
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

'ΑΓΑΠΑΩ AND ΦΙΛΕΩ:

(A SUGGESTION FOR JOHN XXI. 15–17.)

BY HERBERT WILLIAM MAGOUN, PH. D.

II.

IN the New Testament, 'to love' is commonly expressed by *agapao*. This was to be expected. Where *phileo* is employed, the reason for its use is generally clear. The context usually settles the kind of love that is indicated. When John says (v. 20), "For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth"; the relation referred to is plainly of the friendly order. The verb used is *phileo*. Would *agapao* have suggested the sharing of confidences? Does it, moreover, lessen the dignity of the Son, if the Father treats him as a friend? Where the relationship of a father is involved, as in John iii. 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand"; the idea of friendship has no place, and the word used is *agapao*.

In John xvi. 27, "for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me," the kind of love is not so clear. God must feel *agape* for all his children, however, and *agapao* might seem cold. In the second clause it might suggest an exalted love. The word used in each instance is appropriately *phileo*. A father's love is naturally *agape*. The use of any other word in such a connection implies some additional and unusual feature. *Phileo* thus gains a certain tenderness in

the first clause, which it does not wholly lose in the second. Where Jesus speaks of the Father's love for himself, the word is regularly and properly *agapao*. It is the best available term.

Language has many limitations; but it is sufficiently exact for practical purposes. The story of Amnon's unnatural treatment of Tamar illustrates the point. In 2 Sam. xiii. 15, it says: "Then Amnon hated her with exceeding great hatred; for the hatred wherewith he hated her was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her."[1] The idea involved is not a simple one, and the words available for expressing it are of a limited capacity. Tamar was Amnon's half sister. He fell desperately in love with her; but he would not ask the king for her as his wife (2 Sam. xiii. 1–2, 11–14). Sin followed with its natural consequences. His lust turned to loathing, all his brotherly affection was destroyed, and whatever of good there may have been in his love for Tamar perished with it. No two words will express all his revulsion of feeling; but *agape* and *misos* cover all but the baser elements.

Such elements may be ignored; but one thing should be noted. He came to hate *(miseo)* Tamar, and loathing, not hate, is the opposite of lust. Greek verbs of loathing seem to have referred to things rather than to persons, and this fact helps to restrict the possibilities of the case. It is safe to say that no better way of covering the ground was at hand. It is a question of capacity on the part of the language. The importance of this fact can hardly be exaggerated. The verbs correspond to the nouns not merely because of the idiom used but because other words of a similar meaning are less appropriate. *Erao* offers too great a contrast to be used with

[1] Καὶ ἐμίσησεν αὐτὴν Ἀμνὼν μῖσος μέγα σφόδρα, ὅτι μέγα τὸ μῖσος ὃ ἐμίσησεν αὐτὴν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἠγάπησεν αὐτήν.

agape. Such a combination would be incongruous. *Phileo* would not do, and none of the other synonomous terms would answer. The words for hate show similar limitations. So far as any reference to Amnon's base passion is intended, *agape* and *agapao* are euphemistic. The passage proves nothing so far as usage is concerned; for there are too many elements involved.[1]

The noun *philia* occurs but once in the New Testament (Jas. iv. 4), "know ye not that the friendship *(philia)* of the world is enmity *(echthra)* with God. Whosoever therefore would be a friend *(philos)* of the world maketh himself an enemy *(echthros)* of God." What effect would a change to *agape* have on the meaning? Would a worldly church then be without excuse? 'Fondness' for the world, not 'love' of it, is here condemned.

[1] Various other words involve the idea of love or hate. Cf. the nouns:—

(1) φιλότης (2) φίλησις (3) φιλητής (4) φιλήτωρ (5) φιλοφροσύνη
(6) φιλανθρωπία (7) φιλοστοργία (8) στοργή (9) ἀγάπησις (10) ἀγαπησμός
(11) ἵμερος (12) πόθος (13) εὔνοια (14) ἐλεημοσύνη and
(15) ἔχθος (16) ἀπέχθεια (17) ἔχθρα (18) ἔχθρος (19) στύγος

They mean respectively:—(1) 'affection'; (2) 'fondness'; (3) 'kisser'; (4) 'darling' (Cretic; there are others); (5) 'kindliness'; (6) 'humanity'; (7) 'tender affection'; (8) '(filial) affection'; (9) 'affectionate esteem'; (10) 'affectionate regard' (rare); (11) 'longing'; (12) 'yearning'; (13) 'good will'; (14) 'compassion' (Eng. "alms"); and (15) 'hatred'; (16) 'enmity'; (17) '(personal) enmity'; (18) '(personal) enemy'; (19) 'sullen hate.' Cf. also the verbs:—

(1) στέργω (2) ἀσπάζομαι (3) ἀγαπάζω (4) ἐχθαίρω (5) ἐχθραίνω
(6) στυγέω

They mean:—(1) 'be devoted to'; (2) 'welcome affectionately'; (3) 'show affection for'; (4) 'detest' (poetic); (5) 'feel hostile towards'; (6) 'abominate' (poetic). Exact equivalents rarely exist in any two languages. Definitions are therefore only approximate.

This idea of fondness for a thing is often expressed by *phileo*. He that is 'fond of his life' (John xii. 25)—not necessarily 'devoted to it'—will lose it. Devotion to one's deeper life (see below) would seem to call for a proper regard for it, as in 1 Pet. iii. 10, where *agapao* is used in such a sense. Fondness for a worldly life is what is condemned. The same verb is employed to express fondness for such things as spectacular praying (Matt. vi. 5) and prominent places in public (Matt. xxiii. 6). When combined with an infinitive (a common idiom), it means a fondness for doing something.

Fondness for a person may be expressed by the same word, as in John xi. 3, where it might have seemed conceited if the sisters had used *agapao*. In compound words, the adjective form is especially common in this sense. The verb *erao* could not have furnished any corresponding term suitable for such a use, and *agapao* would have been too strong except for superlatives. For this reason it was not available. *Phileo* was the only appropriate base. Its use was no accident. It was a matter of fitness and expediency.

In cases where excessive fondness was meant, *hyperphileo*[1] could have been used; but it was simpler to use *agapao*. Devotion to the world was so expressed (2 Tim. iv. 10, and 1 John ii. 15), as was devotion to pecuniary rewards (2 Pet. ii. 15). In Luke xi. 43, *agapao* approximates the sense of 'dote on.' The Pharisees doted on the uppermost seats, they 'loved' them. They 'loved' glory also (John xii. 43) of the earthly kind—they doted on it. With an infinitive this verb implies a great fondness for doing something. Although it is necessarily implied both in this usage and in that of *phileo* with an

[1] Excessive devotion could be expressed by ὑπεραγαπάω. A few instances of its use occur.

infinitive, the meaning 'wont to do,' 'accustomed to do,' is hardly sufficient to reproduce the force of the original. Content should never be lightly passed over, if the local color is to be retained.

The disciple whom Jesus 'loved' might involve either *agapao* or *phileo*. The latter occurs once, the former four times.[1] *Phileo* seems to be more modest; but John spoke in the third person. In comparing his love for the disciples to that of the Father for him (John xv. 9), in each case Christ used *agapao*. He meant something more than friendship. Love for one's enemies was enjoined with *agapao*.[2] Friendship with an enemy is impossible. A kindly consideration is what the command requires. In Matt. x. 37, *phileo* is used: if the followers of Jesus 'thought more of' their parents or their children than they did of him, they were 'not worthy of' him. *Agapao* might have been used; but it would have been less considerate. "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own" (John xv. 19), can hardly refer to more than a friendly interest. The verb is *phileo*. "Salute them that love us in faith" (Tit. iii. 15), uses *phileo*. It is more modest than *agapao* would have been and more general. "As many as I love, I reprove and chasten" (Rev. iii. 19), refers to a friendly interest, *phileo*. In 1 Cor. xvi. 22, "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema," the verb is *phileo*. If it were *agapao*, the statement would be intemperate.

Occasionally a passage occurs where the usage is contrary to what might have been expected. This is due to the meaning intended. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth" (Heb. xii. 6), has *agapao*. The author's thought evidently is

[1] The passages are,—John xiii. 23; xix. 26; xxi. 7, 20; and (*phileo*) xx. 2.

[2] The passages are,—Matthew v. 44, and Luke xi. 27, 35.

that the Lord chastens those for whom he has a deep and tender love. God loves all his creatures with a benevolent love; but He loves his disciples with a father's solicitude. The poverty of language compels *agapao* to do duty for both ideas; but the context supplies the key to the meaning. To fail to recognize the fact is to be blind to one of the most common peculiarities of language.

That words are capable of more than one interpretation is proverbial. It is unfortunate, but inevitable. Language is but a compromise at best; and individual words are composite photographs, clear in their main features, but with nebulous edges. Few men are careful of speech; fewer yet weigh their words. Many speak with a more or less accurate instinct because of a natural linguistic capacity. The majority feel things nebulously; a few feel them with some clearness; an idea becomes clear-cut and fixed only when it has been thought out and formulated. When this has once been done, there need be no difficulty. The use of *agapao* in this instance involves no contradiction, as can be seen readily, unless some defect blurs the mental vision.

The eyes of the mind, like those of the body, are subject to strabismus, myopia, hyperopia, and astigmatism. Allowance must be made accordingly; for these defects are certain to influence results. But that is not all. The same physical object, when viewed by different persons, is likely to produce images that would by no means coincide. The thing itself is not affected, and its exact form can be determined if the proper means are used. It is not merely individual eyes that affect results: it is also the viewpoint. That may entirely change the appearance of things. Mental vision may be similarly influenced with respect to ideas, and the fact must be recognized.

Any form that love may assume, provided it does not originate from physical attractiveness or from some intellectual fellow feeling, must be classed with the *C* type,—it is love, properly so called. An attachment between individuals of different sexes, however, although originating from one or both of these causes, may lead to certain exalted feelings, which may arise from some phase of love, or may be merely due to fascination. It depends upon the elements involved. Such feelings may be compared to the green or the blue of the spectrum, or to the orange or the violet. To carry out the figure, it may be said that feelings of friendship developing into a warmer regard resemble the yellow shifting to green. A stronger infusion of admiration or devotion leads to the blue (often in more senses than one), and love thus really begins. Admiration for beauty tinged to a greater or less degree with friendship resembles the orange. This is a common form of what is called conjugal love; but it is rather a kind of fascination, as the records of the divorce court and the unhappy wedded life of thousands can testify. Admiration for physical charms combined with an unreasoning devotion may be compared to the violet. This is only another form of fascination. It easily turns into hate on provocation.

The love that is "blind" is to be looked for in the last two classes. There are others; but these must suffice. True love is seldom blind and its course is often smooth. Selfishness makes any experience hard, and selfish love is no exception. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Love is harmless. Fascination is not. Love gets the credit, be it good or bad; for a lover is wont to be color blind; and, whatever the tint may be, he sees only blue. The result is reflected in language, and both *agape* and *agapao* show the effects of it. *Agapao,* however, is Plato's favorite word, and the fact is significant.

Only a fraction of the passages in the New Testament which involve a verb of loving have been referred to; but the story for *phileo* is nearly told. Luke xx. 46, "the scribes . . . . love salutations"; Rev. xxii. 15, "every one that loveth . . . a lie"; and one other passage (see below) complete the list.[1] In each case the meaning is 'fond of.'

The other *agapao* passages are as follows:—Matt. v. 43, "love thy neighbor" ("as thyself," xxii. 39; similarly, Mark xii. 31, 33; Luke x. 27; Rom. xiii. 8, 9; Gal. v. 14; Jas. ii. 8); Matt. v. 46, "if ye love them that love you" (so Luke vi. 32); Matt. vi. 24, "love the other" (of two masters; so Luke xvi. 13); Matt. xxii. 37, "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" (similarly, Mark xii. 30, 33; Luke x. 27); Mark x. 21, "Jesus . . . loved him" (the rich young man); Luke vi. 32, "even sinners love those that love them"; vii. 5, "he [the centurion] loveth our nation"; 42, "which . . . will love him most?" 47, "she [the forgiven sinner] loved much"; John iii. 16, "God so loved the world"; 19, "men loved the darkness"; viii. 42, "If God were your Father, ye would love me"; x. 17, "Therefore doth the Father love me"; xi. 5, "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus"; xiii. 1, "having loved his own . . . loved them unto the end"; 34, "love one another; even as I have loved you . . . love one another" (similarly, xv. 12, 17; Rom. xiii. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 9; 1 Pet. i. 22; 1 John iii. 11, 23; iv. 7, 11, 12; 2 John 5); John xiv. 15, "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments"; 21, "he it is [the obedient one] that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him"; 23, "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love

[1] Compounds are not counted. There are a number of them; but they have no direct bearing on the question. The adjective, not the verb, is there used.

him"; 24, "He that loveth me not keepeth not my words"; 28, "If ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced"; 31, "that the world may know that I love the Father"; xv. 12, "as I have loved you"; xvii. 23, "lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me"; 24, "lovedst me before the foundation of the world"; 26, "the love wherewith thou lovedst me"; Rom. viii. 28, "them that love God"; 37, "him that loved us" (similarly, Rev. i. 5); Rom. ix. 13, "Jacob I loved"; 1 Cor. ii. 9, "prepared for them that love him" (similarly, Eph. vi. 24; Jas. i. 12; ii. 5); 1 Cor. viii. 3, "if any man loveth God"; 2 Cor. ix. 7, "God loveth a cheerful giver"; xi. 11, "Wherefore? because I love you not?" xii. 15, "If I love you more abundantly, am I loved the less?" Gal. ii. 20, "who loved me, and gave himself up for me"; Eph. ii. 4, "his great love wherewith he loved us"; v. 2, "as Christ also loved you"; 25, "love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church"; 28, "so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his own wife loveth himself" (similarly, 33, Col. iii. 19); 2 Thess. ii. 16, "Father who loved us"; 2 Tim. iv. 8, "them that have loved his appearing"; Heb. i. 9, "Thou hast loved righteousness"; 1 Pet. i. 8, "whom not having seen ye love"; ii. 17, "Love the brotherhood"; 1 John ii. 10, "He that loveth his brother abideth in the light"; iii. 10, "he that loveth not his brother" (is not of God); 14, "passed out of death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death"; 18, "let us not love in word"; iv. 7, "every one that loveth is begotten of God"; 8, "He that loveth not knoweth not God"; 10, "not that we loved God, but that he loved us"; 11, "if God so loved us"; 19, "We love, because he first loved us": 20, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother . . . cannot love God"; 21, "this com-

mandment . . . that he who loveth God love his brother"; v. 1, "whosoever loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten"; 2, "Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God"; 2 John 1, "whom I love in truth" (so 3 John 1); and Rev. xii. 11, "they loved not their life" (see below).

In no instance could *agapao* be exchanged for *phileo* in these passages without a distinct loss.[1] Even in John xi. 5, *phileo* would have failed to express the depth and tenderness of Christ's regard, and it might possibly have been misconstrued. That, however, must be left for the present. The connection must always be considered in studying the passages, and it is this element which prohibits the use of *phileo* in some cases. In others, *phileo* is impossible, as in John xiv. 15; Eph. ii. 4; 1 John iii. 14; iv. 7; etc. The idea of Christian love, the love of 1 Cor. xiii., is plainly involved, and neither *philia* nor *phileo* is capable of expressing such a conception.

It may seem like an inconsistency to put *phileo* into the mouth of the Jews in John xi. 36, "Behold how he loved him!" *Agapao* would have covered the facts better than *phileo* possibly can; but that is not all there is in the question. What did they mean? To this day such a conception as Christian love is incomprehensible to an unregenerate Jew. Such a disregard for self interest is beyond his ken. *Agapao*, therefore, would have meant too much, while *phileo* fittingly expresses their idea, no matter what the form of their words was or the language in which the idea was expressed.

This leads to another consideration, perhaps the most important in the whole discussion. Jesus greatly enlarged the meaning of *agape* and *agapao*. A fountain cannot rise above

[1] Cf. 'beloved son,' which is naturally and appropriately ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός.

its source, and the highest conception which these words had been capable of expressing hitherto was essentially heathen.[1] When he began to define them, they became Christian. What this means can only be imagined at this day. "Love your enemies" (benevolently) is sometimes even now considered a hard doctrine; but at that time it must have been simply astounding. That which is highest and best in the Christian conception of love he put into it. In his mouth *agape* and *agapao* meant more than they had ever meant before. The disciples could hardly have failed to realize this fact with the daily exemplification in his life. For these reasons the Septuagint furnishes no basis for a scientific investigation of the New Testament meaning of these words. Lev. xix. 18 meant but little till Christ explained it, and 1 Cor. xiii. was an impossibility until after he had given this conception to the world.

One other point should be noticed. Character is a basis for love. Cf. Mark x. 21, and also Rom. ix. 13, where Jacob's latent possibilities furnished the basis for the attachment. This involves a new element, perhaps the highest of all. It is the ground for our love for God, and it may be the ground for our love for one who is personally antagonistic to us. There are natural antipathies which we cannot control; but we can always recognize worth. Physical beauty and mental sympathy, or good fellowship, have nothing to do with it. It is an attribute of the divine which manifests itself only in a noble or in a regenerate soul. It is a priceless possession; for it furnishes a basis for sympathy among those of different tastes, different pursuits, and different training.

[1] The Greek feeling for them is well illustrated by a line cited in Plato's "Phædo," 241 D: 'A lover's friendship for a lad is like a wolf's love for a lamb':—

ὡς λύκοι ἄρν' ἀγαπῶσ', ὡς παῖδα φιλοῦσιν ἐρασταί.

On general principles, *agapao* and *phileo* may be compared to "love" and "like." In some cases they would translate them. "Mary likes *(phileo)* William and Peter, but she loves *(agapao)* Joseph." If they are her kindred, the implication is that her affection is centered on Joseph. If they are not her kindred, she is a friend of two of them, but has given her heart to the third. It would be fitting for her to marry him; but there is no suggestion of such a thing in "like." The most ignorant must feel this, no matter how hard he may find it to express it. Love and like will not answer, however, as a means of translating the two verbs in the chapter under discussion because of a peculiar subtlety of meaning, such as is common in language. The point of the conversation would be lost and the meaning would be changed. In Peter's mouth "like" would here be uncomplimentary, while *phileo* is quite the contrary. Fortunately English is abundantly provided with diverse forms of expression, and these are admirably adapted for bringing out any desired shade of meaning. The thought can be translated, whatever difficulty there may be with the words.

Before attempting this, the circumstances under which the words were uttered should be considered. It will not do to neglect the background. That may change the entire situation. What suggested the question in the first place? Why did Christ ask it? One thing alone stands out as an appropriate cause. Peter's professions of devotion at the last supper were effusive,—he would stand by Jesus though all men forsook him, Matt. xxvi. 33–35; Mark xiv. 29–31; Luke xxii. 31-34; John xiii. 36–38. But he denied him, nevertheless, and denied him with an oath.

Christ's only notice of it was a look; but that look was sufficient. Peter remembered his prophetic warning, and went

out and wept bitterly. After the resurrection Peter knew that he would be forgiven from the angel's message (Mark xvi. 7) and because the Lord appeared to him in person (Luke xxiv. 34). He was thus received back into the company of the apostles, but his denial was still an obstacle between him and his master. They could not come to a perfect understanding or even resume their former fellowship, until his conduct, following so closely such professions, had been faced. That was human nature. There was a genuine chasm between them,—on Peter's side,—and it had to be bridged. Otherwise, Peter could never entirely rid himself of the old Simon. His self conceit had been shattered; but it needed to be supplanted by something better, after the ground had been prepared. Here, then, was a motive for the question: 'Simon John's [son],[1] do you really love me more than these?'

This question must have brought a flood of memories to Peter's mind. His professions of loyalty, his rashness in the garden, his following at a distance, his denial, his Lord's look of reproach,—how could he forget them? He was not worthy to make such a claim, and he knew it. And yet he longed to do so. The impulse to reassert his devotion must have been a strong one; but there was his denial. His reply was accordingly tinged with self abasement, although it was something of a protest: 'Certainly, Lord, you have seen that I am your friend.'

This much he could say. He could not profess any superiority, such as was implied; but he was sure that Jesus must have seen evidences of his friendship. This, then, he made haste to claim,—not that he was fully conscious of his

[1] The omission of "son" was probably no more felt in *Simon Ioanou* than its presence is, in the corresponding English words, Simon Johnson. Cf. such expressions as "down to John's" (house), etc.

mental processes; for no one ever is under such circumstances. He spoke as he felt. All men do so when they are taken by surprise and are deeply moved. They do not reason things out: they feel them. The feeling may be nebulous or only semi-conscious; but it is there.

Jesus did not deny the truth of his statement. He simply said: 'Feed my little lambs.' In a way, this was a renewal of the commission, which had originally been given to Peter and his brother (Matt. iv. 19); but it was also to be a test of Peter's sincerity. He may have realized it. Jesus, however, had not yet gone deep enough, and Peter had not yet comprehended his full meaning. He therefore said: 'Simon John's [son], do you really love me?' It was no longer a question of degree: it was a question of fact, and there was no mistaking it.

Peter's conception of the meaning of *agapao* must have slowly expanded during the three years of his daily association with Christ. He may not have been conscious of the fact. Men seldom are conscious of these mental changes at the time. But now the word became crystallized, and with an unpleasant shock he began to realize what it implied. Could he claim any such love for his Lord as his Lord had talked of and shown,—he, the man who had denied him with an oath? What could he say? What, but repeat his former words, as he did? Jesus replied: 'Shepherd my little flock.'[1] This was a somewhat broader command than the other. Though not then regarded as a part of Christ's flock, be-

[1] The ordinary rendering of these passages ("Feed my lambs," "Tend my sheep," "Feed my sheep") seems to lack point. Ἀρνία is a diminutive, as is προβάτια. Πρόβατα, 'going forward,' from which it comes, means any kind of domestic animals that feed in a pasture. In this form (plural) it often means:—'cattle,' 'a flock,' 'a herd,' usually of sheep. See Westcott and Hort's text.

lievers among the Gentiles were so included, and Peter was to open the door to them (Acts x.).

But Christ was not yet done. 'Simon John's [son], are you really my friend?' This time the steel went home. Jesus abandoned his exalted word for Peter's own. 'Do you claim to love me as your friend?' Did his Lord, then, doubt even this? Had he not seen enough in the past to convince him of it? He must have, and out of Peter's sorrowful heart came the cry: 'You have seen everything, Lord, you know that I love you as my friend.' It was enough, and again the command was given: 'Feed my little flock.' Thus was he called to his work. Another was to be the apostle to the Gentiles; and yet Peter's influence was to be felt throughout the church.

It must have sounded strangely formal, when Christ began, 'Simon John's'; and, as he looked into the eyes that were reading his very soul, Peter must have felt the solemnity of what was coming and felt it with a sinking heart. He could not then realize that this was a part of the price which he must pay to become Peter, the 'Rock.' To fail to see it now is to show a lack of insight into Christ's character. With all the tenderness of a woman, he yet possessed all the sternness of a man. How else is it possible to explain his two cleansings of the temple (John ii. 13–22; Matt. xxi. 12–17; Mark xi. 15–18; Luke xix. 45–48), his rebukes of the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xii. 22–45; Mark iii. 22–30; Luke xi. 14–54), his discourse after their sophistical questions (Matt. xxiii.; Mark xii. 38–40; Luke xx. 45–47), his awful words concerning the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv.–xxv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi. 5–36), and his rebuke administered to the man who struck him at the trial (John xviii. 19–23)?

He was patient and long-suffering, but never weak or sentimental; and this last interview was no tender farewell: it was

rather a re-enlistment and a commission in the Christian army,—"when thou shalt be old, . . . another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. . . . If I will that he tarry . . . what is that to thee? follow thou me" (John xxi. 18, 22). Peter's moral good and the future stability of his character outweighed all other considerations now. Sentiment, even if it was the hour of parting, was out of place. Jesus did not look at things from a narrow or personal standpoint, and a tender farewell was hardly to be thought of. What he did think of was the regeneration of Peter.

These, then, were the reasons for Christ's questions, and Peter understood. Not that he reasoned it all out in detail. He understood, because he felt instinctively what was involved. A drowning man feels many things that he cannot put into words; but he understands them nevertheless. It was some such way with Peter. He may not have been able to explain it; but he understood. He could not come up to his claims of unswerving devotion; for he had failed to make good his pretensions and failed miserably. He had been a traitor in a way; and yet he had repented. Deep down in his heart he still loved his Master. This he knew; but he could not go back to the old ground. He had surrendered that by his denial. But if Jesus knew that, he also knew that he did love him as a friend. This much he could maintain, and he did so stoutly. He saw the indigo, so to speak, and knew that he had claimed it as his own; but he now recognized and admitted that yellow and not indigo was the limit of his attainments. It is unnecessary to go further.

However subjective this explanation may appear, it seems to be justified by the facts. No view can entirely escape the subjective element, least of all the one which involves the

assumption that *agapao* and *phileo* require no difference of meaning in this passage. To claim the contrary would be partisanship unworthy of a scholar. This must be clear; for, if the two verbs are regarded as synonomous here, the events which preceded the interview lose their force, and some of the most common characteristics of language must be ignored. Then, too, there is the plain teaching of certain other well established facts, some of which must now be considered.

Love is not the only word that does double duty in the English version of the New Testament. "Life" is used to render *βίος*, 'manner of life' (as in Luke viii. 14 and 1 John ii. 16), *ψυχή*, 'breath,' 'physical life,' 'life of the body' (as in Matt. x. 39; Luke xii. 22, 23; Acts xx. 10, 24, etc., etc.), and *ζωή*, 'existence,' 'inner life,' 'life of the soul' (as in Matt. vii. 14; John i. 4; iii. 36; v. 24, 26, 29, 40; Acts viii. 33; Rom. viii. 6, and many other passages). It was the *psyche* which Christ laid down (Matt. xx. 28, etc.); and it was this which Peter promised to lay down (John xiii. 37). It was the *psyche* that men were to lose if they were 'fond of' it (John xii. 25, etc.; 'excessively fond of,' *agapao*, once, Rev. xii. 11); but it was the *zoe* to which they might properly be devoted (1 Pet. iii. 10).[1]

Again, "sound" appears in Acts ii. 2 and 6, where two different words are used: "a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind," and "when this sound was heard."[2]

As the word used in the second instance commonly means 'voice,' the implication seems to be that when the multitude

[1] In a few instances *zoe* has a neutral meaning (Luke xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 19; 2 Cor. i. 8; Jas. iv. 14); but there is no better word available.

[2] The first is *ἦχος*, the second *φωνή—γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης συνῆλθε τὸ πλῆθος.*

heard what had happened—not the original sound—they came together. At least two hours appear to have been consumed in the process. Cf. Acts ii. 1–2, where daybreak seems to be referred to, and 15, where the time is not far from 9 A.M.

The Greek words are plainly not synonomous. The same is true of *bios, psyche,* and *zoe.* The life that Christ came to give his disciples (John v. 21; x. 10, etc.) cannot be the life that he came to lay down (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45, etc.) nor yet the life (manner of life) whose pleasures[1] choke the word (Luke viii. 14). The life that we are to hate, *miseo* (John xii. 25, etc.), cannot be the life that believers obtain through Jesus Christ (1 John v. 11, 12, etc.). Such a combination is unthinkable; and yet many do not differentiate the various kinds of life. Would any such claim that there is no difference in them?

Although *agape* is used approximately one hundred and fifteen times in the New Testament, in no instance is the meaning obscure. The thing referred to is 'Christian love,' as Paul defines it. Is there nothing of significance in the fact? Could the noun be thus used in the most exalted sense known to literature without affecting the verb? Nay: could it be so used while the verb was losing its original superiority—it shows it even in heathen writers—and sinking to the level of *phileo?* If the two are synonomous, that must have happened, and the meaning of *agape* cannot fail to be what Christ made it. Did he have no influence over the verb? Is the parable of the Good Samaritan without significance in this matter?

Even in the New Testament *phileo* sometimes means 'to kiss' (Matt. xxvi. 48; Mark xiv. 44; Luke xxii. 47). *Katafhileo,* 'to kiss tenderly,' is also used (Matt. xxvi. 49; Mark xiv. 45; Luke vii. 38, 45; xv. 20; Acts xx. 37). A 'kiss' is a

[1] ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου.

philema (Luke xxii. 48; Rom. xvi. 16, etc.). Once, it is the kiss of Christian love[1] (1 Pet. v. 14). With this meaning well established, *phileo* would easily pass from the old sense of 'cherish' to the general idea of showing affection for by kissing. From this viewpoint *agapao* might seem cold by comparison, somewhat as a river seems tame in the presence of a mountain torrent. On the same basis *phileo* might seem ambiguous, if nothing more, in John xi. 5, "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus." *Agapao* is used.

Phileo was drifting, as words often do, and the meaning 'to kiss' was beginning to be common. To avoid ambiguity, it must have become customary to employ *agapao* at times, where the sense really demanded *phileo*. *Agapao* thus became loosely synonomous with *phileo* in the old sense, 'to cherish,' which was now being crowded out by the meaning, 'to kiss.' It was this secondary meaning, not the resemblance in their signification, which finally forced a part of the work of *phileo* upon *agapao*. It was a necessary makeshift; for *phileo* in this sense was obsolescent. It had left its vocation, so to speak, for its avocation. Ultimately some other word had to assume its former duties, and *agapao* was the only one available. This explains the conditions found in modern Greek. Language abounds in such examples; but they prove nothing as to the meaning of the words in the intermediate stage, especially when the two are placed in contrast. Words that are closely synonomous elsewhere often show their fundamental differences when thus brought together. (See above, first paper, pp. 270 f.)

As was to be expected, much has been said on this passage that has not been carefully thought out. The commentators could not ignore the evident difference in the meaning of the

[1] ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης.

words, nor could they take the time to investigate the matter in all its bearings. One shade of meaning appealed to one scholar and another to another. The extensive sphere of *agapao* involved a wide sweep of possibilities, and some guessing was inevitable. The English translation also may have had some influence in distorting the image of the verbs. All of the meanings proposed were legitimate perhaps; but they were not all appropriate.

This diversity of opinion necessarily involved some contradictory statements. That the contradictions are not vital, however, appears from the fact that, with hardly an exception, the meanings assigned to *agapao* by the commentators can, in the last analysis, be classed under love of the *C* type; while those which they have given for *phileo* can be assigned to some phase of the *B*. (Cf. Vol. xlvi. pp. 530–541.) Fundamentally, then, the commentators are in substantial agreement, and their differences are superficial. While they have erred somewhat in going so minutely into detail and in allowing some minor use of the words to color their views in some cases; fundamentally, they are right. The words do differ; and, barring details, they differ essentially as the commentators have supposed.

One thing has been largely forgotten; namely, the change in the meaning of words which took place under Christ's teaching. The people to whom the word [1] was wont to be applied in Classical parlance were by no means 'blessed' (cf. Matt. v. 3–11) according to the Christian view. From a heathen, or even from a Jewish standpoint, Christ's use of the word was a strange one. The idea that the 'meek' [2] could be 'blessed' was as strange to them as that a 'leader' [3] could be a 'servant' [4] (Matt. xx. 27). Until Christ made it so,

[1] μακάριος. [2] πραεῖς (πρᾶος). [3] πρῶτος. [4] δοῦλος.

'humility'[1] was not a virtue, even if such an idea had been inculcated (Prov. xv. 33). Humility was regarded as a characteristic of the mean and degraded.[2] Conceit[3] could be pardoned in a man; but humility, in the popular view, was unworthiness. Christ changed all that, and he changed men's ideas of love and of loving.

The form of the language (direct quotation) remains. Some may object to this point, on the ground that Greek may not have been used. But, whatever language was used, it is evident that John meant to convey the impression that he was telling exactly what was said. This conclusion cannot be escaped; and even if some other language was the vehicle employed, the Greek may still reproduce the substance of the conversation with accuracy.

That the language was not Latin is clear. The Romans were too cordially hated for that; and yet, whatever the vernacular was, it was understood by everybody, Galileans, Samaritans, Syrophoenicians, and Romans, as well as Jews. That must be evident from the facts. It is hardly to be supposed that Hebrew (Aramaic) would be intelligible to Syrophoenicians or to Romans; for the Jews would hardly be anxious to impart their sacred language to those despised heathen. Greek is left, and Greek at this time was to the Roman Empire what French was to Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century.

On the return from the captivity Chaldaic paraphrases (the Targums) were employed to help the people understand the Scriptures; and it is not possible that pure Hebrew ever regained its place as the Jewish vernacular. When Greek became the language of business, in the Roman world, it must soon have gained a foothold among them. Its common use

[1] ταπεινοφροσύνη, etc. [2] ταπεινός. [3] αὐθάδεια or (undue) φρόνημα.

as the Jewish vernacular would go far toward explaining the origin of the Septuagint, which has long been in doubt; for thousands of Jews in Asia Minor and elsewhere must have used Greek constantly to the exclusion of any Hebrew that they may have known.

The inscription written by Pilate was in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek (John xix. 20). When Saul was addressed by the Saviour in Hebrew, the use of that language was of sufficient importance to chronicle the fact (Acts xxvi. 14), as it was when he (Paul) spoke to the people in Hebrew (xxi. 40) after addressing the chief captain in Greek (37). When the Greeks "would see Jesus" (John xii. 20–21), they had no difficulty in making themselves understood. With one or two possible exceptions, the books of the New Testament were written originally in Greek. Matthew, indeed, appears to have been composed in Hebrew; but the Hebrew version has perished. Citations from the Old Testament are mostly from the Septuagint, although Matthew appears to have used the Hebrew version in his narrative. Where he quotes a discourse he cites from the Septuagint, and he even puts this version into the mouth of Jesus himself (cf. Matt. iv. 4, 6, with Deut. viii. 3, and Ps. xci. 11–12; etc.; etc.). This seems to show that the vernacular of the common people was essentially a form of Greek; for Christ must have adapted himself to their needs. When either he or his friends made use of Hebrew words or phrases, the fact seems to have been recorded (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark iii. 17; v. 41; vii. 34; John i. 49; xx. 16; etc.; etc.).

Hebrew was doubtless understood; for it must have been used in the temple service; but the chances are that it was used familiarly by the educated alone. Hebrew words and phrases were doubtless common enough in their every day

speech; but it seems likely that the people really spoke a mongrel Greek dialect, which may perhaps be compared to the German current in Pennsylvania.[1] If so, they could understand pure Greek or Aramaic on occasion; but it would probably require their closest attention to do so. This may have been the reason why Paul used the latter, as noted above. They would hardly have listened to him if he had employed a more familiar tongue.[2]

It is not likely that Peter, an uneducated fisherman from Galilee, could speak anything but the mixed dialect of the people. For Christ to have used Aramaic in this conversation, therefore, would have savored of arrogance; for it would have been a tacit assumption of superiority. Judge Lindsey of Denver reaches the boys in the juvenile court by using their dialect;[3] for Classical English would soon destroy their confidence. Christ had no desire to destroy Peter's. The supposition, then, that Greek was not used on this occasion appears to be without warrant.

[1] Cf. Neh. xiii. 24.

[2] A curious evidence of the truth of this supposition exists in modern times. The vernacular of most European Jews at the present day is Yiddish, a genderless, corrupt, and ungrammatical German, which is written in Hebrew characters and contains many Hebrew words and phrases. It shows traces of the native idioms in whatever country it chances to be spoken. Even in America it is in common use, and books and newspapers are published in it. The Jews are an excitable race; but they will listen respectfully to Christian missionaries speaking in German, although the same thing, if said in Yiddish, would produce a riot.

[3] It is not to be inferred that he does this from policy. His interest is such that he does it instinctively. Love, not policy, is the mainspring. If policy were his ruling motive, his court would be a failure. The "car barn murderers" were graduated from a similar school; but it was devoid of love. They were "let off," because they were boys; but they were not won to something better. In the end, they became desperate criminals; and a similar crop is growing in many a large city to-day. The reaping will come later.

But if it is without warrant, there is no escaping the conclusion that we have the conversation substantially as it occurred and that the different words were used purposely. It was not the mere repetition of the question that caused Peter's pain. It was the adoption of his word, as the form of the language plainly indicates; and that can only mean that the two verbs were not synonomous. The only function of the commentator, therefore, in the premises, is to find out, if possible, what the difference was. If the studies embraced in this paper help to solve that problem, its purpose will have been accomplished.