**089「破碎 ‧ 医治 ‧ 差遣」约21章（完）**

**PPic约21章**

**PPic：**自我高举（夸耀自己）、自我形象（爱面子在意人看法）、自我倚靠（信自己超过信神） 是骄傲的心

**P【1】破碎**

**P1**这些事以后，耶稣在提比里亚[[1]](#footnote-1)海边再次向门徒显现。他显现的经过是这样的：2当时西门．彼得、称为“双生子”的多马、加利利的迦拿人拿但业、西庇太的两个儿子，和另外两个门徒都聚在一起。3西门．彼得对他们说：“我要打鱼去。[[2]](#footnote-2)”他们说：“我们也跟你一起去。”于是他们出去上了船，可是那一夜他们并没有打到甚么。

**P 2Pic约13:36** 主告诉他“你现在不能跟我去”他(自信的)回答：我愿意为你舍命

* 彼得非常自信，**不信主所说的**，其实是一种很难令人察觉出的骄傲

**P Pic**神容许彼得跌倒，在来鸡叫之前，三次以公开的行为不认主。

* 彼得是主所爱，主委以重任的，所以他也必须经历到主的管教
* **加利利:** (太28:7、可16:7) 主吩咐门徒离开耶路撒冷去到加利利 （提比里亚海就是加利利海）
* 彼得亲眼见到复活的主，回到加利利后，本该是在那里大胆传福音。
* 彼得是门徒中的大哥。[[3]](#footnote-3) 带着6个其他门徒一起去打鱼。

**P V3...“我要打鱼去。[[4]](#footnote-4)”他们说：“我们也跟你一起去。”**

* **问：**他为什么去打鱼？为了生活需要？
* 彼得曾在加利利地区，经历过依靠福音为生的，人接待门徒们（太10:5-15）
* **我若是彼得**，我的内心非常痛苦，因我跌的很惨，抬不起头，没有面子。
* 这种心灵上的痛苦，是别人看不出来的。
* 去打鱼，是可能帮助他找回失去的尊严，他本就（渔夫）
* 但不管他们怎么努力，他们却一整夜打不着任何鱼

**P【2】主来寻他**

**Oskip 4**清早的时候，耶稣站在岸边；门徒却不知道他就是耶稣。5耶稣对他们说：“孩子们[[5]](#footnote-5)，打到鱼没有？”他们回答：“没有。”6耶稣说：“把网撒在船的右边，就可以得着[[6]](#footnote-6)。”他们就把网撒下去，可是拉不上来，因为鱼太多。7耶稣所爱的那门徒对彼得说：“是主！”西门．彼得一听见是主，就立刻束上外衣(因为他当时赤着身子)[[7]](#footnote-7)，纵身跳进海里。8其他的门徒，因为离岸不远(约有一百公尺)，就坐在小船上，把那网鱼拖过来。9他们上了岸，就看见那里有一堆炭火，上面有鱼有饼。10耶稣对他们说：“把你们刚才打的鱼拿几条来。”11西门．彼得就上船，把网拉到岸上；那网满了大鱼，共有一百五十三条[[8]](#footnote-8)。鱼虽然这么多，网却没有破。

**P Pic** 7 位门徒中有4位渔夫，整晚去打不到任何鱼

* 主特意显现，是为彼得而来的，因祂要医治彼得破碎的心灵
* 耶稣（陌生男子）在岸边,**吩咐把网撒在船的右边**，结果竟然捕获许多鱼，多到拉不上来！
* **第二次这样的经历！**彼得、约翰、雅各（路5:1-11主呼召他们）
* 约翰就对彼得说“是主！”彼得一听见就明白一定是主了！

**P Pic不顾一切**：丢下所有门徒，跳进海里游回岸上

* 跳进海里前，还特意穿上外衣（反映出他内心对主的尊重），渔夫是不会穿外衣游泳的
* 彼得爱主，他内心太想见主了！
* 彼得内心亏欠主
* Ap 爱主、亏欠主太多了，对主的渴望。
* 153条大鱼，刻意记录目是要凸显神迹，那么多大鱼，网却没有破！
* 你要知道祂爱你，祂要医治你。

**P【3】主医治与差遣**

**P 12**耶稣对他们说：“你们来，吃早饭吧。”门徒中没有一个人敢问他 [[9]](#footnote-9)：“你是谁？”因为知道他是主。13耶稣走过来，拿饼递给他们，又照样拿鱼递给他们[[10]](#footnote-10)。14这是耶稣从死人中复活之后，第三次 [[11]](#footnote-11)向门徒显现。15他们吃了早饭，耶稣问西门．彼得：“约翰的儿子西门，你爱 ἀγαπάω[[12]](#footnote-12)我比这些更深吗 [[13]](#footnote-13)？”他回答：“主啊，是的，你知道我爱φιλέω你。”耶稣说：“你喂养[[14]](#footnote-14)我的小羊。”16耶稣第二次又问他：“约翰的儿子西门，你爱ἀγαπάω我吗？”他回答：“主啊，是的，你知道我爱φιλέω你。”耶稣说：“你牧养我的羊。”17耶稣第三次问他：“约翰的儿子西门，你爱φιλέω我吗？”彼得因为耶稣第三次问他：“你爱我吗？”就忧愁起来，对耶稣说：“主啊，你是无所不知的，你知道我爱φιλέω你。”耶稣说：“你喂养我的羊。

* 主耶稣刻意的问彼得三次“你爱我吗”？
* 一些牧者：ἀγαπάω （动词）ἀγάπη（名词） 神无条件的爱。而φιλέω 是友爱
* 但问题是在约翰福音ἀγαπάω 与 φιλέω 是同义词 [[15]](#footnote-15) （参注脚）。
* 约翰**可能在暗示**，彼得虽然知道自己爱主，却不及主对他的爱
* **彼得忧愁起来**，想起他三次不认主
* 主耶稣好像很不给彼得面子，刻意在众人面前三次问他“你爱我吗”
* e.g.主这样公开的询问彼得，是为了医治彼得的心。
* 后来主也启示4个福音作者，刻意记载彼得三次不认主！（失败、很丢脸）
* 主用人的失败，来荣耀神。
* **主三次托付彼得：**在众门徒面前肯定彼得，把祂的羊托付给他。

**PV15...你喂养我的小羊。16... 你牧养我的羊。17...你喂养我的羊。**

* 真正爱主的人，一定爱教会（主的羊）
* **问：**一个失败的人有什么资格服事主呢？
* 没有人是配得服事主的！
* 我们都是因恩典来服事的！
* 经历失败后的人，才更深入的认识主耶稣

**PV17...“主啊，你是无所不知的，你知道我爱你。” ...**

**P【4】认识耶稣是主**

**P18**我实实在在告诉你，你年轻的时候，自己束上腰带，随意往来；但到了年老的时候，你要伸出手来，别人要把你绑着[[16]](#footnote-16)，带你到你不愿意去的地方[[17]](#footnote-17)。”19耶稣说这话，是指明彼得将怎样死，来荣耀　神。说了这话，就对彼得说：“你跟从我吧！”20彼得转过身来，看见耶稣所爱的那门徒跟着，就是在晚饭的时候，靠着耶稣的胸膛，问“主啊，出卖你的是谁？”的那个人。21彼得看见他，就问耶稣：“主啊，这个人将来怎么样[[18]](#footnote-18) ？”22耶稣回答他：“如果我要他活到我来的时候，跟你有甚么关系呢？你只管跟从我吧！” 23于是这话流传在弟兄中间，说那门徒不会死[[19]](#footnote-19)。其实耶稣并没有对他说他不会死，只是说：“如果我要他活到我来的时候，跟你有甚么关系呢？”

* 在教会的历史中，后来使徒彼得是倒钉十字架，彼得要以他的死来荣耀神。
* 主也说了，这是彼得不愿意去的地方。
* 主也说，他的死会荣耀神！
* 主命令彼得，“你跟从我吧！”
* 彼得转过身来看见约翰，就问那么“主啊，这个人将来怎么样？”

**P V22耶稣回答他：“如果我要他活到我来的时候，跟你有甚么关系呢？你只管跟从我吧！”**

* **功课：**耶稣是主，、主安排、主决定、他需要顺服主
* ap可能现在你正在面临，“别人要把你绑着，带你到**你不愿意去**的地方”
* ap你已多次祷告祈求，但还是被绑起来，没有办法跑掉了。
* ap“求主让我被绑起来的这事情上，**可以荣耀你**”。我刚从祢！
* ap主所要用的人，祂会先，破碎 ‧ 医治 ‧ 然后差遣
* **问：**你愿意吗？
1. *Sea of Tiberias*—an alternative name for Lake Galilee

Prior to his death, Jesus had told his disciples that, after he had risen, he would go before them into Galilee (Matt. 26:32/Mark 14:28). Following his resurrection, he told the women at the empty tomb to tell his disciples to go to Galilee, where they would see him (Matt. 28:10), something the angels reminded the women of at the tomb (Mark 16:7/Luke 24:6). In 21:1–14 Jesus’ meeting with his disciples in Galilee is recounted.Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, pp. 458–459). Inter-Varsity Press.

21:1. Afterwards (meta tauta, as in 3:22) establishes sequence but no chronological details. The disciples have left Jerusalem and returned to Galilee, probably not with the main groups of journeying pilgrims but in small groups of two or three, several days after the week-long Feast of Unleavened Bread.Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 668). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Jesus himself had told them to return to Galilee and that he would see them there. It was natural that they would occupy themselves fishing while they waited for him. Though night-time was the best time for fishing, the disciples caught nothing. Such an experience was not without precedent for them (cf. Luke 5:5).Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 459). Inter-Varsity Press.

21:3. Commentators divide as to whether Peter and his friends are to be blamed for going fishing. Hoskyns (p. 552) describes the scene as ‘one of complete apostasy’ and ‘the fulfillment of 16:32’; Barrett (p. 579) judges it ‘unthinkable’ that ‘Peter and his brother disciples should contemplate a return to their former occupation after the events of ch. 20’; Brown (2. 1096) speaks of ‘aimless activity undertaken in desperation’. By contrast, Bruce (p. 399) insists there is no evidence that Peter was abandoning the commission he had received in order to return to fishing, and meanwhile ‘it was better for him to employ his time usefully than remain idle’. And Beasley-Murray (p. 399) comments, ‘Even though Jesus be crucified and risen from the dead, the disciples must still eat!’The truth is probably between the two, but a good deal closer to the latter. There is no evidence that Peter and the others had gone to Galilee in order to fish. The most reasonable assumption is that they went in obedience to the Lord’s command (Mk. 14:28; 16:7 par.). Moreover by this time Peter himself had seen the risen Lord (Lk. 24:34; 1 Cor. 15:5), a point confirmed by the fact that Peter so quickly threw himself into the water and swam for shore as soon as the identity of the man of the shore was pointed out. This does not read like the action of someone who is running away.But if Peter and his friends have neither apostasized nor sunk into despair, this fishing expedition and the dialogue that ensues do not read like the lives of men on a Spirit-empowered mission. It is impossible to imagine any of this taking place in Acts, after Pentecost. There is a certain eagerness for the risen Jesus, still strangely halting as the reality of Jesus’ resurrection is still sinking in. But most emphatically this is not the portrait of believers who have received the promised Paraclete. There is neither the joy nor the assurance, not to mention the sense of mission and the spirit of unity, that characterize the church when freshly endowed with the promised Spirit. It is this ‘tone’ in the chapter that confirms the exegesis of 20:22, given above, and authenticates the chapter as part of the original Gospel.Although there is evidence that the night time was considered best for fishing on Galilee, one wonders if the Evangelist is not still employing one of his favourite symbols (cf. notes on 3:2, 19–21; 13:30; 20:1). They are coming to grips with the resurrection, but they still have not learned the profound truth that apart from Christ they can do nothing (15:5), and so that night they caught nothing (cf. Lk. 5:5).

Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (pp. 669–670). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 彼得极有可能是十二门徒中年纪较大的一位，虽然圣经没有明言他是否是最年长的，但从多方面可见端倪。他在每次门徒名单中都列在首位，显示他的领导地位（太10:2）。在（太17:24–27）中，主耶稣只吩咐彼得为祂和彼得缴纳圣殿税，这暗示其他门徒可能未满二十岁，而彼得已属征税年龄。此外，彼得已婚（可1:30），也显示他可能比其他门徒年长。初代教会的传统亦普遍视彼得为门徒中的领袖与长者。综上所述，彼得虽然未必是最年长的，但极有可能是在门徒中属年纪较长、也最具带领角色的一位。 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Jesus himself had told them to return to Galilee and that he would see them there. It was natural that they would occupy themselves fishing while they waited for him. Though night-time was the best time for fishing, the disciples caught nothing. Such an experience was not without precedent for them (cf. Luke 5:5).Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 459). Inter-Varsity Press.

21:3. Commentators divide as to whether Peter and his friends are to be blamed for going fishing. Hoskyns (p. 552) describes the scene as ‘one of complete apostasy’ and ‘the fulfillment of 16:32’; Barrett (p. 579) judges it ‘unthinkable’ that ‘Peter and his brother disciples should contemplate a return to their former occupation after the events of ch. 20’; Brown (2. 1096) speaks of ‘aimless activity undertaken in desperation’. By contrast, Bruce (p. 399) insists there is no evidence that Peter was abandoning the commission he had received in order to return to fishing, and meanwhile ‘it was better for him to employ his time usefully than remain idle’. And Beasley-Murray (p. 399) comments, ‘Even though Jesus be crucified and risen from the dead, the disciples must still eat!’The truth is probably between the two, but a good deal closer to the latter. There is no evidence that Peter and the others had gone to Galilee in order to fish. The most reasonable assumption is that they went in obedience to the Lord’s command (Mk. 14:28; 16:7 par.). Moreover by this time Peter himself had seen the risen Lord (Lk. 24:34; 1 Cor. 15:5), a point confirmed by the fact that Peter so quickly threw himself into the water and swam for shore as soon as the identity of the man of the shore was pointed out. This does not read like the action of someone who is running away.But if Peter and his friends have neither apostasized nor sunk into despair, this fishing expedition and the dialogue that ensues do not read like the lives of men on a Spirit-empowered mission. It is impossible to imagine any of this taking place in Acts, after Pentecost. There is a certain eagerness for the risen Jesus, still strangely halting as the reality of Jesus’ resurrection is still sinking in. But most emphatically this is not the portrait of believers who have received the promised Paraclete. There is neither the joy nor the assurance, not to mention the sense of mission and the spirit of unity, that characterize the church when freshly endowed with the promised Spirit. It is this ‘tone’ in the chapter that confirms the exegesis of 20:22, given above, and authenticates the chapter as part of the original Gospel.Although there is evidence that the night time was considered best for fishing on Galilee, one wonders if the Evangelist is not still employing one of his favourite symbols (cf. notes on 3:2, 19–21; 13:30; 20:1). They are coming to grips with the resurrection, but they still have not learned the profound truth that apart from Christ they can do nothing (15:5), and so that night they caught nothing (cf. Lk. 5:5).

Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (pp. 669–670). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The word paidia (NIV ‘Friends’, frequently ‘children’) can be used much like British ‘lads’ or American ‘boys’ or ‘guys’ (cf. M. I. 170 n. 1).Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 670). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Whether in hope or in tired resignation, the men in the boat heed the advice.Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 671). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Ancient art and literature record that cast-net fishermen worked naked, so perhaps Peter, being naked, wrapped not a full outer garment but a simple loincloth around him, to show respect for Jesus before jumping into the water to make his way to the shore to meet him.Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 460). Inter-Varsity Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. It was full of large fish, 153, but even with so many the net was not torn. The evangelist’s reference to the number of fish is probably not meant to be symbolic, as some have suggested,3 but rather to emphasize the miraculous nature of the catch—there was a large number of fish, they were large fish, but even so the net was not torn.Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, pp. 460–461). Inter-Varsity Press.Large quantities of ink have gone into explaining why there should be 153 fish. At the purely historical level, it is unsurprising that someone counted them, either as part of dividing them up amongst the fishermen in preparation for sale, or because one of the men was so dumbfounded by the size of the catch that he said something like this: ‘Can you believe it? I wonder how many there are?’But such pedestrian considerations have not satisfied those who are certain there is profound significance in the number. Throughout the history of the church, the most popular solution is that advanced by Jerome, who in his commentary on Ezekiel 47 ties this miracle with the prophetic vision of the stream of living water that flows from the temple to the Dead Sea, which begins to teem with life. Jerome cites the naturalist Oppian who, he claims, avers that there are 153 different species of fish. Thus this catch of fish, effected by the risen Lord’s command, becomes an acted parable of the fruitful mission of the church that draws (helkyō; the same verb is behind ‘dragged’) all human beings without distinction (12:32).8 The trouble with this explanation is that Oppian’s list, no matter how it is counted, does not yield 153; the most likely number is 157.9 Scholars debate whether Jerome was simply mistaken in the number, misascribed the right number to some other naturalist whose work is now lost, or simply ‘cooked the books’. So far as our evidence goes, however, this is no solution.

Another proposal based on Ezekiel 47 has been put forward more recently. Describing the effect of the stream from the temple, Ezekiel writes: ‘There will be large numbers of fish, because this water flows there and makes the salt water fresh; so where the river flows everything will live. Fishermen will stand along the shore; from En Gedi to En Eglaim there will be places for spreading nets’ (47:9–10). Now each Hebrew and Greek letter stands for a number, so every Greek or Hebrew word has a numerical value. Based on this discipline, called ‘gematria’, J. A. Emerton10 has noted that in Hebrew ‘En’ is the word for ‘spring’, while ‘Gedi’ yields the number 17 and ‘Eglaim’ the number 153. Indeed, the two numbers are related: 153 is the triangular number of 17 (i.e. 1+2+3+ … +17=153; for the reason why it is called ‘triangular’ cf. Hoskyns, p. 553). Thus the number represents the places where, in the time of the fulfillment of messianic hopes, gospel fishermen are to spread their nets. Of course, this ‘solution’ supposes that the readers understand Hebrew. That is extremely unlikely in a book where elementary Hebrew words have to be transliterated (e.g. 1:37, 41). P. R. Ackroyd, noting this point, has derived 153 by adding the Greek numbers for ‘Gedi’ and ‘Eglaim’, but to do so he has had to find variant spellings in different manuscripts.11

That 153 is the triangular number of 17 did not escape the church Fathers. Augustine12 noted it, and observed that 17=10+7, the 10 representing the ten commandments and the 7 the sevenfold Spirit of God (Rev. 1:4). Others break 7 down into 3+4, the number of the Trinity and the number of the new Jerusalem, the city built foursquare. Others have observed that 153= (3x50) +3, the double 3 pointing to the Trinity. Another scholar observes that in the feeding of the five thousand there were originally five little loaves of bread, from which twelve baskets of scraps were taken up, and 5+12=17—i.e. there is a link between that (allegedly) eucharistic feast and this one.13 Other solutions based on gematria have presented themselves: that 153 is the number for the words ‘the church of love’ in Hebrew,14 or of ‘the children of God’,15 or of Pisgah (thus making an allusion to the death of Moses, Dt. 34:1),16 or of the Hebrew for ‘Cana G’ (representing ‘Cana in Galilee’, and thereby tying this miracle to the first two).17Many other suggestions have been put forward, none very convincing. Whatever internal difficulty each might have, as a group most of them do not relate to this passage very well. They tend to offer, at best, an allusion to an admittedly Johannine theme, but nothing that flows naturally out of John 21:11. If the Evangelist has some symbolism in mind connected with the number 153, he has hidden it well.Even so, there may be symbolism in the sheer quantity, if not the number itself, since the Evangelist draws attention to it: but even with so many the net was not torn. It is hard not to see an allusion to Luke 5:1–11, where the nets were torn. This may suggest that the gospel net will never break, that there is no limit to the number of converts it catches (Bruce, pp. 401–402). If such symbolism is operating, it may owe something to Jesus himself, who elsewhere promised to make his disciples ‘fishers of men’ (Mk. 1:17).21:12–13. It was almost as if the disciples were reluctant to come, even as they were eager to be with him. Jesus must spell out the invitation: Come and have breakfast (aristēsate, here used, as classically, for the first meal of the day, as v. 4 requires; more commonly in the New Testament for a later meal—e.g. Lk. 11:37–38; 14:12).Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (pp. 672–674). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. . This is not the same reticence as that exhibited by the two disciples on the road to Emmaus who were kept from recognizing him (Lk. 24:16): these disciples know it is the Lord, and yet are still so uneasy, so hesitant, so uncertain, that they apparently long to ask him, in effect, ‘Is it really you?’, yet dare not do so.Perhaps it is the lack of imaginative historical reconstruction on our part that makes us hesitate to see the compelling power of this interpretation. Our creeds make the resurrection of Jesus Christ so central that it requires considerable mental effort to put ourselves in the places of the first disciples. The evidence of ch. 20 is here presupposed. The disciples had been granted the strongest possible reasons for believing in Jesus’ resurrection, and indeed did so: they knew it was the Lord. But whether because they could see Jesus was not simply resuscitated (like Lazarus), but appeared with new powers, or because they were still grappling with the strangeness of a crucified and resurrected Messiah, or because despite the irrefutable power of the evidence presented to them resurrection itself seemed strange, they felt considerable unease—yet suppressed their question because they knew the one before them could only be Jesus.Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 674). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 主耶稣身体复活之后，是能享用美食的(路24:41-43 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The reference to the third time Jesus appeared probably enumerates only the appearances reported in this Gospel (20:19–23; 20:26–29).Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 675). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. . Sometimes a lot has been made of these differences, but, in fact, agapaō and phileō are used synonymously in the Gospel of John, and we should not make too much of the evangelist’s choice of verbs. For example, both agapaō and phileō are used of the Father’s love for the Son (10:17; 15:9; 17:23, 24, 26/5:20), Jesus’ love for Lazarus (11:5/11:3, 36) and the beloved disciple (13:23; 19:26; 21:7, 20/20:2), and the Father’s love for the disciples (14:23/16:27).Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 462). Inter-Varsity Press.

Some expositions of these verses turn on the distribution of the two different verbs for ‘love’ that appear. When Jesus asks the question the first two times, ‘Do you love me?’, the verb is agapaō; Peter responds with ‘I love you’ (phileō). The third time, however, Jesus himself uses phileō; and still Peter cannot bring himself to use more than the same. Commonly it is argued that agapaō is the stronger form of ‘to love’, but so powerfully has Peter had his old self-confidence expunged from him that the most he will claim is the weaker form—even when Jesus draws attention to the point, using the weaker form himself when he asks the question for the third time. This accounts for the distinction the NIV maintains between ‘truly love’ and ‘love’.18

This will not do, for at least the following reasons:(1) We have already seen that the two verbs are used interchangeably in this Gospel. The expression ‘beloved disciple’, more literally ‘disciple whom Jesus loved’, can be based on either verb (cf. notes on 20:2). The Father loves the Son—and both verbs serve (3:35; 5:20). Jesus loved Lazarus—and again both verbs serve (11:5, 36).(2) No reliable distinction can be based on the LXX. For instance, Jacob’s preferential love for Joseph is expressed with both verbs (Gn. 37:3, 4). When Amnon incestuously rapes his sister Tamar, both verbs can be used to refer to his ‘love’ (2 Sam. 13). Despite one verb for ‘love’ in the Hebrew text of Proverbs 8:17, the LXX uses both agapaō and phileō.

(3) Convincing evidence has been advanced that the verb agapaō was coming into prominence throughout Greek literature from about the fourth century BC onward, as one of the standard verbs for ‘to love’. One of the reasons for this change is that phileō has taken on the additional meaning ‘to kiss’, in some contexts.19 In other words, agapaō does not come into play because it is a peculiarly sacred word.(4) Even in the New Testament, agapaō is not always distinguished by a good object: Demas regrettably ‘loved’ the present age (2 Tim. 4:10).(5) Nor does it help to argue, with Hendriksen (2. 494–500), that because the total range of meaning of each verb is not the same as that of the other (e.g. agapaō never means ‘to kiss’), therefore there is necessarily some distinction to be made here. But this conclusion is invalid. All agree that synonyms enjoy differences of association, nuance and emotional colouring within their total semantic range. ‘But within any one individual passage these differences do not amount to a distinction of real theological reference: they do not specify a difference in the kind of love referred to.’20(6) Amongst those who insist a distinction between the two verbs is to be maintained in each verse, there is no agreement. Thus, Trench21 insists agapaō is philanthropic and altruistic, but without emotional attachment, and therefore much too cold for Peter’s affection. That is why the apostle prefers phileō. By contrast, for Westcott (2. 367) agapaō denotes the higher love that will in time come to be known as the distinctively Christian love, while Peter cannot bring himself to profess more than ‘the feeling of natural love’, phileō. Bruce (p. 405) wisely comments: ‘When two such distinguished Greek scholars (both, moreover, tending to argue from the standards of classical Greek) see the significance of the synonyms so differently, we may wonder if indeed we are intended to see such distinct significance.’

(7) By now it has become clear that the Evangelist constantly uses minor variations for stylistic reasons of his own (cf. Morris, SFG, pp. 293–319). This is confirmed by the present passage. In addition to the two words for ‘love’, John resorts to three other pairs: boskō and poimainō (‘feed’ and ‘take care of’ the sheep), arnia and probata (‘lambs’ and ‘sheep’), and oida and ginōskō (both rendered ‘you know’ in v. 17). These have not stirred homiletical imaginations; it is difficult to see why the first pair should.Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (pp. 676–677). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. 15. When they had finished eating, Jesus said to Simon Peter, ‘Simon son of John, do you love me more than these?’ Jesus singled Peter out and asked him whether he loved him more than these. What more than these means has been variously explained: (1) more than the other disciples present loved Jesus; (2) more than Peter loved those other disciples; (3) more than the large catch of fish, the boats and fishing gear; or (4) more than anything else. Of these options, the first is supported by the fact that Peter had been the most forward in asserting his dedication to Jesus (13:37–38; cf. Matt. 26:33). The second is unlikely because there is no mention elsewhere of Peter’s love for the other disciples. The third is possible if one regards Peter’s decision to go fishing (21:3) as a turning away from Jesus to go back to his old trade. The fourth represents the most comprehensive question: do you love me more than anything else? The first of these options has most to commend it for two reasons: (1) the other disciples were present; and (2) Peter had said, ‘Even if all fall away, I will not’ (cf. Mark 14:29).Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, pp. 461–462). Inter-Varsity Press.

The public nature of Peter’s reinstatement is suggested by Jesus’ initial question, Simon son of John, do you truly love me more than these? By itself, more than these (toutōn, genitive of comparison) could be interpreted in three ways: (1) ‘Do you love me more than you love these disciples?’ But this question does not cohere with any theme in the book. (2) ‘Do you love me more than you love this fishing gear?’ That is possible; the boat and the nets have been mentioned, and doubtless other gear was lying around. But in John 1 Peter is not called from his fishing, and the fishing of 21:3 has fewer negative overtones than some suppose. In any case all seven disciples went fishing: why then focus on Peter? (3) ‘Do you love me more than these other disciples do?’ (which of course assumes they are still present). This makes sense. Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (pp. 675–676). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Two other things call for comment. First, it would seem that Peter’s love for Jesus had to be expressed in the shepherding of his Lord’s flock. **Second, similar terminology is used in 1 Peter 5:1–4 and Acts 20:28–29, where elders are charged with the responsibility of shepherding God’s flock**. This suggests that Jesus’ commission to Peter to feed his sheep here in 20:15–17 was not understood to be restricted to Peter in any exclusive way Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 463). Inter-Varsity Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. 【父爱子】 约5:20 父爱φιλέω子，将自己所作的一切事指给他看，还要将比这更大的事指给他看，叫你们希奇。约10:17 我父爱ἀγαπάω我；因我将命舍去，好再取回来。【主爱人】约11:3 他姊妹两个就打发人去见耶稣，说：「主啊，你所爱φιλέω的人病了。」约11:5 耶稣素来爱ἀγαπάω马大和他妹子并拉撒路。约11:36 犹太人就说：「你看他爱φιλέω这人是何等恳切。」【人对主的爱】约14:23 耶稣回答说：「人若爱ἀγαπάω我，就必遵守我的道；我父也必爱ἀγαπάω他，并且我们要到他那里去，与他同住。 约16:27 父自己爱φιλέω你们；因为你们已经爱φιλέω我，又信我是从父出来的。【耶稣所爱的门徒约翰】约19:26 耶稣见母亲和他所爱ἀγαπάω的那门徒站在旁边，就对他母亲说：「母亲（原文作妇人），看，你的儿子！」约20:2 就跑来见西门彼得和耶稣所爱φιλέω的那个门徒，对他们说：「有人把主从坟墓里挪了去，我们不知道放在那里。」 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Peter is known to have suffered a violent death (cf. 1 Clement 5.4, written c. AD 96), and it was believed to have been by crucifixion (cf. Tertullian, Scorp. 15.3). If 21:18–19 refers to crucifixion, it is the earliest testimony to Peter’s martyrdom by this means.7 Jesus’ next words to Peter were, in that case, most apt: Then he said to him, ‘Follow me!’ Peter was to take up his cross literally and follow Jesus.Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 464). Inter-Varsity Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. By the time the Fourth Gospel was written, the prediction had been fulfilled, and Peter had glorified God by his martyrdom, probably in Rome, under the emperor Nero. Extra-biblical sources for the event are not strong. Clement of Rome (c. AD 96) mentions Peter’s martyrdom but does not reveal what form it took (1 Clement 5:4). Writing about AD 212, Tertullian affirms that it was when Peter was bound to the cross that he was girded by someone else (Scorpiace [‘Antidote for the Scorpion’s Sting’] 15), but it is unclear whether Tertullian has access to independent information, or is simply referring to this text. Later accounts of Peter asking to be crucified upside down, because he felt unworthy to be crucified as his Lord was, are too remote and too infected with legendary accretions to be reliable.26 What is undisputed is that the indelible shame Peter bore for his public disowning of the Lord Jesus Christ on the night he was sentenced to death was forgiven by the Lord himself, and subsequently overwhelmed by the apostle’s fruitful ministry and martyrdom.Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 680). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Second, the episode at the last supper calls to mind that Peter signalled to John to get him to ask Jesus a question: i.e. it assumes a certain intimacy between the beloved disciple and Peter. That intimacy makes Peter’s question more comprehensible, if not more justifiable. His own prognosis is not very good: for Peter the cost of discipleship will be high. What about him?Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 681). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans.

it seems reasonable to suppose that, if the beloved disciple were already dead, the falsity of that interpretation could instantly be established by pointing out the disciple’s grave. The silence on this point supports the view that the beloved disciple was still alive at the time of writing. Carson, D. A. (1991). The Gospel according to John (p. 682). Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Jesus’ reply to Peter gave rise to a rumour that Jesus would return before the death of the beloved disciple. The evangelist had to explain that ‘Jesus did not say that he would not die; he only said, “If I want him to remain alive until I return, what is that to you?” ’ This shows how easy it is for people to jump to wrong conclusions when the word of the Lord is not carefully considered and properly understood.Kruse, C. G. (2017). John: An Introduction and Commentary (E. J. Schnabel, Ed.; Second edition, Vol. 4, p. 467). Inter-Varsity Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)