

ETERNITATIS One obstacle is world-weariness, adult cynicism, etc which blurs the child-self you must recover. If I were a primitive religionist you could reject this (and me) very easily. But I am not! I am at least your equal, my fine friend...

As an example there is a bad mistranslation in the New Testament - it is really STUPID. The result is that a tense interchange between Jesus & Peter is converted into a mere question & answer THREE TIMES repeated POINTLESSLY. It is even repeated in the Revised Standard Version. It is John 21, verses 15-17.

LOVE OR Jesus asks Peter "Do you love me? ( $\lambda\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\omega$ ) Peter answers "You know I love you" EFFECTION ( $\phi\lambda\epsilon\omega$ ).  $\rightarrow$  Non-emotion (Jesus) versus emotion (Peter).

Again Jesus asks: "Do you love me?" ( $\lambda\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\omega$  - with emphasis) Peter says "You know I love you ( $\phi\lambda\epsilon\omega$ ).

~~The third~~ The third time Jesus asks tactfully & sadly: "Do you love me?" ( $\phi\lambda\epsilon\omega$ ) Peter says "Lord, you know everything, you know I love ( $\phi\lambda\epsilon\omega$ ) you."

There are two kinds of love,  $\lambda\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\omega$  which is the love I call "God" &  $\phi\lambda\epsilon\omega$ , a personal & mechanical love which can turn to hate even. When I said "friendship" to you I meant " $\lambda\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\omega$ " which is outgoing, eternal [for since it is "God" himself, or itself, in us, it is truly "eternal".] Happy are the people who know this rare and wonderful thing below personality level! It can exist between two people of the same sex - David & Jonathan or between a man & woman. In the latter case it overrides "sex"; "sex" is its conscious servant & supremely natural. Then the man & woman are equals & their association ("married" in the customary sense or not) is a "sacrament" in some old & genuine usage of this term.

The woman is not merely a convenient receptacle for a sex organ and intercourse does not lead to satiety. Also, this is rare indeed. It can be a young man or woman's ideal, but they usually settle for less.

Here then is the "love" of two child-selves (wise as serpents and innocent as babes) and it truly reflects the Source of the Universe for which I used so obsolete & curious a word ("God").

The English "Revised Version" of 1884 notes in margin "Peter twice uses a different Greek word than Jesus" (Not much help to a casual reader!)

Maurice Nicoll in "The New Man" (Harcourt Street, 1955) deals with it in detail.

The "Twentieth Century New Testament" (1900) catches it & uses "love" as said by Jesus, and "I am your friend" as said by Peter (but this is incorrect as "friend" is merely the wrong use of that word we all make)

(1941) The "New Testament in Basic English" also catches it & uses "love" in Jesus' first two questions and "you are dear to me" as Peter's replies.

Since very likely you do not know this "heightened awareness" ( $\lambda\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\omega$ ) but only the emotion ( $\phi\lambda\epsilon\omega$ ) you have NO REFERENT to "God". You must naturally discard all semantic overtones.

This love (agape) "loves" the personality for what it is, good or bad, pleasant or unpleasant, as a mother loves an erring son.