want but He would provide? And as  
connected with the parable, Matt. xiii. 47  
ff., has the net *enclosing a great   
multitude and yet not rent*, no meaning?  
Has the ‘taking the bread and giving to  
them, and the fish likewise’ no meaning,  
which so closely binds together the   
miraculous feeding, and the institution of the  
Lord’s Supper, with their future meetings  
in His Name and round His Table? Any  
one who recognizes the *teaching* character  
of the acts of the Lord, can hardly cast all  
such applications from him ;—and\_ those  
who do not, have yet the first rudiments  
of the Gospels to learn.   
  
**15—23.**] *The*  
*calling, and its prospect*.   
  
**15. So  
when they had dined**] There appears to  
have been nothing said during the meal.  
Surely every word would have been   
recorded. One great object of this   
appearance, observes Stier, certainly was the   
confirmation, and encouragement of the *‘fisher  
of men*,’ in his apostolic office.  
  
  
**Simon son of Jonas**] A reminiscence   
probably of his own name and parentage, as  
distinguished from his apostolic name of  
honour, Cephas, or Peter, see ch. i. 43.  
Thus we have the same address, Matt. xvi.  
17, connected with the mention of his  
natural state of flesh and blood, which had  
not revealed to him the great truth just  
confessed —and Luke xxii. 31, ‘Simon,  
Simon,’ when he is reminded of his   
natural weakness. See also Mark xiv. 37, and  
Matt. xvii. 25, where the significance is  
not so plain.   
  
**more than these**] **more  
than these thy fellow-disciples**, compare  
Matt. xxvi. 33; Mark xiv. 29, ‘Though  
*all* should be offended, yet not I.’ That  
St. John does not record this saying,  
makes no difficulty here; nor does it tell  
against the genuineness of this   
appendix to the Gospel. The narrator tells  
that which he heard the Lord say, and  
tells it faithfully and literally. That it  
coincides with what Peter is related to  
have said elsewhere, is a proof of the  
*authenticity*, not of the *connexion*, of the  
two accounts.   
  
The word **these** has  
been strangely enough understood (Whitby,  
and others) of the *fish*, or the ‘employment  
and furniture of a fisherman.’—Olshausen  
sees a reference to the pre-eminence given  
to Peter, Matt. xvi. 19,—and regards the  
words as implying that on that account  
he really did love Jesus more than the  
rest ;—but surely this is most   
improbable, and the other explanation the only  
likely or true one. Perhaps there is also  
a slight reference to his present just-shewn  
zeal, in leaping from the ship first to meet  
the Lord. ‘Has thy past conduct to Me  
truly borne out thy former and present  
warmth of love to Me above these thy  
fellows?’ “Wonderful is the wisdom of  
Christ, who in so few words makes Peter  
render account to Him whom He had denied,  
and to his brother-apostles, to whom he had  
made himself superior in love ;—thus giving  
us an example for the exercise of church  
discipline.” Grotius.   
  
Peter’s answer  
shews that he understood the question as  
above. He says nothing of the **more than  
these** —but dropping all comparison of  
himself with others, humbly refers to the  
Searcher of hearts the genuineness of his  
love, however the past may seem to have  
called it in question.   
  
We may note  
that *two* Greek verbs, both signifying **to  
love**, are used in this conversation. The  
one (*agapain*) is applied to the ordinary  
love which men have to one another, or to  
the reverential love which is borne towards  
God and man by the child of God: the  
other (*philein*) to the closer love of a man  
for his own friend or his dearest relatives.  
The *former* word is used in ch. xi. 5,  
where it is said “Jesus *loved* Martha and  
her sister, and Lazarus:” the *latter* by  
the Jews in ch. xi. 37, when judging by  
the tears of Jesus for Lazarus, they   
exclaimed, “See how he *loved* him.” “Now  
in observing this conversation in the  
original, we notice, that the Lord’s *two*