

The Journal of Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1926

Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ.¹

THE effective clause of the Statute governing the lectureship founded by Mr Grinfield, of which I have the honour to be the present holder, runs as follows:

‘The lecture to be on the LXX version of the Hebrew Scriptures, its history, its philological character, its bearing on the criticism of the New Testament, and its value as an evidence of the authenticity of the Old and New Testaments.’ And if further testimony were needed as to Mr Grinfield’s interest in the bearing of the LXX on the New Testament, it will be found in his own book—a book not, I think, as well known as it deserves to be—the *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Hellenistica*, published in two volumes in 1843, and followed by two more volumes of *Scholia Hellenistica in Novum Testamentum* in 1848. The first book consists entirely of LXX parallels or illustrations to each verse of the New Testament. I believe it was Dr Sanday who gave me the four volumes just thirty years ago.

Therefore I am confident that I am proposing to-day what would be very close to the mind of the founder if I ask your attention to an important phrase in the New Testament, and to the LXX authority for the interpretation that I suggest for it, *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός*, as used in the evangelic accounts of the Baptism and Transfiguration.

In Mark i 11 we read, at the Baptism,

Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα

and in Mark ix 7

Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ

¹ A lecture delivered at Oxford, on the foundation of Mr Grinfield, on October 17, 1925.

to which we must add a third use of the phrase, in the parable of 'the Wicked Husbandmen, Mark xii 6

ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν.

In all these cases we are familiar with one, and only one, rendering, 'beloved son'. And it is undeniable that ἀγαπητός is of frequent occurrence in Christian literature, from St Paul's epistles onwards, in this sense. So the *onus probandi* rests on the scholar who has the temerity to champion a quite different rendering, and to translate υἱὸς ἀγαπητός 'only son'.

A different rendering, but not entirely a new one. There is at least one scholar—though I do not know that there are any more, and so far as I know his argument remained without effect—who has anticipated me; but he was one who has a very honourable place in the history of scholarship, Daniel Heinsius of Leyden, whose *Exercitationes ad Novum Testamentum* were published at Leyden in 1639.¹ Heinsius belonged to the great succession of scholars who made Holland and Leyden illustrious from the end of the sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century, Scaliger, Grotius, Meursius, Heinsius, Graevius, Gronovius, the Elzevirs, not to speak of other lesser men who are now only names to us.

In pleading for a reconsideration of the meaning of ἀγαπητός, I must needs begin a long way back, and take my start from the well-known fact that ἀγάπη is to all intents and purposes a word of Christian creation. Ἀγάπησις indeed is occasionally found in classical writers in the sense of 'affection': but ἀγάπη first emerges in Jewish circles in the generations that immediately precede the Christian era. As first employed, it means normally 'sexual love'. It is found about twenty times in the LXX, if we include cases where the reading is doubtful, but of these more than half come from the Song of Songs: in the historical books twice only, and not before II Kingdoms, and in one of these two places B has ἀγάπησις: in the Prophets once only, Jer. ii 2, figuratively 'the love of thine espousals': in Ecclesiastes twice, as contrasted with hatred: in the higher sense, first definitely in the book of Wisdom (iii 9, vi 18), and in the Jewish writer

¹ Second edition, Cambridge, 1640. The Bodleian copy of the original edition contains an autograph inscription from Heinsius: 'Eximio ac summae eruditionis viro Ioanni Selden Ic. singulari observantiae testandae d. m. autor.'

Aristeas. That is to say, it was coming into use among Alexandrine Jews during the first century B.C.: but still only occasionally, and not yet as restricted to a spiritual meaning. It has its roots in the Jewish inheritance of Christianity: but it was the Church that took hold from the first of the word, and at once made it current coin as the expression of God's love to man and man's love to God and man. In the First Epistle of St John it reaches its zenith as the most adequate definition of the moral nature of God, iv 8 *ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν. Ἀγάπη*, it is not too much to say, was the first and greatest achievement of Christianity in the sphere of terminology.

As addressed to Christians, or used of individual Christians, *ἀγαπητοί, ἀγαπητός* follow on, and are soon used concurrently with, the new sense of *ἀγάπη*. But the significant fact for our purpose is that, though *ἀγάπη* had not, *ἀγαπητός* had, a much older history. So also, of course, had *ἀγαπάω*. But the development of *ἀγαπάω* and of its derivative *ἀγαπητός* were not quite uniform with one another. *Ἀγαπάω* comes down through the whole tradition of the Greek language as 'to love', and so develops in the LXX into all senses of love, and especially, though not exclusively, the higher senses; and in this way it was doubtless the direct ancestor of *ἀγάπη*. But in classical Greek it tended to mean particularly to love in the sense of 'to cherish', 'to prize', so that Plato can speak, for instance, of *λιθίδια τὰ ἀγαπώμενα* 'precious stones'. And in Attic Greek generally it was much used in the restricted meaning 'to be content with': and this meaning can be traced back as far as Homer.

Now about the derivative word *ἀγαπητός* the crucial point is that, while *ἀγαπάω* has a double history, as used both in a general and in a restricted or technical sense, *ἀγαπητός* appears to be derived from one meaning only of *ἀγαπάω* and that the restricted one. It is most instructive here to compare the new edition of Liddell and Scott—the first part is happily available for the subject of this lecture—with the previous one, and to note the change in the treatment of the word. As now given, the primary meaning is 'that wherewith one must be content,¹ hence of only children': and the classical writers cited as authorities under this

¹ One would like to suggest as an alternative account of the development 'that which one has special reason to prize' 'precious'.

head are Homer (both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*), Sappho, Aristophanes, Demosthenes, Aristotle (*Politics* and *Eudemian Ethics*), as well as the lexicographer Hesychius. In the later classical age the meaning 'only' was extended from only children to unique things, and for this Aristotle (*Rhetoric*) and the comedians Hipparchus and Menander are adduced.

In proof of this general statement two or three of the citations must be given in full. After Homer, the authors selected will be the later ones, whose usage brings us nearest to the LXX and New Testament.

1. Homer *Iliad* vi 401 (of Andromache and Astyanax, wife and only son of Hector: cited by Heinsius)

παῖδ' ἐπὶ κόλπῳ ἔχουσ' ἀταλάφρονα, νήπιον αὐτῶς,
'Ἐκτορίδην ἀγαπητόν.

Odyssey ii 365 (of Telemachus, only son of Odysseus, where he tells his nurse Eurycleia that he is going to seek for his father)

Τίπτε δέ τοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐνὶ φρεσὶ τοῦτο νόημα
ἔπλετο; πῆ δ' ἐθέλεις ἰέναι πολλὴν ἐπὶ γαῖαν
μόνους ἐὼν ἀγαπητός; ὁ δ' ὤλετο τηλόθι πάτρης
διογενῆς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀλλογνώτῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ.

2. Xenophon *Cyropaedia* iv 62

ἔθαψα . . . ἄρτι γενειάσκοντα τὸν ἄριστον παῖδα τὸν ἀγαπητόν.¹

3. Demosthenes 21. 165 (*Midias*, p. 567)

οὐ μὴν Νικηράτος γ' οὕτως ὁ τοῦ Νικίου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς παῖς . . .

4. Aristotle *Eudemian Ethics* 1233^b 2 (iii 6. 3)

οἷον εἰ εἰς γάμον δαπανῶν τις ἀγαπητοῦ, πλούσιος ὢν, δοκεῖ πρέπειν ἑαυτῷ τοιαύτην κατασκευὴν οἷον ἀγαθοδαιμονιστὰς ἐστιῶντι (i. e. if a rich man orders the wedding feast of an only son as though he were entertaining members of a temperance society).

Rhetoric 1365^b 16 (i 7. 41), of unique things

καὶ τὸ ἀγαπητὸν καὶ τοῖς μὲν μόνον τοῖς δὲ μετ' ἄλλων· διὸ καὶ οὐκ ἴση ζημία, ἂν τις τὸν ἑτερόφθαλμον τυφλώσῃ καὶ τὸν δὴ ἔχοντα ἀγαπητὸν γὰρ ἀφήρηται. Here the meaning appears to

¹ I owe this reference to Dr Armitage Robinson's *Ephesians* p. 229 n. 2.

be 'Take the case of unique things, and where the thing is unique to one man, but other men have more than one of it: e. g. if you blind a man of an eye, the penalty will be different according as the man has one eye left or not: for if you cause the loss of an eye to a one-eyed man, you deprive him of his only remaining eye', his *ἀγαπητόν*.

5. Julius Pollux the lexicographer (saec. ii A. D.) *Onomasticon* iii 2

καλοῖτο ἂν υἱὸς ἀγαπητὸς ὁ μόνος ὦν πατρὶ ἢ μητρὶ· ὥσπερ καὶ ἀγαπητὴ θυγατὴρ καὶ μονογενῆς καθ' Ἡσιόδου.¹ τηλύγετος δὲ παρὰ ποιηταῖς εἶτε ὁ ἀγαπητὸς εἶτε καὶ ὁ ὄψιγονος.

6. Hesychius the lexicographer (saec. v? A. D.) *s.v.*

ἀγαπητόν· μονογενῆ, κεχαρισμένον.

The word is occasionally found of things in the sense of 'desirable': L.S. quote two examples, with *ἡθη* and *βίος* respectively. It is presumably of such cases that Hesychius was thinking when he gave *κεχαρισμένον* as an alternative, in the second place, to *μονογενῆ*.

But the assertion may safely be hazarded that when *ἀγαπητός* is used in connexion with *υἱός*, *θυγατήρ*, *παῖς*, or similar words, no Greek of pre-Christian times would have hesitated in understanding it of an 'only child', or would for a moment have thought of any other meaning as possible.

The usage of the LXX.

What then of the usage of Greek-speaking Jews? We turn to what is central for our purpose, the usage of the LXX.

Now both meanings 'only' and 'beloved' are quite certainly found there, representing different Hebrew words. That is to say, both the old classical sense 'only', and the new sense 'beloved' which became current among Jews and Christians as *ἀγαπάω* and *ἀγάπη* came to be part of their religious terminology, exist there side by side. In the neuter and in the plural we should not really expect to find the sense 'an only child'. It is enough for my purpose to point out that in the Octateuch, in the Prophets, and in the deutero-canonical books there are absolutely clear instances where the singular, with or without *υἱός*, means 'an only child'.

¹ The quotation is not from the now extant works of Hesiod. Like other ancient writers, Pollux doubtless had access to poems of Hesiod that have not come down to us.

1. Gen. xxii 2, 12, 16 *Λάβε τὸν υἱὸν σου τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ὃν ἠγάπησας, τὸν Ἰσαάκ . . . οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ* (this phrase of verse 12 is repeated in verse 16). The Hebrew shews that in all three cases *ὁ υἱός σου ὁ ἀγαπητός* is the rendering into Greek of 'thy only son'.

2. Jud. xi 34 *καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰεφθάε εἰς Μασσηφὰ εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ θυγατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐξεπορεύετο εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ ἐν τυμπάνοις καὶ χοροῖς· καὶ αὕτη μονογενὴς αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή, οὐκ ἐστὶν αὐτῷ πλὴν αὐτῆς υἱὸς ἢ θυγατὴρ.* That is the reading of A, and in all essential points it is supported by our other chief authorities (including Lucian), apart from B. B omits *ἀγαπητή*: but its testimony is suspect, for it gets rid of the word in the same way in Tobit iii 10. B or its ancestor in fact incorporates the work of a scholar who made from time to time slight grammatical or literary changes: but it happens that in the two books of Judges and Tobit the peculiarities of B are such as to amount to a different recension, in Judges as contrasted with cod. Alexandrinus (A), and in Tobit with cod. Sinaiticus (N). And if other ancient testimony is taken into account, it would seem that there is good reason to prefer the witness of A in Judges, and of N in Tobit.

3. Tobit iii 10 *μία σοι ὑπῆρχεν θυγατὴρ ἀγαπητή.* So N: B gets rid of *ἀγαπητή* and has simply *μία μὲν εἰμι τῷ πατρί μου.* Conversely in x 12, where the meaning is 'dear brother', B has *ἀδελφὲ ἀγαπητέ, N ἀδελφὲ ἀγαπώμενε.*

4-6. Lastly, in the Prophets there are three cases where *ἀγαπητός* stands alone, without *υἱός*, in the sense of the mourning for an only son.

Jer. vi 26 *θυγατὴρ λαοῦ μου . . . πένθος ἀγαπητοῦ ποιήσαι σεαυτῇ, κοπετὸν οἰκτρὸν.*

Amos viii 10 *ἀναβιβῶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὄσφυν σάκκων καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν κεφαλὴν φαλάκρωμα, καὶ θήσομαι αὐτὸν ὡς πένθος ἀγαπητοῦ.*

Zech. xii 10 *ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με . . . καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητῷ.*

To this list I suspect that Baruch iv 16 should be added, *καὶ ἀπήγαγον τοὺς ἀγαπητοὺς τῆς χήρας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων τὴν μονογενῆν* (so A: *μόνην BQ*) *ἠρήμωσαν.*

And finally, though the word used is *ἀγαπώμενος*, not *ἀγαπητός*, mention should be made of Prov. iv 3 (cited by Heinsius) *ἀγαπώ-*

μενος ἐν προσώπῳ μητρός, 'an only one in the sight of my mother'.

There was then no such clear tradition as in classical Greek of a dominant and almost exclusive sense 'only son': on half of the occasions or rather more where it occurs the newer meaning 'beloved' is in evidence. Nevertheless, wherever the masculine or feminine singular is found, the normal meaning is still 'an only child': and two of the passages where that is so are well known to Christian usage as applied to Messiah, Gen. xxii and Zech. xii 10. It is worth while therefore, before passing on to the New Testament, to ask whether Christian antiquity retains any trace of the proper sense of ἀγαπητός in these passages.

Naturally so distinctive an idiom is more likely to have survived in Greek than in Latin or Syriac circles. I do not think there is any trace of ἀγαπητός = 'only child' in Syriac renderings: and among Latins Jerome, who, if any Western of his day, might have been supposed to have a thoroughgoing acquaintance with Greek, assumes the LXX translators of Jer. vi 26 (see his Commentary *ad loc.*) to have rendered the wrong Hebrew word: 'ubi nos diximus *luctum unigeniti fac tibi*, pro *unigenito* in Hebraico scribitur I A I D, quod magis *solitarium* quam *unigenitum* sonat; si enim esset *dilectus* siue *amabilis*, ut LXX transtulerunt, I D I D poneretur'.¹ Nevertheless there is one, if only one, exception in our extant Latin authorities, and it prevents us from saying that the tradition of the true sense of ἀγαπητός had entirely died out in the Latin translations. For in Gen. xxii 2 the Bible of St Cyprian (*Testimonia* iii 15: Hartel 127. 20) gave 'accipe filium tuum illum unicum quem dilexisti illum Isac': and though the MSS differ among themselves in smaller points, their testimony to the word *unicum* is unanimous.²

And may not St Paul be quoted on the same side? When he wrote in Rom. viii 32 *ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφέλατο*, he was certainly thinking of Gen. xxii 12, 16, and of the LXX version, for he uses the same verb and the same part of the verb as we find in the LXX. When therefore he gives *ἰδίον* instead of the

¹ Vallarsi IV 889. Cited in Robinson *Ephesians* p. 229 n. 2.

² It is fair to add that in Gen. xxii 12 (*Test.* ii 5 [67. 11] and iii 20 [134. 12]) Cyprian read 'non pepercisti filio tuo dilectissimo propter me'. But all that is contended is that the tradition of the true meaning of ἀγαπητός υἱός had not entirely vanished: and one passage is enough to prove that.

LXX ἀγαπητοῦ, it is natural to think that he did so because he knew the meaning of ἀγαπητός and intentionally substituted an unambiguous word for one which many of his readers might misunderstand.¹

The usage of St Mark.

We are approaching the culmination of our argument. But its process will be placed in clearer light if we consider the three Marcan passages in the reverse order of their occurrence in the Gospel, and make our beginning with the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen.

1. Mark xii 6 ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν, υἰὸν ἀγαπητόν.

Of the derivative accounts, Matthew has only ὑστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἰὸν αὐτοῦ: Luke retains the critical word πέμψω τὸν υἰὸν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, though I should not definitely assert that he understood it in the sense 'only son', for which he uses the alternative μονογενής,² a word not found in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, or in St Paul.

But what of ἀγαπητόν in Mark? The son of the Parable is not only the heir, but he is according to Mark ἕνα, the one available person left: and so to translate υἰὸν ἀγαπητόν as 'only son' is (as I think) natural and obvious in itself; it has also support in both ancient and modern exegesis. Let me cite Dalman *Die Worte Jesu* (1898), p. 230 *ad loc.*: after referring to the Greek and Hebrew texts of Gen. xxii 2, he goes on 'sodass also ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός sich von ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής Joh. iii 16 nicht unterscheidet'. That is to say, μονογενής and ἀγαπητός are in this connexion identical. So Swete *ad loc.* 'the one and only Son is contrasted sharply with the many servants'. And Robinson

¹ No doubt it is possible that St Paul made the substitution ἴδιος for ἀγαπητός, not because he knew what ἀγαπητός meant, but because he knew what the Hebrew original meant. But conversely it may also be that in Eph. i 18 ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ is used to express 'in the Beloved', because he knew that ἐν τῷ ἀγαπητῷ, which would be a more obvious form for his purpose than the perfect passive participle, meant something different. I owe both these suggestions to a member of my Seminar, the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College. One might employ the same reasoning about the phrase παῖς ἠγαπημένος in Clem. Rem. lix 3 and Hippolytus in Dan. iv 60.

² Luke vii 12, the widow's son at Nain: viii 42, the daughter of Jaecirus: ix 38, the boy from whom the disciples could not cast out the evil spirit. In the last two cases Luke has added the detail on his own account: Mark does not say that either the girl or the boy was an only child.

Ephesians p. 230 'If [this example] stood alone, it would be natural to interpret it in accordance with the Greek idiom . . . and a close parallel might be found in *Tobit* iii 10 (N text)'.¹

Of ancient testimony I think that *Hermas Sim. v 2. 6 προσκαλεσάμενος οὖν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ὃν εἶχε κληρονόμον* is an undoubted echo of the Gospels, probably of St Mark, who alone has εἶχεν: and I think that, here as well as in St Mark, the meaning is 'his only son and heir'; but the case is not susceptible of proof, and it is fair to say that the Latin version has 'filio quem carum et heredem habebat'. But another piece of evidence is incontestable: codex *e* of the Old Latin Gospels renders the parallel verse in Luke (xx 13) 'mittam filium meum unicum, fortasse hunc cum uiderint reuerbuntur'. Unfortunately *e* is not extant for Mark xii 6, where its sister MS *k* gives (immediately after 'alios multos') only 'nouissimum misit filium dicens' &c., omitting with Matthew the whole phrase οὗς μὲν δέροντες οὗς δὲ ἀποκτένοντες· ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν, except the single word υἱόν.¹

The net result then is that, just as with Gen. xxii in the Old Testament, so here in Mark xii 6 and parallels one solitary Latin witness preserves the tradition of the older meaning of ἀγαπητός. In both cases the witness in question belongs to the very earliest accessible stratum of the Latin Bible.

2. Mark ix 7 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

There is not much to be said about the Voice at the Transfiguration apart from the Voice at the Baptism: it conveys to the disciples the same assurance that had at the outset of the Ministry been conveyed to our Lord Himself. Nevertheless it is worth while just to look at the immediate context: for that emphasizes the appropriateness of the sense that I should give to ἀγαπητός. St Peter proposes to make three tabernacles, one for Christ, one for Moses, and one for Elias. That is to say, although he puts Christ first, he still puts Him in the same category with Moses and Elias: in strong contrast with the plural 'three', the Voice marks the uniqueness of the Son. Law and Prophets have done their work and have had their day: the Son

¹ *k* is so erratically transcribed that in a case like this we cannot get back behind the actual text. The O.L. MSS *a* and *c* have respectively *unicum dilectum* and *unicum dilectissimum*: but in both *unicum* presumably represents ἕνα.

has come, and He alone is to be heard. St Cyprian has caught the intention truly when he writes 'quod Christus debeat solus audiri, pater etiam de caelis contestatur dicens . . .' (*ep.* lxxiii 14 [712. 19]). If it is the Only Son who is set over against the representatives of Law and Prophecy, the sentence comes with specially appropriate weight of emphasis.

3. Mc. i 11 *Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.*

Here is the ultimate point of our enquiry: and it will be found convenient I think to classify the different strands of the argument under four heads: (a) Is it probable that Mark would have used such a word as *ἀγαπητός* in any but the sense ordinarily current among Christians? (b) What light does the use of the word in the Greek Old Testament, when taken into connexion with the general appeal of the early Church to prophecy and type, throw on the use of the word here? (c) What light, if any, does consideration of the structure and purpose of the Gospel throw on the meaning of the word? (d) What is the evidence of Greek Christian exegesis as to the meaning of the word as used in the accounts of the Baptism and the Transfiguration?

(a) It may be urged that Mark, whose Greek admittedly falls so far below the standard of classical accuracy, would hardly have been acquainted with so unusual and idiomatic a phrase. No doubt it was found in the LXX: but Mark's knowledge of the LXX does not seem to have been at all profound—almost all his quotations from it belong to the record of our Lord's words, and he hardly ever cites it on his own account.

That is all true. But in the first place the shaping of the phrase may well go back behind Mark. It is just the sort of formula which would have acquired definiteness at an early stage of the Hellenization of the Church. And though that answer is enough, it may be added in the second place that a clear distinction has to be drawn between Mark's Greek grammar and Mark's Greek vocabulary. His grammar, if (as I conjecture with other scholars) he was son of the *οἰκοδεσπότης* of Mark xiv 14, may reflect the rough but effective Greek of the inn and the stableyard: but his vocabulary cannot be entirely accounted for on such a supposition. It is, compared with his grammar, rather surprisingly correct. There is, I think, only one *vox nihili* in his Gospel, *ἐκεφαλῶσαν* in xii 4, and it is rather obvious to suspect

textual corruption there. Not rarely he has the 'mot juste': and I have sometimes fancied that he must have had a good *Vocabularium* at his disposal. So I should not feel any difficulty in his employment of a correct Greek idiom—even if the idiom in this connexion did not go back, as I surmise it did, behind Mark himself.

(b) But I believe that the phrase is derived direct from the Old Testament. The reading in Luke iii 22 (whether we ascribe it to the evangelist or to scribes) 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee', is obviously adopted from Ps. ii 7. I should hesitate to ascribe the Marcan phrase to the Psalm as its source, if only because while *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός* is common to Mark i 11 and ix 7, the *Σὺ εἶ* of the Baptism becomes *Οὗτός ἐστιν* at the Transfiguration. But in Gen. xxii we have, thrice repeated, the exact counterpart of the Marcan phrase so far as it is common to both occasions. No story in the Old Testament is more susceptible of a Christian application: we might have been sure that it would have formed part of any Christian collection of *Testimonia*, even if we had not the evidence of Rom. viii 32 to shew that the Messianic application of it goes back to St Paul himself. Knowledge of the fact that *ἀγαπητός* here did not mean 'beloved' must have been shared by any Jewish Christians who were acquainted with the Hebrew original, and must have formed part of the common equipment of all who tried to meet their fellow Jews on the debating ground of prophecy. 'Only Son' added one more point to the analogy between Isaac and Christ; and if *ἀγαπητός* is retained in the phrase, why should we hesitate to believe that the evangelist, or his authority, used it in that sense? Remember that the other meaning was not so universally assumed in those days as it is to-day, when even many classical scholars have hitherto been unfamiliar with the idiom.¹ Now, *ἀγαπητός* = 'beloved' has been in long and exclusive possession.

¹ I must be venturesome enough to rank even Dr Hort, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, among the number. He could not otherwise have written (*Two Dissertations* p. 49) 'where an only son or daughter is meant . . . Singularly enough the LXX has *ἀγαπητός* . . . But at least some form of the LXX must once have had *μνογενής* for Isaac . . . for we have clear Old Latin authority accidentally preserved for *unicus* in Gen. xxii 2, 12 . . . though most Old Latin quotations follow *ἀγαπητός*.' If Hort and Jerome fail to know, the rest of us may take comfort when our knowledge is found wanting.

It was not so in Mark's day, and we are free to be guided by the probabilities of the case.

(c) What then, we go on to enquire, is the relation of the words ascribed to the Voice from heaven at the Baptism and Transfiguration to the general purpose and structure of St Mark's Gospel?

We must beware of course of attributing to the apostles and evangelists of the first Christian generation too much of a cut-and-dried plan in their sermons and writings. But if I divine at all correctly the sort of need on the part of Christian converts which St Peter's recollections, as embodied in St Mark's Gospel, were intended to meet, I should put it in some such way as this: 'We have been instructed in the teaching of Jesus Christ: we learnt as catechumens what is the ideal of the Christian life to which we then pledged ourselves at our baptism to conform: but we know that Christianity means not only acceptance of a code of ethics but, even more, loyalty to the person of a Master. We want to know, from you who lived with Him, what He was like in His life on earth, and how it was that you who knew Him first as a man better than other men, came to understand that He was not only more than other men but more than man, not only God's anointed one but the very Son of God Himself.' And the autobiography of a disciple, as we have it recorded in St Mark's Gospel, is, I believe, the answer to that question.

If that way of putting things is anywhere near the truth, then the witness to our Lord's person, set down step by step and stage by stage in the process of the narrative, is fundamental to the meaning of the Gospel, and its opening words, 'The good news about Jesus as Messiah and Son of God', are correctly descriptive of its purpose. The confession, 'Thou art the Christ', in the middle of the Gospel is only the first and preliminary stage. Beyond and behind that lies another and greater venture of faith: Jesus Messiah, the Son of Man, is also the Son of God. In that the Gospel story finds its culmination: when the disciples have been led to the realization of that Sonship, the Christian religion has come into being.

Now of that development, as our earliest Gospel portrays it, the witness of the disciples is the end, the witness of the Father is the beginning. First to our Lord alone, as He is brought on

to the stage of the history at His Baptism, then to the chosen disciples at the Transfiguration, immediately after St Peter's confession of the Messiahship, God bears witness to His Son in the words *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός*. It needs no saying that, if we can properly translate this phrase 'My Only Son', it gains immensely in its relation to the Gospel as a whole. The point of the witness, it can hardly be doubted, is to a unique Sonship. And when Greek idiom, and LXX precedent, and the theology of the Gospel, all point in the same direction, is it overbold to press their convergent testimony, and to translate 'Thou art My Only Son, in Thee I am well pleased', 'This is My Only Son: hear Him'?

(d) There is one, and as I think only one, argument which might, if made good, invalidate this conclusion. If the tradition of the Church, and especially of the Greek-speaking Church, nowhere confirms that interpretation of *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός* for which I have pleaded, have we the right (it may be asked) to read back into St Mark an exegesis which was not that of those who knew and used the Gospel in its original language? Now occasion has already been taken to note that at two points the earliest Latin translators of the Bible recognize the equation *ἀγαπητός* = 'unicus': and the examination of the testimony of Greek Christian writings of the first four centuries will shew that these writings do in fact contribute a strong body of support to the interpretation.¹

ἀγαπητός and *μονογενής* are already combined in the LXX version of Jud. xi 34 according to the text of codex A: Jephthah's daughter was *μονογενῆς αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή*, where the Hebrew has simply 'his only child'. We find the same combination in Irenaeus, Eusebius, Athanasius, and in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, apparently in Gregory of Nyssa, and perhaps in Serapion. The most decisive witness is that of Athanasius, and he will therefore be cited first.

¹ Most of the patristic passages have already been collected in an article on the word *ἀγαπητός* which appeared in *J. T. S.* xx 339-344 (1919) as a preliminary draft for the *Lexicon of Patristic Greek*. I should like to acknowledge here the help given me on the classical side on that occasion by my colleague Prof. J. A. Smith and by the late Charles Cannan, whose eminence as an Aristotelian scholar was obscured for the world at large by his devoted and successful administration of the Clarendon Press.

a. Athanasius *Oratio IV contra Arianos* (probably composed about A. D. 355: directed against Marcellus, see Zahn's *Marcellus von Ancyra* and Robertson's *Athanasius* in Wace and Schaff's *Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, pp. 304, 431).

c. 24 καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ περὶ υἱοῦ πολλὰ λέγεται· οἶον ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ψαλμῷ [Ps. ii 7] . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐννάτῳ ἢ ἐπιγραφῇ . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοστῷ τετάρτῳ [Ps. xliν (xlv) τίτ]. . . ὡδὴ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑσαία ἄσω δὴ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἄσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου . . . τὸ δὲ ἀγαπητός τις ἂν εἴη ἢ υἱὸς μονογενής; . . . ταῦτόν γάρ ἐστι τό τε μονογενὲς καὶ τὸ ἀγαπητόν, ὡς τὸ Οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ γίος μου ὁ ἀγαπητός. οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην σημᾶναι θέλων εἶπε τὸ ἀγαπητός, ἵνα μὴ τοὺς ἄλλους μισεῖν δόξῃ· ἀλλὰ τὸ μονογενὲς ἐδήλου, ἵνα τὸ μόνον ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶναι αὐτὸν δείξῃ. καὶ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ γοῦν σημᾶναι θέλων ὁ λόγος τὸ μονογενὲς, φησὶ Προσένεγκε τὸν γίόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· παντὶ δὲ δῆλον ἐκ τῆς Σάρρας μόνον εἶναι τὸν Ἰσαάκ.

c. 29 *ad fin.* τὸ δὲ ἀγαπητόν καὶ Ἕλληνας¹ Ἰσακίον οἱ δεινοὶ περὶ τὰς λέξεις ὅτι ἴσον ἐστὶ τῷ εἰπεῖν μονογενὲς. φησὶ γὰρ Ὀμηρος ἐπὶ Τηλεμάχου τοῦ υἱοῦ Ὀδυσσεώς, μονογενοῦς ὄντος, ταῦτα ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας

Τίπτε δέ τοι [quoted above, p. 116: *Odyss.* ii 365] . . .

μοῦνος ἐὼν ἀγαπητός;

. . . ὁ ἄρα μόνος ὢν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγαπητός λέγεται.

The witness of St Athanasius is thus abundantly clear: and it must not be forgotten that the Orations against the Arians were presumably very familiar to the orthodox writers of the next generation. There is at least a possibility that the two writers now to be cited may have learnt from Athanasius the equation ἀγαπητός = μονογενής.

b. Serapion of Thmuis is not a certain witness. But he once uses the phrase διὰ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου υἱοῦ (*J. T. S.* i 105, 10), while his regular phrase is τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς: and he may owe his exceptional use of ἀγαπητός to Athanasius.

c. Gregory of Nyssa *de deitate Filii et Spiritus sancti* (ii 905) Δάβε μοί (φησὶ) τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν τὸν μονογενῆ [*Gen.*

¹ I suppose that Ἕλληνες here means 'pagans'. If so, the implication would seem to be that, though the idiom was passing or had passed out of current use, it was known even to non-Christians if skilled in the classical tradition—but still better (he must mean) to Christians.

xxii 2]. ὄρα τὰ κέντρα τοῦ λόγου, πῶς κεντεῖ τοῦ πατρὸς τὰ σπλάγγχνα . . . υἱὸν ἀγαπητὸν καὶ μονογενῆ καλῶν. Here I think it is clear that Gregory was familiar with the combination ἀγαπητὸς μονογενῆς, though I am not sure that he recognized that the words were equivalent and interchangeable. We cannot rate the probability of direct debt to Athanasius so highly as in Serapion's case. But the possibility that Gregory had learnt either from tradition or from Athanasius (or both) that ἀγαπητὸς meant μονογενῆς is not to be excluded.

We pass back from Athanasius and the orthodox school of the fourth century to a writer who is rather earlier than Athanasius and represents a different channel of theological tradition, Eusebius of Caesarea: and we find in him too a regular use of the combination ἀγαπητὸς μονογενῆς, quite commonly in reference to the relation of the Son and the Father, but also in reference to human relationships. Eusebius nowhere indeed says, as Athanasius does, that the two words are in fact synonymous: but it would be very difficult, I think, after consideration of the half-dozen passages now to be cited, not to admit that he uses them as synonyms.

d. Eus. *laud. Const.* xiii 6, 7 (Heikel 238. 12, 17) the heathen εἰς τοσοῦτον ἤλαυνον ἀνοίας ὡς . . . ἤδη καὶ τὰ μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὰ τῶν τέκνων μανίᾳ καὶ διανοίας ἐκστάσει κατασφάττειν . . . Κρόνω μὲν γὰρ Φοίνικες καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἔθουον τὰ ἀγαπητὰ καὶ μονογενῆ τῶν τέκνων.¹

eccl. theol. i 10 (Klostermann 68. 15) ὁ δὲ ἀληθῶς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἄτε δὴ ἐκ πατρὸς ἀποτεχθεὶς, εἰκότως καὶ μονογενῆς καὶ ἀγαπητὸς χρηματίσειεν ἂν τοῦ πατρὸς· οὕτω δὲ καὶ θεὸς ἂν εἴη.

ib. i 20 (86. 8) οὐκ ὡς λόγος ἀνούσιος καὶ ἀνυπόστατος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ὦν μονογενῆς καὶ ἀγαπητὸς τοῦ πατρὸς.

ib. ii 7 (104. 23) υἱὸς μονογενῆς καὶ ἀγαπητὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰκῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς πατρικῆς δόξης.

ib. ii 14 (118. 6) St John wrote λόγον μὲν ὄντα καθ' ὃ . . . , θεὸν δὲ καὶ μονογενῆ καθ' ὃ μόνος ἀληθῶς ἦν υἱὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ, υἱὸς γνήσιος ὄντως καὶ ἀγαπητὸς, τῷ αὐτοῦ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα ἀφωμοιωμένος.

¹ Note that on each occasion he uses only a single article: though two adjectives are used, they convey one idea.

ib. ii 20 (129. 27) πατέρα εἶναι . . . τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγαπητοῦ υἱοῦ.

In all these last five passages it is the nature of the Son in His relation to the Father that is emphasized: not the love of the Father, but the uniqueness of the Sonship. *Ἀγαπητός* is equated four times with *μονογενής*, once with *γνήσιος*.

e. The *Apostolic Constitutions* are profoundly influenced in their theological language by the writings of Eusebius¹: and though the equation *ἀγαπητός* = *μονογενής* is not so sharply expressed as in Eusebius, it appears to be in the mind of the compiler. His interest is as predominantly theological as that of Eusebius: but he keeps more strictly to Scriptural language.

iii 17. 4 (Funk 213. 2) Χριστὸς ὁ μονογενὴς θεός, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς υἱός, ὁ τῆς δόξης κύριος.

viii 12. 31 (506. 23) ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς υἱός, ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. With which compare also

ii 24. 3 (91. 23) τὸν τῆ φύσει ἀπαθῆ, τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἀγαπητόν, τὸν θεὸν λόγον. While in

v 20. 2 (295. 6) τότε ὄψονται τὸν ἀγαπητὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν κόψονται . . . the reference is obvious to Zech. xii 10, with its *κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητῷ*.

In the fourth century, then, there was, alike in Egypt and in Syria, habitual combination of the terms *ἀγαπητός* and *μονογενής*. For Athanasius there is certainty, for Eusebius there is an overwhelmingly strong presumption, that the terms are combined because their meaning is in effect identical. But the combination can be traced more than a century further back. The gap between the New Testament and Eusebius is filled by Irenaeus.²

¹ This would be exactly what we should expect if Zahn's conjectural attribution of Ps.-Ignatius to the authorship of Acacius of Caesarea (*Ignatius von Antiochien* p. 141) were accepted: for, unlike Zahn, I am confident that Ussher was right in attributing both forgeries, Ps.-Ignatius and the Apostolic Constitutions, to a single hand. So far as date and place goes, an Acacian origin seems to me to have almost everything in its favour. I do not think that the equation Christmas = Dec. 25 is fatal to this view. Chrysostom no doubt tells us that the observance of the Nativity on that day was only introduced at Antioch ten years before a sermon which Montfaucon dated to A. D. 386: but I see no reason why it should not have come into use fifteen or twenty years earlier at Caesarea than at Antioch.

² When Hippolytus wrote (*Ref. Omn. Haer.* vi 16. 2: Wendland, 142. 3) πιστὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀγαπώμενος . . . ἐδρίσκειται, would not the natural word have been *ἀγαπητός*, unless it was known to mean something else than 'beloved'?

f. Iren. *Haer.* IV v 3 [x 1]—the Greek was discovered by Combefis in a *catena* on Genesis—Abraham προθύμως τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν παραχωρήσας θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς εὐδοκῆσῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ παντὸς τὸν ἴδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν υἱὸν θυσίαν παρασχεῖν εἰς λύτρωσιν ἡμετέραν. The use of the verb εὐδοκῆσῃ clinches the proof that Irenaeus is here bringing the υἱὸς ἀγαπητός of Gen. xxii into relation with the similar phrase of Mark i 11 and parallels. In both cases he expands ἀγαπητός by combining it with μονογενής: the ambiguity of the former word he clears up by reinforcing it with its unambiguous synonym.¹

The evidence, then, of the two Latin translators who in individual cases rendered ἀγαπητός by 'unicus' is borne out by a small but highly significant *catena* of Greek Fathers. Their testimony must be considered as a whole: one or another may be indecisive if taken alone, but the clear witness of Athanasius and the scarcely less clear witness of Eusebius gives cohesion to the whole body of evidence.

From Homer to Athanasius the history of the Greek language bears out, I venture to think, the argument of this paper that ἀγαπητός υἱός is rightly rendered 'Only Son'.

C. H. TURNER.

¹ Since unfavourable criticism is sometimes made of Harvey's work as an editor of Irenaeus, let it be recorded to his credit that he recognizes the LXX use of ἀγαπητός = μονογενής.