every man, and began that shining which  
even now continues.

**9, 10.]** We now come to the *enunciation  
of the law of brotherly love*, and in a  
form resembling that used in ch, i. 8, 10:  
and in ver. 4, 5. First is asserted the  
incompatibility of living in hatred and  
walking in the light: then the identity  
of walking in love and walking in the  
light: then lastly as a contrast to the  
last, the same fact with regard to hatred  
and the darkness, and the blinding effect  
on him who walks in it. The *light* is  
as before, the light of Christ, now partially  
shining, but one day to be fully revealed:  
the *darkness* is the darkness of  
this present world, now passing away).  
**He that saith that he is in the light, and  
hateth his brother, is in the darkness until  
now** (Düsterdieck has very properly protested  
against the softening down of this  
hate into “loving too little, neglecting, not  
cultivating,” &c. “Nothing,” he says,  
“can be more shallow and weak as compared  
with the ethics of the whole Scripture.  
All the truth, depth, and power of  
Christian ethics rests on the contrast so  
distinctly insisted on by St.John. On the  
one side is God, on the other the world:  
here is life, there is death [ch. iii. 14]: here,  
love; there, hate, i.e. murder [ch. iii. 14  
ff.], there is no medium. In the space  
between, is nothing. Life may as yet be  
merely elementary and fragmentary. Love  
may be as yet weak and poor, but still, life  
in God and its necessary demonstration in  
love is present really and truly, and the  
word of our Lord is true, ‘He that is not  
against me is with me,’ Luke ix. 50: and  
on the other side, the life according to the  
flesh, the attachment to the world, and the  
necessary action of this selfishness by means  
of hatred, may be much hidden, may be  
craftily covered and with splendid outer  
surface; but in the secret depth of the  
man, there where spring the real fountains  
of his moral life, is not God but the world;  
the man is yet in death, and can consequently  
love nothing but himself and must  
hate his brother : and then that other word  
of the Lord is true, ‘He that is not for me  
is against me,’ Luke xi. 23. For a man  
can only be either for or against Christ, and  
consequently can only have either love or  
hate towards his brother.” Bengel says  
well, on ver. 11, “An immediate opposition:  
where there is not love, there is hate :  
for the heart is not empty” It has been  
questioned, who is meant by **his brother.**  
It seems plain that the expression here is  
not the same as “*his neighbour,*” seeing  
that St. John is writing to Christians, and  
treating of their *fellowship with one another*.  
On the other hand, if we are to restrict  
the meaning to Christian brotherhood,  
it is plain that we cannot understand  
strictly *his brother* in verses 9, 11, seeing  
that the man there spoken of is in reality  
not a Christian at all. So that either we  
must enlarge the sense of *brother*, or suppose  
some impropriety of language in the use of,  
the term in these verses, so that it might  
mean, him who ought to be loved by him  
as a Christian brother, supposing himself  
to be really a Christian. This difficulty  
does not seem to have struck any of the  
Commentators: but it is one which certainly  
will not allow us to confine the term  
to its utmost strictness of meaning. **even  
until now,** i.e. *up to this moment* : notwithstanding  
any apparent change which  
may have taken place in him when he  
passed into the ranks of nominal Christians).

**10.] He that loveth his brother  
abideth in the light** (i.e. the continuance  
of the habit of brotherly love is a  
measure of and a guarantee for his continuance  
in that light whose great command  
is Love)**, and there is none occasion of  
stumbling in him** (so A. V., excellently.  
For it is clear by the parallel in ver. 11,  
that this is what is meant, and not, as the  
original words will also bear, that he gives  
no occasion of stumbling to others. Compare  
John xi. 9, 10, which is in more than  
one respect the key-text here. For it also  
explains the apparently difficult term **in  
him**, occurring as it does there in ver. 10,  
*“but if any one walk in the night, he  
stumbleth, because the light is not in him.*”  
The light, and the darkness, hy which we  
walk safely, or stumble, are within ourselves;  
admitted into us by the eye, whose  
singleness fills the whole body with light).