likeness to Him in righteousness, children  
of God, therefore our love brings with it  
also full confidence. Essentially, the reason   
here rendered for our confidence in the  
day of judgment is the same as that given  
ch. iii. 21 f. for another kind of confidence,  
viz., that we keep His commandments.  
This also betokens the righteousness of  
which Christ is the essential exemplar, and  
which is a necessary attribute of those  
who through Christ are children of God),

**18.**] Confidence in (or as understood,   
as to) that terrible day presupposes  
the absence of fear: and this casting out  
of fear is the very work of love, which in  
its perfect state cannot coexist with fear.—  
**Fear** (abstract and general) **existeth not  
in love** (abstract and general also, as in  
ver. 17: not *“God’s lore to us;”* nor *“brotherly love”*),   
**nay perfect** (see on ver. 17)  
**love casteth out fear, because fear hath  
torment** (see below): **but he that feareth  
hath not been perfected in** [**his**] **love.** The  
points here to be noticed are,

1) the emphatic **existeth not**, which is better rendered   
as above, than “there is no fear in  
love,” in order to keep **fear**, which is the  
subject in the Greek, also the subject in.  
the English:

2) **nay**, or *“but:”*  
which is not here the mere adversative  
after a negative clause, in which case it  
would refer to something in which fear *is*,  
e.g. “*fear existeth not in love, but existeth  
in hatred:*” but it is the stronger adversative,   
implying “nay far otherwise:” so far  
from it, that...

3) the argument,   
which is, *a*) that nothing having  
torment can consist with perfect love: *b*)  
that, fear is in us by nature, and needs  
*casting out* in order to its absence.

4) the meaning of hath torment. Does *torment*   
mean *merely* pain, or pain as the result of  
*punishment*? This last is certainly  
the sense, both from the usage of the word,  
and from the context, in which the day of  
judgment is before us. Fear, by anticipating  
punishment, has it even now; bears  
about a foretaste of it and so partakes of it.

5) the last clause, “*he that feareth  
is not made perfect in love,*” is intimately  
connected with what follows [see on ver.  
14] as well as with what went before.  
The **and** [in the original, **but**: see rendering above]   
is adversative to the whole preceding   
sentence, and mainly to the idea of  
perfect love therein expressed.

As regards the absence of fear from the love  
of the Christian believer, it has been well  
observed by Œumenius, that there are two  
kinds of godly fear, one which afflicts men  
with a sense of their evil deeds and dread  
of God’s anger, and which is not abiding:  
and the other, of which it is said, “The  
fear of the Lord is clean, and endureth for  
ever,” Ps. xix. and which is free from this  
kind of terror. And Bengel says in his  
brief pointed manner, “The condition of  
men is various: without fear and love  
alike: with fear and without love: with  
fear and love: without fear and with love.”

**19.**] I am sorry to be obliged here to  
differ from the best modern Commentators,  
and some of the older ones, in holding firmly  
that **we love**, indicative, is right, and not  
“*let us love,*” imperative [either of which  
would satisfy the original word]. This I  
do not merely on account of the expressed  
and emphatic **we**, though that would be  
a strong point in the absence of a stronger,  
but on account of the context, which appears   
to me to be broken by the imperative.   
He that feareth is not perfect in  
love. Our love [abstract, not specified  
whether to God or our brother] is brought  
about by, conditioned by, depends upon,  
His love to us first; it is only a sense off  
that which can bring about our love: and  
if so, then from the very nature of things  
it is void of terror, and full of confidence,  
as springing out of a sense of His love to  
us. Nor only so: our being new begotten  
in love is not only the effect of *a sense of*  
His past love, but is the effect of that love  
itself: **We** (emphatic—one side of the antithesis)   
**love** (most Commentators supply “*Him*” or “*one another*,”   
but unnecessarily. It is of all love that he is speaking;   
of love in its root and ideal), **because  
He** (God: see the parallel, ver. 10) **first  
loved us** (viz. in the sending of His Son).