40 xvii. 6 f., i. 12, James i. 27]. And so  
again on the other side, they who remain  
at last excluded from eternal life, are thus  
excluded not only by God’s decree but by  
their own evil choice and will. The words  
cited above, John vi. 65, were spoken by  
our Lord with direct reference to the  
traitor Judas: but on the other hand St.  
John gives notices of the ethical development  
of Judas, which leave no doubt that  
his depravity went hand in hand with  
God’s judgment on him. Judas was covetous:  
his heart was inclined to mammon:  
hence he understood not the love of Mary  
when she anointed Jesus with her precious  
ointment: he grudged his Lord this token  
of love: he could not abide with Christ,  
because he shut his heart through greed,  
through love of the world, against the love  
of Christ: for the knowledge of the Lord,  
faith in Him, fellowship with Him, are all  
summed up in Love. Thus we see that in  
the rejection, as in the acceptance of eternal  
life, the two factors, God’s will and  
man’s will, are to be regarded in their  
ethical connexion only. In order to that  
knowledge of God, which is eternal life,  
man must be *taught* of God [John vi. 45]:  
but man must also *learn* of God. And the  
more St. John sets forth the essential nature  
of this knowledge of God and Jesus  
Christ as *ethical*, the more does he recognize,  
in putting forward God’s will in the  
matter, man’s will also. Christ is the Saviour  
of the whole world, ch. ii. 2, iv. 14.  
But in the personal appropriation of this  
universal salvation, not all really take it to  
themselves,—and many, who have taken  
it, fall away again, because they do not  
keep the grace given, do not abide in  
Christ, do not walk in the light. This  
last is by no means denied by St. John  
when he says, “If they had been of us, they  
would have remained with us.” The words  
set forth an ideal similar to that in ch. ii,  
5, iii.9, v.18. As in no one of those places  
can the Apostle possibly mean, that a true  
believer, one really born of God, has perfect  
love to God and cannot sin [for what  
then would ch. ii. 1 mean?],—so neither  
here can he mean that whoever once inwardly  
and truly belongs to the communion  
of believers cannot by any possibility  
fall from it).

**20, 21.]** "The Apostle puts them in mind,  
in an apologetic form, of the truth which  
they as Christians possessed, and the very  
possession of which, not the contrary, was  
his reason for thus writing to them. This  
reminiscence carries at the same time with  
it the force of an exhortation, as so many  
of the ideal statements on Christian perfection  
in our Epistle. What they *have* in  
the ideal depth of their Christian life, that  
they ought to have in living and working  
reality. **And** (the copulative conjunction  
here denotes only the passage to a new particular,  
without distinctly marking its adversative  
relation to the last) **ye** (expressed  
in the original as emphatic: see above)  
**have an anointing** (the word signifies properly  
the oil or ointment with which the  
anointing takes place, not the act itself of  
anointing. For this we have in English  
no word adequate to the necessity of the  
passage: “unguent” is the nearest approach,  
but is still inadequate. On the  
meaning, see below) **from the Holy One**(viz. from Christ, the *righteous* One of our  
ver. 1, the *pure* One of ch. iii. 3, the *holy*  
One of Acts iii. 14, and *holy One of God* of  
John vi. 69: see also Rev. iii. 18), where  
the Laodicean church is counselled to  
buy of *Christ*, “*eye-salve to* **anoint** *thine  
eyes that thou mayest see*”), **and know  
all things** (or, according to another reading  
of some old MSS., “*ye all know*[*this*].” But this seems not so appropriate  
to the context. The full and perfect knowledge  
of Christian truth is the ideal completion  
of those who have this anointing.  
This of course must not he understood as  
actually predicated of these readers: but  
the expression explains itself as referring  
to all things needful for right action in the  
matter under consideration: all things that  
belong to this matter. Some understand,  
all things necessary to Christian life and  
godliness. But now the question recurs,  
What is this **anointing**, and what leads the  
Apostle to use this peculiar expression here?  
The reply to the latter question is probably,  
as Bengel, “that it is introduced by the  
sound and derivation of the words Christ  
and antichrist which he has just been using.”  
Christ is the **anointed** one, *Christos:* the  
anointing itself being *chrisma*. The Apostle  
sets his readers, as anointed of God,  
over against the antichrists, the enemies  
of the anointed of God. Then as to the  
nature of the *anointing*, we can hardly fail  
to be right in interpreting it of the *Holy*