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CHAPTER ONE

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE

"John the disciple of the Lord who leaned upon His breast himself too set forth the Gospel while dwelling in Ephesus the city of Asia." -- Irenaeus
I. The authorship and date of the five books in question

(1) The authorship

In this study, the historical situation, involving the date and environment of the Johannine writings, is of more immediate concern than the particular problem of their authorship. We need to know when the works that bear John's name were produced, in order that the author's use of \textit{monogenēs} may be compared with the preceding and contemporary usage thereof. The comparison in turn should develop whatever distinctiveness there may be in the employment of the term by the writer of the Johannine works. However, let it be accepted that the possibility of determining the date of the books apart from their authorship is remote, since the evidence for the one problem will assist in solving the other; the authorship and the date are interdependent.

It must be remembered as a matter of simple fairness that they who question or deny that the Apostle John is the author of the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Revelation, attributed to him, must still bear the burden of the proof. The critics who do not credit this man with writing the Johannine books must succeed in demonstrating not only that someone else might have written them, but also that this John could not have been their author. The critics must find and organize and present external and internal evidence of creditable character, and apply it to the problem with such compelling force and fairness as to account adequately for all the phenomena of these books. They must also remove a larger number of the difficulties confronted than does the "traditional" position. If John the Apostle is not the
author, proof that he is not must include: the presentation of another author equally or better equipped than he for this particular task; and a demonstration that a writer (or writers) far removed both in time and place from the earthly life of Jesus could give a historically accurate and religiously transforming picture of the Savior. Therefore, the "modern critical school" — or those members thereof who deny the Johannine authorship of the books in question — will do well to prepare to defend their own theories. The defense, moreover, must display more plausibility than has thus far been observed in their attacks on the position of the still considerable group who find it both intellectually reasonable and spiritually reassuring to say that these books are, indeed, the work of the Beloved Disciple John.¹

For we are dealing here with religious literature that claims to contain guidance for man in his relations with God. The religious value of the literature is dependent upon its historical accuracy in that its author presents selected examples of the life and teachings of One who is represented as living and working and speaking in a manner that led men to give Him their religious devotion, to worship Him as Deity. If the traditional position is in error, and if an intimate companion of Jesus is not the author of these writings, what are we to say of their religious value? The proof of their production by some one other than their reputed author would throw a serious question on their historical value, which question in turn would create serious

doubts regarding their religious trustworthiness. For it is as religious documents, attested with historical accuracy that is in keeping with intrinsic certainty, that the Johannine books must be accepted or rejected. The fact that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is unknown does not present a fair analogy to the problem of the Johannine authorship, for the authenticity of Hebrews is in no way dependent upon any conclusion about its authorship. But the author of the Gospel of John, although he keeps himself unnamed, clearly lays claim to having been an eyewitness to the life of Jesus. Kinship in style between the Gospel and the Epistles indicates common authorship; and the author of the Revelation calls himself "John." That this "John" is in each case the author of the books involved is the position assumed herein.

Since these are historical as well as religious documents, the external and the internal evidence for their authorship and date has been given due consideration. It is obvious, however, that this thesis, by its very nature, rules out the necessity and propriety of giving even a summary of either type of evidence leading to the conclusion adopted. The positions other than that held herein have been as fully consulted as the nature of the study has permitted. "Whatever consequences may follow from it, we are compelled on critical grounds to accept this Fourth Gospel as the genuine work of John, the son of Zebedee."1 "I feel sure that the eyes which saw, the ears which heard, and the hand that wrote belonged to the same man; if so, that man must have been John."2

2. Ibid., p. 122.
(2) The date

Assuming that the Apostle John wrote the five books and that he spent his later years in Ephesus, except for his exile on the Island of Patmos, we can determine an approximate date beyond which he could not have lived and written. For, although John may have been younger than Jesus by ten years, he was no less than ninety-five years of age when he died, about the close of the first century (reckoning Jesus' birth as in 6 or 5 B. C.). The tradition that he was early martyred by the Jews is self-contradictory. "His writings belong to the closing years of his life, unless we put the Apocalypse near the time of Nero as some scholars -- wrongly in my opinion -- still do."

The dates, then, may be somewhat as follows: Epistles, 80-90; Gospel, 85-90; Apocalypse, 95. These are the dates given in Dr. Robertson's *Chronological New Testament* (1904) and in his posthumous *Epistles in the Life of the Apostle John* (1935). It is significant that over this span of about a generation he evidently saw no reason to alter his judgment.

(3) Conclusion

Since the nature of this study forbids further development of the matter of the historical setting as far as that matter is connected with the authorship and date, the following conclusions will be offered as proceeding from or assumed in the foregoing discussion, and as providing a foundation for the ensuing consideration of John's

relations with religious thought contemporary with his life and work:

a. That John the Beloved Disciple is the author of the Fourth Gospel, the three Epistles, and the Apocalypse, and that they are all historically and structurally trustworthy in their present form. "The onus probandi rests with those who would impugn its (Gospel's) genuineness, and nothing short of the fullest and most decisive marks of spuriousness can fairly be considered sufficient to counterbalance this evidence. . . . The internal marks of authen-

ticity and genuineness are so varied, so circumstantial, and so incon-
spicuous as to create an overwhelming body of evidence in its favor."¹

"John has told his story well. There is no need for any man to at-
tempt to tell it better."²

b. That the books were written in or near Ephesus, in the closing years of John's life, probably between 80 and 100 A. D.

c. That the question of John's authorship and of his trustworthiness as an author is more than the question of his being an eyewitness to those events which he narrates. It is rather a question of his experience with One who, by daily companionship, impressed the writer as being not only fully human, but also as having inherent qualities which, confirmed by long and profound reflection and by the observation of the experience of his fellow-disciples, led John finally to give his testimony to the truth of the divine claims made by men for Jesus, and by Jesus for Himself. It is a question of John's obtaining

¹ Lightfoot. op. cit., p. 137.
the consent of his intellect, his emotions, and his will to narrate a few chosen events from the life of his Teacher, to whom the Beloved Disciple could attribute, after most of his life was spent in obeying that Teacher's will, the immeasurably profound term: μοναρχίς Θεός.

E. John's relations with contemporary religious thought

(1) The finality of John's message

If John's writings were produced in Ephesus between 80 and 100 A. D., they are, since the other New Testament books precede them, the final word in point of time that we possess concerning the life and message of Christ. Whether or not John realized that it was to be his distinction to say the last word, we cannot know. Nevertheless, knowing that he was among the last of the eyewitnesses to Jesus' earthly ministry, and knowing that he had a message supremely needed in his time, he would surely strive to give forth that message with as much power and consciousness of finality as he could command. He writes with the assurance of one confident that he has the remedy for the maladies of man. He has learned from his Teacher that the maladies of man head up finally in sin; that sin is less an outward, overt misdeed than an inward attitude, leading, if unchecked, to spiritual bondage, from which only the Son of God can set man free. John's entire rich and unparalleled heritage from the ages past, from his intimate association with Jesus, and from his vantage point of full maturity both in age and in contemplation -- all this he gave in fulfilment of his purpose to write that "You may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you may have life
in His name" (John 20.31). Modern writers accepting the Johannine authorship frequently point out that John's thought-forms and expressions show him to be a Palestinian Jew. His unobtrusively accurate topographical notes and his striking reports of events and conversations show him to be an eyewitness of the matters that he relates. His frequent explanations of Jewish words and customs likewise show him to be writing in time and place apart from the occurrence of the matters he narrates. Other lines of evidence relative to the authorship and characteristics of these books are frequently cited, but these are sufficient to show some points in John's equipment and training for his task. In his case, as truly as in Paul's, or in Moses', we can see the guiding effect of God's leading of this man through experiences that fitted him for his work in interpreting the final and supreme revelation of God in terms of His sending His Only Son to take away the sin of the world. Generally assumed is John's knowledge, if not actual possession and utilization, of the Synoptic Gospels, much as we have them now. Others seem to find dependence in John upon Paul's Christology, and, to a probably lesser degree, dependence upon the ideas of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Surely there is no reason to deny the possibility that John consciously supplemented several of the earlier New Testament books. Whether or not dependence upon, or a desire to correct, the New Testament writings preceding his own ever be proved of John, the very presence and nature of his testimony prove him to have regarded his work essential and applicable to the religious situation of his closing years. His Gospel especially
reveals how John regarded the whole sphere of life as primarily religious -- to him the environment in all its particulars related to his idea of the relation man should establish and maintain with God. Religion was for him great enough to embrace the whole life. Accordingly, when it is proposed to deal with John's contacts with contemporary religious thought, it is necessary to use the modern division of the "religious" from the "secular," for a survey of the entire Roman world of John's time, in all its aspects, cannot be made here.

(2) Survey of the three major types of religion encountered

Only a very brief survey can be attempted, for it is sufficient here to positionize John in a general way in the midst of a multitude of complex and often hostile religious systems. To essay a chronological presentation would involve research beyond the scope and purpose of this study. Some sort of classification, however, is necessary; that followed herein was proposed not long since in an Archaeology Seminar by Dr. J. McKee Adams. The three major types are: the political, the philosophical, and the "mystery" religions. These designations may not be mutually exclusive, but will serve the present need admirably.

a. The political type of religion

This type was preeminently represented in the cult of emperor-worship. More directly, openly, and consistently than did any other type of religion, this one clashed with the tenets and results of the Gospel of Christ, for these two were inherently irreconcilable. The decision had to be made between "Lord Christ" or "Lord Caesar." This politically-conditioned institutional religion, which apotheosized men
who were often manifestly degraded in character and mediocre in ability and achievement, held no real charm, and was practiced without genuine enthusiasm. Its only "enthusiasm" came from a desire to obtain political patronage or to escape political retribution. Confessedly nationalistic in its essence, this "religion" demanded a blind obedience to the Empire as personified in the Emperor. Yet emperor-worship helped to prepare the way for the acceptance of Jesus' Incarnation, for, "Never possessed of any real religious value, the imperial cult betrays in a remarkable way the tendency of that age to look for an incarnation of deity, and to prefer a praesepe deus to all the gods of polytheism. When Christ was preached as Son of God who had tabernacled among men, such an idea was not unfamiliar to the people of that day, who recoiled from it less than some do now."

As John viewed his world in relation to the imperial cult, he seemed not to have regarded it as a particularly formidable rival of the Christian Gospel. There are strong indications that in the Apocalypse John did definitely reckon with the imperial problem, but that work does not come directly into consideration here. In the Gospel and Epistles, however, there is no such pointed effort to refute the fallacies of the emperor-cult as is the case with the Gnostic and Mystery doctrines, which will shortly be considered. When Pilate stood on trial before Jesus (although he thought Jesus was on trial before him) and asked about Jesus' Kingship and Kingdom, the Savior admitted His royal claim, but explained: "My Kingdom is not of (έ&x) this

world" (John 18:33-37). This record is perhaps typical of John's dealing with the problem of political rivals of the King of the Jews. Specifically, although the question of the political religion does not arise in connection with the passages in which John uses πονοκεφής, it is obvious that his use of that word would refute the claim of any other "Lord" upon man's spiritual obedience.

b. The philosophical religions

The immediate concern just here is to determine something of the sources of the term Logos: whence came it? What did it mean to John and to his readers? The salient facts regarding the development of the term are as follows: "Logos is not the word of language, but of conversation, of discourse; not the word as a part of speech, but the word as part of what is uttered."1 It is insufficient to look either to Greek or to Hebrew sources alone for the origin and the development of the Logos idea; each source contributes important elements. On the Greek side of its genealogy we find Heraclitus of Ephesus, who lived about 500 B.C., enunciating: "(1) The Logos is eternal, both pre-existent and everlasting. (2) All things happen through the Logos. (3) The duty of man is to obey this universal Logos."2 Then Zeno and his Stoic school took over this Heraclitean word, and added their ideas. Cleanthes dealt with it; Posidonius passed it on to Roman Stoicism, and perhaps also to Philo and the Jewish Christians. In Philo of Alexandria the doctrine gained the degree of prominence that inevitably and

2. Angus. op. cit., p. 122, 123.
invariably prompts the question: "Did John get his Logos-doctrine from Philo?" But the answer to this question is deferred until the Hebrew genealogy is reviewed. Rendel Harris is probably foremost among the writers who adopt the view that the Logos idea is almost exclusively traceable to the Hebrew Wisdom Literature. His Origin of the Prologue to John's Gospel presents a brilliant case for the Wisdom Literature as the fountain from which both Philo and John drew their Logos doctrines. But Harris seems to prove too much, rather than too little. His conclusion exalts Wisdom to the position of a feminine Deity, the "Only-Begotten-Sophia-Daughter," from whom evolved the "Only-Begotten-Logos-Son."¹ Harris has performed a great service in turning attention to the Hebrew sources, but his ingenious identifications have not commended themselves generally to current scholarship. It is true that there developed a tendency in Judaism to personify Wisdom, and to regard God's "Word" as a designation of His power. Again, the paraphrasts in the Targums had been using "Meshura" in seeking to interpret how God communicated with men. It is readily seen, therefore, that both Philo and John had ample sources in the Hebrew literature, both canonical and apocryphal, for the Logos-idea. And "even if we attribute John's use of the term Logos to the direct or indirect influence of Philo, we do not thereby disprove the Old Testament origin of the conception."²

The parallels between Philo's Logos-doctrine and that of John are apparently many, but one readily notices that the differences are

¹ Harris, R. Origin of the Prologue to John's Gospel, p. 13.
² Stevens, G. B. Johannine Theology, p. 76.
far more numerous and fundamental than the similarities. Despite G. E. C. MacGregor's assertion to the contrary (without citation or other proof of his claim), no instance was found of Philo's use of μορφερις. Philo at times approaches, but never arrives at the personal conception of the Logos that is clear in John's writings. "The personification of the Divine Word in the Old Testament is poetical, in Philo metaphysical, in John historical."² "His (Philo's) speculations, like those of the Neoplatonists who owed much to his theories and the thought of Greece, merely revealed the need of, without supplying, an intermediary power or mediator to make a wholly transcendent Deity accessible."³ Surely it is safe to conclude that whatever is the answer to the question of his literary dependence upon Philo, John did not accept Philo's philosophical or metaphysical conclusions. Conscious he may have been of Philo's teaching; nevertheless, John historically interpreted the Logos, and identified Him with his Teacher and Lord. "The essential thing to note is that John employs the term in a new sense to denote the Eternal Son of God who became incarnate in Jesus Christ, and to express what he conceives to be His divine significance."⁴ It was a natural and judicious approach that John made to his readers by the employment of the term Logos. In Him whom John portrayed, the term Logos had its symbolism turned into reality, its capacity fulfilled, its preparatory mission completed.

The other types within the general classification of philosophical religion will not be discussed here, since the problem of the sources

---

of the term Logos is, for this study, foremost in importance. Stoicism had become largely pantheistic, hence only a step removed from atheism. The Epicureans admitted the possible existence of a God, but felt that He was far removed from man. Indeed, many of them held that the idea of God was only a phantom, an illusion of the popular mind. Life's highest good was in finding happiness, and God did not aid very much in its pursuit. It may safely be said, then, that the philosophical religions did not seriously bid for man's deep devotion; they rather sought the explanation of life's phenomena, leaving man free to follow whatever emotional religious outlet they chose.

c. The "mystery" religions

(a) General features and strength

The mystery religions were largely, if not wholly, Oriental in origin. They contended more successfully for the devotion of men than did the nationalism of the imperial cult and the rationalism of the philosophies. In the "procession of the gods" (to use Atkins' phrase) came: Mithra or Magna Mater from Persia, the Syrian goddess and the Beals from Syria, Isis and Osiria from Egypt, and many others. "They invaded the west encircled with the hoary authority of a venerable past, with esoteric doctrines, established dogma, and a well-developed priesthood. From the beginning they were proselytizing faiths, like Judaism; as such they were religions of enthusiasm. . . . Like Christianity, they began with the lower classes and worked upward. . . . They met and partially fulfilled religious needs. . . . The Eastern Gods could die and rise again, could suffer and enjoy. They understood how to comfort. . . . In the Eleusinian mysteries (taken over by Athens
about 600 B. C.), arose a new principle of membership in a divine community by initiation instead of by birthright.  

The mysteries added the element of enabling the devotee to participate in the life of the deity through mystic initiations. That they did have a powerful attraction is a matter of historical record.

(b) Gnosticism

Gnosticism is included here, although it might have been classified as well under the philosophical religions. But along with its philosophical dualism, Gnosticism tended to produce character and conduct similar to the products of the other mystery religions. Again, the "gnosis" was claimed to be of an esoteric nature, mystically gained by special impartation. The two general types of Gnosticism are:

Docetic, which regarded Jesus as a "phantom" man, who only "seemed" (from Ἰσχάω) to have had a human body, only "seemed" to have suffered and died and risen. These were the "false prophets" who "confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (1 John 4.2). The other Gnostics, of whom Cerinthus the Jew was the leader, claimed that the "Christ" came as an "asen" upon Jesus at His baptism, and deserted Him before His death on the cross, so that Jesus was merely human. Many direct and indirect blows are aimed at Gnosticism in all its main features in John's writings. We find John "like Paul, combatting Gnosticism by so interpreting the nature of Christ as to cut the ground from beneath it."  

To John, Jesus was the fully incarnate God-man, both divine and human. Into His holy society one entered through faith, not by magic rites.

In His redemptive purposes one shared by accepting His redemption and by giving lifelong obedience to His will.

d. Judaism

No survey of first century religious thought would be complete without a consideration of Judaism, especially in view of the many evidences of John’s Hebrew background. Moreover, Judaism had within it elements of a mystery religion, as has also Christianity. John left it to Paul to be sole user of the term “Judaism” (Galatians 1.13, 14), while he himself used the term “the Jews” sixty-five times in his Gospel to report the respective attitudes of the Jewish people and their leaders toward Jesus. An examination of the passages containing the term “the Jews” reveals the tragic fact of the constant and increasingly bitter hostility of the Jewish leaders toward Jesus. John, more vividly than any other Evangelist, painted their hostility as a background for his portrait of Jesus, in whom God wrought the fulfilment of His universal redemptive plan. In that plan was also the divine expectation that Israel should help, not oppose, God in bringing His plan to perfection. For God did specifically reveal Himself and His redemptive message primarily to Israel, and commission the Hebrews to make Him known to all men. That commission was left unfulfilled in the Jews’ pride of their being the “chosen” people. Not only did Judaism fail in its divinely given mission; it added to its failure the desperate effort to make Christ’s Gospel fail by persecution, ridicule, and perversion of its truth. No wonder is it then that John writes often of “the Jews” as the enemies of Him who “came to His own, and they who were His own did not receive Him” (John 1.11). But God’s purpose is not to be
defeated: "As many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God" (1.12).

(3) Conclusion

For the Beloved Disciple, it was not a question of earthly citizenship, or of philosophical keenness, or of mystically-gained knowledge, or even of race, whether or not one could have the abundant, eternal life in Christ. It was a matter wholly of one's relation to the Christ. This great exponent of Jesus virtually passes over the imperial cult as if it were a shadow. He employs some of the terms of philosophy to bring men to see that he, as well as Paul, had the knowledge of the "Unknown God," whom the Graeco-Roman world was worshipping, not knowing Him. He sets forth the truth of God, that all might intelligently and gladly worship Him "in spirit and in truth." Thus, while maintaining that "salvation is from (σωτηρία) the Jews" (John 4.22), he proclaims Christ as the universal Saviour, and writes to the end "that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you may have life in His name" (John 20.31).
CHAPTER TWO

THE PREPARATORY DEVELOPMENT OF MONOGENHE

"Language has been called sacred ground, because it is the deposit of thought. We cannot tell as yet what language is. It may be a production of nature, a work of human art, or a divine gift. . . . If it be a gift of God, it is God's greatest gift; for through it God speaks to man and man speaks to God in worship, prayer and meditation." — Max Muller
CHAPTER II. THE PREPARATORY DEVELOPMENT OF ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ

The epithet "preparatory development" is not necessarily a claim that there was a consciousness on John's part of using a term which he regarded as either divinely or historically prepared for his purpose. Nevertheless, the discussion seems to justify the use of the designation "preparatory" to this extent at least: that John found μονογενής to be the word uniquely capable of expressing the incomparable relation of Jesus Christ the Only Son to God the Father.

1. The technical development of the term

(1) The component elements

In beginning the study of μονογενής an effort will be made to apply the following definitions in presenting the evidence on the roots of its component elements: μόνος and γένος. "We call a root or radical whatever, in the words of any language or family of languages, cannot be reduced to a simpler or more original form."¹ Warning of the danger of pushing too far the endeavor to break up words into their elements, Curtius adds, "A root is the combination of sounds which remains when everything formative and accidental has been stripped away from a given word."²

a. The element μόνος

(a) The root and meaning

Boissacq,³ Skeat,⁴ Wyld,⁵ Peile,⁶ and Curtius⁷ agree essentially

7. Curtius. op. cit., p. 354, 335.
in connecting μόνος with *μονός (*μαράσιος), showing, with the loss of the \( \kappa \), an Attic μονός, Ionic μονός, Doric μονός. Curtius continues, "Sanskrit root \( \text{ma} \): diminish. We may thus connect with this root also the Sanskrit man-ak: a little, only. The Petersburg Dictionary on man-ak reminds us of μονό-ς, which, however, from the Epic μονός, appears to go back to *man-va-ς.\(^1\) Wyld and Skeet also present the relationship to man-ak. Valpy\(^2\) traces μονός back to μένω through μέ-μονα, the perfect middle: one who remains, i.e., is left alone. Strong\(^3\) tentatively concurs in deriving μόνος from μένω. If this be the case, perhaps we have, after all, the root of μόνος, for Peile\(^4\) suggests, in a list of stems strengthened by reduplication, " ... μενωμεν μέν-\( \nu \), existing beside μένω, from the root μέν." Curtius adds, " ... Old Latin cino-\( s \), Latin unus, uni-\( o(n) \), uni-\( cu-\( r \), Gothic sin-s \( \tilde{e} \)s, μονός, sine-\( ha \) μονογεια.\(^5\) Donaldson\(^6\) connects μόνος with oίνος: see, and \( \tilde{e} \)s: one, as Schmidt\(^7\) also does. Donaldson further suggests, " ... We have therefore μείς, μία, μέν, as complete in all its parts as \( \tilde{e} \)s, \( \tilde{e} \)s, \( \tilde{e} \), and containing the elementary pronominal form \( \nu \). We find the same root with the same significance in μόνος: only (one-ly), which answers also to the Gothic possessive mein.\(^8\)"

One cannot but grant some confusion from the foregoing evidence.

To claim to have found the actual root of μόνος in the authorities cited

1. Curtius. loc. cit.
4. op. cit., p. 178.
5. op. cit., p. 320.
8. op. cit., p. 282.
would be hazardous. The evidence demonstrates, however, the fact that the root-idea indicates oneness, aloneness, isolation, singleness, and possibly uniqueness.

The element μόνος is a simple adjective, formed by the addition of the vowel suffix -ος to the (conjectural) root μον- or μον-. Its meaning is represented in the lexicons as follows: Boisacq: 1 alone, only, single, unique. Lidell and Scott: 2 alone, solitary; bereft of, without; only, single; unique. Thayer: 3 alone.

(b) The New Testament usage of μόνος and its compounds

The adjective μόνος is variously translated and interpreted. Its attributive use in the sense of "only" will be examined in the next chapter. Here we have: ei μη μόνος o Θεός, "but God alone" (Luke 5.21); αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρείας, "Him only shalt thou serve" (Matthew 4.10); ἐὰν μόνος εἰς εἰμί, "because I am not alone" (John 8.16); κατ’ ἑαυτὸν μόνος, "apart by themselves" (Mark 9.2); εἰς ἐν ἄνω μόνος, "not by bread alone" (Matthew 4.4).

Not once does μόνος appear in a compound verb form in the New Testament. Only one compound adjective form is found: εἰς τὴν ἐννιά καθέλθειν μονεφθαλμον, "to enter into life with one eye" (Matthew 18.9, Mark 9.47). The New Testament thus presents a striking contrast in this respect to the older Greek usage, and to the contemporaneous Koine usage, both of which show many compounds with μόνος. The various

2. op. cit., p. 664.
Greek versions of the Old Testament show a number of such compounds, as

μοῦνῃ, μοῦρας, μοῦρος, μοῦριμος, μῦρος, μοῦζων, μοῦκερος, μοῦκρονος, μοῦκρομος.

b. The element γένος

(a) The root and meaning


"As an unbroken tradition reigned in the history of language, γένος is the heir of the root gán."  

"Aryan gán-, gán-, gán- to produce, engender, beget; whence also Greek γένος, γόρας, γίγας-οματία, Latin gánum, etc."  

That γένος is the root of γένος needs no further illustration; Skeet, Thayer, Wyld, and Schmidt all agree to this derivation.

The element γένος is a primary or primitive verbal substantive (formed: γένος-ο-ς, as λόγος-ο-ς). The suffix -ος, nominative -ος denotes result: γένος (γένος-ο-ματία): offspring. The lexicons give

2. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 47.  
4. op. cit., p. 231.  
5. op. cit., p. 113.  
6. op. cit., p. 475.  
for ἰένος the following meanings: Boiscaq: birth, origin, race, genus; Liddell and Scott: race, stock, kin, offspring, sex, class, sort, kind, genus, species; Thayer: (*γένος, γίγομαι) offspring, family, stock, race, nation, kind, sort, species.

(b) The New Testament usage of ἰένος and its compounds

The New Testament usage of ἰένος by itself shows: ἐκ παντὸς ἰένος, "of every kind" (Matthew 13.47); Ἴῳρομήσιον τῷ ἰένοι, "Syrophoenician by race" (Mark 7.26); ἐκ ἰένος ἀρχιερατικοῦ, "of the kindred of the high priest" (Acts 4.6); τοῦ ἱδρ καὶ ἰένος ἐσμέν, "for we are also His offspring" (Acts 17.28). The compounds formed with ἰένος include: τὰ ἄγνη, "the base things (without 'birth')" (1 Corinthians 1.26); οἱ πολλοὶ ἐγνεῖς, "not many noble (well-born)" (1 Corinthians 1.26); ὁ ἀλλογενὴς ὁδός, "this stranger (of another race)" (Luke 17.18); ὁ ὁμογενὴς ὃν ὁδ, "being a relative of him" (John 16.28). The Old Testament presents among others, this example: ὁ δὲ ὁμογενής μου κληρονομήσει μέ, "and he that is born in my house will be my heir" (Genesis 15.3).

c. The result of the combination of the radical elements

When μόρος and ἰένος are combined, we have the form μορογενής, a descriptive determinative compound adjective, wherein the first element describes the second. Moulton adds a subdivision to this group: com-

1. op. cit., p. 144.
2. op. cit., part 2, p. 21.
3. op. cit., p. 113.
4. Robertson and Davis. op. cit., p. 182.
pounds with numerals, citing μονογενής as an example.¹ The suffix 
-ες, nominative -ης, "conveys no very definite idea; (it is found) 
chiefly in compounds."² Jannaris, however, assigns to this -ες 
suffix the function of denoting character or feature.³

(2) The equivalents assigned to μονογενής

The lexicons of Abbott-Smith, Bauer, Cremer, Liddell and 
Scott, Parkhurst, Preuschel, Preisigke, Sophocles, Souter, and Thayer 
present the following equivalents for μονογενής: only, only-begotten, 
only born, the only member of a kin or kind, of one gender; Monogenes 
(as a proper name in the Gnostic literature, the emanation from βυθός, 
or from λόγος and ζωή); adverbial form, μονογενῶς: in a unique manner; 
(grows) only in one place; as the only begotten Son. The lexical mean-
ings will, of course, be subject to revision and final determination 
after the examination of the usage in each context in which the word 
appears.

The following statements are appropriate here: "μονογενής 
is literally 'one of a kind,' 'only,' 'unique,' (unicus), not 'only be-
gotten,' which would be μονογενήσιος (unigenitus)."⁴ "The word μιμη-
thetos has in general usage lost entirely the early sexual sense of the 
root μεν. It means simply 'to arise,' 'to become.' It signifies 
'that which previously was not there and had no existence comes into 
being'; μονογενής is 'what alone acquires or has existence.' . . .

². Robertson and Devis, op. cit., p. 176, 177. 
When we have to do with living beings — men or animals — the meaning 'born,' 'begotten,' is of course congruous, but there is no emphasis whatever attached to this side.¹

Thus far the presentation of the available evidence on the preparatory development of the term under consideration has had to do with its technical features. An examination of the word as it has been used in all its discoverable sources will do more, perhaps, to bring to light its precise meaning than will lexical and grammatical considerations alone. For the final conclusion must be made in the light of the ways in which the word has been used, never in terms of what any one should like to have it mean.

2. The historical development

The study of μονογενής naturally involves the examination of the usage of the term both prior and subsequent to, as well as contemporaneous with the writing of the Johannine literature. The periods of the Greek language are followed according to Dr. A. T. Robertson's outline:² Mycenaean, 1500-1000 B. C., Dialects, 1000-300 B. C., Koine, 300 B. C. to 330 A. D., Byzantine, 330-1453 A. D., Modern, 1453 A. D. to the present time. The citations that follow are given as nearly as possible in the chronological order of their authors. In most instances the particular sense in which μονογενής is used will be self-explanatory; only a few cases will call for comment in passing.

(1) The age of the dialects

Hesiod leads the procession with three citations: μονογενής

² Grammar, p. 43.
There should be an only son, to feed his father's house; 1 oš' eis ρωινην ἥτιν τι ἐγέρμη πατῆς, "Also, because she is an only child, the goddess receives not less honor"; 2 oš' ρωινην ἥτιν τι ἐγέρμη πατῆς, "So then, albeit her mother's only child, ..." 3 Next in line comes Aeschylus: Ἐτὸς πολύρ ρωινην τίκων πατην, "A foundation pillar of the lofty roof, an only child to a parent." 5 Then follows Parmenides, who presents: oš' ρωινην ἥτιν τι καὶ ἄρηρης ἕπ' ἀπέλεκτον, 6 ("Reality is uncreated and indestructible, both complete and unique, unmoved and eternal." Along comes Euripides with: Ῥωινην α' αἵματος, 7 "(But be assured:) The same high blood (ye spring from with the best and chastest sister)." 8 Herodotus writes (7:221): τὸν δὲ πατὴν ρωινην ἄρηρην, 9 "(But he had) an only son (present with the expedition), whom he sent away." 10 Plato completes the group for the age of the dialects with four citations: Κλειτῶ δὲ ρωινην ὑπατίαν ἐγερμῆσαν, 11 "And they had an only daughter, Clito"; 12 ἀλλ' ἐν ἠδρόν, 13

5. Burges, G. The Tragedies of Aeschylus, p. 121.
8. The Plays of Euripides, p. 158.
μονογενής οὐρανὸς μετανόης ἐκ τε καὶ ἐπορευθαί. 1 "(The Creator made neither two nor countless worlds), but this one and only universe, having come into existence, both is and will be"; εἰς οὐρανὸς ὁ δὲ μονο-
γενής ὁ λόγος. 2 "This one and only universe." The two virtually identical citations from the "Timaeus" indicate Plato's striving for (possibly a revelation of) the knowledge of the One Cause for the unique universe.
The singularity of the universe is grounded in the fact of its being the only universe created; the unique manner of its coming into being, if present at all, is surely not emphasized. Plato gives one further use of μονογενής: τὴν τῶν βασιλέων μέκοσαν ἐκ μονογενοῦς. 3 "the twofold generation of kings descended from one." 4 The singleness of the origin (or the progenitor) of the royal line seems to be the prominent idea here.

(2) The age of the Koine
a. The literary Koine

The Orphic Hymns, sometimes alleged as a source of John's use of μονογενής, contain a citation of the term, but in a sense so different that it is unthinkable that, even assuming John's acquaintance with this literature, he would have borrowed the word therefrom. These pagan hymns were probably composed between 200 B.C. and the beginning of the Christian era. In Hymn 29.2 is found this usage: Περσεφόνη, θύρατερ μετάλοι δίος, ἐλθέ, μέκαρκ μονογένεισι θεά, κεκαρισμένη δὲ θάλασσα. 5

"O Persephone, daughter of the great Zeus, come, thou blessed only (be-
gotten) goddess, and receive pleasing offerings." The apparent resem-
blance in this citation to ἀγαθή θεός in John 1.18 virtually dis-
appears upon recalling the polytheism underlying all ideas connected with
Persephone. Apollonius Rhodius offers a citation that has similarities
to the one just examined: ἄρεσσάμενος Κυρήνη, μονογένειαν, "Having
first appeared the Maiden, the only-begotten." 1

Two citations in Josephus' "Antiquities" next claim attention:

τὸ αὐτὸν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἐπηρέαμα μονογένη ἐννα, 2 "Now his father
loved Issas greatly, as being his only-begotten"; Δένι μὲν μονογένεις
ην παιδίον Οδίσ , 4 "Dan had an only-begotten son, Uzi." 5 In the
former case Josephus reflects the usage in Genesis 28.2, 12, 16, which
usage, together with the reference thereto in Hebrews 11.17, will be
considered shortly.

Arrian, sometimes called the "second Xenophon," uses the
term thus: ἄρεσας μὲν παιδίας πολλὰς θεότερα μὲν μονογένεις , * "Very
many male children, but only one daughter." 6 The fundamental meaning
of the word appears here, for the one daughter was truly unique, but
her relation to her father did not exclude the presence of other children
of the same father.

Oppianus Anazarbensis: κυρή μονογένεια (μεν), * "A
maidens only-born (only-begotten)," presents the first of three cita-

5. Whiston. op. cit., p. 72.
* Citations so indicated are unavailable in the original contexts.
tions showing the form μονόγενος, "only-born." Here also is another use of the (variant) form indicating the only daughter of a pagan divinity. Hapheasio offers an unusual citation: ὁ ἐπίτετας τέταρτος, ὁ καὶ μονογενής — — — *, "The 'foot' (in which the ratio of θέμις to ὄροις is 4:3), which is also single (unique)." In the period of the Koine appear also the substantive, μονογενέα, "uniqueness," 1 and the adverb, μονογενὸς. "Periplus Maris Rubri," (58, p. 11) shows: μονογενὸς ἐν ἑνὶ τόπῳ βέρεται; * "grows in one place only," and "Periplus Maris Erythrean" (p. 149, 173) has: φίλοτε μονογενὸς ὁ λίθανος; * "The frankincense comes into being alone," while Apollonius Dyscolus uses the adverb as "having one form for all genders," in his "De Adverbis" (145: 18). *

b. The inscriptions and papyri

The first citation in this group presents the final indication of an only daughter to a pagan divinity: Δήμητρι καὶ Μονογενῆ, 2 "To Demeter and Mounogone (the only-born daughter)." In the next instance appears the final use of the variant -γενος form: μαρέτι μονογένον ἕτο ἐν, 3 "But the 'one' discloses the only-born." Concerning the inscription: πλασίκεις ὁ καὶ Μονογένος εὐχαριστῶ τῇ θεῷ, Ramsay says, "Probably we should read Μονογένης or Μονογένης. *4 "The word is apparently used as a proper name." 5 The inscription may be translated as follows: "(I), Flevianus, who am also Monogone (Monogenes or Mono-

2. Inscriptiones Graecae, 9(2)305.
3. Hondius, J. J. Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, No. 634, vol. 4, p. 120.
genes) (an only son), give thanks to the goddess." An inscription in
memory of a certain Plutarchus describes him as: ο η μονοχρήστης πατέρων
πατέρων ἡδος, "being, however, an only son and a friend to the
fathers." A supplication reads: ἐξαίρεσιν ζητῶν τοῦ θεοῦ... τοῦ μονοχρήστης,
"I adjure thee by the god ... the only one." Another supplication has:
εἰς ναόν μονοχρήστης μονοχρήστης, "Hearken unto me, thou who art one and
unique." (Compare the use of εἰς ναόν in Matthew 6:7). The following ci-
tation, in a third or fourth century papyrus, seems to refer to the Holy
Spirit as μονοχρήστης. If it does, it is the only such reference dis-
covered in this study. The magical papyrus in which the citation is seen
somewhat offsets the "Christian" terminology: τὸ ἀκρός τῆς ἡμέρας, τὸ μονο-
χρήστης, τῷ ζῷῳ, "The Holy Spirit, the Only One, the Living One." In
an undated "Liebeszauber," (love-charm) appears: ἐν τῷ αἰωνίῳ οὐκ,
ο ο μονοχρήστης, "In the heaven (there is) God, the Only One." Clement
of Rome writes thus of the "Phoenix": ταῦτα μονοχρήστης ἰδέαν, "This,
being the only one of its kind, ..." And according to Epiphanius, in
"Haer." 51, the mother of Dusares (the northern Arabian equivalent for
Tammuz, etc.), was adored as "the Virgin" (μηθέρες κόρη), while her
son was worshipped as μονοχρήστης τοῦ Αριστίνα."

c. The Greek Old Testament

In the several Greek Old Testament versions μονοχρήστης alter-
nates with ἀπεργος in translating the Hebrew 7'7'7: only, solitary,

in Moulton and Milligan. op. cit., p. 416.
2. Wunisch, R. Antike Fluchteln, 4(18.31), cited in Goodspeed and Col-
well. Greek Papyrus Reader, p. 81.
3. "Great" Magical Paris Papyrus, line 1585.
7. Thorburn, Thomas James. The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels,
p. 15.
only one, from ἑν μόνον γένος; be united. Illustrations here will include only those in which ἑν μόνον γένος is translated by μονογενὴς in at least one of the Greek versions.

(a) The canonical Scriptures contain the following examples: Λάβε τὸν ὑιόν σου τὸν ἀραπηγητὸν ἐν Ἰακώβ, τὸν (Aquila, μονογενής; Symmachus, τὸν μᾶνον σου;) "Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac" (Genesis 22.2); καὶ οὐκ ἐφείσω τὸν οἱκὸν σου τὸν ἀραπηγητὸν δέ ἐμε' (Symmachus, μονογενος), "Seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me" (22.12). (Genesis 22.16 also has this identical phrase.) In ο ὦ θεός .... τὸν ὑιὸν οὐκ οὐκ ἐφείσω, "God ... spared not His own Son" (Romans 8.32), we see the Supreme Father not withholding, but rather offering, His Only Son for all humanity. Again in Judges 11.34 is seen the unmistakable only-child relationship: καὶ ἦν αὐτὴ μονογενὴς, οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ ἕτερος υἱὸς ἡ ὑμάτηρ, "And she was his only child, besides her he had neither son nor daughter." In Psalm 22.20 and 35.17, there is shown in the phrase ἑν μονογενὴς μου, "my darling (only one, dear life)," "The one unique and priceless possession which can never be replaced (in each parallel to ἦν σοι ὑιόν; 'my soul')," or "The one single irreparable life of man." The word expresses another idea in Psalm 25.16: ὁ μονογενὴς καὶ πτωχὸς εἰμι ἐγώ, "For I am desolate and afflicted," approximating somewhat the thought in Psalm 68.7: ὁ θεὸς κατακίζει μονογενοῦς ἐκ ὦκυ (Aquila μονογενεῖς), "God setteth the solitary in

2. Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are from the American Standard Version.
families (Hebrew: maketh the solitary to dwell in a house).” Return is made to the only-child relationship in Proverbs 4.3 ὥστικες καὶ ἀρατώμενος ἐν προσώπῳ μητρός (Aquile, Symmachus, Theodotion, μονογενής), “tender and only beloved (Hebrew: an only one) in the sight of my mother,” and in Jeremiah 6.26: πένθος ἁρπητῶν πινήσας σταυρῆ (Symmachus, μονογενῶς), “Make thee mourning, as for an only son.”

(b) The Old Testament Apocrypha contains the following occurrences of μονογενής, which provide profitable illustrative material in the history of the word: μονογενής εἰμὶ τῷ πατρὶ μου, “I am the only daughter of my father” (Tobit 3.15); (A): καὶ ἑσσίν αὐτῇ θυγατέρα μονογενής (B and X omit), “And he hath an only daughter” (6.10); (X): μονογενής εἰμὶ τῷ πατρί μου, “And now I am the only son of my father” (6.14); ἔλεψας δὲ μονογενῆς, “Thou hast had mercy on two that were the only begotten of their parents” (8.17); καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν θυγατέρων τὴν μόνην ἀρχήσουσαν (A, μονογενής, R, ἡ), “and left her that was alone desolate of her daughters” (Baruch 4.16). A different conception is found in Wisdom of Solomon 7.22: ἔσον εἰς αὐτῇ πνεῦμα μερός, ἵνα μονογενῆς, πολυγενῆς, λεπτόν, “For there is in her (Wisdom) a spirit quick of understanding, holy, alone in kind (Greek: sole-born), subtil.” “Wisdom was the only one of her kind.”


These references need no more than citation, for they correspond to the basic meaning and usage of the term, being used in each case to denote the relation of an only child to his parents. They are:

Pnpa:reto!7 Deftlopa.t

By faith ... Abraham ... was offering up his only son" (Hebrews 11:17). But Isaac was not Abraham's only son in the absolute sense, nor yet even his first-born son. For he had other children, Ishmael preceding Isaac and the children of Keturah following him (cf. Genesis 16:15; 25:1-9). Isaac was Abraham's only son in the sense that he was the heir of God's promises to Abraham, and the one through whom the promises would be transmitted. In this instance, the translation "only-begotten" fails to convey the true idea of monogenh; "unique" is in every way preferable here.

The patristic usage of monogenh has been omitted from the survey, because of the fact that the Fathers' employment of the term is with reference to its meaning in the Johannine literature. Therefore, the Fathers are not especially good witnesses for the meaning of the word in any other connection. Some account of the patristic usage will naturally appear in the last two chapters of this study.

3. Conclusion

A restatement of the total evidence of the present chapter is unnecessary, since decisions were reached and recorded in connection with nearly every topic in the foregoing technical and historical survey of the development of monogenh, down to its use in the New Testament. The root-meanings and separate uses of the component elements, and the historical usage of the compound term compel the decision that
the fundamental meaning of *monerguson* is "unique." Even "unique," however, is often loosely used; its derivation, traced through the French to the Latin *unicus*, from *unus*, "one," shows its correct meaning to be:
one and no more, only, single in kind or in excellence, having no like or equal, unmatched, unparalleled. "Unique" is wrongly used to signify: remarkable, wonderful. Within the limits of the basic meaning of the term *monerguson* there is room for special resultant meanings, as the following table, summarizing the foregoing citations, demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of an only child</td>
<td>16 (a)</td>
<td>5 (b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (b)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a single fact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of soliteriness, desolateness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of pagan divinities</td>
<td>4 (c)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of miscellaneous singularity</td>
<td>7 (d)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Including *monerguson*, "only-born." Six of these sixteen citations denote pagan goddesses who were "only daughters."
(b) Including the references to Isaac.
(c) With possible exception in F. Leid. V. (See page 30).
(d) Including the substantival and adverbial forms, etc.

The idea of the miscellaneous singularity represented in the last group of usages in the table needs not to be taken up further. In the case of the pagan deities, *monerguson* possibly indicates, despite the polytheism underlying such usages, a longing for a God of such nature and character as men had not found in paganism. The soliteriness and desolatensens expressed by the term is quite in keeping with the basic meaning thereof. In the second group of usages, it is clear that Plato's "universe," the "Phoenix" of Clement of Rome, and Parmenides' "real-

ity" have nothing with which to be compared. Each is the absolutely μόρος (single) representative in its own μόρος (kind). In the first group are more than half of the total number of citations, designating, with practical unanimity, an only child in relation to his parents. It is preeminently with reference to this only-child relationship that the discovery of the precise force is determinative for the purposes of this study. What factor or factors distinguish an only child? The fact that such a child is "begotten" may be simply expressed by μενετός (from μεν- 

τάω), without any need of introducing the numerical singleness of the child at all. Hence the stress is not, except artificially, upon the idea of "begetter." Again, the second element of μονογένης is μόρος (kind), closely related to μίνομα (become), not μενετός (begotten), from μεν- 

tάω (beget, bring forth). Μίνομα is the broader term, denoting a "coming into being," a "becoming," without any reference as to the manner of that becoming. The broader word may on occasion express the idea contained in the narrower μεν- 

tάω, which Liddell and Scott call the "causal" of μίνομα. There is, as is commonly recognized, confusion and inaccuracy displayed in the application of the terms μίνομα and μεν- 

tάω. The confusion is illustrated in the following case: "μήν- 

μα, 'produce,' passim in the papyri. This form is from μίνομα and is not the same as μίνημα which is from μεν- 

tάω, and they do not have the same meaning."  

The evidence hitherto presented leads to the necessity of regarding μονογένης as expressing basically uniqueness of being, rather  

1. op. cit., part 2, p. 344.  
than any remarkable ness of manner of coming into being, or yet uniqueness resulting from any manner of coming into being. Therefore an only child is so called because he is literally (or legally) the one single offspring of his parents, the only one of his ὑέρος, which in his case is simply his own immediate family; the parents and the one child comprise the total number of the representatives of the genus involved.

The task in the remainder of this investigation is to discover how the Evangelist John makes use of the term whose career has been followed thus far. In anticipation, it may be said that μονόγερος, as used by the Beloved Disciple, reaches its grand climax, the τελείωμα of its divine mission.
CHAPTER THREE

RELATED TERMS COMPARED WITH ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ

"Synonyms are ... words of like significance in the main; with a large extent of ground which they occupy in common, but also with something of their own, private and peculiar, which they do not share with one another." — R. C. Trench
1. The nature and degree of their relationship to \( \text{μονογενής} \)

Several New Testament terms are so applied to the Christ as to raise the question of their actual or possible relationship to \( \text{μονογενής} \). These terms demand examination as to their similarity and their individuality of significance, especially when used with reference to the Son of God. To the evidence discovered in the foregoing survey will be added the findings of this comparative investigation. Only the evidence hitherto presented, rather than the consideration of any Johannine citation of \( \text{μονογενής} \), will be used in the comparison proposed. Thus, it is hoped, will be added a further element of preparation for the study of John's exclusive application of the term to his Master. A clearer understanding of John's ability to select and to use effectively the words best fitted to bear his distinctive message of the Son of God should be the result.

2. The related terms and the manner of comparison

The comparison of the selected terms with \( \text{μονογενής} \) -- and to a lesser degree with one another -- will follow in a severely condensed degree the method used in tracing the development of the thesis word. Although the list might be extended to include additional terms both within and outside the vocabulary of the New Testament, it is believed that the six that follow may fairly claim to be the only ones having special bearing on the present problem.

(1) \( \text{Ἀγαπητός} \)

This word is a verbal adjective in which "the verbal idea
developed that of completion, never becoming a part of the verb, "\textsuperscript{1} from \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os} be contented, be well pleased, love; hence: that wherewith one must be content or pleased; of persons: beloved, dear, esteemed, favorite. Extra-Biblical illustrations include: \textit{\textgreek{p}istos} καί \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os}, \textit{an only child and well-beloved}; \textit{\textgreek{n}ik} ι\textit{t}ο\textit{os}, . . . . \textit{\textgreek{e} to\nu} \textit{\textgreek{n}ik} ι\textit{w}, \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os}, \textit{\textgreek{N}ik} ι\textit{t}ο\textit{os}. . . . the beloved (son) of Nikias}; \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os} ἡν οἰκούμενος, \textit{to his beloved brother in the Lord}.\textsuperscript{5} The Septuagint uses \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os} to translate five different Hebrew words: \textit{\textgreek{n}a\textit{t}i}: beloved, Isaiah 5:1, from root \textit{\textgreek{n}a\textit{t}i}: swing, rock, fondle, love; \textit{\textgreek{t}i\textit{t}a}: beloved, Psalm 45 (title), from root \textit{\textgreek{t}i\textit{t}a}: love; \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: only, only one, solitary, from \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: be united; \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: very precious, dear, Jeremiah 31:20, from \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: be precious, prized, appraised; \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: (Piel plural participle): friends, Zechariah 13:6, from \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: love.\textsuperscript{7} Quotations will be confined to those in which \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os} translates \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}: Genesis 22:16 (cf. identical phrase in Genesis 22:12, in preceding chapter); Amos 8:10: \textit{kai ἐξαρεθηκεν αὐτὸν ὡς πένθος ἀγαπητὸν}, \textit{And I will make it as the mourning for an only son}, resembles Zechariah 12:10: \textit{kai καύρον ἐπὶ αὐτὸν κατετάξω ὡς ἐπὶ ἀγαπητῷ} (Aquila ἀγαπητῷ ), \textit{And they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son}. The translators of the American Standard Version follow the Hebrew text here, of course, giving "only" as the equivalent of \textit{\textgreek{p}a\textit{t}i}, rather than "beloved," as the Greek text reads. Evidently there is in this use of \textit{\textgreek{a}pant}ο\textit{os} the prominent idea of an affection that rests

\textsuperscript{1} A. Robertson, \textit{Grammar}, p. 372.
\textsuperscript{2} Homer, \textit{Odyssey}, 2.565.
\textsuperscript{3} Butcher and Long, \textit{Odyssey of Homer}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{4} Demosthenes. \textit{Against Meidias}, 21.166.
\textsuperscript{5} P. Grenf. 2.75, Milligan, G. \textit{Greek Papyri}, p. 117.
\textsuperscript{6} Hatch and Redpath. \textit{Concordance to the Septuagint}, vol. 1, p. 7.
on the basis of uniqueness — the only son is the more dearly held in affection because he is the only son, on whom alone the parents bestow their full devotion. The Book of Tobit shows the same tendency to attribute a special degree of deep affection because of the singleness of the object of the love, μία μέν εἰμι τῷ πατρί μου (Codex B), "I am the only daughter to my father." Codex L reads: μία σοι ὑπήρξεν αὐτήν ἡ ἀγαπητή, "There is to thee one beloved daughter" (Tobit 3.10). The word is also commonly used in personal address, ἰδίελε ἀγαπητέ, "Dear brother" (Tobit 10.13).

In the New Testament the references of ἀγαπητός to Jesus Christ occur only in the Synoptic Gospels, with one exception: 2 Peter 1.17. One occurrence of ἑραπημένος is found in Ephesians 1.6: ἐν τῷ ἑραπημένῳ, "In the Beloved." The adjective does not appear at all in John's Gospel, although ἐραπητή is found seven times and ἐραπάω thirty-seven times (ἐλέω thirteen times).

The two instances in which Jesus is called by the Father the ὦ τὸ ἀγαπητὸς are His Baptism and His Transfiguration. In recording the former, Matthew 3.17 reads: ὦ τὸ ἐστιν ὁ ὦ τὸ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν ὡς εὐδοκοῦσα, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Mark 1.11 and Luke 3.22 read identically: ἔστιν ὡς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὡς εὐδοκοῦσα, "Thou art my beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased." The Father's voice at the Transfiguration said: ὦ ἐστιν ὡς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὡς εὐδοκοῦσα ἔχωντες αὐτόν, "This is my beloved Son, in

whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him" (Matthew 17.5). Mark 9.7 omits the command, and Luke 9.35 substitutes ὁ ἐκλεγμένος, "my chosen," for "beloved." J. A. Robinson regards "the Beloved" as a Messianic title: "Thou art my Son, the Beloved," is that which presented itself to the minds of St. Matthew and St. Luke. With this question it is manifestly inexpedient to deal further. Rather the concern is with evaluating such statements as: "In every place where John has μοναρχής (except perhaps 1.14), we might substitute ἄγνωτος for it, without affecting the sense materially," and, "In all the passages in John, with the exception of 1.14, it seems we might substitute the expression ἄγνωτος for μοναρχής." Kattenbusch states in the same paragraph: "In the Synoptics (in the narratives of the Baptism and the Transfiguration), where Christ is called ἄγνωτος, μοναρχής could hardly be substituted." But Cremer remarks: "In John μοναρχής is used to denote the relation of Christ to the Father, ... to which the ἄγνωτος of the Synoptists does not quite correspond." Bernard and Kattenbusch have rightly emphasized the μόρος element in μοναρχής, but apparently to the degree of overlooking the νέος element in the term that must be reckoned with in some manner or other. ἄγνωτος, with all its depth of meaning, still lacks the feature of denoting, as Cremer points out, the relationship of an only son to a father, a feature inherent only in μοναρχής. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to deny Kattenbusch's second contention. For Jesus' distinctiveness from men and His relation to God consist not

4. op. cit., p. 150.
so much in His being a "beloved" Son as in His being the only Son of His kind. Hence, no essential difficulty presents itself to forbid the use of μορφήν in the references to His Baptism and to His Transfiguration.

The use of ἀγαπητός in Matthew 12.18 will be omitted, and one further citation only will appear: ἐτὶ ἔρχεται, ὥσπερ ἄγαπητόν, "He had yet one, a beloved son" (Mark 12.6). This verse parallels Luke 20.15, where the word is used in an identical way, and Matthew 21.37, where it is omitted. The point of interest in this citation is Mark's inclusion of "one, a beloved son," bringing together the "loneliness" and the "belovedness" of the son, the latter evidently depending upon the former. Again it is to be noted that the context is Jesus' own discourse -- the parable of the unfaithful tenant husbandmen -- and that His message therein announces the doom of Israel for rejecting the "one, the beloved Son" of God.

(2) ἐαυτοῦ (ἀὑτοῦ)

"Reflexive pronoun of the third person; ... in the genitive, joined with a noun, it has the force of a possessive pronoun."¹ This usage is seen in τῶν ἐαυτοῦ ὥσπερ ὅσαν, "his son Tho尼斯";² and ἡμῶν ἐαυτῆς τῶν ἀδελθῶν, "seeking for her brother."³ Luke 14.26 shows the intimacy the word is capable of bearing, εἰ τὴς τοῦ μισθοῦ τῶν πατέρα ἐαυτοῦ ... ἐτί τε καὶ τῆς γυναῖκος ἐαυτοῦ; "If any man ... hateth not his own father ... and his own life also," and Paul

¹ Thayer, op. cit., p. 165.
² P. Oxy. 2757, Milligan, G. op. cit., p. 55.
³ P. Oxy. 886, Ibid., p. 111.
contributes: ἡ ἀγάπη... δόῃ ἑαυτῷ τι ἑαυτὴς, "Love... seeks not her own" (1 Corinthians 13.5).

Now the instance of the usage of this word that calls it to the witness stand in this connection is found in Romans 8.3: οἱ Θεοὶ τῶν ἑαυτῶν περίμασι, "God, sending His own son." Here only is ἑαυτῶ used with reference to the Christ. Does it mean as much as, or more than μονογενής? The decision must be a negative one, for when tested beside μονογενής, and in the light of the other uses of ἑαυτῶ, both Biblical and profane, the latter term fails to have the power to distinguish a son as unique from all other sons, and to place primary emphasis on the relation of the Son to the Father. Even the intimacy of the relation indicated by ἑαυτῶ is unable to measure up to the incomparable Father-Son bond in μονογενής.

(3) Ἰδίος

"Brugmann derives Ἰδίος from *φίδιος: cf. Sanskrit vi. The adjective therefore implies 'sequestered from the common stock.'¹ "In later Greek almost as a possessive pronoun, equivalent to ἑαυτῶ."² The numerous papyri citations include: Στοτόγης τῷ Ἰδίῳ, "to his own Stotoetis";³ νῦν βουλεύεται τῷ Ιδίῳ τοῦ τέκνου ἠποσπάσας; "and now they wish to carry off my own child."⁴

New Testament examples of the possessive use of Ἰδίος are fairly numerous. They include: καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν Ἰδίων αὐτῶν,

1. Moulton and Milligan. op. cit., p. 298.
2. Liddell and Scott. op. cit., part 5, p. 818.
"and not to forbid any of his (friends)" (Acts 24.23), and among John's uses: τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἱδίον, "his own brother" (1.41); πατέρα ἱδίον ἐλέητο τὸν Θεόν, "called God His own Father" (5.18) — whereupon the Jews tried to kill Him for "making Himself equal with God." The sole Christological example of this term's use has already been noted in Genesis 22.12, 16, in the comparison between μονογενὴς and ἀραπητός. This example is Paul's statement in Romans 8.32 that ὁ Θεὸς μὴ τοῦ ἱδίου νικόν ἐφείσατο, "(God) indeed withheld not His own Son." Cremer sees a correspondence between ἱδίος and μονογενὴς that seems to him absent in the case of the comparison of the latter with ἀραπητός. In the instances in which ἱδίος is used, however, it does not show itself able to perform the singular function of μονογενὴς. Separateness and distinctness to a degree are present in the word, to be sure; the affection of the father-son relation also appears. But ἱδίος does not contain the indispensable element of "unique being" that μονογενὴς declares as its basic significance.

(4) Μόνος

While this word is not used in the New Testament to describe Jesus' relation to God, it must be examined simply because it is, as already noted, the determinative element in μονογενὴς. Its use may be illustrated from Homer: μόνος ἕων καὶ ἀραπητός, "an only child and well-beloved." This usage by Homer of μόνος (Epic μόνος) in connection with ἀραπητός (already cited thereunder), is possibly his nearest approach to μονογενὴς. Lucian has μόνος αὐτὸς ἐστὶ καὶ πρῶτος.

1. op. cit., p. 150.
2. Odyssey, 2.365.
"that he is unique and first."1 Abbott goes on, "The Greek 'only' is used . . . to mean 'unique,' more than merely 'first.' In the New Testament 'only' is connected with ascriptions of glory."

The New Testament examples of the use of μόνος in the sense of "only" are: Romans 16:27: μόνον σοφιώ θείῳ, "to the only wise God"; 1 Timothy 1:17: μόνῳ θεῷ τιμῇ, "to the only God (be) honored"; 6:15: ὁ μεγάλος καὶ μόνος Δυνάμεως, "the blessed and only Potentate"; Jude 4: τοῖς μόνοις Δεσπότεσσας Κυρίου ἡμῶν, "our only Master and Lord"; 25: μόνιμος Θεῷ Σωτηρίου, "to the only God our Savior"; John 5:44: παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ, "from the only God"; 17:3: τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, "the only true God."

Because of the etymological kinship of μονογενής and μόνος, it would be surprising not to find them sometimes used interchangeably and given the same equivalents. These conditions do obtain, for Homer has just been cited as using μόνος of an only child, and the various lexicons give "unique" as one meaning of the word. Have we, then, exact synonyms in these terms? Supported by the conclusion that μονογενής has "one of a kind" for its fundamental meaning, one may safely state that μόνος unaided by πέρος, cannot carry the same significance. Μόνος by itself can denote an absolute singleness, but it cannot explain the reason for that singleness. The simple adjective μόνος, therefore, cannot be regarded as truly equivalent to μονογενής, for the latter term alone fulfills the meaning "unique."

First must be decided the question of the accent and the resultant meaning of this word in its New Testament occurrences, πρωτότοκος, the paroxytone, giving an active sense of "bearing (bearer of) a first-born," appears in Homer's "Iliad," 17.5, in Aristotle's "Animal History," 546a12, 546a30, and elsewhere, referring to animals; and, with reference to women, in Plato's "Theaetetus," 151a, 161a. No modern New Testament writer consulted suggests this meaning in any of the eight appearances of the word therein. Virtually alone even among the ancient Fathers stands Isidore of Pelusium (born about 370 A. D.), who in his "Epistle" 3.31, makes the word read πρωτότοκος. He does so in a manner confessedly innovating. He thus makes Christ the "First Author of all creation" (Colossians 1.15), rather than the "Firstborn." After testing the active meaning in each of the New Testament citations, it seems evident that the passive form and sense of πρωτότοκος must stand in each instance. Should the active idea be proved preferable or necessary in any or all the passages in question, there would be greater distance placed between the two terms, for μονογενής cannot be made to mean, so far as has yet been noticed in this study, an "only-begetter" or "only-bearer."

πρωτότοκος, like μονογενής, is a descriptive determinative

compound adjective (cf. p. 85), from πρωτός: first, and τίκτω: bring forth, bear, produce. Illustrations of its extra-Biblical usage include: Philo, "De Cherub." #16 (so Thayer, s. v.); inscriptions on epitaphs (Kaibel, op. cit. #730,3), decrees of sacrifice (Syll. 615 (3.1024)17), adoption papers (P. Lip. 589.15), magical papyri (P. Oxy. 1.318).1 One citation will illustrate the common use: ἑρείς μόνο εἰμί πρωτότοκος εἰς τελεθανγ. (= τελεθανγ.?): "for I am a priest by the rites of the first-born." 2 Deissmann mentions the editor's suggestion that in the family of the deceased the firstborn always exercised the office of priest.

The word appears with much greater frequency in the Septuagint than in profane literature, translating the Hebrew נְכָל: first-born, from נָכָל: bear early, make or constitute as first-born.3 Genesis 49.3 shows: ὃς πρωτότοκος μου... καὶ ἄρξῃ τέκναν μου, "Reuben, thou art my first-born, ... and the beginning of my children" ("strength; ASV). Here is the natural manner of denoting an eldest child among several. The figurative use in Exodus 4.22: ὃς πρωτότοκος μου Ἰσραήλ, "Israel is my first-born," shows the chosen nation in a position of first interest and duty in God's purpose. The Old Testament transfers many ideas of Israel collectively, as God's "first-born" to the Messiah individually; μονογενής is not used in this manner. But not only are men πρωτότοκοι, for Ἄβελ ἤνεχθεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτότοκων τῶν προβατίων "and Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock" (Genesis 4.4).

2. Deissmann, A. Light from the Ancient East, p. 91.
Variations of these general types of meaning are exhibited in the other occurrences of πρωτότοκος throughout the Old Testament. In the case of family relations, both privilege and duty descended upon the eldest son from his father. The substantive πρωτότοκος: birthright, right of primogeniture, is used in Genesis 25.31: Ἀπέδωκαν μεν μὴ σημερον τὰ πρωτότοκη αὐτοῦ ἐμοὶ, "Sell me today thy birthright." Reference to this event occurs in Hebrews 12.16: Ἡσαύ, ὡς ἀντὶ βρώσας μὲν ἀπίδευτο τὰ πρωτότοκη ἐμοῦ, "Esau, who for one mess of food sold his own birthright."

Of the New Testament appearances of πρωτότοκος, two have no reference to Jesus, one designates Him as Mary's firstborn, and in five the Christological use occurs. In Hebrews 11.28: ἕνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων τὰ πρωτότοκα θύμα, "that the destroyer of the firstborn should not touch them," the allusion is to the last great plague in Egypt, and presents the firstborn collectively. A metaphorical sense is given to πρωτότοκος in Hebrews 12.25: ἐκκλησία πρωτότοκων, "to the church of the firstborn (sons)," comparable with the instance in Exodus 4.22, noted on the preceding page. "The term firstborn here appears to describe a common privilege... In the Body of Christ we have fellowship with a society of 'eldest sons' of God, who share the highest glory of the divine order."¹ Luke 2.7 presents the natural and common sense of the word: καὶ ἐτεκνὸν τὸν ὦν αὕτης τὸν πρωτότοκον, "and she bore her firstborn son." There seems to be no reason for rejecting the inference that other sons and daughters followed the firstborn Son of Mary.

¹. Westcott, B. F. The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 415.
an inference confirmed into fact by the listing of Jesus’ brothers and sisters (Matthew 13.55f). Here we may pointedly compare ἐπιστότοκος with μονογενής by observing that the uίδος ἐπιστότοκος of Mary is the ὦδος μονογενής of God. But He was from eternity the Only Son of God, not by means of and dating from the Incarnation. The rest of the citations of ἐπιστότοκος designate Christ as the Firstborn Son of God and as the "Elder Brother" of men. In Romans 8.29: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν ἐπιστότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, "that He might be the first born among many brethren." He is "The Eldest Brother in this family of God’s sons, though a ‘Son’ in a sense not true of us."¹ His association with and His likeness to all humanity is clearly stated, but not in a way that lessens His sovereignty over men. Both priority in time and dominion in rank in respect to every creature (or all creation generally) are clearly claimed for the Christ in Colossians 1.15: ὁ ἐστιν εἰκών τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἐπιστότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation." The same two truths are stated, but now in respect to the Resurrection, in Colossians 1.18: ὁ ἐστιν αρχή, ἐπιστότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, "who is the beginning, the firstborn from among the dead," and Revelation 1.5: ὁ ἐπιστότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, "the firstborn of (or from) the dead." Finally, there is a probable reference to His Return in Hebrews 1.6: δόκην δὲ πάλιν εἰς-νάρυ τῶν ἐπιστότοκων εἰς τὴν εἰκονήν, "whenever He shall again

have introduced the Firstborn into the inhabited world." "The patristic commentators rightly dwell on the difference between μονογενής, which describes the absolutely unique relation of the Son to the Father in His divine nature, and πρωτότοκος, which describes the relation of the Risen Christ in His glorified humanity to man." 1

(6) Υἱός

Hitherto this chapter has been concerned with a few of the New Testament terms modifying, or capable of modifying the term Υἱός, as used of Jesus Christ. Now brief mention must be made of the word Υἱός itself, especially in relation to the question of its absolute use, which is found in the Gospels alone thirty-three times (Matthew eight, Mark three, Luke four, John eighteen). Illustrations include: Matthew 11.27: οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν ὤν εἰ μὴ δότῃς, "No one knows the Son except the Father," a phrase in the so-called "Johannine" passage (Matthew 11.25-30) parallel to Luke 10.21-24. In these places the absolute use of Υἱός and τὸν πατήρα μου, "my Father." The section showing most strikingly this parallel absolute use of Υἱός and πατήρ is John 5.17-27, where eight times John reports Jesus' reference to Himself as Υἱός, and the same number of times to God as πατήρ. Of compelling interest here is the use also of τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ in verse 25, and Υἱός ἀνθρώπου in verse 27. The "Son," the "Son of God," and the "Son of man" are used with evident identity as to the Person indicated, if not, indeed, with identity of significance. But men also are called "sons of God" and "sons

of men" frequently. There is no real trouble, however, in seeing the
clear distinction between the application of these terms to Jesus and
to others. In particular, it is of interest that John, whose usage is
for this study the most important, never directly uses 
\( \upsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \) to indicate
human sonship to God (Revelation 21:7; \( \alpha \omega \tau \omega \delta \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \ \mu \varepsilon \iota \upsilon \varepsilon \) , "he will
be a son to me," is quoted from 2 Samuel 7.14). His word in such cases
is \( \tau \varepsilon \kappa \nu \nu \eta \) : John 1.12; 11.52; 1 John 3.1, 2, 10; 5.2. In view of John's
favoritism for an absolute use of 
\( \upsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \), and of his avoidance of the
term referring to the human-divine relation as sons to the Father, may
we not say that 
\( \upsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \) alone could serve for 
\( \upsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \ \mu \nu \oeta \eta \varepsilon \gamma \zeta \) ? But to
ask the question nearly answers it. It is quite evidently because of
John's frequent absolute use of 
\( \upsilon \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \) that he brings in \( \mu \nu \oeta \eta \varepsilon \gamma \zeta \) to
emphasize the fact that this Son is unique, alone of His kind. He is
the Son whose singleness is the basis of His surpassing preciousness
to God. He is likewise the only hope for men's redemption. This is the
Son of whom alone it is true that, "One Son left no regret; One Son ful-
filled every hope; One Son made a Galilean cottage as the Father's home."1

3. Conclusion

Since a decision was made in the comparative study of each of
the foregoing related terms, a general conclusion is uncalled for. The
distinctiveness of \( \mu \nu \oeta \eta \varepsilon \gamma \zeta \) in comparison with other similarly used
terms can now be added to the evidence of the etymology and the histor-
ical usage of the word. The combined evidence demonstrates that there

is no other word in the vocabulary of the New Testament that is capable of fulfilling all the requirements of the meaning of "unique."

It seems justifiable, therefore, to enter upon the survey of John's employment of the term with a favorable disposition — avoiding premature judgment — to the idea that the Evangelist was able to select and to use his words with discrimination. The word μονογένης is distinctive. What will be discovered henceforth as to the Beloved Disciple's exclusive application of it to the Son of God?
CHAPTER FOUR

ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΘΕΟΣ. THE REVEALER OF GOD

tis eúrakein auton kai ekdeipnetai;
Kai tis megalupes auton kathas eis tnu;

o eúrakion eme eúrakein tiv Patéra.
1. The problem of John's reference of \( \text{monogenēs} \)

"The question of \( \text{monogenēs} \) is a twofold one: it concerns the inherent significance of the word and its reference." Does John in his use of \( \text{monogenēs} \) refer only to the incarnate Son or also to the pre-incarnate Logos-Son? That is, when did the unique "begetting" of the Son, or His "becoming" occur? An answer to this question will be proposed here, in order to provide a viewpoint for the remainder of the study, and to eliminate the necessity of arguing the point in each Johannine use of the term. There is a strong attraction to allow the question of John's \( \text{monogenēs} \) reference to become the major problem of the thesis. That attraction must be resisted, for the thesis is a word-study in which constant effort must be exercised to keep to a minimum the problems properly belonging to some other department of investigation. Therefore, the answer offered here will necessarily be the viewpoint of the entire thesis.

As a starting point, let notice be taken of the words of Psalm 2.7, "Thou art my Son; this day I have begotten thee." This verse is quoted in Acts 13.33, Hebrews 1.5 and 5.5. In the first instance, Paul, speaking in Antioch of Pisidia, makes the statement a metaphorical expression of God's raising Jesus from the dead. The Resurrection is the Father's signal demonstration that Jesus is His Son; the sonship is not said to have begun therewith. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the author is establishing the essential superiority of Christianity to Judaism, it is expected that the highest possible degree of honor should

---

be paid to the Son. Accordingly, the Resurrection is set forth in
Hebrews 1.5 as the sign of the Son's sovereignty by virtue of His being
the Son of God. The repetition of the quotation in 5.5 combines the
sonship and the high-priesthood of the Christ, the former qualifying
Him for the latter. Neither the statements examined here, nor any other
New Testament reference to Jesus' Resurrection can be made to teach that
Jesus became the Son of God as a result of being raised from the dead.

The reports of the Lord's Baptism do not warrant the Corinthian
Gnostic idea that Jesus' sonship began with that experience. The quota-
tion from Psalm 2.7, to which reference has just been made, and which
is found in some manuscripts in Luke 3.22, is an obvious interpolation
in that place. Both at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration of Jesus
the heavenly voice spoke in such manner as to forbid the notion that
Jesus was, in either experience, being "invested" with sonship by the
Father. There is, therefore, evidence that the sonship of Christ did
not begin with His Resurrection, or with His Transfiguration, or yet
with His Baptism. Jesus Himself was conscious of something unique in
His relation to God when but twelve years of age, for He said (as the
Chinese version goes), "I must put the things of my Father first."

Now the question may be asked, "Did Jesus become the Son of
God as the result of His Incarnation?" In the angelic announcement to
Mary there is the declaration: "He will be great, and will be called
the Son of the Most High." Do these words mean that Jesus' sonship to
God began with His Virgin Birth, and that consequently the Johannine use
of μνημόνευμα must be understood to refer to His incarnate life only?
The following remarks demonstrate that there are those who hold such a position.

"Even in John 1.14, it is not the λόγος ἀπαράκτος, but the historical Christ that is meant by the μονογενής. . . . This connection of μονογενής with the idea of the human historical Son is now pretty generally recognized."¹ "There is no mention here (1.14) of an 'incarnation' or 'kenosis'; these ideas are only imported into the text."²

Thayer remarks, "He is so spoken of by John (μονογενής) not because the Logos which was ἐγένετο οίκος in Him was eternally generated by God the Father, . . . but because by the Incarnation of the Logos in Him He is of nature or essentially Son of God."³ Two further items are given by Vos, who does not indicate their proponents, "(1) The point at which the term μονογενής is introduced has been deemed as significant as indicating the time when Jesus became the μονογενής (1.14). A vital nexus between the point of introduction and the manner of introduction exists. (2) The context in chapters one and three of John favors the reference to the supernatural human birth, because in close proximity the new birth, or birth from above, of believers is spoken of, and some analogy between this and the μονογενής-birth seems to lie in the mind of the writer or speaker."⁴

No formal argument controverting the Incarnation-reference position will be offered, nor will the views of those holding the opposite position be quoted. It is noteworthy that the following are

² Ibid., p. 425.
³ op. cit., p. 417.
⁴ op. cit., p. 224.
among the scholars who agree in general upon the view that John's reference of "\(\pi\)\(\nu\)\(o\)\(\nu\)\(e\)\(v\)\(i\)\(s\)\" is to the pre-incarnate life of the Christ: Cremer, Bernard, Robertson, Holdsworth, Sanday, B. Weiss, Warfield, Westcott, Brewster, Vos, Vincent, Goodspeed, Burton.

The Evangelist himself must be allowed to say the deciding word. Aside from the passages to which reference will be made in examining the "\(\pi\)\(\nu\)\(o\)\(\nu\)\(e\)\(v\)\(i\)\(s\)\" citations, the following statements will illustrate John's conception of His Lord's sonship. They will also tell whether or not he is more likely to have regarded the Son of God as "\(\pi\)\(\nu\)\(o\)\(\nu\)\(e\)\(v\)\(i\)\(s\)\" before, or after the Incarnation. Although the words given here are Jesus' own declarations, they also represent John's convictions beyond a doubt. In the first place, the Gospel of John alone records thirty times that the Son is sent from God the Father. Even though John the Baptist is also designated as sent from God, and the disciples are "sent even as the Son is sent," the high frequency and the varying contexts of the declaration of the Son's mission leave a strong presumption favoring the view that the writer is assured of Jesus' eternal Sonship.

Jesus asserts in John 10.28: "I gave them eternal life." Did He give that which He Himself did not have, that which He had not experienced? The duration idea cannot be separated from the qualitative idea in "eternal life." Jesus further testifies as follows: "He that is from God, He has seen the Father" (6.46); "What I have seen with the Father I speak" (8.38); "I came forth from the Father" (16.27); "Glorify me, Father, with Thyself with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was" (17.5); "Thou didst love me before the foundation of the world" (17.24). All these utterances represent Jesus as possessing
a consciousness, or at least a belief, that He was in an intimate, eternal sonship-relation to God previous to His Incarnation. If, therefore, He is eternally God's Son, does it not follow that μονογενής must refer to the eternal Son as well as to the incarnate Son?

The attempt to refer μονογενής only to the incarnate Son appears to raise and to leave unanswered at least the following questions: (1) What meaning does the Incarnation itself have left, if the unique sonship is purely temporal: who or what became incarnate in Him whom we know as Jesus? (2) Must we abandon the identification (not the mere combination) of the eternal Logos with the historical Jesus? (3) What shall be said about the eternity, personality, and deity of the Logos? (4) Does not the position of those holding a doctrine of "subordinationism" with reference to the relation between the Son and the Father, become stronger when the Son is said to have become a Son, not until, and only by virtue of, the Incarnation? (5) How shall other New Testament declarations of an eternal sonship-relation (Philippians 2.5-8; Colossians 1.15, etc.) be interpreted, if John's μονογενής reference is only to the temporal life of our Lord?

The conclusion that μονογενής must refer to the eternal Son as well as to the incarnate Son must stand as stated, and be the assumed basis for many statements in the following pages that might otherwise seem unexplained. The Only Son is the Revealer of God and the Redeemer of man by virtue of His inherent qualifications. "Only He who was essentially the Son of God could become the Son of man, and as such win
2. The relation of the Prologue to the entire Gospel

Significantly, John employs μορφή in just those sections of his writings wherein the revelation of God by the Incarnation of the Son, and the redemption of men by the Crucifixion of the Son are most prominently set forth. To these inseparable activities, in which, with perfect unity of motive and unison of operation, the Father and the Son took the initiative in and consummated man’s salvation, the rest of the thesis will be devoted.

Although it is manifestly beyond the scope and purpose of this study to examine the Prologue in detail, it is necessary to note its structure, its theme, its central ideas, and its importance — all in relation to the total purpose of the Evangelist’s use of μορφή.

(1) The structure of the Prologue (1.1-18)
   a. The eternity, personality, and deity of the Word (1.2)
   b. The relation of the Word to creation generally and to humanity specifically (3-15)
   c. The revelation of the Father by the Incarnate Word (14-18)

(2) The theme of the Prologue

That Jesus is the Revealer of God is the theme of the Prologue. Stated in its closing words, this theme serves the double purpose of being a fitting climax to the matchless array of lofty declarations about the Son of God and of leading the reader into the narrative of

1. Cawley, op. cit., p. 100.
the Son's earthly life. Jesus' revelation of God thus becomes the theme of the entire Gospel, since the narratives about and the discourses of the Christ lead at last to the Evangelist's statement of his purpose: "That you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His name" (20:31).

(3) The central ideas in the Prologue

a. The Prologue makes the following significant declarations concerning the Word, as to His Being, characteristics, and activities: He is eternal (1, 2, 15, 18), personal (1, 2), Divine (1, 18), the Agent of creation (3, 4, 10), the source and giver of life (4), the source, unquenchable manifestation (5), the essence (8), and the giver (9) of light to the world generally and to men individually; He is the immanent Creator, but unrecognized (10); He was nationally rejected (11), but the giver of the right of divine sonship to the individuals, irrespective of race, who accepted Him through belief (12, 13); He is God Incarnate in humanity (14), the inexhaustible source, the bringer, and the incarnation of grace and truth (14, 16), the unique possessor of the divine glory of the Only Son (14); He is preeminent over prophecy (15), and over the Law (17); He is (by virtue of all these attributes, and of His intimate fellowship eternally with the Father) the Revealer of God (18).

John allows these statements to stand as axiomatic, making no formal effort to prove their truth. Nor does he develop therefrom any dogmas, leaving it for Irenaeus to declare: "He became what we are that He might make us what He is."1

b. The contrasting reactions of men to the Word have already been noted, in the national rejection (11), somewhat balanced by the individual acceptance of Him by some men without respect to race (12, 13). Here is John's first note of the "Jews" (οἱ Ἰδού) hostility toward Jesus. Here is also the evidence of the Evangelist's own universal outlook, together with his confidence in the ultimate victory of the Son.

c. The record of John the Baptist and his testimony, presented in 1.5-8, 15, has raised a problem of literary criticism. Why and how did these parenthetical references to the Baptist come to be given in their particular position and manner? The problem will receive here only the recognition of its existence, with no attempt at a solution.

The nature of the Baptist's testimony is clearly prophetic, since God sent the spokesman. It was temporary, and preparatory to the Savior's greater mission. Its purpose is demonstrated in the messenger's positive, undeniable declarations of divine fact, persuading men to exercise repentance and faith in view of the Kingdom of God, which had arrived among them.

(4) The importance of the Prologue

Both in relation to the entire Gospel (since its philosophical terms do not and need not appear again), and in relation to the whole sum of religious literature, this Prologue of John's commands amazed admiration.

a. First of all, the author identifies the Logos of philosophical speculation with the Jesus of history, the Jesus of his own
personal experience. "This is John's great contribution to religious philosophy, that Jesus is the Word."  

b. In declaring the efforts of "darkness" to overcome the Light (5), the indifference to and the violent rejection of the Word (10, 11), and the invisibility of God (18), John sets forth the necessity of the Incarnation. He likewise shows the preparation for that event, by pointing out the immanent presence of the Divine Logos among men (10), and by introducing the witness of John the Baptist. Finally, the Evangelist records the actual Incarnation of the Eternal Logos (14), whereby He entered into humanity to the end that He might interpret God to man (18).

3. The Incarnation of the Word (John 1.14)

(1) The fact of the Incarnation stated: ἐπεράτω, ἐπεράτων

John once again takes up the term Logos (not mentioned since verse 1), and in the fewest possible words states the fact of the Incarnation. Thus by his severe simplicity, John at once defies the Gnostics of every age and taxes the abilities of every reader who attempts to "divide rightly the Word of truth." If we give to ἐπεράτω the same significance here that it seems to demand in 1.3, 10, the very Incarnation becomes a creative act; the eternal Logos prepared for Himself a "tabernacle" of human flesh. Even allowing ἐπεράτω to mean simply "became," we are able still to see the striking contrast between πίνακα and εἰπεῖ (ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐπεράτω, 1.1). The same contrast is prominent also in 8.58: τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐπεράταν ἐπεράτω. The least that ἐπεράτω can mean here, then, is

that the Logos became something other than that which He was previously. For ἐγένετο does not stand alone as it does in 1. 5, 10. The structure of this succinct statement cogently demands a recognition of at least a pre-incarnate existence of the Logos. The nature and eternal duration of that pre-existence are fully treated elsewhere in the Prologue.

It would be most difficult to find a stronger corroboration of the accounts of Jesus' Virgin Birth than John's declaration of the fact of the Incarnation: ὁ λόγος σώφρ ἐγένετο. Here is the proclamation of the unparalleled, unprecedented event of the entrance of the Logos into humanity, as seen from the viewpoint of God. Matthew and Luke deal rather with the viewpoint of man, relating the manifestations and the manner whereby the Incarnation was accomplished. There is no need that John repeat the narrative of the manner of the Incarnation; he interprets the birth of Jesus as the union of God with man. Reference to Jesus' birth in Bethlehem, in the comparison of μνείαν with πρωτόκος (Luke 2.7), has already demonstrated that Jesus is not God's Only Son by reason of, or dating from, His being born of the Virgin Mary. Manifestly, the Virgin Birth is a supernatural event, but Jesus is the eternal Only Son of God, who became flesh in the way that Matthew and Luke describe.

Legitimate inquiry arises respecting the presence, in other New Testament writings, of ideas in agreement with or contradictory to John's announcement of God's entrance into human form. John himself makes the acknowledgment of Jesus Christ's coming ἐν σοφίᾳ a test of one's being "of God" (1 John 4.2; 2 John 7). The Epistle to
the Hebrews has: "Both He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one . . ." in that "he also in like manner partook of aîmastos kai σαρκός" (8.11-14). This statement represents the "connexion of the Son and the sons completed by the Incarnation."\(^1\) The confirmations that Paul gives to the fact and significance of the Incarnation in 1 Timothy 3.16; Galatians 4.4; Romans 1.3, 8.3 (noted in Chapter III, under ἐαυτόν), and 2 Corinthians 8.9 cannot be developed here. But a pause will be made to consider Philippians 2.5-8. This interpretation by Paul of the eternal majesty and the temporal humility of the Savior perhaps more clearly than any other passage in the New Testament corresponds to John's statement of the Incarnation. Paul, with ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, . . . ἐκ δυνάμεως ἀνθρώπου γένεσαν, draws near to the Johannine σάρξ ἐγένετο. "Jesus is so utterly human that He must be seen as what God intended men to be."\(^2\)

(2) The historical manifestation of the Incarnate Word:

καὶ ἐκένωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν

Whether this phrase refers to the transitoriness of Jesus' earthly mission, or to a new manifestation of the "Shekinah" of God, or to a reestablishment of His Tabernacle among men, wherein anew "God shared the . . . punishment of Israel,"\(^3\) is not clear. Nor must a decision be reached here regarding these theories. Chiefly important is the Evangelist's testimony that the Logos, now incarnate, lived among

---

men. No longer need any man speculate about the Logos. He is here: Immanuel, God with us (Isaiah 7.14).

(3) The character of the Incarnate Word: πλήρης Χάριτος καὶ Ἀληθείας

πλήρης is indeclinable \(^{1}\) and is here taken to agree with λίνες, anticipating, possibly, πλήρωμα in verse 16. Grace and truth specify the character of Him who became incarnate and manifested Himself and His Father to humanity.

(4) The personal experience with the Incarnate Word: οἱ ἐθεασάμενοι τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (δόξαν ὡς μορφερᾶς) παρὰ παρέξα

The Evangelist associates with himself at least Peter and James, his companions in witnessing Jesus' Transfiguration, to which, as the chief manifestation of the Son's glory, he evidently refers. However, a wider circle of co-witnesses is indicated in 2.11: εἴδοντες τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, by the "beginning of signs" that Jesus performed at the wedding in Cana. Probably we should not feel restricted to these events, but should allow the statement to include the total personal experience of all the believers who knew Jesus personally "in the days of His flesh."

The double parenthesis is adopted not arbitrarily, but because thereby the ideas are most clearly presented: "and we saw His glory, a glory (received) from a father, (a glory) as of (such as characterizes) an only son." The "glory" signifies "God's essential character as Redeemer and Savior, manifested as the Shekinah" (Dr. W. H. Davis). It

---

is here a glory with a twofold majesty: its Giver is the Father (God); its Receiver is the Only Son (Jesus Christ). "Neither the Son nor the Father, as such, has as yet been named, and they are not named here: there is but a suggestion by means of a comparison (the particle ὁς and the absence of articles being mutually necessary), because no image but the relation of a μονογενής to a father can express the twofold character as at once derivative and on a level with its source."¹

In interpreting ὁς μονογενής to mean "as of an only son," there is no desire to beg the question of the essential significance of μονογενής. Because of the presence of μακάριος in the same verse, the addition of the word "son" is necessary to complete the thought. It is to be remembered that in John 3.16, 18, and 1 John 4.9, the word ὁς is used with μονογενής. Therefore, the added word is felt to be abundantly justified. As to the use of the word "only" several remarks will be made.

a. The majority of the citations of μονογενής, both profane and Biblical, describe the relation of an only child to a parent (see the table on page 34).

b. The use of "only" designates Jesus as the only Son of God who possesses the same essential nature as that of the Father Himself. "Only" is acceptable as thus used, and avoids the need of using "unique" excessively. The following modern New Testament versions translate μονογενής by "Only Son" in this verse: Moffett, Montgomery, Torrey, Twentieth Century, Goodspeed, and Neymouth.

c. Since μονογενής deals basically only with the kind of sonship Jesus enjoys with the Father, the origin of the sonship becomes a secondary question. The early Christian writers were deeply involved in the dispute over the Son's origin: was He created or begotten? Despite much confusion in the use of the terms they used, these men did make a real distinction in ideas. The "orthodox" group, by employing ἀγέννητος, denied the Son's creation. This term is obviously subject to confusion with the term ἁγέννητος, which denies His generation or parentage.  

1. Similar confusion in form and meaning has been seen in the case of γέννημα and γέννησα, mentioned on page 35 of this study. As far as the term μονογενής is concerned, however, "The adjunction of the adjective 'only-begotten' need add only the idea of uniqueness, not of derivation."  

2. Since the Son of God is the only Son to whom can be attributed eternity, creative and redeeming power, the authority of judgment and the forgiveness of sin, it must follow that His origin is in keeping with His essential nature. The attributes of the Son are likewise the attributes of the Father, because they are essentially the same. Obviously, therefore, such a Son is not a "created" Son in any sense in which we understand "creation." Yet Jesus said, "The Father is greater than I" (14.28), which confession on His part raises the question of the Son's "subordination" to the Father. If Jesus here admits subordination, as it will be assumed for the moment, then is

He not of some lesser, some other nature? In reply only this will be
said (for the question almost crosses the boundary of this study):
the subordination need be, and quite surely is, only such as is natural
and necessary to the maintenance of the Father-Son relationship. It
has already been abundantly demonstrated that the sonship in question
here is a natural one, in which the Father and the Son are of the same
essence or nature. The sonship is more than a legal or an ethical son-
ship; it is the sonship of the only eternal Son to the only eternal
Father. The subordination is, in the divine order, the same as that
which a human son sustains to his human father, when father and son are
fulfilling the possibilities of that relationship: when they are united
in mind and heart and purpose. The unique sonship Jesus sustained to
the Father "before the world was" must not be considered as cancelled
or even suspended during His incarnate life on earth. The limitations
of His full humanity modified only the mode of the united operation of
the Father and the Son in effecting man's redemption. The Son of God
brought into humanity all the sonship He ever possessed, without its
glory and its freedom from material limitations.

d. The sonship of Jesus to God described by πατριαί is
neither affirms nor denies the possibility of human sonship to God.
Jesus' sonship "does not differ from the divine sonship of all men in
degree, but in kind." 1 It is true that men could not possess a sonship-
relation to God apart from Jesus' redemptive mission; but that issue as
such does not depend upon the force of πατριαί. "Πατριαί

distinguishes between Christ as the only Son (οις) , and the many
children (τέκνα) of God; and further that the only Son did not become
(γεννηθεὶς) such by receiving power, by adoption, or by moral regeneration,
but was (γεννηθείς) such in the beginning with God."1

e. Here it is imperative to consider the question of the
reason for the long-established prevalence of "only-begotten" as the
translation of μονογενὴς in its Johannine occurrences. The question
is dealt with at this point in order to avoid the necessity of extended
notes of this nature in the consideration of each citation in question.
The primary problem to be solved in this study is that of the exact ap-
plication of the word by the man who knew Jesus the best. Some indica-
tions, rather than a complete treatment of the questions of when and why
"only-begotten" came to be the given equivalent of μονογενὴς, will be
presented. "Some of the Old Latin texts (a, e, q) render μονογενὴς
here (1.14) by unicus, which is the original meaning, rather than by
unigenitus, which became the accepted Latin rendering so soon as con-
troversies arose about the Person and the Nature of the Christ."2 Again,
"It was the dogmatic disputes as to the inner essential relations between
Christ and God, especially those raised by Arius, that first gave occasion
for emphasizing the point that Christ as the Son of God was a begotten
Son, i. e., that He did not form part of the creation."3 Westcott prob-
ably gives the best historical survey of the change from "unique" to "only-
begotten." His concluding remark: "Other thoughts, true in themselves,

were gathered round it (μονογενής), and at last the sense was given by Gregory of Nazianzus as describing 'not the only Son of an only Parent, at one only time, but also that He was (begotten) in a singular way (μονογενός)' (Orat. 30.20). And this conception, with which no fault can be found except that it is not contained in the word, became popularly current afterwards, and was admirably expressed by John of Damascus: Μονογενής δὲ οτι μίνος ἐκ μίνος τοῦ πατέρος ἐγεννήθη (De Fid. Orthod. 1.8.135)."¹

Beyond a doubt, the translation "only-begotten" is here to stay, regardless of the fact of its departure from the word's basic idea.

Finally, the connection of μονογενής with the Incarnation of the divine eternal Logos gives the Evangelist's mature judgment on the truth and everlasting significance of the event he records. The Incarnation has reality, meaning, and value because, and only because, it is concentrated in one Son alone. The Divine Nature is not, like the Divine Love, bestowed on all humanity, but resides within the Godhead exclusively. Therefore, it was necessary that One who was essentially possessed with and characterized by Deity (John 1.1) should "become flesh" in preparation for the perfect revelation of God to man. The Incarnate Logos is the one and only Interpreter, who knows God because He is God, and knows man because He is also Man.

4. The revelation of God to man (John 1.18)

(1) The textual problem

The issue in the textual reading is between μονογενής Θεός.

¹. Epistles of John, p. 171.
in the critical texts of Westcott and Hort, Nestle, and Tischendorf's edition of the Siniatic Codex, and ὁ μοναρχὴς θεός, in the Received Text, and in Tischendorf's eighth edition. The evidence for the readings is taken from Hort's summary rather than Tischendorf's apparatus, for Hort's work is the more recent.

The evidence for ὁ μοναρχὴς θεός is as follows: Manuscripts: Λ'BΟ*Λ35 (Λ* omits the ὁ θεόν; Λ'C and 35 prefix θ) ; Versions: Memphitic, *Peshito* Syriac, Harclean Syriac (margin), (?Aethiopic); Fathers (numbers following the names show the number of citations): The Valentinian Gnostics (2), Irenaeus (?3), *Clement (2), *Origen (3), (Eusebius, 2), #Syn. Anœ., *Epiphanius (?4), *Didymus (?5), *Basil (2), *Gregory of Nyssa (10), *Cyril of Alexandria (?4).

The evidence for ὁ μοναρχὴς θεός is as follows: Manuscripts: AC56EFGHIKMNTSUAV (7D) (?D also, unknown to Hort), and all known cursives except 35; Versions: Old Latin, Latin Vulgate, Old Syriac, Harclean Syriac (text), Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary, Armenian, (Aethiopic); Fathers: (?Irenaeus, in Latin only), #?Epistle from Antioch bishops, ?#"Acts" of a disputations between Archelaus and Mani (Latin), *Eusebius of Caesarea (6), *Athenæus (7), #Eustathius, ?#Alexander of Alexandria, (?Basil of Caesarea), Gregory of Nazianzus, (?Gregory of Nyssa), #Titus of Bostra, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Chrysostom, and later writers generally.

No more than a condensed summary of Hort's conclusions can be

1. op. cit., p. 2-8. (Testimonies marked with * are clear and sufficient; those marked with # depend upon a single quotation, with a neutral context.)
presented. On external evidence: "Θεός is commended to us as the true reading, alike by the higher character of the authorities which support it, taken separately, and by the analogy of readings having a similar history in ancient times." On probabilities of transcription: "μονοτερνύς Θεός is an unique phrase, unlikely to be suggested to a scribe by any other passage of Scripture." "Thus, on grounds of documentary evidence and probabilities of transcription alike, we are irresistibly led to conclude that μονοτερνύς Θεός was the original from which ὁ μονοτερνύς ὦς and ὁ μονοτερνύς proceeded." On intrinsic fitness: "Without μονοτερνύς Θεός the end of the Prologue brings no clear recollection of the beginning: Ἰεάς is the luminous word which recites afresh the first verse within the last, and in its combination with μονοτερνύς crowns and illustrates the intervening steps." "The whole Prologue leads up to it, and, to say the least, suffers in unity if it is taken away."

The "Two Dissertations" of Hort on this text and on the use of μονοτερνύς Θεός in the ancient church creeds comprise the classic work of this nature. His conclusions are not, of course, accepted unanimously. But there seems to have been no dissenting voice raised since its publication (1876) that compares with Ezra Abbot's and James Drummond's, both of whom had contended earlier for νός. Rees and Thayer plead

1. Ibid., p. 8.
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for οἶδες, while Burton, Gremer, Stevens, and Kattenbusch seem unwilling to commit themselves definitely. Of the recent New Testament translations, only Torrey has "the only begotten Son of God"; his testimony to the Greek text is naturally uncertain. The following scholars give clear testimony to their acceptance of θεός: E. A. Abbott, Bernard, Harnack, Plummer, Robertson, J. Weiss, and Westcott. In addition to the discussions of the foregoing men, the following modern versions show the use of θεός: Moffett, Montgomery, Rotherham, Twentieth Century, Goodspeed, Weymouth (margin), (A.B.P.S.) 1912 Improved Edition (margin), Numerie New Testament, and the American Standard (margin). The reading μετέβηθεν θεός abundantly satisfies the requirements of textual correctness. Its bearing on the revelation of God to man will now be sought.

(2) The interpretation of God

a. The invisibility of God: θεόν οἶδες ἐὕρηκαν ὄντος,

"No man hath seen God at any time." The Evangelist gathers up into one postulate all the experience of man in his fruitless, tragic longing to see his God. He reminds his readers that "man shall not see my face and live" (Exodus 33.20), and that at Sinai the people "saw no form; only ye heard a voice" (Deuteronomy 4.12). He does not admit even the many theo-

---
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phanies to the rank of revelation he is about to set forth. The following events "do not transcend the limits of partial knowledge": 1 "They saw the God of Israel . . . they beheld God" (Exodus 24.10, 11), "Thou shalt see my back" (Exodus 33.23); "I saw the Lord . . . Woe is me, for mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts" (Isaiah 6.1,5); and "We shall surely die because we have seen God" (Judges 15.22).

Indeed, the theophanies are really the manifestations of the Son of God Himself (cf. John 12.41; Isaiah 6.1; Revelation 4.2ff.). 2 John gives the Savior's own declarations of the invisibility of God: "God is Spirit" (John 4.24); "You have not seen His form at any time" (5.37); "not that anyone has seen the Father" (6.46). The Evangelist adds his own testimony in a phrase strikingly like the one now under consideration: Ἐγὼ οὐδεὶς πάντως τεθείσα: "No man hath beheld God at any time" (1 John 4.12). The same truth is indirectly affirmed in 1 John 4.20: "he cannot love God whom he has not seen." Paul contributes: " . . . the King eternal, immortal, invisible" (1 Timothy 1.17), and " . . . whom no man has seen, nor can see" (6.16); and Hebrews 11.27 reads: "(Moses) endured, as seeing Him who is invisible." All these items of evidence on the invisibility of God are introduced at this point to illustrate how thoroughly all the Scriptures seek to lead men into a conception of God as spiritual. The outcome of the conception of God as spiritual should be the acceptance of His many revelations, of which the Son is the final and perfect culmination.

1. Plummer. OP. CIT., p. 75.
Because they were fearful and bewildered, and because of Moses' long delay on Mt. Sinai, the Israelites persuaded Aaron to make for them a visible "god" such as they had seen in abundance in Egypt (Exodus 32.1-5). Israel's experience at Mt. Sinai has been, and is being, repeated countless times by mankind, both socially and individually. Idolatry, therefore, results when man is unable or unwilling to follow the leading of the God who is Spirit. The invisibility of God is an essential feature of the God who is eternal, omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent. Yet God's very invisibility has been used as the occasion for man to deny His existence. The denial, however, usually, if not always, comes ultimately to some form of idolatry, which, as was noted, is proof of man's inescapable longing for a visible revelation of the true God. That idolatry in any form is but a miserable substitute for the worship of God is unquestioned by reason; but reason alone has left men blindly groping for God, "if haply they might feel after Him and find Him" (Acts 17.27). But man has now been given that long-sought visible revelation of the Most High God. For both John and Paul -- the latter speaking in Athens -- complete their statements with reassuring words. Paul adds: "and yet He is not far from each of us, for in Him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17.27b, 28). John's word of promise, yes, of fulfilment, balances his necessary declaration of the invisibility of God. The Apostle has anchored the drifting speculations of man about the divine Logos in the haven of the truth of His Incarnation in the historical Jesus. Now he proposes Jesus as the answer

to the question: "How can God reveal Himself to man?"

b. The invisible God revealed: μονογενὴς Θεός οὐν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐγερθήσατο.

No translation of these words is attempted here. Indeed, in this study any attempt at translation would be no less than presumptuous, for in all the modern versions and commentaries examined, the verse is apparently beyond adequate translation. The paraphrase: "God, in the person of the Only Son, who is eternally in the Father’s bosom, He it is who interpreted Him(self)," is given only as the basis for the examination of the Evangelist’s declaration.

(a) "God, . . . the Only Son"

The liberty of supplying οὗς after μονογενῆς in 1.14 was taken because of the sonship-relation often expressed by μονογενῆς (see page 34) and because of the presence of πατρὸς in the same verse. Hence it may be regarded as justifiable to adopt a similar procedure in this verse, with the result shown in the paraphrase. "Without some such arrangement the predicative force of μονογενῆς Θεός is lost."¹

Again, the fundamental significance of μονογενῆς (unique, only son) demands an arrangement that cannot be procured by the attributive construction, which would be "God only begotten" (ASV margin), or "the (an) only begotten God." Renderings of this kind leave the reader with no clear idea of John’s meaning. There is no possible doubt that the Evangelist, in using μονογενῆς Θεός, has the Son in mind. To that fact his use of οὗς (3.16,18, 1 John 4.9) and the sonship he expresses in this same verse (εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς), together with

¹ Hort. op. cit., p. 18.
the reference in 1.14, all testify. In using the phrase "God, . . . the Only Son," there is no desire or effort to avoid the attributing of deity to the Son. For the Logos has already been called \( \theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma \) (1.1), and the Incarnate Son is shown to be the very same as the eternal Logos (1.14). In 1.18, therefore, John combines "the two great predicates of the Word, which have been previously indicated."¹ "In the person of" simply denotes the manner whereby the self-revelation of God was effected. Necessarily, the revelation was made by the incarnate Son; the aim of the Incarnation is thus brought into clear statement. The Evangelist's statement, "God, in the person of the Only Son," shows remarkable parallelism with Hebrews 1.1-3: "God, . . . at the last of these days spoke to us in (His) Son ("qualitative sonship"), . . . who, being (\( \ddot{\omega} \nu \)) the splendor of His glory and the character (expression) of His substance." The two ideas that John and the author of Hebrews make prominent are: that God (\( \theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is the subject in each instance) takes the initiative in the revelation of Himself to man; and that it is through the Son that the final, perfect revelation is accomplished.

(b) "Who is eternally in the Father's bosom," is the phrase by which John expresses the intimacy of fellowship, the uniqueness of affection, and the unity of purpose that characterize the relation of the Son to the Father. These features of the filial relationship further qualify the Son to interpret God to man. The eternity of the filial relationship appears in: \( \dot{\omega} \nu \varepsilon\varepsilon\varsigma \tau\varepsilon\nu \kappa\nu\lambda\nu \nu \). Here is simply the expression of the eternal (\( \ddot{\omega} \nu \) a timeless present

participle) fellowship of the Son with the Father. Needless are the sup-
positions that \( \omega \) means "was" or "is now, since the Ascension," or "went
into" the Father's bosom. The natural meaning of the words must be al-
lowed to stand. Now it is only through the Son that God can be revealed
to man as Father; the Only Son, alone of all Beings, could, and did, make
that highest and final revelation. The Only Son's eternal experiential
knowledge of God the Father is certainly emphasized in the following
statements: "I know Him" (John 8.55); "The Father knows me and I know
the Father" (10.15). In the parallel "Johannine" passages in Matthew
11.25-30 and Luke 10.21-24 the exclusive prerogative of the Son to "re-
veal the Father to whosoever He wills" is stressed.

(c) "He it is who interpreted"

The Greek offers no object, but \( \theta \) in the emphatic position
in the verse, points out that it is God the Father who is revealed in
the person of the Only Son. It may be said concerning the use of "Him-
self" that the "self" is suggested because the revelation that God makes
in and through the Son is truly a self-revelation, since the Son is also
God.

\[ \text{"Exeivos is both anaphoric and emphatic.1 } \]


"God, . . . who is

. . . He it is (and He alone) who . . ." \( \varepsilon \), the effective
aorist of \( \varepsilon \), shows the completion, the finality of the inter-
pretation (exegesis) of God to man, and finds illustration in the fol-
lowing references: \( \alpha \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon \), "There was a man telling
his dream" (Judges 7.13) (the "telling" is \( \varepsilon \), verse 15); ( \( \delta \) \( \theta \) \( \epsilon \))
... ἐζητήσατο αὐτῷ "God . . . declared it" (Job 28.27). The word is used also in Luke 24.35; Acts 10.8; 15.12, 14; 21.19, in the sense of "rehearsing" events to which the narrator was an eyewitness. The substantive ἐζητήσις appears in Genesis 41.8: πάντας τοὺς ἐζητήτας Αίγυπτου, "all the interpreters (magicians ASV) of Egypt"; and in Proverbs 29.18: οὐ μὴ ὑπάρξῃ ἐζητήσις ἐκεῖνοι παραίως, "There will not be an interpreter to a lawless people." "The function of the ἐζητήσις, or Interpreter, was one with which the Greek world was quite familiar, and possibly this fact may have suggested the use of this significant word here."¹ In common usage today our own word "interpreter" is applied to one who knows two languages sufficiently well to effect communication between the users of both.

That the Savior Himself was fully conscious of the glory and the burden of being the ultimate Interpreter of God to man appears in His words as follows: "He who sees me sees Him who sent me" (John 12.45); "From henceforth ye know Him and have seen Him" (14.7); "He that has seen me has seen the Father" (14.9); "Now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father" (15.24), and "I manifested Thy name unto the men Thou gavest me out of the world" (17.6).

In Paul's use of ἐξήκων appears his testimony that Jesus is the Revealer: "Christ, who is the image of God" (2 Corinthians 4.4); "The Son, . . . who is the image of the invisible God" (Colossians 1.15).

Here is One at last, the God-Man, through whom man verily

¹ Johnston. op. cit., p. 45.
knows God, in whom man sees God, yet lives (see Exodus 33.20) not in spite of having seen God but because of having seen Him. "God, in the person of the Only Son, who is eternally in the bosom of the Father, He it is who has interpreted Himself."

(3) Summary

The Evangelist states two major propositions in this verse (1.18): (1) God is invisible; (2) God has manifested Himself visibly in the Son. The first truth must be accepted not for its own sake alone, but rather as the intellectual and spiritual prerequisite to the understanding and the appropriation of the second truth. That is, God has not, and cannot, become visible through human effort. If He is ever seen, it must be by His self-revelation. Nevertheless, whatever revelation God makes must be understandable by man. "God is to be known in experience if at all."¹ Exactly that condition is met in the Incarnation of God in the Son, for thereby God entered into human experience; thereby He identified Himself with man.

The problems of the Trinity and of monotheism are left untouched in this thesis. Concerning the question of how God is at once transcendent and immanent, only one remark is offered: in the Incarnate Son the transcendent God has now become immanent. Many other questions press upon one who studies the New Testament from any angle, questions that surpass the limits of any one type of study. Possibly some of the further questions may be answered by means of information

¹ Hocking, Wm. E. God in Human Experience, p. 229.
and techniques that grow out of such an investigation as this one.

From a wholly unexpected source — an article on volcanoes — comes a fitting climax to this chapter: "The sense walls of the Universe are shattered by these higher values of power, and Deity is indirectly more in evidence than in the case of lesser things. A blade of grass as surely, but far less forcibly, reveals the truth that That which manifests cannot be seen, nor heard, nor felt, except through and because of the manifestation."

CHAPTER FIVE

O MONOGENH JS THE REDEMPTOR OF MAN

€ΞW ΕΙΜΗΝ
ΟΔΟ CKAΗΛΗΘΕΝ
ΑΚΑΗΖΩΝ.
1. The redemptive purpose of God

The preceding chapter examined the relation of John's use of
\( \text{μονογενής} \) to the revelation of God in the person of the Only Son. That
the Only Son, alone of all Beings, possessed the inherent qualifications
for explaining ("translating") God to man, was found to be a truth so fun-
damental as virtually to require no proof, but rather proclamation only.
The invisibility of God and man's idolatrous efforts to "see" God were
found to establish the fact of man's need to know God through His self-
manifestation. The nature of that self-manifestation of God must tran-
scend all the theophanies recorded in the Old Testament. John declares
plainly: "No man has ever seen God at any time." Yet the interpretation
of God must be in terms of human experience, revealing the Unknown God
by means of a known Man. All the foregoing conditions, which are in
keeping with God's nature and with man's need, are declared by the Evan-
gelist to have been met in the coming of the God-man, the Incarnate Son
of God, Jesus Christ. John has, therefore, in the closing verse of his
Prologue, announced the theme of His Gospel to be the revelation of God
by Jesus Christ. The Incarnation, accordingly, was not an end in itself,
but the means to the end of revealing God. The question remains, why
did God reveal Himself to man? Is it a valid procedure to take John
20.31: "These things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the
Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His name;"
as the purpose, not only of John's Gospel, but also of the Incarnation
of the Son of God? Has John so interpreted Jesus' life and mission as
to justify the assertion that the revelation of God in the person of
the Only Son is both the proof of and an act in the redemptive purpose of God? The further uses of μυρόνυς in John's works will be investigated in the light of this question.

(1) Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus (John 3.1-15)

No certainty is claimed for the view that the Evangelist begins his comments on the conversation with verse 16 of this chapter. Matters of vocabulary and style, in comparison with sections where certainty can be affirmed, give this division the advantage of probability. Similar uncertainty, resulting from John's ambiguity, occurs in 1.16-18; 3.31-36; 4.9b. E. A. Abbott holds these all to be the remarks of the Evangelist. Westcott concurs, remarking that one of the several evidences for this position is that μυρόνυς "is used of Christ elsewhere only in 1.14, 18; 1 John 4.9, and in each case by the Evangelist." Bernard finds the Evangelist using μορονυω to introduce comments in 2.25; 4.8; 5.15, 20; 6.6, 64; 7.39; 13.11; 20.9. Robertson adds 12.37-41 to the list of Johannine comments.

a. The universal human need for redemption is the first of two preeminent verities declared by Jesus in His attempt to lead the "teacher of Israel" into a full comprehension and acceptance of the nature of the Kingdom of God. Whether the λέγωμεν , "ye must," in verse 7 refers to the Jewish religious leaders or to humanity generally is uncertain. If the former is the case, and if even these "righteous"

3. op. cit., vol. 1, p. 117.
man need redemption, then who shall escape that need? Thus the same result of universal need is obtained from either position. The universal application of the Savior's declaration of man's need for redemption is found in verse 3: "Except one (τίς) be born from above (ἐναντίον ὑμῶν), he cannot see the Kingdom of God." "We are not born at all until we are born from above. It is a birth, not a re-birth, that Jesus is declaring to be necessary." (Dr. W. H. Davis). The indefinite τίς here and in verse 5 evidently carries the idea of "any one" and justifies the use of "universal" in describing the need of humanity for redemption.

b. The single condition of entering God's Kingdom is the second prominent truth appearing in the words of Jesus to Nicodemus. That condition is that one shall be born from above. Jesus restates the condition in this way: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (verse 5). Dr. W. H. Davis gives the following interpretation of the statement: "'Water' signifies John's baptism, which stands for repentance and remission of sins. Those who submitted to it proclaimed also their faith in the new Kingdom. But it is God who cleanses; the Spirit comes to man as the initial act, giving life." The Kingdom is spiritual. It is necessarily so, in keeping with God's spiritual nature. Hence the citizens of the Kingdom must become spiritually alive by means of the birth from above, in order to see and to enter into and to partake of the life of the Kingdom.

An incidental but important observation concerning John's use of ἄνωθεν to describe the beginning of the spiritual life may be made here. Six times Jesus uses the term in His efforts to illustrate for

---

Nicodemus the radical nature of the change that men must experience in order to see the Kingdom: 3.3, 5, 6 twice, 7, 8. Twice Nicodemus replies with the same term (3.4), though plainly without understanding its meaning as Jesus used it. The translation "born" (ASV) for each of these eight occurrences rightly emphasizes the result of God's "beg- getting." One must be "born from above," be "born from water and the Spirit," be born "from (of) the Spirit," in order to have spiritual life, just as one is "born of the flesh" at the beginning of the physical life. What implications does this use of "born" have with reference to the translation of μονογενής by "only-born" or "only-begotten"? Let the answer to this question await the examination of John's own uses of γεννάω in the sense of the beginning of the spiritual life. The following verses connect γεννάω with ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ or ἐκ θεοῦ: John 1.13; 1 John 2.29, 3.9 twice, 4.7, 5.1 twice, 5.4, 18 twice. In John 1.13 "begotten" is clearly preferable to the usual translation "born." Since that is the case, there are eight citations in which γεννάω in the connection in question is best translated "born" and eight cases in which the term is best translated "begotten." (The statement that "faith is that which is begotten of God," in 1 John 5.4 does not, after all, introduce a new idea, but conforms to the other statements under examination.) Now there are sixteen citations of γεννάω used of the Divine act whereby men become "sons of God." Men, therefore, are "begotten" sons of God. It becomes obvious, then, that "only-begotten" (or "only begotten" without the hyphen) is a translation that invites

confusion. In the light of the citations just made, Jesus cannot be regarded as the only "begotten" Son of God. In adopting the use of "Only Son" as the resultant meaning of μονογενής υἱός, it was granted that "Only Son," if used in an absolute sense, is also too restrictive. The preference for Only Son, rather than for Only-begotten Son results from the fact that μονογενής υἱός, although it admits the idea of "an only son begotten," or "only-begotten son," basically signifies "unique son," "the only son of his kind." In order to cling to "only-begotten" in translating and interpreting μονογενής in its application to the Christ, a distinction must be made between the nature, or the manner, of the "begetting" whereby the eternal Son of God came into being, and the "begetting" whereby men come into being, both physically and spiritually. For there arises therein a paradox: that Jesus is like men, and that He transcends men infinitely. For He is, on this view, a "begotten" Son, but how He was "begotten" has not yet been disclosed. Of course, to say that man cannot understand how the Son of God can be begotten does not dispose of the problem. No more can one understand how men are begotten of God. Herein Jesus' sonship resembles the spiritual sonship of men. But there the resemblance stops, for He is the one and only Son of divine nature, the Only Eternal Son of the Eternal God.

Now in contrast to Jesus' being eternally the Son of God, the section in the third chapter of John's Gospel, as well as the other verses just examined, shows that men become sons of God by means of, and resulting from the "birth from above" that Jesus strove to explain to Nicodemus. The birth of the spirit life is the birth of one who becomes a citizen in the Kingdom of God. Jesus quite clearly adopted the
figure of physical birth in order to make it plain to Nicodemus that there is no other way to enter the Kingdom. The very fact that there is no other way for human lives to begin than by physical birth should have been sufficient illustration for the aged Pharisee. But, like many others who constantly handle the Scriptures, he never got beyond the illustration to the reality, and missed the point. And Nicodemus still leads an almost endless procession of those who insist upon making ἐνναίον mean "again," thereby robbing Jesus' words of the eternal principle that He established in using the term. Man has no control over his physical birth, even to refuse to be born. But man has the power to refuse to be born spiritually. Therein lies the chief difference between the two births. For they are identical in so far as man has done no more to achieve spiritual life than he has done to achieve physical life. Therefore, man has only one condition to meet in order to be born from above. In meeting that condition, man must acknowledge the first of the preeminent truths Jesus pronounced — that he needs the redemption Jesus offers, the life that Jesus alone can impart to him.

(2) The Evangelist's commentary (5.16-21)

There are two factors in redemption. For this reason, the section may well be entitled: "The Divine and Human Elements in Redemption." In the development of the theme, the relation of the Only Son to the redemptive purpose of God will be kept central.

a. The Divine initiative: redemption offered (5.16, 17)

The value of any gift depends, in the first place, upon the person and the character of the giver. Let this truth be applied to
God's redemption of man, considering redemption as the gift in question. "The atonement originates with God who 'was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself' (2 Corinthians 5.19), and whose love gave Jesus to redeem sinful men (John 3.16)."

The Savior has already prepared for the "epitome of the Gospel" (verse 16) by announcing the manner whereby God's antidote for sin's deadly poison will be made available: "The Son of man must be lifted up" (14). He adds the directions for applying the remedy: "Every one who believes" (πιστεύον, present participle, used absolutely) (15a). He promises complete recovery: "eternal life in Him" (15b). Nicodemus would be quite familiar with the reference to the uplifted brazen serpent that became the symbol and means of salvation and life to the once rebellious but later repentant Israelites (Numbers 21.4-10). Man's universal need for salvation and the one single condition whereby he must be saved were clearly pictured for the Savior's nocturnal guest by the reference to the event from which Jesus drew His figure of the uplifted Son of man. That event in the history of the children of Israel discloses also God's initiative in redemption. The brazen serpent was erected by the direct command of God, in order "that every one that is bitten, when he seeth it, shall live."

The Beloved Disciple now takes up the interpretation of the conversation, of which he apparently gives only a condensed summary.

(a) The motive of redemption is the Divine love:

"γάνησεν τὸν θεόν, "God loved." Πρόκειται για τον φράστη του εννιάτου χιλιοστού, που αναφέρεται στο θαυματουργό της πανεπιστημίου της Βεγκλόρι, ο οποίος μεταφέρει τον θάνατο στον κόσμο της ψυχής. Το "κτισμένο" είναι αρχικά σε αντίληψη και είναι το παράδειγμα του εννιάτου χιλιοστού με τον κλειστό στην παλαιά Εβραϊκή λογοτεχνία. Το "κτισμένο" είναι το παράδειγμα του εννιάτου χιλιοστού με τον κλειστό στην παλαιά Εβραϊκή λογοτεχνία. Το "κτισμένο" είναι το παράδειγμα του εννιάτου χιλιοστού με τον κλειστό στην παλαιά Εβραϊκή λογοτεχνία. Το "κτισμένο" είναι το παράδειγμα του εννιάτου χιλιοστού με τον κλειστό στην παλαιά Εβραϊκή λογοτεχνία. Το "κτισμένο" είναι το παράδειγμα του εννιάτου χιλιοστού με τον κλειστό στην παλαιά Εβραϊκή λογοτεχνία. 

The manner of effecting redemption is demonstrated by the giving of the Only Son to be man's Redeemer: οὕτως γὰρ ἐστι τὸ παράδειγμα, "God loved thus, ... that ... He gave." οὕτως, "thus, in this manner," occurs again with γὰρ γὰρ in 1 John 4.11: "if God thus loved us." The word οὕτως is a modal adverb, used about 200 times in the New Testament. Its expression of manner is illustrated in the following places: ἐκάθεντο οὕτως ἐν τῇ πηγῇ, "He set thus on the well" (John 4.6); οὕτως ἔλεγχε το ὕδατι πάνω, ὅπως ἦθεν, "Let your light shine in such manner ... that they may see" (Matthew 5.16). The latter illustration, like the use of οὕτως in John 3.16, 

1. Robertson, Grammar, p. 1146.
has been often loosely given the meaning, "Let your light shine, so that they may see," just as ὄπτως... ὄπτε has been made to read, "(God loved the world) so that (He gave)," etc. The appearance of ὄπτε with the indicative is found only one other time in the New Testament: ὄπτε καὶ Ἄρων διὰ συναντήσεως, "insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away" (Galatians 2.13). "Here the direct result is distinctly accent."¹

The gift of the Son, from God's side, is complete; the acceptance of God's "unexplainable gift" (2 Corinthians 9.15) rests with morally free and responsible humanity. Therefore, the "so loved" in our common versions, if taken quantitatively, must give way to "loved in such manner that He gave."

A word must be included about ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ζιον, "God sent the Son" (verse 17). Both ἐσπέρκευς and ἀπέστειλεν are "effective" aorists, emphasizing the completion of God's activity in redemption. Jesus thus is presented as God's Ἀπόστολος, "Apostle" (by which title He is designated in Hebrews 3.1), as well as God's gift. John is earnestly using all his effort to make clear the central place of the Son in man's redemption (τὸν ζιον is used absolutely in verse 17). It is the Son who is given; it is the Son who is sent. The use of these verbs, "gave" and "sent," might allow the Son's free volition in the redemption activity to be overlooked. For both verbs have ὁ Θεὸς (God as personally designated when the article is used) as their subject. Yet Jesus' very "food" was that He might "do the will of Him who sent" Him (John 4.35). Here is no unwilling bond-slave sacrificed

¹ Robertson. Grammar, p. 1000.
at the whim of a capricious tyrant. Here rather is the free Son "emptying Himself" into that form of being, and submitting to that form of death by which He wrought redemption. What more need be said of the Son's part in redemption than that it is the "Son of God who loved me and gave Himself up (παραδόθησα) for me" (Galatians 2.20)? He was given by the Father who sent Him into the world to save the world; but at the same time He came willingly and gave Himself for man's sin. Jesus' estimate of the reasonableness of His supreme self-sacrifice is further illustrated in His parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl of Great Price (Matthew 13.44, 45). To establish His Kingdom, the King must give all He has, including His life.

The motive of love could not but issue in giving, for:

"Love ever gives, forgives, outlives, And ever stands with open hands; For while it lives, it gives. For this is love's prerogative: To give, and give, and give."

— John Oxenham

(c) The measure of the redemption and of the Divine love is revealed in that: ὁ θεὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ μονογενῆ ἐσώτερον, "God gave His Son, His Only Son." A further mark of the value of a gift is that of its value to the giver; and that value may well be measured by how much is left to the giver after the gift has been made. "This poor widow ... cast in all the living that she had" (Luke 21.36).

Again must one return to Beersheba to hear the command that
sent Abraham and Isaac on their sad journey: "Take now thy son, thine only (μονογενής) son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt-offering" (Genesis 22:2). Even the similarity between Abraham's sacrifice of his only son and God's sacrifice of His Only Son does not account for all that is revealed here of the measure of the love of God for His Son. Abraham's act of obedience stands as an example of the heights to which man's love for and faith in God can attain. But the analogy must not be carried too far, for the finite love of Abraham is but a feeble reflection of the brilliance of the Divine love, infinite in every respect. Some, doubtless, will always insist upon "only-begotten" as the best vehicle to carry the meaning of μονογενής, seeing, or at least thinking to see in "begotten" some element of added preciousness to the Father. Others will demand "only-begotten" for more purely theological reasons, fearing, lest it is used, that the Son becomes somehow less distinctive, less divine. These matters of preference for one translation or another do not materially affect the sense of μονογενής as used here. For the Son is God's Unique Son, regardless of how He may have become the Unique Son. The Evangelist is chiefly concerned with showing that God's love is not a matter of theological speculation and debate, but an activity. It is God going forth to redeem a lost humanity. The measure of any love, human or divine, is, to use another figure, the measure of that which it voluntarily surrenders for the highest good of the object of the love. If this principle is valid, then the giving of the Only Son by the heavenly Father fills up, and overflows, and
makes insignificant, all the standards of measurement that man has ever yet imagined.

If God's love transcends all measurement, what of the measure of the redemption that His love wrought? Is redemption measured by humanity's sin? "Where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly" (Romans 5.20). No, not even the total of man's sin is able to tax the love of God, or the magnitude of His willingness and power to redeem. The Redeemer comes as "very God of very God," for, "No half-God could redeem the soul which it took the whole God to create" (P. T. Forsyth).1

(d) The scope of redemption is presented in its widest and in its narrowest terms: τὸν κόσμον, . . . πᾶς ὁ πίστεων εἰς αὐτὸν, "the world, . . . every one who believes in Him." If God's love is boundless in quantity and quality, it must follow that His love is unlimited in relation to all races and classes and ages of men. It does not need to be argued that mankind, rather than the material world, is the object of God's love. His love for man does not mean indifference to other forms of life or to creation generally, for it is all His creation, and "God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good" (Genesis 1.31). The universal need of humanity for redemption, to which need Jesus Himself gave expression in speaking with Nicodemus (3.3, 5, 7), is thus proclaimed by Paul: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Romans 3.23). But that universal need is now matched, and over-matched, by a universal love, offering a universal,

unlimited redemption.

In πᾶς ὁ πιστεύως εἰς αὐτόν, there is presented the individual's relation to the Only Son. Πιστεύω, the present participle, expresses the durative, continuous state of belief; believing in Him is a matter of a lifetime, not a mere "confession of Christ," after which life goes on in the same old self-centered manner and attitude.

Eis αὐτόν centralizes one's belief in the Only Son, yet does not allow one to lose sight of the loving, redeeming Father. "Believe," is a characteristic word of John, who never uses the substantive πίστις, "faith." Eis αὐτόν is necessarily connected with πιστεύω here and in 3.18; likewise εἰς τὸ ἄνεμον in the latter verse. In 3.15 ἐν αὐτῷ must go with ἐχεῖ, "may have in Him" eternal life. In all these instances the centrality of the Son is inescapable. It is a man's relation to the Son that determines his eternal destiny. The Father is by no means excluded from consideration. But the Father is not known to man except through the Son, for "no man comes to the Father except through me" (John 14.6).

Similar confirmations of the indispensable role of the Only Son of God in the eternal drama of redemption appear in great profusion throughout the New Testament.

(e) The purpose of redemption is to bring men to his true destiny. That purpose is announced first in its negative aspect: ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύως εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπέληται, "That every one (whosoever) believing in Him should not perish," ou... ὁν κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, "not that He should judge the world." The positive aspect of the pur-

pose is thus announced: ἀλλ' ἔχει ζωήν αἰώνιν, "but that he should have eternal life," ἂλλ' ἐνα οὐκ ὁ κόσμος δι' αυτοῦ, "That the world should be saved through Him."

The unmistakable purpose clause, ἐν ... μὴ ἀπέλθῃται, exposes to view the magnitude of the peril from which man must be rescued. The term ἀπέλθημα, when in the middle voice, applies to the future and eternal doom of godless man. In this use the verb is "peculiar to the New Testament, and is without analogy in the profane Greek." The form used here is the second aorist subjunctive middle, the subjunctive allowing for the possibility of escape, rather than stating an unavoidable prospect. The middle endings come from the dative case forms (ματί). One may therefore venture the suggestion that "personal interest" is always more or less prominent in the use of the middle voice. In the case of ἀπέλθημα there is at least a possibility that the destruction is largely, if not entirely, self-imposed, although it is not insisted that "destroy one's self" is the exact force. The matter of the responsibility for man's eternal doom is, however, so much within his own control that indifference is unthinkable.

The corresponding purpose clause, οὐ ... ἐνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, completes the statement of the negative aspect of the purpose of redemption. It will be seen that man's response to the offered redemption determines the matter of his being judged.

The individual and the entire human race are again set in parallelism in the expressions, ἀλλ' ἔχει ζωήν αἰώνιν, and ἂλλ' ἐνα οὐκ ὁ κόσμος δι' αυτοῦ.

The infinite care of God for the individual soul, and the limitless outreach of His saving love are both revealed. It is as if John is assuring men that no one of them, because he is only one, will be lost, and that the total sum of them cannot exceed the limits of the concern that God has for humanity's eternal welfare.

Since God has taken the initiative in redemption, He must be regarded as feeling responsible for mankind. Without entering into the problem of the reason for and the origin of sin, one may still grant the probability, if not indeed the fact, of the responsibility of God in regard to humanity's sin. But the nature of His responsibility must be kept clearly in mind: it is the responsibility of love. God's love includes His justice and His power. The attribute of justice in God demands satisfaction for the rebellion of sin. God Himself provides the way for His own justice to be satisfied. Jesus Christ, the Only Son, is that way. Again, God's possession of the power to save man obligates Him to save. In keeping with His ethical love He cannot do otherwise. "God is the most obligated Being in the universe." If God's love obligates Him to redeem an undeserving, sinful humanity, both the negative and the positive aspects of redemption are necessary. The negative aspect results in men's being delivered from condemnation and eternal destruction — separation from God. The positive result of redemption puts man in possession of security and of eternal life. The latter feature of God's redemptive activity is the expression of what God intends man's true destiny to be: eternal life in spiritual union with God through Christ. The union with God begins at the time of man's acceptance of

---

the redemption that is offered. It is in this sense qualitative. But eternal life is also quantitative, having the quantity of duration, for it is without end. The purpose of the redemption initiated in the love of God, therefore, is that man may be brought to his God-planned destiny of eternal sonship with the Father.

b. Man's response to the redemption God offers (16b, 18-21)

(a) The positive response (16b, 18a, 21)

The manner of man's positive response is his believing in and his obedience to the Only Son: μᾶς ὁ πίστευων ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁ πιστεύων, ὁ πιστεύων τῷ θεῷ. According to these statements man's response to the redemption offered in the Only Son is summed up in "believing in Him" and in "doing the truth." The fact that belief is a lifelong attitude, and obedience a lifelong practice is inescapably established by means of the use of the present participles in each instance. The total of man's capacity for achieving his own salvation is that he can do no more than to accept and to appropriate the salvation that God brings to him in the Only Son. "What shall I render unto Jehovah for all His benefits toward me? I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of Jehovah" (Psalm 116.12, 13). The result of the response of belief (of which obedience is as integral a factor as assent) is that God's purpose for man is thereby fulfilled, and man reaches his true destiny.

(b) The negative response (16b, 19, 20)

The manifestation of man's rejection is in his unbelief: ὁ μὴ πιστεύων, "he who believes not," and his love of darkness, in which he
may practice evil: "man loved the darkness rather than the light."

Here are the antitheses of the ways in which man positively responds to redemption. Man's unbelief is set alongside his overt acts of evil, his love of the cover of darkness for his nefarious deeds. It is known from other Scripture sources as well as here that unbelief in the Son, even more than "sins of commission" condemns man to ἀπώλεια (see also Revelation 17:8, 11).

The result of man's rejection of the redemption revealed and consummated in the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Only Son of God is a completed state of condemnation: ἐξῆλθεν κέριτα, "has already been (and is now) condemned." That the condemnation is a self-condemnation has already been indicated by the "dative" (personal interest) idea in the middle voice, ἀπόδημα. But it must be remembered constantly that God's desire is that man may be saved from loss and may enter into eternal life. In every way possible even to the infinitely loving and powerful God, redemption is offered to win man to its acceptance. At the same time, lest God violate any element in His own nature, provision must be made for those who will not "come to the light." Therefore, "Truth, like light, necessarily judges everything it touches. Jesus' disclosures of truth to men, and His very efforts to save them, involve their judgment if they spurn His truth and reject His salvation (3.18)." 1

The peril of unbelief is further enforced in the realization that εἰς τὸ ἄνω Τοῦ μονοσελεύνοντα υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "(he has not believed) in the name of the Only Son of God." John is true to his Hebrew ante-

cedents in his deep reverence for the "Name." He reports Jesus' use of the "Name" as applied to the Father in 5.43, 10.25, 12.28, 17.6, 11, 12, 26. He reports its use by the multitudes during Jesus' Messianic entrance into Jerusalem, as quoted from Psalm 118.26 (John 12.13). The Apocalypse shows the application of the "Name" to the Father in 3.12, 11.16, 13.6, 14.1, 15.4, 9, 17.4. John applies the "Name" to Jesus in 1.12, 2.23, 3.18, 20.31; 1 John 3.23, and 5.13 in connection with "believing in the name" of the Son. Jesus' own application of the "Name" to Himself is seen in 14.13, 14, 26, 15.16, 16.23, 24, 26. The Evangelist's additional applications of the "Name" to Jesus appear in: 1 John 2.12, 3 John 7 (?), Revelation 2.3, 13, 3.12, 14.1. "The name of God denotes all that God is for men, and this is said to be known by men so that they are said to know God accordingly; it is the expression for men of what God is. ... We must remember ever that what Christ is, not only lies in His name, but is said to be present to us in the name whenever we use it."¹

The application of μόρφης to the Son of God in relation to the human response to redemption strikingly expresses the meaning of the Son for man's eternal destiny. If μόρφης in 3.16 primarily denotes the infinite love of God for His Only Son, whom He gave for the atonement of men's transgressions of the Divine will, the term in 3.18 emphasizes for man the singleness and finality of his hope of eternal life. "And in none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts 4.12). The magnitude of God's redeeming love has been found mea-

¹. Cremer. op. cit., p. 455, 456.
sureable only in infinite terms. The magnitude of man's rejection of God's greatest gift can be reckoned only in terms of the value of the gift itself. To reject human love is rightly accounted as man's most despicable offense to man. What hope of escape then shall one expect to obtain here or hereafter from the consequences of the rejection of the Divine love? Can any other term except eternal suicide be applied to the act of him who persists in refusing to believe in "the name of the Only Son of God"? Furthermore, it is not so much a case of being violently evil as a case of being pitifully stupid, when one rejects the redemption offered from God. For over against the infinite love of God the unbeliever sets those perishable satisfactions of his life, and chooses them in preference to eternal life. But to the believer there comes ἀμαντίαι ἐναίρετα.

2. The relation of the redemption in Christ to the Christian life

(1) The context in which the final Johannine occurrence of ἐναίρετα is found will not be developed. Its introduction is intended only to relate the verse in which it appears to its surrounding thoughts.

I. The spirit of the Christian life: God and Love (4.7-21)

1. The ground of love (7-10)

(1) This spirit is love, the presence of which is the proof of divine sonship, seeing that God is love (7, 8)

(2) The manifestation of love in the Incarnation (verse 9)

(3) The essence of love in the Incarnation (10)
2. The inspiration of love (11-16a)

3. The activity of love (16b-21)\(^1\)

The question of the relative priority of the Gospel and the First Epistle of John seems not to have been answered. Accordingly, it is impossible to regard the Apostle's use of \(\text{πανορμίας}\) in either work as the later development of his use thereof. In John 3.1-21 the emphasis is rather on the beginning of the Christian life by means of the "birth from above." In the present instance, the Apostle may safely be said to be emphasizing the activity of the person who has "come to life" through the Only Son. To the extent indicated by the differently stressed aspects of the life of the spirit, John appears to be showing an advance in the Epistle beyond his manner of employing \(\text{πανορμίας}\) in the Gospel. However, it is unsafe to see distinctions where they do not really exist.

The very fact that the citations of \(\text{πανορμίας}\) in John 3.16, 18 and in 1 John 4.9 are included in the same chapter of this study is the result of the conviction that great similarity in thought belongs to its use as indicated. The likenesses and the differences between the two occurrences (considering John 3.16, 18 as one) will appear in the course of the investigation of 1 John 4.9.

(2) The manifestation of God's love (1 John 4.9)

a. \(\text{λάθυς τοῦ Θεοῦ}\) "The love of God," is the subject of the verse. \(\Thetaεο\) is here a subjective genitive.\(^2\) The same form and syntax appear in 2.5, "in this one the love of God has been perfected."

---

Thus it is the love that characterizes and describes God, rather than the love that man has for God. God has just been defined as "love" in verse 8; and the definition is repeated in verse 16, "God is love." Therefore, when the Apostle tells that the love of God has been manifested, he is telling that the nature of God has been made known. Here again is announced the manner of God's approach to man; it is the manner of His self-revelation. The attributes of might and of justice and of righteous wrath in God were well known before the coming of Jesus. The love of God is not, indeed, an idea foreign to the Old Testament revelation. But it remained for the Only Son of God to show God clearly to mankind. After Jesus came, the most intimate companion He had could write that "God is love." God is characterized by love, and that is a redeeming love; He is love in redemption. One might speculate abstractly that God would have done better never to have made the world, since it has become filled with sin and sorrow. But such speculation not only is of no intrinsic value; it also occupies time that must be spent in dealing with realities. One reality -- who will say it is not the greatest reality of all? -- is that God is love. In that assurance, though the world is always endangered by sin, the believer in the reality of God's love need not despair. His love cannot be measured; hence it cannot be exhausted. "Love never fails" (1 Corinthians 13:8). God's love is matched by His moral holiness; hence man dare not presume upon it as though that love were non-moral sentimentality. For the very presence of redeeming love condemns him who rejects it. The influence of Jesus was "an influence as condemning as it was saving, and a love
that searched even while it saved.\(^1\)

\(\text{b. } \varepsilon \phi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \theta \eta \varepsilon \nu \mu \nu, \text{ "was manifested in us,\" expresses}\)

the fact and the sphere of the activity of the Divine love.\(\varepsilon \phi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \theta \eta\),

aorist indicative passive, seems best taken as "effective," in its \(\text{Aktionsart,}\)
especially when used in connection with the perfect \(\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \tau \omega \tau \alpha \kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \),

"has sent," which verb declares the completed state of the mission of

the Only Son. The verb \(\varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omega\), "to make manifest," "make known,"

"show," is used synonymously with \(\dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \kappa \alpha \lambda \zeta \omicron \upsilon \tau \iota \mu \nu\), "to uncover," "unveil,"

"reveal." \(\dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \kappa \alpha \lambda \zeta \omicron \upsilon \tau \iota \mu \nu\) refers only to the object revealed, but \(\varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omega\)
directly refers to those to whom the revelation is to be made.\(^2\)

The love

of God in sending His Son is expressed as the manifestation of the Son in

1 John 3.5: \(\acute{\iota} \kappa \epsilon \iota \varsigma \nu \varepsilon \phi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \theta \eta \iota \alpha \varsigma \tau \iota \mu \nu \varsigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \; \acute{\iota} \tau \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \mu \nu \varsigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \; \acute{\iota} \tau \iota \mu \nu \varsigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \; \acute{\iota} \tau \iota \varsigma \mu \nu \varsigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma \), "He was manifested
to take away sin." In 3.2 the Apostle writes that "it is not yet made manifest (\(\varepsilon \phi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \theta \eta\))

what we shall be. We know that, if He shall be manifested (\(\varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omega\),

we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is." In all these instances John uses \(\varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omega\) clearly in the sense

indicated by Cremer; the \(\varphi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omega\) is referred to mankind, and especially
to the believers.

David Smith renders the phrase, \(\acute{\iota} \gamma \varsigma \mu \nu \iota\), as "in our souls; an

inward experience."\(^3\) This rendering avoids the need of deciding between

"in us believers, as the medium in which it was revealed, and in which

it was effective,\(^4\) and "in our case, not 'among us' or 'to us.'\(^5\)

\(^1\) Cawley, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 109.
\(^2\) Cremer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 566.
\(^3\) \textit{Epistles of John, Expositors Greek Testament}, vol. 5, p. 191.
\(^4\) Westcott. \textit{The Epistles of St. John}, p. 149.
The truth that God's love is manifested in redemption "toward us" is not dependent upon the translation of ἐν ἡμῖν in this verse. The significant fact is that the love of God, no matter how He may offer it to man, never becomes a reality until it becomes an inward experience. For the love of God is purely spiritual in nature and transforming in its effect. Therefore, its manifestation in the life of man can be complete only when the spiritual element in man responds to and is transformed by the love of the heavenly Father.

c. ἐν τούτῳ... ὁτι, "in this, ... that," is a phrase pointing forward to the disclosure of what "this" indicates.

The same phrase is also found in John 9.30: ἐν τούτῳ μὴ το θαυμαστῖν ἔστιν, ὁτι, "in this is the marvel, that (ye know not)"; it appears also in 1 John 3.16, 24; 4.10. The thoughts presented here and in the analogies cited forbid taking... to mean "because" in these places.

d. Ἄπεσταλκέν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υιὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενή ἐκ τοῦ Κόσμου, "God has sent His Son, His Only Son into the world." The perfect tense Ἀπεσταλκέν is used in harmony with the aorist ἐβαπτίζω in this verse and the aorist Ἀπέσταλκεν in verse 10. The aorists cited are "effective," stressing the culminating act of God's love. In John 3.16 ἐγένετο was seen to be "constative," as it is in 1 John 4.10. The perfect tense reveals the completion of the act of God's sending the Son. He was sent, and the influence of His mission continues. In the preceding chapter the numerous references to Jesus' being sent were noted, sent from God.

Once is He named God's "Apostle" (Hebrews 3.1). "The expression that Jesus is sent by God denotes the mission which He has to fulfill, and
the authority which backs Him. . . . The importance of the mission is denoted by the fact that it is His Son whom God sends.1 Nor must the fact be overlooked that it is God who sends His Son. It is the Eternal God sending His Only Son for man's salvation. Again, it is to be noted carefully that here and in John 3.17, it is ὁ θεός, not ὁ πατὴρ, who sends the Son. For the divine preeminence of the Son is emphasized along with His unique sonship.

The Evangelist uses εἰς τὸν κόσμον here in virtually the same sense as in John 3.17. And although no issue need be made of it, there is unmistakably here the thought of the Son's pre-temporal life as Son, and of His coming from the realm of the spirit into the realm of the physical by means of the Incarnation. Erich Haupt remarks that God sent Him into "that human world which deserved not love but wrath -- this is the act of love which has brought the nature of love in God to full development, in which it is manifested."2

The phrase τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν μεταφορὴν adds αὐτῷ to the otherwise identical expression in John 3.16. The same construction has been discussed in connection with Genesis 22.2, 12, 16, where the article is repeated as in the two Johannine instances. It will be well at this point to pause for a restatement of what the Apostle has said thus far: "The love of God was manifested in us in this, that God has sent His Son, His Only Son into the world." The love of God is His all-inclusive characterization; His love is of such nature that it was manifested in

the spiritual experience of the believers; its manner of manifestation was that of the sending of His Only Son. The recapitulation has brought the thought directly to the question of the use of μορφής in this context.

The Apostle has opened the exhortation to mutual love, of which verse 9 is a part, by grounding the reason for that mutual love in the fact that God is the source of all love. He proceeds to make it plain that the exercise of love is the evidence of the acquaintance with God on the part of the professed believer. John gives the opposite fact that the man who lives a life devoid of love (ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν) does not know God, for to know God is to know love. Moreover, the implication is inescapable that to know love is to practice love. Now John tells his readers that God has demonstrated His nature and character in the supreme manifestation of Himself through the sending of the Only Son that man might come to life through Him. The Apostle does not in any sense deny or ignore any single deed of God's love, and he does not seek to evade the countless sum of such deeds or manifestations in ages past. Nor does he hint that such deeds of the divine love will ever cease. He does, however, look backward to the beginning, then forward into eternity, and gather up the whole sum of God's acts of love into one supreme act: "In this was the love of God manifested in us, that He has sent His Son, His Only Son." Who, sensing even a small bit of the meaning of God's love thus revealed in the Incarnation, can dare to think and live carelessly thereafter? If God is love, as He is, and if He chose to manifest His love preeminently in the way that John affirms, as He did — then the place of the Only Son in the eternal scheme of revelation and
Redeemers of Man

Redemption has inestimable magnitude and unfathomable significance. No one less than the Only Son of God was able to be God's ambassador of reconciliation to rebellious humanity. No one less than God's Eternal Son was held in unique affection by the most loving Father in the universe. No one less than the Only Son could cost the Father the price He paid in offering up the Son for man's sin. "His Son God has sent -- no servant, nor created angel -- but the Only One, His perfect image, the object of His unmeasured love, His other self."¹ Is it possible to accept as true such statements as the foregoing, which exalt Jesus to so lofty a station and activity in redemption, without feeling that He is "lost" to man, or at least "estranged" from humanity? "Redemption becomes feasible, not merely when we have a revelation of how far up man can go, but when we also have a revelation of how far down God can come."²

1. The aim of the manifestation of God's love is stated in the purpose clause: ἵνα ἐξώμεν ἰη αὐτῷ, "that we may enter into life through Him." The aorist subjunctive with ἵνα is clearly "ingressive," stressing the beginning of the life of the spirit, the Christian life. John is true to the teaching of Jesus in His conversation with Nicodemus (to which the Beloved Disciple may have been a witness). For Jesus had therein shown man's necessity of being "born from above" as the prerequisite to life in the Kingdom of God. Now the aged John uses ἐξώμεν (the only occurrence of the verb ἐξω in the Epistles) in an

absolute sense, "that we may live (receive life) through Him." That is to say, we simply do not live in relation to God, apart from the redeeming activity of God's Only Son. "Eternal life" is the outcome of believing in the Son, according to John 3.16. Belief in the Son is for the purpose of "having life" according to 20.31. "Life" to John is that spiritual consciousness and activity that results only from a personal experience with God in Jesus Christ. Here in 1 John 4.9 the stress is on the beginning of man's eternal relationship with God rather than on the act of God in rescuing man from eternal destruction.

In the concluding phrase, ὑπ' ἀντιστοῖο, "through Him," the Son is specified as the intermediate Agent of Creation (ὑπὲρ with the genitive), as in John 1.3, 10; 1 Corinthians 8.6; Colossians 1.16; Hebrews 1.2. The positive aspect of redemption receives emphasis here: the realization of the true destiny of all men as sons of God eternally.

Who can hope to say the final word about the supreme manifestation of the love of God? Who can express all the meaning of the Only Son to His Father? Who can declare the glorious privilege man has of "coming into life" through the Only Son? Who can summon words and the required power to persuade men to accept the life He alone brings, or to warn them of the consequences of their rejection of Him and of His offer of life?

"God so loved the world that He gave His Only Son," and the Son came to redeem His world at the cost of His death on the Cross. "In this the love of God was manifested."
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