truth to be brought out.

**18.] cometh not into judgment**—see ch. v. 24, where the  
same assertion is made more fully ; and note  
there.

**is judged already**, implying,—*by  
no positive act of judgment of Mine*,—but  
by the very nature of things themselves.  
God has provided a remedy for the deadly  
bite of sin; this remedy the man has not  
accepted, not *taken*: he must then perish  
in his sins: he is *already judged and sentenced*.

**hath not believed]** The *perfect* sets before us the deliberate choice  
of the man, q. d. ‘he hath not chosen to  
believe’ see 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.

**in the name**—not without meaning: that name  
was “JESUS, *for He shall save his people  
from their sins*,” Matt. i, 21.

The word **only-begotten** also here sets before us  
the *hopelessness of such a man’s state*: he  
has no *other* Saviour.

**19.]** The particular *nature* of this decided judgment is  
now set forth,—**that the light** (see ch.i. 7,  
and notes) **is come into the world, and  
men** (men in general; an awful revelation  
of the future reception of the Gospel) loved  
(the perversion of the affections and will  
is the deepest ruin of mankind) **the darkness** (see note on ch. i.5; = the state of  
sin and unbelief) rather than (not to be  
resolved into ‘*and not*;’ but, as Bengel  
says, “The loveliness of the light struck  
them, but they persevered in the love of  
the darkness,” see ch. v. 35; xii. 43;  
2 Tim. iii. 4) **the light, because their deeds  
were evil** (their habits, thoughts, practices,  
—all these are included,—were perverted).

**loved** and **were** are the *indefinite  
past tense*, implying the general usage and  
state of men, when and after the light  
came into the world.

**20.]** This verse  
analyzes the psychological grounds of the  
preceding. The *light* is not here ‘the common light of day,’ nor light in general :  
but, as before, **the Light**; i.e. *the Lord  
Jesus*, and His salvation: see ver. 21 end.

There is here a difference between  
the verbs used in the original in the expressions **doeth evil** and **doeth the truth**,  
which is too remarkable to be passed over,  
—especially as the same distinction is observed in ch. v. 29. I think the distinction is perhaps this,—that the first verb  
represents more the *habit of action*; so  
that we might say ‘*he that practises  
evil*;’ but the second the true *doing* of  
good, good *fruit*, good that *remains*. He  
who *practises*, has nothing but his *practice*,  
which is an event, a thing of the past, a  
source to him only of condemnation; he  
has nothing to shew for it, for it is also  
empty, worthless (which is the real primitive meaning of the adjective here rendered  
“*evil*”); whereas he that **does, makes,  
creates** (for this is the force of the second  
verb), has his **deed**, or **thing made**,—he has  
abiding fruit; *his works do follow him*.  
So that the expressions will not perhaps  
here admit of being interchanged. In the  
allusion to *darkness*, there may possibly be  
a hint at the *coming by night* of Nicodemus, but surely only by a distant implication. He might gather this from what  
was said, that it would have been better  
for him to make open confession of Jesus;  
but we can hardly say that our Lord reproves him for coming even as he did.

**21.]** Who is this *doer of the truth*? the  
end of ch. i. will best explain to us,—*in  
whom there is no guile*, see also Luke viii.  
15, and Ps. xv. The *practiser of wickedness* is crooked and perverse; he has a  
light, which he does not follow; he knows  
the light, and avoids it; and so there is no  
truth, singleness, in him; he is a man at  
variance with himself. But the simple and  
single-minded is he who knowing and approving the light, comes to it; and comes  
that he may be carried onward in this  
spirit of truth and single-mindedness to  
higher degrees of communion with and  
likeness to God. “The good man seeks the  
light, and to place his works in the light, not