

## WHAT SHALL I SAY?

JOHN xii. 27.—Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father glorify thy name.

THE darkness was thickening. The gloom and anguish of his passion, like the clouds bringing the tempest, were overspreading the sky. Now, he stands not upon the deck of the laboring ship, to quell the storm, and quiet the sea; but all the raging billows are about to roll over and overwhelm him. He is not now at the tomb of Lazarus, to exhibit his divine majesty in its power over death; but, within a step of Gethsemane and Calvary, where himself is to "taste death for every man:" every man's sins upon him, and he to suffer what was due to every man. The depth and bitterness of the cup, we can neither see nor taste. "But we see Jesus who was made a little lower (*eelattoomenon*, lessened, decreased) than the angels for the suffering of death," in his human aspect, as the cup is being put to his lips; we hear his human groan of horror, that he must drink the fearful draught. The man, though he be Christ Jesus, and because he is Christ Jesus, THE DIVINE HUMAN, exclaims in his horrōr, "Now is my soul troubled, and how shall I express it? (*kai ti eipoo*)?" Not, What shall I say? except in the sense of despairing to be able to utter any words that could convey a full idea of his trouble, his *tarachee*: that our souls might be filled with "a joy unspeakable," I Pet. i. 8; his soul was flooded with unspeakable woe.

To understand our Lord as inquiring, whether he should say, Father, save me from this hour, cannot be the force of *ti eipoo*, here. There is a similarity of the passage with Matth. xxvi. 38; "My soul is exceeding

sorrowful (*perilupos*, surrounded with sorrow), even unto death :” and, his anguish being unutterable, indescribable, he adds, “Tarry ye here (you can neither understand nor help me) and watch with me. And he went a little farther, (so as to be alone,) and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me : nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.” So we read the mournful words we are examining. The *ti eipoo*, What shall I say! is an exclamation, relating to the mysterious trouble with which he was overwhelmed ; “out of the depths” of which he prayed, as out of the depths of the exceeding sorrow. Therefore we understand the words, “Father, save me from (*ek* out of) this hour :” as a prayer for deliverance from the deadly clutch of death’s dreadful hand, the horror of which none other has ever experienced. So he prayed in Gethsemane, “If it be possible, let this cup pass from me.” Here, he adds not mine, but thy will be done. There, in our passage, his soul gathers confidence, in the thought that the victory is assured to him ; his own arm is almighty, and will bring the salvation that he had invoked : for, “for this cause (*dia touto*, therefore) came I unto this hour.” Not meaning, as we think, that he came unto this hour, to be troubled, to experience the unutterable anguish, that wrung from him the piteous wail *ti eipoo!* What shall I say! But, “that he might be saved from (out of the grasp of) this hour :” for it was not the suffering, the agony, the death, that was to save man for whom he was suffering ; but his victory over death ; his ability to die and then to live again ; to lay down his life and to take it again. Had he as man, the race, the second Adam, groaned, died, and sunk into that hour of death, remained there, what would have been accomplished? Death. Not life. But life was the great aim ; and to reach it, he must needs go through death, and beyond :

into this hour, he must go of necessity ; but with equal necessity must he come out of it (*ek tees hooras tautees*): so that he might be our life. Therefore he adds, "Father glorify thy name:" let the plan proceed, I go down into this dark hour: but beyond the darkness, I see the light; I shall come out of this hour.

---

## WHY THEY COULD NOT BELIEVE.

JOHN xii. 39.—Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias (Isaiah) said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.

THEY could not believe because Isaiah said something, cannot be the meaning of the Evangelist. Such a cause of unbelief, is not known in Holy Scripture, fairly interpreted. To suppose so, is a hypothesis contradicted by plain revelation. We must find some other key to the Evangelist's meaning. But, are not the words simple and clear? Does not John say "Therefore (*dia touto*, through this, on this account) they could not believe, because that Isaiah said," etc.? Yes: there is no denying it: but words do not always have the meaning that lies upon the surface. Elijah said of Baal to his priests; "Cry aloud: for he is a god (*elohim hoo*); either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." *I Kings* xviii. 27. Certainly Elijah did not mean, to be understood as affirming Baal to be

Elohim ; or that a mere imaginary thing was acting as an intelligent, supernatural being. He was mocking : he meant the very opposite of the literal import of his words. Language is a grand instrument, and we cannot be sufficiently grateful for such a capacity. Yet it is not perfect ; it cannot contain all our thoughts. It is very figurative. Therefore the inattentive fail to understand it, in many instances.

Let us examine this Scripture. They could not believe, "because Isaiah said again:" what did he say again? There is no repetition. True, the Evangelist cannot signify that the inability to believe was caused by Elijah's repetition ; for there is no repetition reported. Then, the inability was caused by the fact, that on another occasion Isaiah said, "He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart," etc. But, the history of the day demonstrates that their eyes were not blinded. They saw the meek and patient Messiah ; watched him ~~him~~ vigilantly ; followed him about, eager to get some cause of accusation against him ; they saw well enough with their eyes : and as to the hardening of "their heart," could it be that *they* had but a *heart* ; one heart to a great multitude ; this, surely was not so : and if the prophet meant the heart of each Jew, this was not hardened, for they were alive, active, maliciously active ; while if each man's *heart* had been hardened death would have occurred instantly. Then, after all, it must be admitted, that the words of the Evangelist and of the prophet are figurative and must not be taken literally. And what do they mean figuratively ? That the prophet having predicted, that the Jews would reject Christ, they could not do otherwise than reject him ? Our Lord never urges such an inability : he puts the cause in their will : "Ye will not (*ou thelete*) come unto me ;" *John* v. 40 : "— how often would I (*eetheleesa*) \* \* \* and ye would not (*ouk eetheleesate*)." *Luke* xiii. 34.

It is not Scriptural teaching, that every prediction must necessarily be fulfilled. There is at least one example to the contrary. "Then they told David, saying, Behold, the Philistines fight against Keilah, and they rob the threshing-floors. Therefore David inquired of the Lord, saying, Shall I go and smite these Philistines? And the Lord said unto David, Go, and smite the Philistines, and save Keilah. And David's men said unto him, Behold, we be afraid here in Judah: how much more then if we come to Keilah against the armies of the Philistines? Then David inquired of the Lord yet again. And the Lord answered him and said, Arise, go down to Keilah; for I will deliver the Philistines into thy hand. So David and his men went to Keilah, and fought with the Philistines, and brought away their cattle, and smote them with a great slaughter. So David saved the inhabitants of Keilah."

"And it came to pass, when Abiathar the son of Ahimelech fled to David to Keilah, that he came down with an ephod in his hand. And it was told Saul that David was come to Keilah. And Saul said, God hath delivered him into mine hand; for he is shut in, by entering into a town that hath gates and bars. And Saul called all the people together to war, to go down to Keilah, to besiege David and his men. And David knew that Saul secretly practiced mischief against him; and he said to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod. Then said David, O Lord God of Israel, thy servant hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to Keilah, to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hands? Will Saul come down as thy servant hath heard? O Lord God of Israel, I beseech thee, tell thy servant. And the Lord said, He will come down. Then said David, Will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And the Lord said they will deliver thee up."

Now here is a case in which there are two distinct events clearly predicted. Saul will come down. The men of Keilah will deliver thee up. So, of course, according to our hypothesis, David can only remain there with his men, and all be captured, thus fulfilling the divine prediction. The prediction must be fulfilled: David and his men must necessarily remain, and be delivered into the hand of the ungrateful, jealous, bloody minded Saul. Their fate is settled. But the sacred record reads quite to the reverse. "Then David and his men, which were about six hundred, arose and departed out of Keilah, and went whithersoever they could go." The language is descriptive of a very hasty and energetic retreat: *vayithhallechu baasher yithhallachu*; the words sound like galloping; and no doubt David and his "six hundred," fled bravely; they "arose, departed out of Keilah, and went whithersoever they could." They had a correct method of understanding human responsibility, in connection with divine predictions; having not the most remote idea, that the divine foreknowledge controls, forces, or restrains human will and action. Is there any physical force in knowledge? In what sense is knowledge power? Did knowledge ever build a bridge, or a mill? When a man knows how to build a bridge, does his knowledge build it? Knowledge can direct physical force, and if it be obeyed, the bridge will be built: but knowledge has no physical force; nor, *per se*, any force. At all events, the predictions instead of nailing fast the feet of David and his men, put wings to them, and the sacred historian describes the flight as *instante*; so soon as the predictions are heard, the sacred writer exclaims, *yithhallachu baasher yithhallachu*; they fled lustily to get the start of the jealous Saul, and the cowardly ingrates of Keilah: they succeeded; both predictions failed of fulfilment: "And it was told Saul that David had escaped from Keilah; and he forbore to go forth." *I Sam.* xxiii. 1-13.

One might venture the opinion, that at least part of the aim of this detailed incident, was to instruct us as to the relation of human responsibility, to the divine foreknowledge. The THEREFORE THEY COULD NOT BELIEVE of John, did not signify the impossibility of the Jews to believe, because of Isaiah's predictions: the traditions had made the word of God of none effect: it was not Isaiah, not any of, not all the servants of God, not God, that hindered them from believing: it was their own will: had they tried to get the eyes of their minds open, they would have had plenteous grace given for their success. And had the predictions failed, it would have been no more to the divine dishonor, than the failure of the TWO EXPRESS, UNQUALIFIED PREDICTIONS in the case of "the man after God's own heart." And we are utterly ignorant of any dishonor attributed to God, because of that incident. Certainly there is no record of any complaint on his part, that David defeated the predictions: the "matter of Uriah" being the only stigma on his bright escutcheon.

Taking down our *Benedictus Pictetus*, we turn to his sect. iv. Of the Nature Of the Decrees. p. 102. "That is also proved from the absolute perfection of God, which does not permit, that anything should be done (*fiat*) without his will; yea and by all his knowledge, through which he knew from eternity, not only what is possible, but also what will be; for he could not know certainly what would be, unless he had decreed what should be: (non enim futurum certo nosse posset, nisi decrevisset quid futurum sit.)" David was an inspired man, and from his early youth, had a deep knowledge of the divine character; but, to judge from his conduct at Keilah, he harbored no such theology as this; he could not have held, that the divine foreknowledge depended entirely on the divine decrees. When he implored the divine foreknowledge, he was losing his trouble

and breath, if he believed that the foreknowledge possessed nothing as certain, except as decreed: and when that foreknowledge communicated the decreed facts, that Saul would come down; and the Keilah cowards would deliver him into Saul's hand; where was the propriety, or the hope of his *yithhallachu baasher yithhallachu*: could he hope to escape the divine decree, by attempting an escape from Keilah? No one can think that of David. The foreknowledge was not founded upon the divine decree; nor had the foreknowledge, or the predictions any force to hold David within a city of gates and bars. He arose forthwith and escaped without molestation. It was not Isaiah that hindered the Jews from believing. God "all the day long was stretching out his arms, to a disobedient and gainsaying people." "I would but ye would not."

---

## WHY WAS PETER GRIEVED?

JOHN xxi. 17.—Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee.

IT might be thought, that Peter was grieved at our Lord's repetition of the question "lovest thou me." But there was no repetition. Instead of one question propounded three times; there were three distinct questions. There is a uniformity in Peter's replies; but not in the questions asked him. Dr. Clarke, *in loco*, affirms a uniformity of the latter; "It is remarkable, that in these three questions our Lord used the

verb *agapao*, which signifies *to love affectionately, ardently, supremely, perfectly.*" But while we admit his definition of *agapao*, he is evidently wrong in stating, that it was used in the three questions: he used it in the first, and second, but not in the third question; so that, in fact, this very lack of uniformity in the questions, is a chief element of the proper exposition of the passage.

The verbs *agapao* and *phileo* are used in this colloquy. Alford says, "The distinction (between the words) must not be lost sight of, nor must we superficially say with Grotius, 'John uses *agapan* and *philein*, here, promiscuously, as presently he uses *boskein* and *poimainein* (to feed). Nor must subtilities be here sought.' If so," continues Alford, "why do the Lord's two first questions contain *agapas* while Peter's answers have *philo*—whereas the third time the question and answer both have *philein*? This does not look like accident.—The distinction seems to be that *agapan* is more used of that reverential love, grounded on high graces of character, which is borne towards God and man by the child of God;—whereas *philein* expresses more the personal love of human affection. Peter therefore uses a less exalted word, and one implying a consciousness of his own weakness, but a persuasion and deep feeling of personal love." \* \* \* "Then in the third question, the Lord adopts the word of Peter's answer, the closer to press the meaning of it home to him." *Alford, in loco.*

This seems to be pretty near our own view. Dr. Clarke's definition of *agapao* has already been given. Of *phileo* he says, "—which signifies *to love, to like, to regard, to feel friendship for* another. As if our Lord had said, 'Peter, dost thou love me ardently and supremely?' To which he answers, 'Lord, I feel an affection for thee—I do esteem thee—but dare, at present,

to say no more.'” *In loco.* Lidd. & Scott distinguish between *agapao*, *erao*, *phileo*, which all signify *to love*, but under different modifications: as with reference to being well pleased, contented with one; to love as one's wife; to love as a friend: clear distinction, but chiefly as to classic use. But Greek words have a New Testament meaning, which critics understand, and it is that meaning we are in search of.

Alford and Dr. Clarke give us their opinions, made up from careful observation, no doubt, and, in the main reliable. We add some results of our own observation. *Erao* is not in N. T. literature. *Phileo*, in various inflections, is used twenty-four times; in the noun form *philia*, friendship, once, *Jas.* iv. 4; in the adjective form used as a noun *philos*, invariably rendered *friend*, twenty-eight times. *Agapao*, in various inflections, occurs one hundred and seventeen times; in the noun form *agapee*, love, one hundred and nine times; as an adjective *agapeetos*, beloved, *i. e.* in the Christian sense, sixty-two times. To examine these words, as displayed in a full N. T. Greek Concordance, a glance is sufficient to show, that in the N. T. *agapao* is, as the learned Alford affirms, the higher word, as to its sense; *phileo*, the lower. The former, he says, and properly, “is more used of that reverential love, grounded on high grades of character, which is borne towards God and man by the child of God; whereas *philein* expresses more the personal love of human affection.”

In friend, friendship, friendly, philosophy, philanthropy, etc., we have an idea of the force of *phileo* in the N. T.; while in God is love, God so loved the world, thou shalt love the Lord thy God, that disciple whom Jesus loved, having loved his own which were in the world he loved them to the end, the greatest of these is charity (*agapee* love), and multitudinous other such expressions indicate the N. T. use of *agapao*: in

distinction, this latter, is eminently the Christian word. So, we are ready, now, to exhibit the colloquy.

1. JESUS: Lovest thou (*agapas*) me more than these?  
PETER: Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (*philoo*) thee.
2. JESUS: Lovest thou (*agapas*) me?  
PETER: Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (*philoo*) thee.
3. JESUS: Lovest thou (*phileis*) me?  
PETER: (Grieved that, the third time, this time, he said unto him *phileis me*, instead of *agapas me*) Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love (*philoo*) thee.

We annex the questions in their Greek form.

1. Agapas me pleion toutoon?  
*Ans.* Philoo se.
2. Agapas me?  
*Ans.* Philoo se.
3. Phileis me?  
*Ans.* Kurie, panta su oidas, su ginooskeis hoti philoo se.

Should one know nothing of the Greek, yet he can easily distinguish between these questions: can see that here is not a question asked three times; but three questions, each differing from the others, no two alike. He can see, also, that there is nothing in the form, and may assume that there can be nothing in the sound of *agapas* to suggest to Peter the answering *philoo*: why not answer *agapoo*? Alford's "This does not look like accident," is corroborated by examination. There certainly must have been some design on the part of Peter, in the use of his *philoo*. The natural answer was, Yea (*nai*) Lord; and this he uttered; and if he wished to appeal to his Lord's knowledge, the natural

expression was, Thou knowest that *agapoo se*. There was nothing in the sound of our Lord's *agapas*, certainly, to suggest *phileo*; and upon the hypothesis that the two words were exactly synonymous, as the Master had selected the former, it was not very becoming in the disciple to prefer the latter word, and adhere to it until he had compelled the Master to adopt it. Besides, upon that theory, how could Peter have been grieved, that, the third question contained his own preferred expression? The words are not exact synonyms; there is a distinction in their sense.

In his *Synonyms Of The New Testament*, Trench discusses these two words with great ability. The first discussion, indeed, we had seen, after our own attention had been called to the subject, some twenty years before: by an examination of John xxi. 15, as to the signification of "these," in the phrase "more than these:" in which we had arrived at a conclusion, somewhat differing from that of the learned and able writer of the *Synonyms*.

Dr. T. distinguishes between *agapao* and *phileo*, so as to make the former correspond with the Latin *diligo* and the latter with *amo*; and then adduces the authority of Cicero, for *amo* being the stronger of the two terms. "Thus writing to one friend of the affection in which he holds another (*Ep. Fam. xiii. 47*): *Ut scires illum a me non diligi solum, verum etiam amari*; and again (*Ad Brut. I.*): *L. Clodius valde me diligit, vel, ut emphatikooteeron dicam, valde me amat.*" We have not translated the citations yet, as we desired to exhibit the original text, that the two words might appear in their proper connections and relations: and we now translate as nearly in the Latin order as possible. First: That you may know him by me not *to be loved* (*diligi*) only, but even *to be loved* (*amari*). Second: L. Clodius greatly me *loves* (*diligit*), or, as more emphatically I

may speak, greatly me *loves* (*amat*). The rendering both Latin words by the one English word *love*, does not give us Cicero's meaning: indeed it makes the place a puzzle, to the mere English reader. That L. Clodius *loved* Cicero, or, to be more emphatic, *loved* him, is a singular expression. Did he mean that Brutus should understand the second *loves*, to have been written with more emphasis than the first? Or how? Where is the greater emphasis in *loves*, than in *loves*? This ought to lead to the suspicion, that possibly, the rendering of the two Greek words *agapao* and *phileo*, by the one English word *love*, might make a puzzle out of *John* xxi. 15-17. And such is the case.

But, it is very evident that Cicero uses *amo* as the stronger of the two: he can make Clodius to be understood to love him more, by using *amo*, than by using *diligo*. Dr. T. proceeds, "— we might conclude that 'amare,' which corresponds to *philein*, is stronger than 'diligere' which, as we shall see, corresponds to *agapan*: and this in a certain sense is most true; yet it is not a greater strength and intensity in the first word than in the second which accounts for these and for a multitude of similar employments of them. Ernesti has successfully seized the law of their several uses, when he says: *Diligere* magis ad iudicium, *amare* vero ad intimum animi sensum pertinet. [*Diligere* pertains rather to the judgment, but *amare* to the affections.] So that, in fact, Cicero in the passage first quoted is saying,— 'I do not *esteem* the man merely, but I *love* him; there is something of the passionate warmth of affection in the feeling with which I regard him.'"

We have nothing to object to in all this, except Dr. T.'s decision that *amare* corresponds to *philein*; and *diligere*, to *agapan*. To be sure, he promises that "we shall see" this; but we do not. All that he alleges in proof, that we see, is that the Vulgate, "In almost all

these passages of the New Testament (alluding to some citations involving *agapaoo* and *phileoo*), by the help of 'diligō' and 'amō,' has preserved and marked the distinction, which in each case we have been compelled to let go." The Vulgate is no more an inspired, than our own version. Nor does Dr. T. demonstrate why the Vulgate made *amare*, rather than *diligō* to correspond with *phileoo*. His phrase "in almost all these passages," is proof that in *all* these passages, uniformity is not preserved. *Alford* pronounces *phileoo* the lower term; and, as we have said, the two words exhibited in their connections in the N. T., make it clear that *agapaoo* is the higher term; while its noun form *agapee* is a *peculium* of the N. T., unknown to Greek writers. Dr. T. is authority for "— men are continually bidden *agapan ton Theon* (Matth. xxii. 37; Luke x. 27; I Cor. viii. 3), and good men declared to do so (Rom. vii. 28; I Pet. i. 8; I John iv. 21), the *philein ton Theon* is commanded to them never." *Alford's* view, from the Scriptural standpoint, is the better maintained.

By the hypothesis of *The Synonyms*, "— the risen Lord, addressing Peter says, first, *agapas me*; (the Dr. should have added the *pleion toutoon*, for that is the distinction of the first, from the second question.) At this moment, when all the pulses in the heart of the now penitent Apostle are beating with an earnest affection toward his Lord, this word on that Lord's lips sounds too cold; not sufficiently expressing the warmth of his personal affection toward Him. Besides the question itself, which grieves and hurts Peter (ver. 17), there is an additional pang in the form which the question takes, sounding as though it were intended to put him at a comparative distance from his Lord, and to keep him there; or at least as not permitting him to approach so near to Him as fain he would. He therefore in his answer substitutes for it a word of a more

*personal* love, *philoo se* (ver. 15). When Christ repeats the question in the same words as at first, (the reader will perceive that he does not *repeat the question*; and that he omits precisely one-half of the words, forming a very different question.) Peter in his reply again substitutes his *philoo* for the *agapas* of his Lord (ver. 16). And now at length he has conquered; for when the third time his Master puts the question (how could the learned Dr. misunderstand our Lord as putting *the* question a third time? Nothing could be plainer, than that he used three distinct questions; each, once.) to him, He does it with the word which Peter feels will alone express all that is in his heart, and instead of the twice-repeated *agapas*, his word is *phileis* now (ver. 17). The question grievous in itself to Peter, as seeming to imply a doubt in his love, is not any longer made more grievous still, by the peculiar shape which it assumes. All this subtle (subtile?) and delicate play of feeling disappears perforce, where the variation in the words used is incapable of being reproduced." Thus the author of *The Synonyms*, whom no student of the New Testament can think, speak, or write of with disrespect.

But he has erred here, undoubtedly. Nothing in the narration is clearer, than that it was this very third question, where the hypothesis makes him to "conquer," that was peculiarly distressful to him: the record being, "Peter was grieved that he said unto him the third time *phileis me*:" it was only the third time (*to triton*), not the first, not the second, that "he said unto him *phileis me*." If then *agapas* was too cold an expression, and the icy word was in the first, in the second question; those were the times for him to be grieved: but under the first, he displays no grief; nor, under the second; but when he had conquered, and his Lord uses the warm, grateful, fully expressive *phileis me*;

Peter breaks down with anguish. The hypothesis is inconsistent with the narration. It is curious, that at the foot of the page, here, 70, there is a note, which we transcribe. "Bengel generally has the honor *rem acu tetigisse*: here he has singularly missed it, and is wholly astray: *agapan*, amare, est necessitudinis et affectus; *philein*, diligere, iudicii." That is, Bengel holds that Cicero's strong *amare* corresponds to *agapan*; and the cooler, weaker *diligere*, with *philein*: but how that demonstrates Bengel to have erred we do not see. To us it is a more reasonable supposition, that as Dr. T.'s adjustment of correspondency between the Greek and Latin words, leads him to the most palpable contradiction of the Scripture narrative; the exactly opposite theory would lead to an exactly opposite result; and might prove *rem acu tetigisse*.

In II Peter, i. 5-7, there is a gradation of Christian virtues, rising from faith to love; from *pistis* to *agapee*; and in ascending the series, the two words we are discussing make their appearance: faith, energy, knowledge, continence, patience, godliness, brotherly KINDNESS (*philadelphia*; from *philos*, a friend, loving, and *adelphos*, a brother; and so the compound word signifies brotherly love, love to Christians as brethren), LOVE (*agapee*), the crowning grace; the greatest of the great three, "faith, hope, love (*agapee*), these three; but the greatest of these is love (*agapee*)." *I Cor.* xiii. 13. The apostle, to express this most illustrious grace, uses the N. T. word, *agapee*, and not the classic *philia*; the latter appearing but once (*James* iv. 4) in that sacred collection. Why is this? Is *philia* too warm a word, in which to express the highest Christian grace? Notice, also *Coloss.* iii. 12-14; "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if

any man have a quarrel against any : even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things (put on) love (*teen agapeen*), which is the bond of perfectness (*sundesmos tees teleioteetos*), a construction of "the apposition in the genitive to the noun on which it depends (*Winer*, 531); instead of the two agreeing in case; and the sense here being 'which is the bond, the perfection.' " That is, the proper bond keeping the society in union, thus securing perfection. Or as Dr. Parkhurst renders it, "The bond of perfectness ;" *i. e.* says *Whitby*, "the most perfect bond of union among Christians, *Eph.* iv. 15, 16 ; (comp. ver. 3, and John xvii. 23,) the end and perfection of the commandment, I Tim. i. 5 ; that which fulfils the rest, Rom. xiii:8 ; (comp. ver. 9, 10,) and that which renders us perfect and unblameable in holiness before God, I Thess. iii. 12, 13."

Surely if *philia* were a warmer term than *agapee*, the latter would never have been coined and substituted for it, in such connections as these : and, certainly, it would not have occurred but once in the N. T. and then to signify only friendship of the world, *Jas.* iv. 4.

We hold with Bengel, Alford and others, that *agapao* is the higher term ; and that when they had dined (ver. 15) Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon (omitting the Peter, the name that signified *steadfast*), son of Jonas (not *my disciple, friend*), lovest thou (*agapas*) me more than these (thy brethren, Matt. xxvi. 29) ? This was the first question ; asking *Simon*, as if he had lost his grand surname, if he had been steadfast, as he declared he would be, above all *these*. Peter, not daring to ascend to the high level of our Lord's query, with becoming modesty and shame, replies, Yea, Lord ; or Verily, Lord, thou knowest that I esteem thee (*philoo se*). As if he had said, I can by no means claim any such distinction, as that I remained steadfast in the general defection ; for when they "all forsook thee and fled," the *all*

included me, the shameful *denier*: yet, thou knowest that I have not lost my regard for thee; I esteem thee.

Then came the second question, quite distinct from the first, by the omission of the feature of comparison: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou (*agapas*) me?" Descending a degree, toward the low level where Peter had taken position, he inquires, If you do not any longer claim to have a love for me, superior to that of your brethren, do you really love me at all? Nothing about any grief yet; but much that looks like modesty; in the repeated (Peter, not our Lord repeats) reply, "Verily, Lord, thou knowest that I esteem thee (*philoo se*)." I dare not go higher: I am sure that I have a kind regard for thee: but I dare not use so strong an expression as *agapoo*: with my *philoo* I am safe: I stand in no danger here.

But now for the *third time*, the third question, which is very distinct from the second, and from the first. "Simon (still Simon, only) son of Jonas (no change here yet. But now stepping suddenly down, and, this time, to Peter's own low level, from which he supposed he could not be dislodged, to the consternation of Peter he says), dost thou esteem me (*phileis me*)?" Poor Peter! How unexpected! The question had commenced as usual, but what a sudden, unlooked for, alarming change of term. My Lord intimates that I do not even esteem him. I admit that I have not exhibited a love superior to that of my fellow disciples. I admit that I am not entitled to claim a love becoming a disciple; for I who proudly claimed superiority, merit to be held in the opposite category. But, O the grief of being put entirely beyond the pale of friendship for my Lord! This third question has broken my heart! Here dear Master, here; thou knowest all things; and well I know that; but look, I throw open my breaking heart; search it; O my Lord, "thou knowest that I esteem thee." He did know it. He does

not now rebuke him, as in Matt. xxvi. 34, with the prediction that his claim of *philoo se* would prove to be hollow, unreliable : but proceeds to utter a prediction, that he would not only prove his claim to an esteem for his Lord, but even to his surname Peter, by nobly dying in his cause.

Peter's disgraceful conduct, at the arrest of his Master, and at the hall of judgment, after his having professed a love and fidelity, that would outlast the attachment of the other apostles, must have sunk him very low in their esteem, as well as in his own ; and yet in that small company, chosen for the important office of witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, in crowning proof, of his being the Christ ; mutual confidence and proper esteem, were of very great moment. This remarkable incident, must have had controlling influence in that very direction. Peter having been probed thrice, and in degrees of deep, deeper, deepest ; sustains the probing ; and instead of disgrace at the conclusion ; is honored by the Master's testimony, that he would end his life by martyrdom in the cause of him, whom he had so shamefully denied. This testimony must have deeply impressed his brethren ; restoring him to their confidence. He was not superior to themselves, for they all forsook him and fled ; but then this boaster had been examined by an eye that could not be deceived, and pronounced cured of both his vain glory and cowardice. Peter by his *philoo se*, in the presence of them all, had humbled himself ; and the Lord had exalted him : not above his brethren, but to an equality with them. Having by his first *philoo* abandoned all claim to superior affection ; and by his second, to even an equality ; while clinging, in his third use of the term, with the energy of a last hope, to a claim of at least an inferior love ; the strong hand of his loving and beloved Lord lifts him gently but firmly to his proper place of equality with

the other witnesses of his resurrection. To us, at least, all this seems natural, reasonable, and every way consistent with the incident, and the other facts of the divine record ; leading us to think our exposition of the passage, to be correct.

---

---