

Translation Guide 2
I John 2:19 - 3:21

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

Chapter 2 Verse 19 ἐξ ἡμῶν (ἐξῆλθον OR ἐξῆλθαν),

Verb (Plural Aorist Active Indicative with either 1st person or 3rd person) *went out* goes in the verb

Prepositional phrase *from us* must modify the verb since there is nothing else in the clause

There is nothing in the nominative case so we need to extract the subject from the verb. It might be "we" or it might be "they." "We went out from us," does not seem to make very much sense so I chose "they." However, we will keep this variant in mind so that if later context makes it possible that "we" was what John meant we can come back to this clause and correct it.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: they	went out from us Plural Aorist Act Ind	IO:

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν

Verb (Third person plural imperfect active indicative) *were* is the verb

Conjunction *but* is the conjunction

Adverb *not* must modify the verb because nothing else is available for it to modify

Prepositional phrase *from us* must be the predicate adjective since we need one

The subject must be extracted from the verb.

IP/C: but	Verb:	PN:
Subj: they	were not 3 rd Plu Imperfect Act Ind	PA: from us

Next we have the segment where it might be one or two clauses. We will try it first with two.

εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν

Verb (3rd Plu Imperfect Act Ind) *were* is the verb

Conjunctions *if for* is the conjunction but makes more sense in English in the opposite order

Prepositional phrase *from us* must be the predicate adjective since we need one

We must extract the subject from the verb.

IP/C: for if	Verb:	PN:
Subj: they	were 3 rd Plu Imperfect Act Ind	PA: from us

μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν

Verb (3rd Plu Pluperfect Act Ind) *were abiding* goes in the verb slot

Contingency particle Indicates what is being said could or could not occur or be true. It is not translated but effects how the clause is to be understood. I add the helper words "would have been" to try to capture this idea.

Prepositional phrase *with us* must modify the verb because there is nothing else

We must extract the subject from the verb

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: they	were would have been abiding with us 3 rd Plu Pluperfect Act Ind	IO:

So taken as two clauses we have, "For if they were from us, they would have been abiding with us." Next let's try it with one clause.

εἰ γὰρ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἦσαν μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν

Verb (3rd Plu Pariphrastic Pluperfect Act Ind) *were abiding* goes in the verb

Conjunctions *if for* is the conjunction but makes more sense in English in the opposite order
Prepositional phrase *from us* might modify the verb or the pronoun in the other prepositional phrase

Contingency particle Indicates what is being said could or could not occur or be true but since I am having trouble understanding what is being said I do not know what to do with it.

Prepositional phrase *with us* might modify the verb or the pronoun in the other prepositional phrase

There is nothing around in the nominative case so the subject is taken from the verb. At this point I am inclined to accept the two clause variant above since I can not make sense of this. It should be noted, however, that just because the εἰμι form is next to a pluperfect verb does not mean that it is only to be understood periphrastically. This variant could also be translated as the two clause version above. In that case this textual variant only has an effect on emphasis.

IP/C: for if	Verb:	DO:
Subj: they	were abiding from us? with us? 3 rd Plu Pariphrastic Pluperfect Act Ind	IO:

ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν

Verb (Third person plural aorist passive subjunctive) *might be made manifest* is the verb

Conjunctions *but that* is the conjunction

The subject must come from the verb

IP/C: but that	Verb:	DO:
Subj: they	might be made manifest 3 rd Plu Aorist Pass Subj	IO:

ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν.

Verb (Third person plural present active indicative) *are* is the verb

Conjunction *that* is the conjunction

Adverb *not* is probably modifying the verb but we'll keep in mind other possibilities

Adjective, nominative case plural, *everyone* might to be taken as a substantive since there is no noun for it to modify.

Prepositional phrase *from us* must be the predicate adjective or it might be modifying the verb if *everyone* is the predicate adjective.

We have two possibilities depending on whether we extract the subject from the verb or use *παντες* for the subject.

IP/C: that	Verb: are not 3 rd Plu Present Act Ind	PN: all from us PA:
Subj: they		

OR

IP/C: that	Verb: are not 3 rd Plu Present Act Ind	PN: from us PA:
Subj: all		

We need the context of the entire verse to sort this out. So far we have, "They went out from us but they were not from us. For if they were from us, they would have been abiding with us. But that they might be made manifest ..." and either "...that they are not all from us," or "...that all are not from us." There does not seem to be a difference in meaning here so I just chose the first one.

I also used a different word from the range of sense of *εκ* to make a distinction between when I believe John was talking about physical and spiritual belonging. To this point I have, " They went out from us but they were not of us. For if they were of us, they would have been abiding with us. But that it might be made manifest that they are not all of us." The final sentence seems more like a subordinate clause looking for a main clause than a real sentence. From the context I believe the first sentence is meant to be the main clause to which the last two clauses are subordinate. There are several ways this could be expressed by moving things around or adding phrases. You could even leave everything as is and make the middle sentence a parenthetical. I decided add a phrase giving, "They went out from us but they were not of us. For if they were of us, they would have been abiding with us. But *they went out* that it might be made manifest that they are not all of us."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they all are not of us." (ASV)
- "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest, that none of them were of us." (NKJV)
- "out of us they went forth, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would have remained with us; but -- that they might be manifested that they are not all of us." (YLT)
- "These people left our churches because they never really belonged with us; otherwise they would have stayed with us. When they left us, it proved that they do not belong with us." (NLT)

- "They left us, but they were never really with us. If they had been, they would have stuck it out with us, loyal to the end. In leaving, they showed their true colors, showed they never did belong." (MSG)
- "They went out from among us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have surely remained with us, but that they might be made manifest that none are of us." (DARBY)
- "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." (KJV)
- "They went out from us, but they were not really of us; for if they had been of us, they would have remained with us; but they went out, so that it would be shown that they all are not of us." (NASB)

It appears the experts also felt the need to rearrange the words and clauses more than usual to make the verse sensible in English. More than one is close to mine. I am content that we have substantial agreement.

Chapter 2 Verse 20

καὶ ὑμεῖς χρῖσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου,

Verb (Second person plural present active indicative) *have* is the verb

Conjunction *and* is the conjunction

Pronoun nominative plural *you* has to be the subject because of the person and number of the verb

Noun nominative or accusative singular neuter *anointing* has to be the accusative since we already have a subject. That means it is the direct object.

Prepositional phrase *from the holy one* (there is no noun inside the prepositional phrase and the adjective is preceded by an article so it is taken as a substantive and therefore the object of the preposition.) the phrase itself modifies "anointing."

IP/C:	and	Verb:	DO:	anointing from the holy one
Subj:	you	have	IO:	
		2 nd Plu Present Act Ind		

καὶ οἶδατε (πάντα OR πάντες).

Verb (Second person plural perfect active indicative) *are seeing* is the verb

Conjunction *and* is the conjunction

Adjective (Nominative or Accusative) (Singular or Plural) (Masculine or Neuter) everyone, everything, some of all type, etc. There is nothing for the adjective to modify so it is taken as a substantive. It must be the direct object since the verb requires a second person subject. This eliminates the textual variant in the nominative case only. However it does not solve the gender and number question. I chose "all" because it seems to cover the possibilities but we need to note the possibility it is wrong in case the context drives us to make a different choice later.

The subject is taken from the verb.

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

It says, "And you have an anointing from the holy one and are seeing all."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "And ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all the things." (ASV)
- "And *ye* have [the] unction from the holy [one], and ye know all things." (DARBY)
- "And ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and have known all things;" (YLT)
- "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." (KJV)
- "But you are not like that, for the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and all of you know the truth. [Greek: But you have an anointing from the Holy One.]" (NLT) *It is clear they know what the Greek really says but choose to render it some other way. I do not understand why anyone would want to do this.*
- "But you have an anointing from the Holy One, and you all know." (NASB)

Again, they prefer "know" over "see" for οἶδα. Other than that we are in agreement. Even with this difference, the difference in meaning is almost non-existent given the general context.

Chapter 2 Verse 21

οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν

Verb (First person singular aorist active indicative) *wrote* is the verb

Adverb *not* modifies the verb

Personal pronoun in the dative *you* is the direct object so I add the helper word "to"

The subject is extracted from the verb. I add a "did" to keep it from sounding awkward in English and we have, "I did not write to you..."

IP/C:	Verb: did not wrote 1 st Sing Aorist Act Ind	DO: to you
Subj: I		IO:

ὅτι οὐκ οἶδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν,

Verb (Second person plural perfect active indicative) *are knowing* is the verb

Conjunction *that* is the conjunction

Adverb *not* modifies the verb

Noun phrase in the accusative *the truth* is the direct object

The subject may be extracted from the verb but because the clause is already subordinate to the "you" in the main clause it might be less awkward without it. That is, "I did not write to you that are not knowing the truth." Another reasonable translation could be, "I did not write to you because you do not know the truth." Let's gather some more context before deciding.

IP/C: that	Verb: are not knowing (2 nd Plu Perfect Act Ind)	DO: the truth
Subj: you or you		IO:

ἀλλ' ὅτι οἶδατε αὐτήν,

Verb (Second person plural perfect active indicative) *are knowing* is the verb

Conjunctions *but that* is the conjunction

Personal pronoun in the accusative *her* is the direct object referring back to the truth which is feminine in Greek. We usually use "it" in English for things that have no gender.

This is a subordinate clause attached to the you in the main clause as well so, we have the same issue of whether to supply the you or not. It might be, "I did not write to you that are not knowing the truth but those that are knowing it," or "I did not write to you because you do not know the truth but because you do know the truth." Let's try for more context.

IP/C: but that	Verb: are knowing (2 nd Plu Perfect Act Ind)	DO: it
Subj: you or you		IO:

καὶ ὅτι πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστι.

Verb (Third person singular present active indicative) *is* is a linking verb

Conjunctions *and that* are the conjunctions

Noun phrase in the nominative *any lie* is the subject because it is in the nominative case

Prepositional phrase *from the truth* must be the predicate adjective but the *from* is awkward.

Using "based on" from the range of sense seems to flow best.

Adverb *not* modifies the verb

IP/C: and that	Verb: is not 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: based on the truth
Subj: any lie		PA:

Neither of my options so far seem to work well with this final clause. The latter seems to flow a little better so we have, "I did not write to you because you do not know the truth but because you do know the truth and because any lie is not based on the truth." Everything in this sentence is true and the grammar makes sense but why would John say such a thing? I puzzled over this for a while and finally realized that the final clause is part of what the reader does know. Not only do they know the truth but they also know that lies are not found in the truth. So finally, "I did not write to you because you do not know the truth but because you do know the truth and that any lie is not based on the truth."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and because no lie is of the truth." (ASV)
- "I did not write to you because ye have not known the truth, but because ye have known it, and because no lie is of the truth." (YLT)
- "I have not written to you because ye do not know the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth." (DARBY)
- "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth." (KJV)
- "So I am writing to you not because you don't know the truth but because you know the difference between truth and falsehood." (NLT)

Somehow, I lost track of the αὐτην in the second clause and substituted the antecedent, the truth. I made it awkward when I did that. Other than my mistake we seem to be in substantial agreement.

Chapter 2 Verse 22 Τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ψεύστης,.

Verb (Third person singular present active indicative) *is* goes in the verb

Interrogative/Indefinite *who* if it is a question, *someone* if it is not a question. The existence of *μη* in the next clause suggests this might be a question so I will start out that way and see if it works. This is the first nominative encountered with a linking verb so it is the subject.

Noun phrase in the nominative *the liar* is the only thing left so it must be the predicate nominative.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj:	is	the liar
who	3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA:

εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος ...

I tried to make everything from "if" (εἰ) to "the Christ"(ο Χριστος) into one clause and got very confused. When I separated out these first four words as a participial phrase things began to fall into place. With an understood "is" it forms the main clause to the two clause answer to the question posed in the first clause above.

Conjunction introduces the participial phrase. I could not come up with anything that made sense using "if" so I searched the range of sense for εἰ and settled on "*surely*."

Adverb *not* besides being a negative hints that this might be a question expecting a negative answer and modifies the participle.

Participle introduced by article making it a substantive in the nominative case *denying*.

IP/C:	Verb:	PN:
Subj:	is not	the liar (implied by this being the answer to the previous question)
surely	3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	
the one denying (subordinate clause below)		

In English, double negatives are improper and seem to imply a positive to our ears. In Greek, multiple negatives were used to emphasize negatives. So it means an emphatic denial of Jesus being the Christ, "...surely the one *strongly* denying..."

ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός;

Verb (Third person singular present active indicative) *is* goes in the verb

Conjunction *that* is the conjunction

Noun in the nominative case *Jesus* is the subject

Adverb *not* modifies the verb

Noun phrase in the nominative *the Christ* is the predicate nominative

IP/C: that	Verb: is not 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: the Christ
Subj: Jesus		PA:

So far that gives us, "Who is a liar? Surely the one strongly denying that Jesus is the Christ"

This makes the "is" understood in English as well. Another reasonable possibility is, "Who is a liar, if it is not the one denying that Jesus is the Christ."

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν

Verb (Third person singular present active indicative) *is* goes in the verb

Demonstrative pronoun in the nominative case *this* is the subject

Noun phrase in the nominative case *the antichrist* is the predicate nominative

Participle introduced by article *the one denying* is in apposition to the predicate nominative, "the antichrist"

Compound noun phrase used as the object of the participle	Noun phrase in the accusative <i>the father</i> Conjunction <i>and</i> Noun phrase in the accusative <i>the son</i>	
IP/C:	Verb: is 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: the antichrist, the one denying the Father and the Son
Subj: this		PA:

So for the verse we have, "Who is a liar, if it is not the one denying that Jesus is the Christ. This is the antichrist, the one denying the Father and the Son."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "Who is a liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist who denies the Father and the Son." (NKJV)
- "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, even he that denieth the Father and the Son." (ASV)
- "And who is the great liar? The one who says that Jesus is not the Christ. Such people are antichrists, for they have denied the Father and the Son." (NLT)
- "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." (KJV)
- "Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? *He* is the antichrist who denies the Father and the Son." (DARBY)

- "Who is the liar but the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, the one who denies the Father and the Son." (NASB)
- "Who is the liar, except he who is denying that Jesus is the Christ? this one is the antichrist who is denying the Father and the Son;" (YLT)

Since this represents my second attempt after I consulted the experts in total confusion, we have agreement as expected.

Chapter 2 Verse 23 πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ (τὸν πατέρα ἔχει ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱόν και) τὸν πατέρα ἔχει.

Verb (3rd Sing Present Act Ind): *have* is the verb..

Adjective (Nom Sing Masc): *all* modifies the participial phrase.

Article (Nom Sing Masc): *the* adds some kind of pronoun before the participle.

Participle (Present Mid Nom Sing Masc): *denying* is the first nominative so it is the subject of the verb

Noun phrase (Acc Sing Masc): *the son* is in the accusative case so it is the object of either the verb or the participle. Position strongly suggests it is the object of the participle.

Adverb: *neither, nor, not, not at all, not even, or not either* - seems to be modifying the verb.

Noun phrase (Acc Sing Masc): *the father* must be the object of the verb. Both context and position argue in favor of it. The verb is transitive and requires a direct object.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj:	have not	the father
all who deny the son	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

"All who deny the Son do not have the Father." The next clause follows a similar pattern.

Article (Nom Sing Masc): *the* adds some kind of pronoun before the participle.

Participle (Present Act Nom Sing Masc): *confessing* is the subject.

Noun phrase (Acc Sing Masc): *the son* is the direct object of the participle

Conjunction: *and* is joining two things, but what two things? I tried making it join the two noun phrases but there was no way for it to make sense doing that. I looked at the range of sense for *και* and found an alternative that makes sense – *also*. I stored it in the front but decided later to put it at the end since the Greek did not have it at the front.

Noun phrase (Acc Sing Masc): *the father* is the direct object of the verb

Verb (3rd Sing Present Act Ind): *have* is the verb

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj:	has	the Father
also	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:
the one confessing the Son		

"The one confessing the Son has the Father also."

Now lets try the alternate textual variant.

πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει.

Verb (3rd Sing Present Act Ind): *have* is the verb

Adjective (Nom Sing Masc): *all* modifies the participial phrase that has been changed into a substantive by the leading article.

Article (Nom Sing Masc): *the* adds some kind of pronoun before the participle

Participle (Present Mid Nom Sing Masc): *denying* is the first nominative so it is the subject of the verb

Noun phrase (Acc Sing Masc): *the son* is in the accusative case so it is the object of either the verb or the participle. Position strongly suggests it is the object of the participle.

Adverb: *neither, nor, not, not at all, not even, or not either* - seems to be modifying the verb.

Noun phrase (Acc Sing Masc): *the father* is the direct object of the verb

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: All who deny the Son	have not 3 rd Sing Present Act Ind	the Father
		IO:

"All who deny the Son do not have the Father."

So that gives us two readings that both make perfect sense. Unlike those that we have encountered so far there does seem to be a point of doctrine involved.

All who deny the Son do not have the Father. The one confessing the Son has the Father also.	OR	All who deny the Son do not have the Father.
--	----	--

It is beyond the scope of this course to address which is correct but you can see from the comparison to the experts below that the longer reading is accepted across the board. Only YLT acknowledges the variant by bracketing the alternate reading.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also." (ASV)
- "Anyone who denies the Son doesn't have the Father either. But anyone who confesses the Son has the Father also." (NLT)
- "every one who is denying the Son, neither hath he the Father, [he who is confessing the Son hath the Father also.]" (YLT)
- "Whoever denies the Son does not have the Father; the one who confesses the Son has the Father also." (NASB)
- "Whoever denies the Son has not the Father either; he who confesses the Son has the Father also." (DARBY)
- "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." (KJV)

Chapter 2 Verse 24 ὑμεῖς (οὖν) ὃ ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς,

Verb (2nd Plu Aorist Act Ind): *heard* is the verb

Personal Pronoun (Nom Plu): *you* is the subject of the verb "heard"

Conjunction: *therefore* is the conjunction

Relative Pronoun (Nom/Acc Sing Neut): *which* is also the conjunction

Prepositional phrase: *from beginning* modifies the verb

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

ἐν ὑμῖν μετέω.

Verb (3rd Sing Present Act Imp) *abides* is the verb

Prepositional phrase: *in you* (plural) modifies the verb

The verb needs a subject so it is taken from the verb.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: he	abides in you 3rd Sing Present Act Imp	IO:

With a "helper" word we have, "Therefore, that which you heard from the beginning, 'He abides in you,' ...

ἐὰν ἐν ὑμῖν μείνη

Verb (3rd Sing Aorist Act Subj) *may have abided* is the verb

Conjunction or conditional particle: *if, though, or even if* is the conjunction. I'll start with "if."

Prepositional phrase: *in you* (plural you) modifies the verb

Subject comes from the verb.

IP/C: if	Verb:	DO:
Subj: he	may have abided in you 3rd Sing Aorist Act Subj	IO:

ὃ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε,

Verb (2nd Plu Aorist Act Ind): *heard* is the verb

Relative Pronoun (Nom/Acc Sing Neut): *which* subordinates the clause to "you" above and also serves as the subject of this clause

Prepositional phrase: *from beginning* modifies the verb

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

καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ μένετε.

Verb (2nd Plu Future Act Ind): *will abide* is the verb

Conjunction: *and* is the conjunction for the clause

Personal Pronoun (Nom Plu): *you* is the subject of the clause

Prepositional phrase: *in the son* modifies the verb

Conjunction: *and* combines the prepositional phrases

Prepositional phrase: *in the father* modifies the verb

IP/C: and	Verb: will abide in the son and in the father 2nd Plu Future Act Ind	DO: TO:
Subj: you		

"Therefore, that which you heard from the beginning, 'He abides in you,' if he may have abided in you which heard from the beginning and you will abide in the son and in the father," makes very little sense. I am completely frustrated and ready to peek at what the experts did. It is close to the end of the day. I'll try again tomorrow. Well, it is the next day and I'm no closer to having any kind of reasonable guess as to the meaning of the verse, so, I'll take a look at how the "experts" did it.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "As for you, let that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning. If that which ye heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall abide in the Son, and in the Father." (ASV)
- "As for *you* let that which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you: if what ye have heard from the beginning abides in you, *ye* also shall abide in the Son and in the Father." (DARBY)
- "As for you, let that abide in you which you heard from the beginning If what you heard from the beginning abides in you, you also will abide in the Son and in the Father." (NASB)
- "Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father." (KJV)
- "So you must remain faithful to what you have been taught from the beginning. If you do, you will continue to live in fellowship with the Son and with the Father." (NLT)
- "Ye, then, that which ye heard from the beginning, in you let it remain; if in you may remain that which from the beginning ye did hear, ye also in the Son and in the Father shall remain," (YLT)

Clearly what I missed was the word "let." Where did it come from? It came from the imperative mood of the first appearance of the verb μένω. It makes all the difference.

Chapter 2 Verse 25 καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία

Verb 3rd Sing Present Act Ind: *is* is a linking verb

Conjunction: *and* is the conjunction for the clause

Dem Pron Nom Sing Fem: *this, this one, or this woman* is the subject. Since the predicate adjective is not a person "this" seems to work best

Noun phrase in the nominative case: *the promise*

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

ἦν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο (ἡμῖν OR ὑμῖν), τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον.

Verb 3rd Sing Aorist Mid Ind: *promised* is the verb. Note it is in middle voice.

Relative Pron Acc Sing Fem: *which* subordinates the clause to "the promise" in the previous clause and goes in the conjunction slot of this clause

Per Pron 3rd Nom Sing Masc: *he* is the only thing around in the nominative case so it is the subject. The fact that it is included when it is already implied by the person and number of the verb means that it is emphasized here.

Both textual variants work as the indirect object:

<i>to us</i>	OR	<i>to you</i> (plural)
--------------	----	------------------------

Noun phrase in the accusative: *eternal life*

IP/C: which	Verb: himself promised	DO: eternal life
Subj: he	3rd Sing Aorist Mid Ind	IO: to us OR to you

I add "himself" to show the middle voice of the verb and I have, "And this is the promise which He Himself promised to us, eternal life," or "... promised to you, eternal life." This kind of textual problem is fairly common in the New Testament. Some scholars speculate that it is because second person plural personal pronouns were pronounced the same as first person plural personal pronouns in the middle ages. Since copies were sometimes made by one dictating to many rather actually copying the text this could explain this kind of variant. Either way, can we doubt that John meant to include both himself and his readers as recipients of this promise of eternal life?

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "And this is the promise which he promised us, even the life eternal." (ASV)
- "And in this fellowship we enjoy the eternal life he promised us." (NLT)
- "and this is the promise that He did promise us -- the life the age-during." (YLT)
- "And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life." (KJV)
- "And this is the promise which *he* has promised us, life eternal." (DARBY)
- "This is the promise which He Himself made to us: eternal life." (NASB)

We are in agreement. All the experts chose "us" instead of "you" for the variant. Only the NASB joined me in showing the middle voice.

Chapter 2 Verse 26

Ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν πλανώντων ὑμᾶς.

Verb 1st Sing Aorist Act Ind: *wrote* is the verb

Dem Pron Nom/Acc Plu Neut: *these* can not be the subject since the verb requires a first person subject. Therefore it must be the object since the nominative sense is not used leaving only the accusative.

Per Pron 2nd Dat Plu: *you* (plural) is the indirect object since it is in the dative case. "To" seems the most appropriate helper word to use with this verb.

Prepositional phrase taking a participle for its object and modifying the direct object: *concerning the deceiving*

Per Pron 2nd Acc Plu: *you* (plural) is the object of the participle.

There is no subject found so it is extracted from the person and number of the verb. As usual the participle needs a helper word as does the direct object in order to avoid awkwardness in English.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: I	wrote	these concerning the deceiving you
	1st Sing Aorist Act Ind	IO: to you

So I translate the verse as, "I wrote these things to you concerning those deceiving you."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "These things have I written unto you concerning them that would lead you astray." (ASV)
- "These things I have written to you concerning those who try to deceive you." (NKJV)
- "I have written these things to you because you need to be aware of those who want to lead you astray." (NLT)
- "These things have I written to you concerning those who lead you astray:" (DARBY)
- "These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you." (KJV)
- "These things I did write to you concerning those leading you astray;" (YLT)
- "These things I have written to you concerning those who are trying to deceive you." (NASB)

The experts varied considerably over which sense they chose for πλαναω but other than that we are in agreement.

Chapter 2 Verse 27

I struggled with getting started with this one for awhile. What is recorded below is my second attempt. The first is too confusing for publication. I decided there is a clause within a clause and moved the subordinate clause to second place. It became clear when I looked at the person and number of the two verbs and the case and number of the available nouns and pronouns.

καὶ ... τὸ χρῖσμα ... (ἐν ὑμῖν μένει OR μένει ἐν ὑμῖν),

Verb 3rd Sing Present Act Ind: *abides* is the verb.

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, likewise* is the conjunction

Noun phrase in the nominative or accusative: *the anointing* is the subject. I know it can not be the direct object because abides is intransitive.

Prepositional phrase: *in you* modifies the verb whether it come before or after.

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

ὕμεῖς ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ

Verb 2nd Plu Aorist Act Ind: *took, received, procured, got* is the verb. I chose "received" because an anointing is not something you take so much as receive.

Per Pron 2nd Nom Plu: *you (plural)* is the subject

Rel Pron Nom/Acc Sng Neut: *who, which, what, another* subordinates the clause to the subject of the previous clause which makes the correct choice from the range of sense, "which"

Prepositional phrase: *from him* modifies the verb.

IP/C: which	Verb: received from him 2nd Plu Aorist Act Ind	DO:
Subj: you		IO:

So, "And His anointing, which you received from Him, abides in you." In the Greek the first "you" is emphasized by its position.

καὶ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε

Verb 2nd Plu Present Act Ind : *have, hold, possess, keep, can* is the verb.

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, both*

Adverb: *no, not; never, nothing, none* modifies the verb

Noun Acc Sing Fem: *necessity, need, lack, duty* is the direct object because it is in the accusative

The subject is taken from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: have no 2nd Plu Present Act Ind	DO: necessity
Subj: you		IO:

ἵνα τις διδάσκη ὑμᾶς

Verb 3rd Sng Present Act Subj: *may or might teach or instruct* is the verb. Note the subjunctive.
Conjunction: *that, in order that, so that* subordinates to the direct object, "necessity," in the previous clause.

Inter/Indef Nom Sing Masc: *Indef – someone* is the subject

Per Pron 2nd Acc Plu: *you (plural)* is the direct object

IP/C: that	Verb: may teach 3rd Sng Present Act Subj	DO: you
Subj: someone anyone		IO:

After seeing the entire context of both these clauses I decided to use "anyone" from the range of sense for τις instead of "someone." I added the helper word "do" to the first verb to avoid awkwardness and used "should" to show the subjunctive mood of the second verb. So we add, "...and you do not have necessity that anyone should teach you," to what we have so far for the verse.

ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ (αὐτὸ OR αὐτοῦ) χρῖσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων,

Verb 3rd Sing Present Act Ind: *teaches, instructs, trains* is the verb

Conjunctions: *but, nevertheless, however* and: *as, like, when, how, about, just as, though* go in the conjunction slot

These three words are written two different ways:

Article Nom/Acc Sing Neut: *the*

Per Pron 3rd Nom/Acc Sng Nt: *it*

Per Pron 3rd Gen Sng Msc/Nt: *his, of him, its, of it, it, him*

Noun Nom/Acc Sing Neut: *anointing, unction*

<i>the it anointing</i>	OR	<i>the anointing of him</i>
-------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------

I chose the second because I could make no sense of the first. It forms a noun phrase that is the subject

Per Pron 2nd Acc Plu: *you (plural)* is the direct object

Prepositional phrase: *concerning, everything* modifies the verb in Greek and is an indirect object in English.

IP/C: but as	Verb: teaches	DO: you
Subj: the anointing of him		IO: concerning everything

"...but as the anointing of Him teaches you concerning everything..."

καὶ ἀληθές ἐστι,

Verb 3rd Sing Present Act Ind: *is, exists, happens, lives* is the verb.

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, then*

Adj Nom/Acc Sing Neut: *true, truthful, honest, genuine* since a linking verb requires both a subject and predicate nominative or adjective in the nominative case we must use this for the predicate adjective and take the subject from the number and person of the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: the truth
Subj: he or it		PA:

καὶ οὐκ ἔστι ψεῦδος

Verb 3rd Sing Present Act Ind: *is, exists, happens, lives* is the verb

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, as well*

Adverb: *no, not; never, without, none* modifies the verb

Noun Nom Sing Neut: *lie, falsehood, untruth* since a linking verb requires both a subject and predicate nominative or adjective this has to be the predicate nominative and the subject must be extracted from the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb: is no 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: lie
Subj: he or it		PA:

Keeping in mind that the subject still might be he (or she for that matter) I used "it" since the predicate adjective and predicate nominative are both neuter. "... and it is the truth and it is no lie..."

καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς,

Verb 3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind: *taught, instructed, trained* is the verb

Conjunction: *as, even as, in as much as* is the conjunction

Per Pron 2nd Acc Plu: *you (plural)* is the direct object

The subject must come from the verb.

IP/C: and as	Verb: taught 3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	DO: you
Subj: he		IO:

(μενεῖτε OR μενεῖτε) ἐν αὐτῷ.

Either Verb 2nd Plu Future Act Ind : *will abide, will stay, will last* is the verb

Or Verb 2nd Plu Present Act Ind : *abide, remain, stay, dwell* is the verb. I decided to start out trying the second one first and see how it turned out.

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, indeed* is the conjunction

Prepositional phrase: *in him or it* modifies the verb.

There being no subject it is drawn out of the verb.

IP/C:	Verb: abide or will abide in him or it 2nd Plu (Present or Future) Act Ind	DO:
Subj: you		IO:

Concluding the verse with "...and as He taught you, you abide in Him."

Altogether with a few minor alterations to avoid awkwardness, we have, "And the anointing which you received from Him, abides in you, so that you do not have a need that anyone should teach you. But as the anointing of Him teaches you concerning everything, and it is the truth and it is no lie, as He taught you, so you will abide in Him." I decided to go with the future tense for the last verb because if you go with the present it sounds like the English imperative. The Greek definitely does not support the imperative so I went with the future tense to avoid sounding as if it did.

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "And as for you, the anointing which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you; but as his anointing teacheth you; concerning all things, and is true, and is no lie, and even as it taught you, ye abide in him." (ASV)
- "and *yourselves*, the unction which ye have received from him abides in you, and ye have not need that any one should teach you; but as the same unction teaches you as to all things, and is true and is not a lie, and even as it has taught you, ye shall abide in him." (DARBY)
- "and you, the anointing that ye did receive from him, in you it doth remain, and ye have no need that any one may teach you, but as the same anointing doth teach you concerning all, and is true, and is not a lie, and even as was taught you, ye shall remain in him." (YLT)
- "As for you, the anointing which you received from Him abides in you, and you have no need for anyone to teach you; but as His anointing teaches you about all things, and is true and is not a lie, and just as it has taught you, you abide in Him." (NASB)
- "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." (KJV)
- "But you have received the Holy Spirit, [Greek the anointing.] and he lives within you, so you don't need anyone to teach you what is true. For the Spirit teaches you all things, and what he teaches is true--it is not a lie. So continue in what he has taught you, and continue to live in Christ." (NLT) *If you know the Greek says "the anointing" why would you translate it "Holy Spirit?"*

We have substantial agreement, which surprised me, after all the difficulty I had with it.

Chapter 2 Verse 28

Καὶ νῦν, τέκνια, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ,

Verb 2nd Plu Present Act Ind : *abide, remain, stay, continue* is the verb

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, yet, so* is the conjunction

Adverb: *now, present, this time* modifies the verb

Noun Voc Plu Neut: *little children* is in the vocative case and therefore forms an introductory phrase

Prepositional phrase: *in him or it* – indirect object in English

The subject has not been found so it comes from the verb.

IP/C:	and, little children	Verb:	abide	DO:	
Subj:	you		2nd Plu Present Act Ind	IO:	in (him or it)

"And, little children, you abide in him..."

ἵνα (ὅταν Οἴ ἐάν) φανερωθῆ

Verb 3rd Sng Aorist Pass Subj: *revealed* is the verb. Note the passive voice and subjunctive mood.

Conjunction: *that, in order that, so that* is the first part of the conjunction

Conjunction:

<i>when, as often as, whenever</i>	OR	<i>if, thought, even if</i>
------------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------

The subject is extracted from the verb.

IP/C: That (when or if)	Verb:	DO:
Subj: he	may have been revealed 3rd Sng Aorist Pass Subj	IO:

"... that (when or if) he may have been revealed

(ἔχωμεν OR σχωμεν) παρρησίαν

The verb is a first person plural active voice subjunctive mood form of the verb "have." What is in question is whether it is present or past time.

<i>may have</i>	OR	<i>might have had</i>
-----------------	-----------	-----------------------

I'll try the first to start with.

Noun Acc Sing Fem: *boldness, confidence* is the direct object

The subject is drawn from the verb.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO: boldness
Subj: we	may have OR might have had 1st Plu (Present or Aorist) Act Subj	IO:

"...we may have boldness..."

καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Verb 1st Plu Aorist Pass Subj : *ashamed, dishonored, shamed* is the verb.

Conjunction: *and, also, too, even, likewise* is the conjunction

Adverb: *not* modifies the verb

Prepositional phrase: *from him* modifies the verb

Prepositional phrase: *in the presence of him* modifies the verb

The subject is taken from the verb.

IP/C: and	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	may not be ashamed from him in the presence of him 1st Plu Aorist Pass Subj	IO:

"... and we are not ashamed from him in the presence of him," does not make much sense so I dig into the range of sense of the various words: "... and we are not shamed away from him at his coming."

I decided to go with "if" instead of "when" because in English "when" gives it a sound of certainty which the subjunctive mood of the verb does not support. I do not suppose that John meant that His coming is in doubt, but it is in doubt that it will be in our lifetime. I decided to go with the present tense of the verb "have" because the past tense sounds odd when speaking of future events. So, "And, little children, you abide in him so if he is revealed we may have boldness and we are not shamed away from him at his coming."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "And now, little children, abide in Him, that when He appears, we may have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming." (NKJV)
- "And now, my little children, abide in him; that, if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." (ASV)
- "And now, children, abide in him, that if he be manifested we may have boldness, and not be put to shame from before him at his coming." (DARBY)
- "And now, children, stay with Christ. Live deeply in Christ. Then we'll be ready for him when he appears, ready to receive him with open arms, with no cause for red-faced guilt or lame excuses when he arrives." (MSG)
- "And now, dear children, continue to live in fellowship with Christ so that when he returns, you will be full of courage and not shrink back from him in shame." (NLT)
- "And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." (KJV)
- "And now, little children, remain in him, that when he may be manifested, we may have boldness, and may not be ashamed before him, in his presence;" (YLT)
- "Now, little children, abide in Him, so that when He appears, we may have confidence and not shrink away from Him in shame at His coming." (NASB)

I accidentally skipped putting in the $\nu\upsilon\upsilon$ but other than that we have substantial agreement. Also, they make the first clause sound as if it is in the imperative mood but I see no justification for that in the Greek. Since they all do it I suspect there is a grammatical cue here I do not yet understand.

Chapter 2 Verse 29

ἐὰν εἰδῆτε

Verb 2nd Plu Perfect Act Subj: *are knowing* is the verb. Notice it is perfect tense and subjunctive mood. I decided to let the conjunction carry the sense of the subjunctive.

Conjunction, conditional particle: *if, though, even if*

There being no subject it is formed from the person and number of the verb.

IP/C: if	Verb:	DO:
Subj: you	are knowing 2nd Plu Perfect Act Subj	IO:

ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστι,

Verb: *is, exists, happens, lives*

Conjunction: *that, because, for, for since*

Adj Nom Sing Masc: *righteous, innocent, guiltless*

We know the subject is *he* rather than *she* or *it* because it is modified by a masculine adjective.

IP/C: that	Verb:	PN:
Subj: he	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA: righteous

ΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΤΕ

Verb: *know, comprehend, is aware* is the verb

The subject comes from the verb.

IP/C:	Verb:	DO:
Subj: we	know 2nd Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

ὅτι (καί) πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται

Verb: *bringing forth, begetting* is the verb. Note the perfect tense and passive voice..

Conjunction: *that also*

Adj Nom Sing Masc: *everyone, everything, any* modifies the subject because it is in the nominative case

Article Nom Sing Masc: *the* makes the participle a substantive (gerund)

Participle Present Act Nom Sing Masc: *making, doing, causing, bringing about, forming*

Noun phrase in the accusative: *the righteousness* is the object of the participle

Prepositional phrase: *from him* modifies the verb.

IP/C: that also	Verb:	DO:
Subj: everyone doing righteousness	being brought forth from him 3rd Sing Perfect Pass Ind	IO:

So, "If you are knowing that He is righteous you know also that everyone doing righteousness is being brought forth by Him." It is so awkward I'm not certain I know what it means. I'm going to take some translation license and guess again. "If you know He is righteous, then you also know that all those doing righteousness come from Him."

My Translation Compared to the Experts:

- "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him." (ASV)
- "If ye know that he is righteous, know that every one who practises righteousness is begotten of him." (DARBY)
- "if ye know that he is righteous, know ye that every one doing the righteousness, of him hath been begotten." (YLT)
- "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him." (KJV)
- "If you know that He is righteous, you know that everyone also who practices righteousness is born of Him." (NASB)
- "Once you're convinced that he is right and righteous, you'll recognize that all who practice righteousness are God's true children." (MSG)
- "Since we know that God is always right, we also know that all who do what is right are his children." (NLT)

I was going in the right direction but I lost the sense of our family connection to Him which is in the last clause and which is very important.

Chapter 3 Verse 1 ἴδετε In English there is no imperative mood in past time. I have chosen to translate it as "You must understand..." Another option I considered was, "Surely you must understand by now already."

C/IP	VERB	DO:
Subj you	must understand	IO:
	2nd Plu Aorist Act Imp	

ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ The construction of the direct object is difficult to understand.. We have an pronoun in apposition to a noun both in the accusative case. I finally decided to go with "what kind of love" but I am anxious see how the experts dealt with it. Literally we have "the Father is giving love what kind." Ironically, to render it into sensible English I have to adopt something closer to the Greek word order. "You must understand what kind of love the Father is giving to us."

C/IP	VERB	DO:
	is giving	what kind of love
Subj the Father	3rd Sing Perfect Act Ind	IO:
		to us

ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθῶμεν. The clause is easily rendered but it is less easily made sense of in context. We know that "the children" must be the object because the verb requires a first person subject. I've never seen a noun that is anything but third person and do not believe there are any 1st or 2nd person nouns. I make it, "You must understand what kind of love the Father is giving to us, that we might be called children of God."

C/IP	VERB	DO:
that	might be called	the children of God
Subj we	1st Plu Aorist Pass Subj	IO:

(καὶ ἔσμεν OR ἔσμεν OR neither) After looking over this clause and sort of reading ahead to the next clause I decided to start with leaving it out and then trying the alternate texts after I had finished the verse.

C/IP	VERB	PN or PA:
(and)	we are	?
Subj	1st Plu Present Act Ind	

διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει (ἡμᾶς OR ὑμᾶς), The phrase dia touto is Greek idiom for "therefore" or "for this reason." The textual variant does not make much difference. Either way it is clear the apostle was referring to the children of God mentioned in the previous verse. I decided to go with "us." "Therefore the world does not know us."

C/IP	VERB	DO:
therefore	does not know	(us OR you)
Subj the world	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτόν. No linguistic surprises here. "Therefore the world does not know us, because it did not understand Him."

C/IP	because	VERB	DO: Him
Subj	it	did not know	IO:
		3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	

When I went back and looked at the εσμεν variations I could find no predicate nominative or predicate adjective for the verb anywhere in the verse so I just left it out. I also decided to go with the second sense of γινωσκω. The world does know us in some sense, it just does not understand us. Using understand instead made it sound like the apostle was using the same word in the introductory phrase so I selected differently from its range of sense to preserve the distinction. This gives me, "You must see what kind of love the Father is giving to us, that we might be called children of God. Therefore the world does not understand us, because it did not understand Him."

Comparing to the Experts: Looks like I was pretty close this time.

- "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not." (KJV) Why did they use the word "sons?" *Greek has a word for "sons" and τεκνον is not it. Τεκνον is also neuter not masculine.*
- "See how great a love the Father has bestowed on us, that we would be called children of God; and such we are For this reason the world does not know us, because it did not know Him." (NASB) *The "and such we are" is from the textual variation. They found the predicate nominative in the object of the previous clause. They took it to mean that not only are we called children of God, we are children of God. I like the idea but I do not see the linguistic justification of it. I would like to see an example of this construction when a textual variant is not involved.*
- "See what love the Father has given to us, that we should be called [the] children of God. For this reason the world knows us not, because it knew him not." (DARBY)
- "See ye what love the Father hath given to us, that children of God we may be called; because of this the world doth not know us, because it did not know Him;" (YLT)
- "What marvelous love the Father has extended to us! Just look at it—we're called children of God! That's who we really are. But that's also why the world doesn't recognize us or take us seriously, because it has no idea who he is or what he's up to." (MSG) *The "marvelous" looks different than the other experts but it can be justified by the range of sense of ποταπος. They made the textual variant into "That's who we really are." There does not seem to be any justification in the Greek for "or take us seriously."*
- "See how very much our heavenly Father loves us, for he allows us to be called his children, and we really are! But the people who belong to this world don't know God, so they don't understand that we are his children." (NLT) *This one also reaches deeper into the range of sense of ποταπος. Perhaps they feel this is justified by the imperative mood of the previous verb. They translated the textual variant as "and we really are!" I believe their translation of the final clause is way off. It is very clear that the verse is saying that the children are not understood any better than their Father. There is no justification either in the grammar, the range of sense, or in the textual variants to narrow the sense of the world's misunderstanding of us to just the fact that we are His children.*

Chapter 3 Verse 2 Ἀγαπητοί, νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν, The adjective in the vocative case serves the same purpose as a noun in the vocative case.

C/IP	Beloved	VERB	
Subj	we	are now	PN: children of God
		1st Plu Present Act Ind	

"Beloved, we are the children of God."

καὶ οὐπω ἐφανερώθη

C/IP	and	VERB	DO:
Subj	it	is not yet made manifest	IO:
		3rd Sing Aorist Pass Ind	

"... and it is not yet made manifest."

τί ἐσόμεθα.

C/IP	what	VERB	DO:
Subj	we	ourselves will be	IO:
		1st Plu Future Mid Ind	

" what we ourselves will be "

οἶδαμεν (δε)

C/IP	(but)	VERB	DO:
Subj	we	are seeing	IO:
		1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	

"but we are seeing"

ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῆ.

C/IP	That when	VERB	DO:
Subj	he	is made manifest	IO:
		3rd Sing Aorist Pass Subj	

"That when he is made manifest,..."

ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα,

C/IP		VERB	
Subj	we	our selves will be like	PN: Him
		1st Plu Future Mid Ind	

"... we our selves will be like Him..."

ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν

C/IP	because	VERB	DO: Him
Subj	we	shall see	IO:
		1st Plu Future Mid Ind	

"... because we shall see Him ..."

καθώς ἐστι. We have a linking verb without a predicate nominative or predicate adjective. When the subject is God, this is certainly possible as in "I am."

C/IP	as	VERB	
Subj	He	is	PN or PA: ?
		3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

For this clause I rendered it, "... as He is."

So I have, "Beloved, we are now the children of God, but it is not yet made manifest, what we ourselves will be. But we are seeing that when he is made manifest, we our selves will be like Him, because we shall see Him as He is."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "beloved, now, children of God are we, and it was not yet manifested what we shall be, and we have known that if he may be manifested, like him we shall be, because we shall see him as he is;" (YLT)
- "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is." (ASV)
- "Beloved, now we are children of God; and it has not yet been revealed what we shall be, but we know that when He is revealed, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." (NKJV)
- "Beloved, now are we children of God, and what we shall be has not yet been manifested; we know that if it is manifested we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." (DARBY)
- "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." (KJV)
- "Beloved, now we are children of God, and it has not appeared as yet what we will be We know that when He appears, we will be like Him, because we will see Him just as He is." (NASB)

I'm beginning to think my lexicon may not be right for οἶδα. It has "see" first in the list and the experts consistently use "know" instead. It seems that all the experts left out the variant δε.

Chapter 3 Verse 3

καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀγνίζει ἑαυτὸν, It looks more complicated than it is. The participle is the subject, the noun phrase in the accusative after the participle is the object of the participle and the prepositional phrase modifies the participle's object.

C/IP	and	VERB	DO: himself
Subj	everyone having this hope upon Him	purifies	IO:
		3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

καθὼς ἐκεῖνος ἄγνός ἐστι. In this case we need to use the demonstrative pronoun as a personal pronoun to keep it from sounding awkward in English.

C/IP	even as	VERB	
Subj	He	is	PA: pure
		3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

The "upon" seemed a little awkward to me so I looked in the range of sense a little deeper, took a creative chance, and came up with, "And everyone having this hope based on Him purifies himself even as He is pure." I can not wait to see what the experts did.

Comparing to the Experts:

- "And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (ASV)
- "And all who believe this will keep themselves pure, just as Christ is pure." (NLT) I see a big difference between "having hope on Him" and "believe." Greek has a word for believe and it is not *εχων ελπιδα*. Either way where did the "in Him" or "on Him" go?
- "And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (KJV)
- "And every one that has this hope in him purifies himself, even as *he* is pure." (DARBY)
- "and every one who is having this hope on him, doth purify himself, even as he is pure." (YLT)
- "And everyone who has this hope fixed on Him purifies himself, just as He is pure." (NASB)

It appears that the experts mostly went with either "on" or "in" for the preposition *επι*. I like the concept of "in" but do not find it in the range of sense for *επι* with the dative case. But then, neither is my exact rendering.

Chapter 3 Verse 4

Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ, This one is difficult for me. It appears that the subject is a participial phrase as in the previous verse but if you take the compound noun phrase (the sin and the lawlessness) after the participle as the object of the participle that leaves the verb screaming for a direct object. The only way I could figure out to render it was ignore the *καὶ* and make the second accusative noun the direct object of the verb. I'm hoping looking at what the experts have done will clear it up for me. I went ahead and put the *καὶ* on front just so I would remember there was one.

C/IP	and	VERB	DO: lawlessness
Subj	all those doing sin	do	IO:
		3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. No surprises on linguistical puzzles here.

C/IP and	VERB	
Subj sin	is	PN: lawlessness
	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

The second "and" seemed a little awkward to me so I looked in the range of sense for καὶ pretty far to find "indeed." So with some trepidation I turn to the experts with, "And all those doing sin do lawlessness, indeed, sin is lawlessness."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness." (ASV)
- "Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness, and sin is lawlessness." (NKJV)
- "Every one that practises sin practises also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness." (DARBY)
- "Every one who is doing the sin, the lawlessness also he doth do, and the sin is the lawlessness," (YLT)
- "Everyone who practices sin also practices lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness." (NASB)
- "Those who sin are opposed to the law of God, for all sin opposes the law of God." (NLT)
- "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." (KJV)

I understand now. I was not far off. The second noun is the direct object of the verb. I just put the καὶ on the front instead of using a different choice from the range of sense. After seeing what the experts have done I would change mine to, "All those doing sin also do lawlessness, indeed, sin is lawlessness."

Chapter 3 Verse 5

καὶ οἶδατε

C/IP and	VERB	DO:
Subj you	are knowing	IO:
	2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	

ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη I elected to use the demonstrative pronoun as a personal pronoun to avoid "that that One" in English.

C/IP that	VERB	DO:
Subj He	was manifested	IO:
	3rd Sing Aorist Pass Ind	

ἵνα τὰς ἀμαρτίας (ἡμῶν) ἄρῃ, We have another one of those cases of an article modifying a noun in a different case as we did in the prior chapter. I did a little research on this construction and it turns out that this kind of thing happens a couple of thousand times in the New Testament. My instinct to use the case and number of the article instead of the noun was correct. There are apparently some other subtle grammatical issues but I do not yet understand them.

I included the textual variant. It does not appear to change the meaning much to have it or not, at least, when taken in the context as a whole.

I chose to go farther into the range of sense of ἵνα in order to keep it distinct from the previous οὔτι.

C/IP	in order that	VERB	DO:
Subj	our sins	might have been taken away 3rd Sing Aorist Act Subj	IO:

καὶ ἀμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι. I decided to make this a separate sentence.

C/IP	and	VERB	PA: in Him
Subj	sin	is not 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

I decided to leave off the καὶ's on the fronts of the sentences just to make it sound better. So that gives me, "You are knowing that He was manifested in order that our sins might have been taken away. Sin is not in Him."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "And ye know that he was manifested to take away sins; and in him is no sin." (ASV)
- "and ye have known that he was manifested that our sins he may take away, and sin is not in him;" (YLT)
- "And ye know that *he* has been manifested that he might take away our sins; and in him sin is not." (DARBY)
- "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." (KJV)
- "And you know that Jesus came to take away our sins, for there is no sin in him." (NLT) There is no justification that I can find for giving the word καὶ the meaning "for."
- "You know that He appeared in order to take away sins; and in Him there is no sin." (NASB)

One difference is that they all chose to keep it in one sentence. I believe they are taking the verse to mean that all three of the final three clauses are subordinated by the initial οὔτι to the main clause. All but YLT and DARBY made the third clause into an infinitive which I agree reads easier without a change in meaning. Only NASB joined me in taking off the initial καὶ. None of them showed both the subjunctive mood and passive voice in the third clause. Generally they also kept the word order of the final clause instead of putting the prepositional phrase in the normal position for a predicate adjective. It seems to work and it preserves the emphasis of the original Greek.

Chapter 3 Verse 6 πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει·

"Sin" is an intransitive verb not requiring a direct object.

C/IP		VERB	DO:
Subj	everyone abiding in Him	does not sin	IO:
		3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν. After trying unsuccessfully to split this into two clauses I finally realized that it has a compound predicate.

C/IP		VERB	DO: Him
Subj	everyone sinning	neither is seeing nor is knowing	(once for each predicate)
		3rd Sing Perfect Act Ind	IO:

So my translation is, "Everyone abiding in Him does not sin. Everyone sinning is neither seeing Him nor knowing Him."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "Whoever abides in Him does not sin. Whoever sins has neither seen Him nor known Him." (NKJV)
- "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither knoweth him." (ASV)
- "every one who is remaining in him doth not sin; every one who is sinning, hath not seen him, nor known him." (YLT)
- "No one who abides in Him sins; no one who sins has seen Him or knows Him." (NASB)
- "So if we continue to live in him, we won't sin either. But those who keep on sinning have never known him or understood who he is." (NLT) *I'm glad the Greek does not support this translation because I keep sinning and yet I believe I know Him and understand who He is. When I abide in Him I do not sin, but I keep forgetting and trying to grab control and live for myself. It is a mistake every time.*
- "Whoever abides in him, does not sin: whoever sins, has not seen him or known him." (DARBY)
- "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him." (KJV)

Except for NLT there does not seem to be any big differences in the meanings. Generally they used "whoever" instead of "everyone" as I did. πᾶς is very difficult to translate because it has such a wide range of sense. They are probably more correct. I do not understand why most of them rendered the compound predicate in past time. Present time seems to me to be more correct both grammatically and doctrinally.

Chapter 3 Verse 7

Τεκνία, μηδεὶς πλανᾷτω ὑμᾶς· Notice the imperative mood.

C/IP		VERB	DO: you
Subj	little children	let ... deceive	IO:
		3rd Sing Present Act Imp	

ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός ἐστι,

I added "one" to the participial phrase to make it less awkward.

C/IP	VERB	PA: righteous
Subj the one doing righteousness	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν· Translated the demonstrative pronoun as a personal pronoun.

C/IP	VERB	PA: righteous
as Subj He	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

I rendered it, "Little children, let no one deceive you. The one doing righteousness is righteous, as He is righteous."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "My little children, let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous:" (ASV)
- "So, my dear children, don't let anyone divert you from the truth. It's the person who acts right who is right, just as we see it lived out in our righteous Messiah." (MSG)
- "Children, let no man lead you astray; he that practises righteousness is righteous, even as *he* is righteous." (DARBY)
- "Dear children, don't let anyone deceive you about this: When people do what is right, it is because they are righteous, even as Christ is righteous." (NLT)
- "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." (KJV)
- "Little children, let no one lead you astray; he who is doing the righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous," (YLT)
- "Little children, make sure no one deceives you; the one who practices righteousness is righteous, just as He is righteous;" (NASB)

We are all pretty much in agreement except the NLT and MSG. They both decided to use nouns instead of pronouns in the final clause. The Greek offers no justification for that.

Chapter 3 Verse 8

ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν,

Added "one" to help the participle be used as a substantive.

C/IP	VERB	PA: from the devil
Subj the one doing sin	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει.

Did not use first in range of sense for ὅτι.

C/IP	because	VERB	DO:
Subj	the devil	sins from the beginning 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, Dug deep in the range of sense of εἰς to get "for"

C/IP	for this	VERB	DO:
Subj	the Son of God	was made manifest 3rd Sing Aorist Pass Ind	IO: in this

ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου. I had to dig very deep into the range of sense of λυω to make sense of this clause. Works can not be the subject because it is plural and the verb needs a singular subject.

C/IP	in order that	VERB	DO: the works of the devil
Subj	He	might have destroyed 3rd Sing Aorist Act Subj	IO:

"The one doing sin is from the devil because the devil sins from the beginning. For this the Son of God was made manifest in order that He might have destroyed the works of the devil."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "he that doeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. To this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (ASV)
- "But when people keep on sinning, it shows they belong to the Devil, who has been sinning since the beginning. But the Son of God came to destroy these works of the Devil." (NLT)
- "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (KJV)
- "He that practises sin is of the devil; for from [the] beginning the devil sins. To this end the Son of God has been manifested, that he might undo the works of the devil." (DARBY)
- "he who is doing the sin, of the devil he is, because from the beginning the devil doth sin; for this was the Son of God manifested, that he may break up the works of the devil;" (YLT)
- "the one who practices sin is of the devil; for the devil has sinned from the beginning The Son of God appeared for this purpose, to destroy the works of the devil." (NASB)
- "Those who make a practice of sin are straight from the Devil, the pioneer in the practice of sin. The Son of God entered the scene to abolish the Devil's ways." (MSG) I like the phrase, "pioneer in the practice of sin." It is not very close to the Greek but it sure paints a pretty picture, doesn't it? I wonder where they got "straight?" There is nothing in the Greek like that.

We are in substantial agreement. It seems like the range of sense of λυω gave us all a little trouble. We have "destroy" four times, "undo," "break up," and "abolish."

Chapter 3 Verse 9 Πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, The grammar in this clause sorts itself into a familiar pattern. When I changed the verb to the second in its range of sense because I found "makes not sin" awkward it renders it into English in a misleading way. It makes the verb seem like a helper verb which in turn makes it seem as if the noun "sin" is the verb "sin" instead. I'm not sure it has a big impact on the meaning but I'm going to keep it in mind as I translate the rest of the verse and perhaps reconsider this rendering later.

C/IP	VERB	DO:
Subj Everyone begotten of God	does not 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	sin IO:

ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει: "Abides" is intransitive. I considered putting the prepositional phrase modifying the verb as an indirect object instead. That would be OK too. I think "because" works better with the preceding clause than "that."

C/IP that because	VERB	DO:
Subj His seed	abides in him 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, This clause is really just the second part of a compound verb sharing the subject of the clause above. "... because His seed abides in him and is not himself able to sin." I have taken the infinitive, "to sin," as an adverbial modifying the verb "able."

C/IP and	VERB	DO:
Subj	is not himself able to sin 3rd Sing Present Mid Ind	IO:

ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται.

C/IP because	VERB	DO:
Subj he	is being brought forth from God 3rd Sing Perfect Pass Ind	IO:

I render it as, "Everyone begotten of God does not sin because His seed abides in him and is not himself able to sin because he is being brought forth from God," but I feel sure the experts will not include "himself" ignoring the Middle Voice in favor of smooth flow in English. I also suspect some of them will change the time of the final verb to past time perhaps because doctrinally they have a problem with our adoption into the family of God being an incomplete process. Let's see...

Comparing to the Experts:

- "Whoever has been born of God does not sin, for His seed remains in him; and he cannot sin, because he has been born of God." (NKJV)
- "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God." (ASV)

- "People conceived and brought into life by God don't make a practice of sin. How could they? God's seed is deep within them, making them who they are. It's not in the nature of the God-begotten to practice and parade sin." (MSG)
- "every one who hath been begotten of God, sin he doth not, because his seed in him doth remain, and he is not able to sin, because of God he hath been begotten." (YLT)
- "No one who is born of God practices sin, because His seed abides in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." (NASB)
- "Those who have been born into God's family do not sin, because God's life is in them. So they can't keep on sinning, because they have been born of God." (NLT)
- "Whoever has been begotten of God does not practise sin, because his seed abides in him, and he cannot sin, because he has been begotten of God." (DARBY)
- "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." (KJV)

We are in substantial agreement. I was right about what they would do with "himself" and partly right about the tense they would use for the final clause. Of course, I could be incorrect about their motives. Perhaps there is a subtle grammatical rule I have not yet learned that justifies what they did.

Chapter 3 Verse 10

ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστι τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου· The nouns are all of ambiguous case. The demonstrative pronoun is the object of a preposition so all the nouns must be nominative since there is no transitive verb for which they could be direct objects. They are in a sentence with only a linking verb so they must be the subject or predicate nominative. I made latter two a compound noun phrase because they are joined by καί. Contrary to the usual practice I made the first noun the predicate nominative because it is a category. In English when describing a noun as being part of a category using a linking verb the category is the predicate nominative. If you do not understand this try it the other way and see how awkward it sounds. I also changed the noun "manifest" to an English participle, "shown."

C/IP	VERB	
Subj the child of God and the child of the devil	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: manifest shown by this

πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. I started out putting the first noun phrase before the linking verb as the subject and the prepositional phrase and second noun phrase as a sort of predicate adjective/predicate nominative combination. This follows the Greek word order exactly.

C/IP	VERB	
Subj Anyone not doing righteousness	is not 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN and PA: from God and not loving his brother

"Anyone not doing righteousness is not from God and not loving his brother," makes sense but sounds a little awkward. After studying it awhile and comparing it with my limited experience I changed my mind. I can recall not a single time when I have found a καὶ that joined two unequal grammatical units. I have always seen it join two substantives, or two verbs, or two clauses, etc. I may be wrong but it seems to make more sense all the way around if we take the καὶ to be joining the two participial phrases as a compound subject like this:

C/IP	VERB	
Subj Anyone not doing righteousness and not loving his brother	is not 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PA: from God

So I rendered this verse, "The child of God and the child of the devil is shown by this: Anyone not doing righteousness and not loving his brother is not from God." I'm anxious to see if these guesses are right.

Comparing to the Experts:

- "By this the children of God and the children of the devil are obvious: anyone who does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor the one who does not love his brother." (NASB)
- "In this are manifest the children of God and the children of the devil. Whoever does not practise righteousness is not of God, and he who does not love his brother." (DARBY)
- "In this manifest are the children of God, and the children of the devil; every one who is not doing righteousness, is not of God, and he who is not loving his brother," (YLT)
- "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." (ASV)
- "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." (KJV)
- "So now we can tell who are children of God and who are children of the Devil. Anyone who does not obey God's commands and does not love other Christians[a] does not belong to God." (NLT)

Perhaps I am becoming over confident. There is little or no support here for my decision to turn "manifest" into a participle. Only the NLT comes close to agreeing with me. As far as moving the phrase, "not loving his brother," to the subject all of them seem to confirm my notion that there is an awkwardness to translating it literally. However, they solve it in different ways. They make the second καὶ a "neither" or "nor". This is a better solution than mine because it solves the awkwardness with less violence to the original word order. Another thing I did wrong was render τέκνα as the singular, "child," when I should have made it plural, "children."

Chapter 3 Verse 11

Ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία I decided to go a little deeper in the range of sense of οτι to make a better connection to what had been said before.

C/IP for	VERB	PN: the message
Subj this	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

ἦν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, No surprises here.

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

ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους: I'm a little unsure of my rendering of the subjunctive mood here. I want to say "should love" instead but that is imperative, not subjunctive.

C/IP that	VERB	DO: one another
Subj we	might love 1st Plu Present Subj Ind	IO:

"For this is the message which you heard from the beginning, that we might love one another."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "because this is the message that ye did hear from the beginning, that we may love one another," (YLT)
- "For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another." (KJV)
- "For this is the message that you heard from the beginning, that we should love one another," (NKJV)
- "For this is the message which ye have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another:" (DARBY)
- "For this is the message which ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another:" (ASV)
- "For this is the message which you have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another;" (NASB)
- "For this is the original message we heard: We should love each other." (MSG)
- "This is the message we have heard from the beginning: We should love one another." (NLT)

It appears I should have followed my instincts and used "should." Only Young's Literal translation joined me in remaining in the normal limits of the subjunctive.

Chapter 3 Verse 12 οὐ καθὼς Κάιν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν The experts rendered the subjunctive mood as imperative mood in the prior verse. Here I rendered the indicative as imperative.

C/IP not as	VERB	PA: from evil
Subj Cain	was 3rd Sng Imperfect Act Ind	

"Be not of evil as Cain was..."

καὶ ἔσφαξε τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ·

C/IP and	VERB	DO: his brother
Subj he	murdered	IO:
	3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	

"... and he murdered his brother..."

καὶ χάριν τίνος ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; I decided to go with the punctuation here. (A semi-colon is a question mark in Greek.)

C/IP and for what	VERB	DO: him
Subj he	did ... murder	IO:
	3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	

"And for what did he murder him?"

ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια. There is an implied "works were" in both the Greek and English. I have shown them in italics so you can see how this works grammatically.

C/IP because	VERB	PA: evil
Subj his works	were	
	3rd Sng Imperfect Act Ind	

C/IP but	VERB	PA: righteous
Subj his brother's <i>works</i>	were	
	3rd Sng Imperfect Act Ind	

"Be not of evil as Cain, who murdered his brother. And for what did he murder him? Because his own works were evil, but his brother's righteous."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "not as Cain -- of the evil one he was, and he did slay his brother, and wherefore did he slay him? because his works were evil, and those of his brother righteous." (YLT)
- "not as Cain was of the evil one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his works were evil, and his brother's righteous." (ASV)
- "not as Cain was of the wicked one, and slew his brother; and on account of what slew he him? because his works were wicked, and those of his brother righteous." (DARBY)
- "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." (KJV)
- "not as Cain, who was of the evil one and slew his brother And for what reason did he slay him? Because his deeds were evil, and his brother's were righteous." (NASB)
- "We must not be like Cain, who belonged to the evil one and killed his brother. And why did he kill him? Because Cain had been doing what was evil, and his brother had been doing what was right." (NLT)

Except for the first clause we seem to be in pretty close agreement. Most of the experts came up with "evil one" instead of "evil." I'm not sure why. Seems to me mine is more accurate but I may be missing something important.

Chapter 3 Verse 13

(Καὶ) Μὴ θαυμάζετε, ἀδελφοί (μου) Note the imperative mood. The "and my" being present or absent has little impact on the meaning. The subject is "you understood" in English just as it is in Greek.

C/IP (and my) brothers	VERB	DO:
Subj	do not marvel	IO:
	2nd Plu Present Act Imp	

εἰ μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. Hate is moved before the subject for emphasis.

C/IP if	VERB	DO: you
Subj the world	hates	IO:
	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

"And, my brothers, do not marvel if the world hates you."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "Do not be surprised, brethren, if the world hates you." (NASB)
- "Do not marvel, my brethren, if the world hates you." (NKJV)
- "Do not wonder, brethren, if the world hate you." (DARBY)
- "Do not wonder, my brethren, if the world doth hate you;" (YLT)
- "Marvel not, brethren, if the world hateth you." (ASV)
- "Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you." (KJV)
- "So don't be surprised, dear brothers and sisters, if the world hates you." (NLT)

No significant differences. None of the experts included the καὶ. Three included the μου and four did not. Notice how the NLT uses the "gender inclusive" phrase, "brothers and sisters." This is not outside the range of sense of ἀδελφοί but are there really people who would suppose that John did not mean all his readers simply because the word is translated "brothers" in agreement with the Greek gender instead of the more general "siblings" or "brothers and sisters?"

Chapter 3 Verse 14

ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν

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

ὅτι μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν,

C/IP that	VERB	DO:
Subj we	are departing from death into life	IO:
	1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	

ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς·

C/IP that	VERB if. ... love	DO: the brothers
Subj we	1st Plu Present Subj Ind	IO:

ὁ μὴ (ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ OR ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν OR ἀγαπῶν) μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. Even if the phrase "his brother" or "the brother" is not included as some textual variants suggest, "his brother" is implied by the context. Whether it is explicit or implicit the subject of the clause is "the one not loving his brother."

C/IP	VERB abides in death	DO:
Subj the one not loving (his brother)	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

"We know we are crossing over from death into life if we love the brethren. The one not loving his brother abides in death."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." (KJV)
- "we -- we have known that we have passed out of the death to the life, because we love the brethren; he who is not loving the brother doth remain in the death." (YLT) *The two "we's" are there trying to show the emphasis indicated by the inclusion of the pronoun in the sentence when the pronoun is already implied by the verb. I suspect the "we" in the next version has asterisks for the same reason.*
- "*We* know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren. He who does not love [his] brother abides in death." (DARBY)
- "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death." (ASV)
- "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He who does not love abides in death." (NASB)
- "If we love our Christian brothers and sisters, it proves that we have passed from death to eternal life. But a person who has no love is still dead." (NLT)
- "The way we know we've been transferred from death to life is that we love our brothers and sisters. Anyone who doesn't love is as good as dead." (MSG)

There is substantial agreement here except for the tenses of the verb in the first two clauses. They are both perfect tense which is present time with combined aspect. YLT translated them both in past time. All the rest translated the first in present time and the second in past time even though they are the exact same tense. I do not understand why.

Chapter 3 Verse 15 πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστί·

C/IP	VERB	
Subj Anyone hating his brother	is 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	PN: a murderer

καὶ οἶδατε

C/IP	VERB	DO:
and	are knowing 2nd Plu Perfect Act Ind	
Subj you		IO:

ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρωποκτόνος οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐν (ἑαυτῷ OR αὐτῷ) μένουσαν. The textual variant does not seem to make much difference to the meaning.

C/IP	VERB	DO:
that	does not have 3rd Sing Present Act Ind	eternal life abiding in (him or himself)
Subj any murderer		IO:

"Anyone hating his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him."

Comparing to the Experts: There is substantial agreement here

- "Every one that hates his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him." (DARBY)
- "Every one who is hating his brother -- a man-killer he is, and ye have known that no man-killer hath life age-during in him remaining," (YLT) "life age-during?"
- "Everyone who hates his brother is a murderer; and you know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him." (NASB)
- "Whoever hates his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life abiding in him." (NKJV)
- "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." (ASV)
- "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." (KJV)
- "Anyone who hates another Christian is really a murderer at heart. And you know that murderers don't have eternal life within them." (NLT) *Where did "another Christian" come from? Are we really to believe that John was not meaning to include all the children of Adam here?*

Chapter 3 Verse 16 ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην (τοῦ Θεοῦ),

C/IP	VERB	DO:
in this	are knowing 1st Plu Perfect Act Ind	the love (of God)
Subj we		IO:

ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκε·

C/IP because	VERB laid aside	DO: His life
Subj He	for us 3rd Sing Aorist Act Ind	IO:

καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφείλομεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς (τιθεῖναι OR θεῖναι). The infinitive could be in present or past time depending on which textual variant you decide to use. It seems to me that the context supports present time. John is writing to people who are still alive. It seems doubtful that he would be suggesting that they should have done this in the past but does not expect them to still be doing it. Surely John meant to convey the idea that laying aside our lives in favor of obeying God's commandment to love others is a daily task.

C/IP and likewise	VERB ought	DO:
Subj we	to lay aside life for the brothers 1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

I elected to go with a different word out of the range of sense of καὶ to show the connection I believe the author meant to show between the ideas. I also added an "our" in order to render it less awkwardly giving, "In this we know the love of God, because He laid aside His life for us. Likewise we ought to lay aside our lives for the brothers."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "By this we know love, because He laid down His life for us. And we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." (NKJV)
- "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." (ASV)
- "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." (KJV)
- "Hereby we have known love, because *he* has laid down his life for us; and *we* ought for the brethren to lay down [our] lives." (DARBY)
- "in this we have known the love, because he for us his life did lay down, and we ought for the brethren the lives to lay down;" (YLT)
- "We know love by this, that He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." (NASB)
- "We know what real love is because Christ gave up his life for us. And so we also ought to give up our lives for our Christian brothers and sisters." (NLT)

There is substantial agreement on the grammar and range of sense. Only the King James Version agrees with me regarding the first textual variant. They all seem to agree on the final textual variant. Most agreed with me on adding the "our." Only the NKJV agreed with me regarding the sense of the final καὶ rendering it "and ... also."

Here the textual difference is involved in a point of doctrine. There can be no question that this verse is talking about Christ laying aside his life for us. The phrase "of God" however is significant evidence of the divinity of Jesus Christ. For people like me, who believe Jesus Christ is Lord, this does not present a difficulty. The verse means much the same regardless of whether the phrase is included or not. For those who have a problem with the divinity of Jesus it could be

a problem. It also seems to me that the context supports the same idea whether the "of God" is explicitly included or not. John says twice in chapter 4 of this epistle, "God is love." If John is not talking about the "love of God" in this verse, then what is he talking about?

Chapter 3 Verse 17 ὃς δ' ἂν ἔχη τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου The verb is in the subjunctive and the clause contains the contingency particle *αν*. The context of the rest of the verse will be needed to render this clause sensibly.

C/IP but	VERB if ... has	DO: the life of the world
Subj who, whoever, whose	3rd Sing Present Act Subj	IO:

καὶ θεωρῆ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχοντα There are two nouns in the accusative. I made the one closest to the verb the direct object of the verb and the one closest to the participle the direct object of the participle. I'm going to need to see more before I can make sense of this verse.

C/IP and	VERB might ... see	DO: the brother of him having need
Subj he	3rd Sing Present Act Subj	IO:

καὶ κλείσῃ τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, I chose to use "closed" instead of "shut" because in English the tense of "shut" is not obvious to the reader. Because of the variety of tenses in the verse I am trying to make an effort to make them visible in English. It is beginning to make sense to me.

C/IP and	VERB might have ... closed	DO: his bowels from him
Subj he	3rd Sing Aorist Act Subj	IO:

πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει ἐν αὐτῷ; The interrogative adverb really modifies the verb but I put it as an introductory component to make the word order work in English. The semicolon at the end is a Greek question mark.

C/IP how?	VERB abides in him	DO:
Subj the love of God	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	IO:

Any thing close to a literal translation seems very awkward. For instance, "But if whoever has the life of this world, and if he sees his brother having need and if he closed his bowels from him, how does the love of God abide in him?" I decided to take a little license to avoid awkwardness and came up with, "If someone having the necessities of life in this world, sees his brother in need and closes his heart to him, how does he have the love of God abiding in him?"

Comparing to the Experts:

- "and whoever may have the goods of the world, and may view his brother having need, and may shut up his bowels from him -- how doth the love of God remain in him?" (YLT)
- "But if anyone has enough money to live well and sees a brother or sister in need and refuses to help--how can God's love be in that person?" (NLT)

- "But whoever has the world's goods, and sees his brother in need and closes his heart against him, how does the love of God abide in him?" (NASB)
- "But whoever has this world's goods, and sees his brother in need, and shuts up his heart from him, how does the love of God abide in him?" (NKJV)
- "But whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him?" (ASV)
- "But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (KJV)
- "But whoso may have the world's substance, and see his brother having need, and shut up his bowels from him, how abides the love of God in him?" (DARBY)

There is substantial agreement here. None of us seem to have come up with a way of showing the past time of the verb in the third clause.

Chapter 3 Verse 18

Τεκνία (μου), μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μηδὲ (τῆ) γλῶσση, (ἀλλ OR ἀλλὰ) ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. This one has me completely confused. There is no enlightenment in the textual variants. There is no real difference in the structure of the verse as a whole whether you introduce it with "little children" or "my little children." Nor is "the tongue" grammatically distinct from "tongue." "Ἀλλὰ" is a simple spelling error and may be discarded.

C/IP (my) little children	VERB	DO:
Subj we	if ... love not but in deed and truth 1st Plu Present Subj Ind	IO: with word neither with (the) tongue

I tried several different fruitless combinations and finally decided the conjunction ἀλλ might justify forming a compound sentence where the second clause reuses the verb from the first clause.

C/IP (my) little children	VERB	DO:
Subj we	if ... love not 1st Plu Present Subj Ind	IO: with word (the) tongue

C/IP but neither	VERB	DO:
Subj we	if ... love in deed and truth 1st Plu Present Subj Ind	IO:

This gives me, "My little children if we love not with word nor tongue, neither do we love in deed or truth." I remain unconvinced this is correct but not able to do better I turn to the experts with a great deal of doubt.

Comparing to the Experts:

- "Children, let us not love with word, nor with tongue, but in deed and in truth." (DARBY)
- "Dear children, let us stop just saying we love each other; let us really show it by our actions." (NLT)
- "Little children, let us not love with word or with tongue, but in deed and truth." (NASB)
- "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." (KJV)
- "My Little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth." (ASV)
- "My little children, may we not love in word nor in tongue, but in word and in truth!" (YLT)

Most of the experts rendered the subjunctive mood as imperative. I do not understand the justification for this but all of them did it except Young's Literal Translation. YLT found a way to render it in the subjunctive and have it make sense in the English. Because of this, I think the YLT is the best English rendering for this verse.

Chapter 3 Verse 19

(καὶ ἐν τούτῳ OR ἐν τούτῳ OR καὶ ἐκ τούτου) (γινώσκομεν OR γινώσομεθα)

The textual variants give a wide choice of options for this clause but they all mean basically the same thing. "In this we will know ourselves..." I decided to go with future tense to match the final clause of the verse.

C/IP ((and)in this OR from this)	VERB (know OR will know ourselves)	DO or PN:
Subj we	1st Plu (Present Act OR Future Mid) Ind	IO or PA:

ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμέν, "... that we are from the truth."

C/IP that	VERB are	PN:
Subj we	1st Plu Present Act Ind	PA: from the truth

καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν (τὰς καρδίας OR τὴν καρδίαν) ἡμῶν, ἔμπροσθεν is followed by a substantive in the genitive case so we can take it to be a preposition here. I discarded the genitive possibility for "hearts" because that would have made two possessives in a row with nothing for them to possess. That left me with either a singular or plural direct object. "Our heart" might imply we all have the same one which is nonsensical, so I decided on the plural. Singular is not out of the question. If you chose to use the singular no one reading it would misunderstand that our individual hearts was what was meant.

C/IP and	VERB will persuade	DO or PN: our heart(s)
Subj we	before Him 1st Plu Future Act Ind	IO or PA:

"In this we will know ourselves that we are from the truth and will persuade our hearts before him," seems like a group of introductory subordinate clauses so I'm going to wait until after I have translated the next verse before checking with the experts.

Chapter 3 Verse 20

ὅτι ἐὰν καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία, "... that if our heart condemns us..." Here we have a singular "heart" that obviously means plural. Notice the double "if" for emphasis.

C/IP that if	VERB	DO:
Subj our heart	if ... condemns	IO:
	3rd Sing Present Act Subj	

ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν I had to add "than" to the comparative "greater" to render it sensibly into English as, "... because God is greater than our hearts..."

C/IP because	VERB	PN: greater than our hearts
Subj God	is	PA:
	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

καὶ γινώσκει πάντα. "... and He knows everything." I translated πᾶσ as a noun and made it the direct object.

C/IP and	VERB	DO: everything
Subj he	knows	IO:
	3rd Sing Present Act Ind	

I am having trouble making sense of, " In this we will know ourselves that we are from the truth and will persuade our hearts before him, that if our heart condemns us, because God is greater than our hearts, and He knows everything." I tried several different ideas and finally decided that the subordinate clauses in verse 19 belonged to the verse before. That comes out, " My little children, may we not love in word nor in tongue, but in word and in truth, for in this we will know ourselves to be from the truth and will persuade our hearts before him. If our heart condemns us, then God is greater than our hearts and knows everything." I'm still very doubtful that I am correct and so turn to the experts.

I John 3:19-20 Comparing to the Experts:

- "And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things." (KJV)
- "And hereby we shall know that we are of the truth, and shall persuade our hearts before him, that if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knows all things." (DARBY)
- "and in this we know that of the truth we are, and before Him we shall assure our hearts, because if our heart may condemn -- because greater is God than our heart, and He doth know all things." (YLT)
- "Hereby shall we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our heart before him: because if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things." (ASV)
- "It is by our actions that we know we are living in the truth, so we will be confident when we stand before the Lord, even if our hearts condemn us. For God is greater than our hearts, and he knows everything " (NLT)
- "We will know by this that we are of the truth, and will assure our heart before Him, in whatever our heart condemns us; for God is greater than our heart and knows all things." (NASB)

The experts' translations made various decisions regarding the conjunctions and sentence divisions. This makes me suspect this is a very difficult passage. It is still not clear to me what the connection is between our struggling to assure ourselves that we are of the truth and God being omnipotent and omniscient. I plan to revisit this verse later when I have translated more and the context is more complete.

Chapter 3 Verse 21 ἀγαπητοί, ἐὰν ἡ καρδία (ἡμῶν) μὴ (καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν OR καταγινώσκη OR καταγινώσκω OR καταγινώσκη ὑμῶν)

I could not see any place to use the second personal possessive pronoun so I left it off. I decided on the verb in the third person, because the subject heart is third person, and in the subjunctive mood, because εἰν suggests it already. The verb is screaming for a direct object. Since the text has so many variants maybe it was smudged, torn at that spot or something. If so, perhaps the second personal pronoun was supposed to be ὑμᾶς instead of ὑμῶν making "you" the direct object. That is too much conjecture so I must be content with an intransitive verb.

C/IP	beloved, if	VERB	DO:
Subj	the (our or your) heart	if.... condemns not 3rd Sing Present Act Subj	IO:

So we have a subordinate clause that reads, "Beloved, if our heart does not condemn..."

παρρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν,

C/IP		VERB	DO: boldness toward God
Subj	we	have 1st Plu Present Act Ind	IO:

That makes it "Beloved, if our heart does not condemn, we have boldness toward God."

Comparing to the Experts:

- "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, we have boldness toward God;" (ASV)
- "Beloved, if our heart does not condemn us, we have confidence toward God." (NKJV)
- "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." (KJV)
- "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, we have boldness towards God," (DARBY)
- "Beloved, if our heart does not condemn us, we have confidence before God;" (NASB)
- "Beloved, if our heart may not condemn us, we have boldness toward God," (YLT)
- "Dear friends, if our conscience is clear, we can come to God with bold confidence." (NLT)

It appears as if the experts found an "us" in the first clause. It may be that "condemn" can take a genitive direct object. I've seen a few of those kind of verbs before. I was so lost in the other problems with the previous verse that I did not notice until now that the experts added an "us" in that verse as well. Perhaps the verb "condemns" implies an understood "us" in Greek. Other than that we have substantial 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.