under his struggle as a hard one): **and  
the victory which** [**hath**] **conquered the  
world is this, our faith** (the identification  
of the victory with the faith which  
it, is a concise and emphatic way of linking  
the two inseparably together, so that  
wherever there is faith there is victory.  
And this is further expressed by the past  
tense here; by which it is signified that  
the victory is already won: see ch. ii. 13,  
iv. 4).

**5.**] If it be asked, How does  
our faith overcome the world? this verse  
furnishes the answer; because it brings  
us into union with Jesus Christ the Son  
of God, making us as He is, and partakers  
of His victory, John xvi. 33, Through  
this belief we are born again as sons of  
God; we have Him in us, One greater  
than he who is in the world, ch. iv. 4.  
And this conclusion is put in the form  
of a triumphant question: What other  
person can do it? Who that believes  
this, can fail to do it? **Who is he that  
conquereth the world, except he that believeth   
that Jesus is the Son of God?**  
By comparing ver. 1 a, we find 1) that  
*“the Christ”* there answers to *“the Son  
of God”* here; 2) that by the combination,  
of the two verses, we get the proposition  
of ver. 4a.

**6–21.**] THE THIRD AND LAST DIVISION OF THE EPISTLE.  
This portion falls  
naturally into two parts: vv.6–13, and  
vv. 14–21: the former of which treats of  
the concluding part of the argument, and  
the latter forms the close of the Epistle.

**6–13.**] As in the former portions, our  
communion with God who is light [i. 5 ff.]  
was treated, and our birth in righteousness  
from God who is righteous [ii. 29 ff.], by  
faith in Jesus the Son of God,—so now we  
have another most important element of  
the Christian life set before us: the testimony   
to it arising from that life itself: *the  
witness of the spiritual life to its own  
reality.* This witness rests not on apostolic   
testimony alone, but on the Holy  
Spirit, which the believer has in himself  
[ver. 10], and which is God’s testimony  
respecting His Son [vv. 9, 10], and our  
assurance that we have eternal life [ver. 13].

There is hardly a passage in the New  
Test. which has given rise to more variety  
of interpretation: certainly none which [on  
account of the apparent importance of the  
words interpolated after ver. 7] has been  
the field of so much critical controversy.  
Complete accounts of both the exposit  
and the criticism will be found in the recent   
monographs on the Epistle: more  
especially in that of Düsterdieck.

**6.**] **This** (viz. the Person spoken of in the  
last verse; Jesus. This, which is maintained   
by most Commentators, is denied  
by Knapp and Huther, who refer this to  
*“the Son of God:”* “The Son of God is  
he, &c.:” making the proposition assert,  
the identity of the Son of God with the  
historical Jesus, not the converse. ‘This  
Huther supports on two grounds: 1) that  
the fact that Jesus came by water and  
blood needed no proof even to Heretics:  
2) that on the ordinary interpretation the  
following words, *“Jesus Christ,”* become  
altogether superfluous. But to these it is  
easily replied, 1) that although the fact  
might be confessed, that was not confessed  
to which the fact bore testimony, viz. that  
Jesus who came in the flesh was the Son  
of God: 2) that the appositional clause,  
*“Jesus Christ,”* is by no means superfluous,  
being only a solemn reassertion of our  
Lord’s Person and Office as testified by these  
signs. The main objection to Huther’s  
view is, that, as well stated by Düsterdieck,  
it makes the coming by water and blood,  
which, by the context, is evidently in the  
Apostle’s argument, a substantiating consideration,   
to be merely an exceptional  
one: “this Son of God is Jesus the Christ,  
*though* He came by water and blood.”  
Therefore the other interpretation must  
stand fast) **is he that came by water and  
blood** (**came** refers not to the Lord’s birth  
in the flesh, but to His open manifestation  
of himself before the world. See above, on  
ch. iv. 2.

The preposition **by**, which passes into  
“*in*” in the next sentence, is thereby  
explained to bear its very usual sense of  
*through* or *by means of*, as said of that  
which accompanies, as the medium through  
which, or the element in which. ‘The very  
same phrases, “*by blood*,” and “*in blood*,”