

Prepositional phrase: *in the darkness* has to be the predicate adjective because that is all that is still missing

IP/C: but	Verb: is 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: PA: in the darkness
Subj: the one hating his brother		

καὶ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ περιπατεῖ, καὶ οὐκ οἶδε

Verb: *walks*

Second conjunction: *and*

Verb phrase: *does not see*

The compound verb goes into the verb slot.

First conjunction: *and* goes in the conjunction slot

Prepositional phrase: *in the darkness* We are missing a subject but a prepositional phrase can not be a subject so it goes in the verb modifier slot since there is nothing else in the clause it can modify. We note by its position that it is modifying only the verb "walks" not the entire compound verb.

We are missing a subject so we take it from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: walks in the darkness and does not see 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	DO: IO:
Subj: he		

ποῦ ὑπάγει,

Verb: *goes* is put in the verb slot

Conjunction: *where* goes in the conjunction slot

The subject is taken from the verb

IP/C:	where	Verb:		DO:	
Subj:	he	3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	goes	TO:	

ὅτι ἡ σκοτία ἐτύφλωσε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

Verb: *blinded* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *that* goes in the conjunction slot but I changed it to *because* when I tried the whole verse.

Noun phrase in the nominative case: *the darkness* goes in the subject because it is nominative

Noun phrase in the accusative case: *his eyes* goes in the direct object because it is accusative

IP/C:	that because	Verb:		DO:	his eyes
Subj:	the darkness	3 rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	blinded	TO:	

"But the one hating his brother is in the darkness, and he walks in the darkness and does not see where he goes because the darkness has blinded his eyes."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "But he that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes." (ASV)
- "and he who is hating his brother, in the darkness he is, and in the darkness he doth walk, and he hath not known whither he doth go, because the darkness did blind his eyes." (YLT)
- "Anyone who hates a Christian brother or sister is living and walking in darkness. Such a person is lost, having been blinded by the darkness." (NLT)
- "But he that hates his brother is in the darkness, and walks in the darkness, and knows not where he goes, because the darkness has blinded his eyes." (DARBY)
- "But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes." (KJV)
- "But the one who hates his brother is in the darkness and walks in the darkness, and does not know where he is going because the darkness has blinded his eyes." (NASB)

There is substantial agreement here. Most of them rendered οἶδα "know" instead of "see" as I did. Both English words are in the range of sense for the word. In this context it pretty much conveys the same idea either way.

Chapter 2 Verse 12 Γράφω ὑμῖν τεκνία

Verb: *write* goes into the verb slot

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* goes into the indirect object slot because it is in the dative case.

We add the helper word *to* to indicate the case in English.

Noun in the vocative case: *little children* goes into the introductory phrase slot because it is in the vocative case

We have no subject so the verb supplies one.

IP/C: little children	Verb: write	DO: to you
Subj: I	1 st Sing Present Act Ind	IO: to you

"Little children, I write to you," is correct but "I write to you, little children," preserves the Greek word order without sacrificing clarity in the English so it is better. We note that John was emphasizing the word "write" by his word order in this verse.

ὅτι ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

Verb: *is being forgiven* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *that* goes in the conjunction slot

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* goes in the indirect object slot with the appropriate helper word because it is in the dative case

Noun in the dative case with article in the nominative case: *the sin* goes in the subject I'm guessing. It is in the dative case but three things support the idea of it going into the subject. (1) it is modified by an article in the nominative case. (2) we already have an indirect object in the dative case. (3) the verb is plural and although sin is singular it is the kind of noun that suggests more than one (like herd or flock, etc)

Prepositional phrase: *for his name* or *because of his name* or *on account of his name* must modify the verb because it would not make sense modifying either "sin" or "you."

IP/C: that	Verb: is being forgiven	DO: to you
Subj: the sin	for his name	IO: to you
	3 rd Plu Perfect Pass Ind	

"... that sin is being forgiven to you for His name." This is one of those cases where the indirect object would actually be better put into English without the helper word. Also, though "for his name" is literally correct, rendering it "for the sake of his name," would probably more accurately convey the meaning of the original.

That makes the verse, "I write to you, little children, that sin is being forgiven you for the sake of His name."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "I write to you, little children, Because your sins are forgiven you for His name's sake." (NKJV)
- "I write unto you, my little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake." (ASV)
- "I am writing to you, little children, because your sins have been forgiven you for His name's sake." (NASB)
- "I am writing to you, my dear children, because your sins have been forgiven because of Jesus." (NLT)

- "I write to you, children, because [your] sins are forgiven you for his name's sake." (DARBY)
- "I write to you, little children, because the sins have been forgiven you through his name;" (YLT)
- "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake." (KJV)

We all seem to be in substantial agreement except for NLT. While it is true that Jesus is the source of our forgiveness, it is not exactly what the Greek says. One point on which I differed from the experts is I used "that" for *οτι* instead of because. Either way it conveys the idea that the reason John is writing is to inform them of their forgiveness and the reason for it.

Chapter 2 Verse 13

There are a couple of textual variants here. The difference is the tense of the verbs so it probably will not have much of an impact on the complexity of the translation effort..

γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες,

Verb: *write* goes in the verb slot

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* is the indirect object because it is in the dative case

Noun in the vocative case: *fathers* goes in the introductory phrase because it is in the vocative case

No subject was not found so we draw it from the verb.

IP/C: fathers	Verb: write	DO:
Subj: I	1st Sing Present Act Ind	TO: to you

ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

Verb: *are knowing* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *that* goes in the conjunction slot

Article in accusative case without a noun nearby: *the* when it is left around loose usually turns what follows into a substantive even if it is not a noun.

Prepositional phrase: *from beginning* has been turned into the direct object by the previous article. I suppose that means that we are to understand the concept as a substantive in some way. I'm a little puzzled by this construction.

This is followed by the verb of the next clause without a conjunction or relative pronoun. That means we are done with the first sentence.

IP/C: that	Verb: are knowing	DO: from the beginning
Subj:	2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	TO:

"I write to you fathers that are knowing from the beginning." I guess we are not to understand this as the fathers knowing some unspecified thing for a long period of time but instead are to understand that what they are knowing is in some way a thing categorized as "from the beginning." Perhaps it means they "are knowing" basic things or foundational principles. I will have to wait and consult the experts on this one.

(γράφω OR ἔγραψα) ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, Same verse, second sentence:

Verb either in present or past time, punctiliar aspect either way: *write* or *wrote* is the verb, but which? It seems to me unlikely that at this point in his discourse the apostle is going to begin to talk about something he wrote to them at earlier time. I'm going to use *write* for now but keep this issue in mind in case something comes up later to change my mind.

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* is the indirect object because it is in the dative case

Noun in the vocative case: *young men* goes in the introductory phrase because it is in the vocative case.

There is no subject so it is drawn from the verb.

IP/C: young men	Verb: write	DO:
Subj: I	1st Sing (Present or Aorist) Act Ind	IO: to you

"Young men I write to you..."

ὅτι νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν.

Verb: *are conquering* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *that* goes in the conjunction slot

Noun phrase in the accusative case: *the bad* goes in the direct object slot because it is in the accusative case

There is no subject so it is taken from the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb: are conquering	DO: the bad evil
Subj: you	2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:

"The bad" seems awkward so I use "evil" instead. "I write to you, young men, that you are conquering evil." This sentence, (and the previous one for that matter, now that I think about it) seem to have an ambiguity around the range of sense of the conjunction. Is John writing to them to inform them "that" they "are conquering" or is he writing to them "because" he is motivated by the fact that they "are conquering?" I am by no means certain which is more correct but my sense of the general context is the former so I am going to leave the conjunction "that" rather than changing it to "because."

(γράφω OR ἔγραψα) ὑμῖν, παιδία, Same verse, third sentence.

Verb either in present or past time, punctiliar aspect either way: *write* rather than *wrote* goes in the verb slot for the same reason as above

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* is the indirect object because it is in dative case

Noun in the vocative case: *little children* goes in the introductory phrase because it is in the vocative case.

No subject was found so it is extracted from the verb.

IP/C: little children	Verb: write	DO:
Subj: I	1st Sing (Present or Aorist) Act Ind	IO: to you

ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα.

Verb: *are knowing* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *that* goes in the introductory phrase slot

Noun phrase in the accusative: *the Father* is the direct object because it is in the accusative case

Again, the subject is implied by the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb: are knowing 2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	DO: the father
Subj: you		IO:

So the verse is,

"I write to you, fathers, that you are knowing foundational principles.

I write to you, young men, that you are conquering evil.

I write to you little children, that you are knowing the Father."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "I write unto you, fathers, because ye know him who is from the beginning. I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the evil one. I have written unto you, little children, because ye know the Father." (ASV)
- "I am writing to you who are mature because you know Christ, the one who is from the beginning. I am writing to you who are young because you have won your battle with Satan. I have written to you, children, because you have known the Father." (NLT)
- "I am writing to you, fathers, because you know Him who has been from the beginning I am writing to you, young men, because you have overcome the evil one I have written to you, children, because you know the Father." (NASB)
- "I write to you, fathers, because ye have known him [that is] from the beginning. I write to you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked [one]. I write to you, little children, because ye have known the Father." (DARBY)
- "I write to you, fathers, because ye have known him who [is] from the beginning; I write to you, young men, because ye have overcome the evil. I write to you, little youths, because ye have known the Father." (YLT)
- "I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning. I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one. I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father." (KJV)

We are in substantial agreement except for the article in the first clause of the first sentence. All of them translated it as a personal pronoun and changed the prepositional phrase into a subordinate clause. There are also some other minor differences of interest. You can see which versions followed which textual variants based on the tense of the verbs. Most of them personified evil in the second clause of the second sentence.

Chapter 2 Verse 14 ἔγραψα ὑμῖν πατέρες

Verb: *wrote* goes in the verb slot

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* goes is the indirect object because it is in dative case

Noun in the vocative case: *fathers* goes in the introductory phrase because it is in the vocative case

The subject is drawn from the verb.

IP/C: fathers	Verb: wrote 1st Sing Aorist Act Ind	DO: to you
Subj: I		

ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς

Verb: *are knowing* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *that* goes in the conjunction slot

Article in the accusative before a prepositional phrase: *the from beginning* (see notes on first sentence of verse 13 above. I hope I learned my lesson.)

The subject is implied by the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb: are knowing 2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	DO: him who is from the beginning
Subj: you		

"I wrote to you, fathers, that you are knowing him who is from the beginning..." which is almost identical to the way the previous verse began except it is "wrote" instead of "write."

ἔγραψα ὑμῖν νεανίσκοι Same verse, second sentence:

Verb: *wrote* goes in the verb slot.

Pronoun in the dative case: *you* is the indirect object because it is in the dative case

Noun in the vocative case: *young men* goes in the introductory phrase because it is in the vocative case

The subject is extracted from the verb.

IP/C: young men	Verb: wrote 1st Sing Aorist Act Ind	DO: to you
Subj: I		

ὅτι ἰσχυροί ἐστε

Verb: *are* goes in the verb

Conjunction: *that* goes in the conjunction

Adjective in the nominative case *strong* goes in the predicate adjective. It is a linking verb and needs a pronoun or noun for the subject. The pronoun is taken from the person, number and gender of the verb.

IP/C: that	Verb: are 2nd Plu Present Act Ind	PN: strong
Subj: you		

καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει

Verb: *abides* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction *and* goes in the conjunction slot

Noun phrase in the nominative case: *the word of God* goes in the subject because it is in the nominative case

Prepositional phrase: *in you* modifies the verb

IP/C: and	Verb: abides in you 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	DO:
Subj: the word of God		IO:

καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν

Verb: *are conquering* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction: *and* goes in the conjunction slot

Noun phrase in the accusative case: *evil* goes in the direct object because it is in the accusative case. I know the experts personified this as if it were Satan, the evil one, in the previous verse. However, I do not believe that John was suggesting that we are a match for angels yet, even fallen ones. I do think he means we should be beginning to enjoy a victorious life.

The subject is taken from the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: are conquering 2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	DO: evil
Subj: you		IO:

So the verse reads: "I wrote to you, fathers, that you are knowing him who is from the beginning. I wrote to you, young men, that you are strong, the word of God abides in you, and you are conquering evil."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "I have written to you, fathers, Because you have known Him who is from the beginning. I have written to you, young men, Because you are strong, and the word of God abides in you, And you have overcome the wicked one." (NKJV)
- "I have written unto you, fathers, because ye know him who is from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the evil one." (ASV)
- "I did write to you, fathers, because ye have known him who [is] from the beginning; I did write to you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God in you doth remain, and ye have overcome the evil." (YLT)
- "I have written to you who are mature because you know Christ, the one who is from the beginning. I have written to you who are young because you are strong with God's word living in your hearts, and you have won your battle with Satan." (NLT)
- "I have written to you, fathers, because ye have known him [that is] from the beginning. I have written to you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abides in you, and ye have overcome the wicked [one]." (DARBY)
- "I have written to you, fathers, because you know Him who has been from the beginning I have written to you, young men, because you are strong, and the word of God abides in you, and you have overcome the evil one." (NASB)

- "I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one." (KJV)

We are substantial agreement. Some of the points from the previous verse apply here as well. My reason for choosing the present tense variant in the previous verse was undermined here since in this verse the apostle did use past time version of "write."

Chapter 2 Verse 15

Μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

Verb (Second person plural present active imperative) *love* goes in the verb slot

Adverb *not* is a verb modifier because it is an adverb next to the verb

Noun phrase in the accusative *the world* is the direct object because it

Conjunction, negative particle *neither* is an adverb that modifies what?

Article without noun in the nominative or accusative case *the* goes some place but where?

Prepositional phrase *in the world* is it modifying something or has the "the" in front of it turned it into some kind of substantive as in verses 13 & 14 above?

I am tempted to peek at how others have translated these last five words but as I puzzle over it I notice in the lexical entry for ο, η, το it says, "sometimes translated as a personal or demonstrative pronoun." If we apply that and assume the article is in the accusative case we have a compound object joined by the conjunction neither – "... the world neither those in the world."

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj:	love not 2 nd Plu Present Act Imp	the world neither those in the world
		IO:

Adding a helper word for the imperative case and changing the awkward "neither" to "nor" we have, "Do not love the world, nor those in the world." The next conjunction may or may not signal a subordinating clause. After translating the next two clauses I came back and closed the sentence here.

ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, ἤ

Verb (Third person singular present active subjunctive) *loves* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction, conditional particle *if* goes in the conjunction slot. The verb is already subjunctive which implies "if" so this "if" is probably for emphasis

Indefinite pronoun in the nominative *someone* goes in the subject because it in the nominative case

Noun phrase in the accusative *the world* is the direct object because it is in the accusative case

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
if	loves 3 rd Sing Present Act Subj	the world
Subj:		IO:
someone		

"If someone loves the world..."

οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ

Verb (Linking third person singular present active indicative) *is* goes in the verb slot.

Adverb *not* probably modifies the verb since it is next to it

Noun phrase in the nominative *the love of the father* is the only nominative in the clause so it is the subject

Prepositional phrase *in him* is the predicate adjective because it is all that is left

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj: the love of the father	is not 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA: in him

So with the second sentence in the verse it says, " Do not love the world, nor those in the world. If someone loves the world the love of the Father is not in him,"

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." (ASV)
- "Don't love the world's ways. Don't love the world's goods. Love of the world squeezes out love for the Father." (MSG) *Squeezes out? Where did that come from?*
- "Do not love the world nor the things in the world If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him." (NASB)
- "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." (KJV)
- "Love not the world, nor the things in the world. If any one love the world, the love of the Father is not in him;" (DARBY)
- "Love not ye the world, nor the things in the world; if any one doth love the world, the love of the Father is not in him," (YLT)
- "Stop loving this evil world and all that it offers you, for when you love the world, you show that you do not have the love of the Father in you." (NLT) *Show? Where did that come from?*

We are in substantial agreement except I said, "... those of the world" and all of them said something like, "... the things of the world." I believe theirs is better. Mine implies we are not supposed to love our brothers who are unsaved. That would directly contradict what John says elsewhere in this letter. Either would be a correct rendering of the Greek but only the way they did it is contextually accurate.

Chapter 2 Verse 16 ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς,

Verb (Linking third person singular present active indicative) *is* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction *that* goes in the conjunction slot

Adjective/Article idiom in the nominative case *everything* is the nominative and might be the subject. There are three more noun phrases, joined by conjunctions, that are also in the nominative case. What I believe we have is a complex subject. We have the main subject, "everything that" with the compound noun phrases in apposition to it.

Prepositional phrase *in the world* modifies the main subject

Compound noun phrase in the nominative case which is in apposition to the main subject of the clause:	Noun phrase in the nominative case <i>the lust of the flesh</i> Conjunction <i>and</i> Noun phrase in the nominative case <i>the lust of the eyes</i> Conjunction <i>and</i> Noun phrase in the nominative case <i>the pride of life</i>
---	---

Adverb *not* modifies the verb

Prepositional phrase *from the father* must be the predicate adjective because it is all that is left

IP/C: that	Verb: is not 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: from the father
Subj: everything in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life		

ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστί.

Verb (Linking third person singular present active indicative) *is* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction *but* is the introductory conjunction

Prepositional phrase *from the world* serving as the predicate adjective

IP/C: but	Verb: is 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: from the world
Subj:		

Looking at the whole verse the conjunction "that" on the front does not seem to be sensible so I substitute the next word in the range of sense for *οτι*, "because."

There is two ways you could view this verse grammatically but they end up with basically the same result. (1) You could view these last few words as a separate clause with an understood subject of "it" which refers back to the "everything" in the prior clause. (2) You could view these last few words as the second part of a compound predicate that shares the subject "everything" with the first "is" in the verse.

Either way I render it, "...because everything in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not from the father but is from the world." making it the second part of the second sentence in verse fifteen: " If someone loves the world, the love of the Father is not

in him, because everything in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not from the father but is from the world."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "because all that [is] in the world -- the desire of the flesh, and the desire of the eyes, and the ostentation of the life -- is not of the Father, but of the world," (YLT)
- "because all that [is] in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." (DARBY)
- "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vain glory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." (ASV)
- "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the boastful pride of life, is not from the Father, but is from the world." (NASB)
- "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." (KJV)
- "For all that is in the world-the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life-is not of the Father but is of the world." (NKJV)
- "For the world offers only the lust for physical pleasure, the lust for everything we see, and pride in our possessions. These are not from the Father. They are from this evil world." (NLT)
What justification is there in the Greek for narrowing βίος to "our possessions?" It's range of sense does include "possession" but context would suggest a broader meaning I think and there is no hint of "our" at all.

We seem to be in substantial agreement.

Chapter 2 Verse 17 καὶ ὁ κόσμος παράγεται καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ·

Verb third person singular present passive indicative *is passing* goes into the verb slot

Conjunction *and* begins the clause

Noun phrase in the nominative *the world* is the first part of a compound subject since it is in the nominative case

Conjunction *and* joins the two noun phrases of the compound subject

Noun phrase in the nominative *the lust of it* is the second part of the compound subject also being in the nominative case

IP/C: and	Verb: is passing away 3 rd Sing Present Pass Ind	DO: IO:
Subj: the world and the lust of it		

The clause, "the world and the lust of it is passing," sounds a little awkward, so I choose another possibility from the verb's range of sense. "And the world and the lust of it is passing away..."

ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Verb third person singular present active indicative *abides* goes in the verb slot

Conjunction *but* is the introductory conjunction which connects it to the first clause

Participial phrase modified by a nominative article *doing the will of God* is the subject of the clause because it is in the nominative case. I added "the one" because of the article.

Prepositional phrase *for eternity* modifies the verb

IP/C: but	Verb: abides for eternity 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	DO:
Subj: the one doing the will of God		IO:

This the verse reads in English, "And the world and the lust of it is passing away but the one doing the will of God abides for eternity."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." (ASV)
- "and the world doth pass away, and the desire of it, and he who is doing the will of God, he doth remain -- to the age." (YLT)
- "And the world is passing, and its lust, but he that does the will of God abides for eternity." (DARBY)
- "And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." (KJV)
- "And this world is fading away, along with everything it craves. But if you do the will of God, you will live forever." (NLT)
- "The world is passing away, and also its lusts; but the one who does the will of God lives forever." (NASB)

We are in agreement for the most part.

Chapter 2 Verse 18 Παιδιά, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστί,

Verb (Linking third person singular present active indicative) *is* is the verb

Noun in the vocative case. *little children* goes in the introductory phrase.

Noun phrase in the nominative case *last hour* is either the predicate nominative or the subject because it is in the nominative case. There is nothing else in the clause and we need one of each. Since we can draw a subject from the person and number of the verb we must get it from there and let "last hour" be the predicate nominative.

I add a "the" to avoid awkwardness and we have, "Little children, it is the last hour."

IP/C: little children	Verb: is 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: last hour
Subj: it		PA:

καὶ καθὼς ἠκούσατε

Verb (Second person plural aorist active indicative) *heard* is the verbConjunctions *and as* goes in the conjunction slot

We pull the needed subject from the verb. This leaves us needing a subordinate clause or quote to describe what you heard.

IP/C: and as	Verb:	DO:
Subj: you	heard 2nd Plu Aorist Act Ind	IO:

(ὅτι OR ὅτι ὁ OR ὁ) ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται,

Verb (Third person singular present middle indicative) *himself comes* goes in the verb slotConjunction and/or article *that* and/or *the* – I decide to go with both. The previous clause is begging for a subordinate clause so having a subordinate conjunction at this point seems reasonable.Noun in the nominative case *antichrist* is the subject being the only nominative case noun around. It needs an article in English whether it had one in Greek or not.

IP/C: that	Verb:	DO:
Subj: the antichrist	himself comes	IO:

So far we have, "And as you heard that the antichrist himself comes." Of course, we should note that "And as you heard the antichrist himself comes," works just as well.

καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γέγονασιν·

Verb (Third person plural perfect active indicative) *are happening* goes into the verb slotConjunction *and* is the introductory conjunction for the clauseAdverb *now* modifies the verbNoun phrase in the nominative case *many antichrists* is the subject since it is nominative case "Antichrists are happening" seems odd so I seek a better choice from the range of sense for the verb and use "appear" instead.

IP/C: and	Verb:	DO:
Subj: many antichrists	are now happening are now appearing 3 rd Plu Perfect Act Ind	IO:

"And many antichrists are now appearing."

ὅθεν γινώσκουμεν

Verb (First person plural present active indicative) *know* is the verbConjunction *consequently* is the conjunction

We take the subject from the verb and start looking for a subordinate clause to go with the verb.

IP/C: consequently	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	know 1 st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν.

Verb (Linking third person singular present active indicative) *is* is the verb

Conjunction *that* is the conjunction

Noun phrase in the nominative case *last hour* is either the predicate nominative or the subject because it is in the nominative case. There is nothing else in the clause and we need one of each. Since we can draw a subject from the person and number of the verb we must get it from there and let "last hour" be the predicate nominative.

IP/C: that	Verb: is 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: last hour
Subj: it		PA:

I add a "the" to the predicate nominative and combine this clause with all the others. Taken together translating ὥρα as "hour" is beginning to seem unfaithful to John's meaning. The writer of Revelations is more likely referring to the end times. The range of sense of ὥρα supports this idea so I make the substitution. Now we have, "Little children, it is the last time. And as you heard that the antichrist himself comes and many antichrists are now appearing, consequently we know that it is the last time."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "Little children, it is the last hour: and as ye heard that antichrist cometh, even now have there arisen many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last hour." (ASV)
- "Children, it is the last hour; and just as you heard that antichrist is coming, even now many antichrists have appeared; from this we know that it is the last hour." (NASB)
- "Children, time is just about up. You heard that Antichrist is coming. Well, they're all over the place, antichrists everywhere you look. That's how we know that we're close to the end." (MSG)
- "Dear children, the last hour is here. You have heard that the Antichrist is coming, and already many such antichrists have appeared. From this we know that the end of the world has come." (NLT)
- "Little children, it is [the] last hour, and, according as ye have heard that antichrist comes, even now there have come many antichrists, whence we know that it is [the] last hour." (DARBY)
- "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time." (KJV)
- "Little youths, it is the last hour; and even as ye heard that the antichrist doth come, even now antichrists have become many -- whence we know that it is the last hour;" (YLT)

Only the KJV, MSG and NLT agree with me about making ὥρα "time." Other than that we are pretty much in agreement.

Introduction to Koiné Greek is a unique new approach to learning the Greek originally used to write the New Testament. The course takes the student very quickly into translating the Bible. Most of the concepts used in translation are then learned by example while the student is also gaining new insights into God's beautiful words.

This course contains everything you will need to translate the entire First Epistle of John into English. It includes a copy of the Greek text and all the reference materials necessary to render it into sensible English. Although designed to be used for home schooled High School students it may be used equally well as a self-study guide for adults or in a classroom.