

---

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY  
OF THE  
NEW TESTAMENT

*EDITED BY*

GERHARD KITTEL

*Translator and Editor*

GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY, D. LITT., D. D.

Volume IV

A—N

WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

COPYRIGHT © 1967 BY WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO.

All rights reserved

*Translated from*

THEOLOGISCHES WÖRTERBUCH ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT

Vierter Band: A—N, herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel

*Published by*

W. KOHLHAMMER VERLAG

Stuttgart, Germany

ISBN 0-8028-2246-0

*Reprinted, February 1977*

sense. On the other hand, μολύνω cannot mean only sexual transgression, for the subject παρθένου would rule out those that are married in the community. In both places the οὐ μολύνειν is surely a symbolical expression for the faithfulness which has been maintained by the community, the bride (2 C. 11:2: παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστῆσαι τῷ Χριστῷ), to its Bridegroom, Christ<sup>3</sup> (→ I, 486).

† μολυσμός.

"Defilement" (→ μολύνειν), physical, Plut. Maxime cum principibus Viris Philospho esse disserendum, 4 (II, 779c) εἶδρε Διονύσιον ὡσπερ βιβλίον παλιψηστον ἦδη μολυσμῶν ἀνάπλεων. Suid. (→ 736): τοῦς μολυσμοῦς τῆς φύσεως, cultic, Jos. Ap., I, 289; religious and moral, Ep. Ar., 106 (μιασθέντες ... τῷ τῆς ἀσεβείας μολυσμῷ); Test. S. 2:13 (with φθόνου). In the LXX only Jer. 23:15 (πῆρῃ, unfaithfulness to God); 1 Eσθρ. 8:80 (τῶν ἀλλογενῶν); 2 Macc. 5:27, of defilement with what is pagan.

It occurs in the NT only at 2 C. 7:1: καθαρῖσωμεν ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγισωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ. As one would expect in the NT, the reference is to the moral defilement entailed by sharing a pagan way of life. The term is chosen in order to correspond to the earlier demand (6:14 ff.) for separation from everything pagan.

*Hauck*

μομφή → 572, 573.

μονή → 579 ff.

† μονογενής

A. The Usage outside the New Testament.

The word does not occur in Homer but is attested from the time of Hesiod.<sup>1</sup> In compounds like διο-γενής, γη-γενής, εὐ-γενής, συγ-γενής the -γενής suggests

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C. Rückert, *Theol. Quart.*, 68 (1886), 391 ff.; 69 (1887), 105 ff.: "Die Begriffe παρθένος u. ἀπαρχή in Apk. 14:4, 5"; Zñ. Apk., 515 f.; Had. Apk., 150. Bss. Apk., 381, on the other hand, favours Christian ascetics (cf. Mt. 19:12; Aug. Sct. Virg., 27), cf. also Loh. Apk., 120: οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν need refer only to avoidance of licentiousness, but παρθένου means full sexual abstinence, cf. 1 C. 7:1, 8.

μολυσμός, Trench, 104.

μονογενής, Pr.-Bauer<sup>3</sup>, Liddell-Scott, Cr.-Kö., s.v. Bau. J.; Zñ. J.; Bultmann J.; H. J. Holtzmann, *Theol. d. NT*, II (1897), 436-441.

<sup>1</sup> The absence from Hom. may be due to the fact that it does not fit the hexameter. Parm. and Hes. use the form μουνογενής in the hexameter, and in Hom. we find μούνος for μόνος. There is a fem. μο(υ)νογένεια in poetry, Apoll. Rhod., 3, 847; Orph. (Abel), 29, 2; also Procl. in Tim., 31 (ed. E. Diehl, I [1903], p. 457). Oppian Halieutica (ed. F. S. Lehrs. Poetae Bucolici et Didactici [1862], 3, 489 codd.; IG 9 (2), 305 (Tricca, 2nd cent. B.C.); Suppl. Epigr., 4, 634 (Sardes, 1st cent. B.C.) also have μο(υ)νόγονος in the sense of μονογενής. On the accent cf. Debr. Griech. Wortb. § 155.

derivation (γένος) rather than birth. Nouns as the first part of the compound give the source, e.g., from Zeus, the earth. Adverbs describe the nature of the derivation, e.g., noble or common. μονο-γενής is to be explained along the lines of εὐγενής rather than διο-γενής. The μονο- does not denote the source<sup>2</sup> but the nature of derivation. Hence μονογενής means "of sole descent," i.e., without brothers or sisters. This gives us the sense of only-begotten.<sup>3</sup> The ref. is to the only child of one's parents, primarily in relation to them. μονογενής is stronger than μόνος, for it denotes that they have never had more than this child.<sup>4</sup> But the word can also be used more generally without ref. to derivation in the sense of "unique," "unparalleled," "incomparable," though one should not confuse the refs. to class or species<sup>5</sup> and to manner.<sup>6</sup>

The LXX uses μονογενής for ἡγῆ, e.g., Ju. 11:34, where it means the only child; cf. also Tob. 3:15; 6:11 (BA), 15 (S); 8:17; Bar. 4:16 vl. This rendering is also found in ψ 21:20; 34:17, where ἡγῆῆ is par. to ψῆῆ and the ref. is to the uniqueness of the

<sup>2</sup> "Deriving from one alone" would be meaningless.

<sup>3</sup> "Only-begotten" comes from the Lat. *unigenitus*, which is a rendering of μονογενής, cf. *uni-cornis* for μονοκέρας. Compounds with *sol-* (*soliloquium* for μονολογία) are rare in Lat.; those with *uni* (*uni-vira*) are more common. In Gk. those with μονο- are very numerous and those with ἐνι- and ἐνο- are rare. With *unigenitus* we also find *unigena* (cf. *indigena*, *terrigena* = γηγενής). For Paulinus of Nola Christ is *unigena* (Carm., 5, 46), and for Cicero the world is *singularis hic mundus atque unigena* (Tim., 4 § 12) (in both cases for μονογενής).

<sup>4</sup> Aesch. Ag., 898: μονογονές τέκνον πατρί, Plat. Critias, 113d; Hes. Op., 376; Theog., 426; Hdt., VII, 221; Antoninus Liberalis (ed. E. Martini, Mythographi Graeci, II [1896]), 32, 1. It is often a predicate of the gods in this sense, cf. the catena in Bau. J. on 1:14 and Bultmann J., 47, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Parm. in his description of being says: "because unbegotten, incorruptible, whole (not in parts), unique (μονογενές), and without end." One cannot use "only-begotten" here, because it is unbegotten, and Parm. is certainly not thinking in terms of a γένος to which being belongs. Plat. Tim., 31b: διὰ ταῦτα οὔτε δύο οὔτε ἀπείρους ἐποίησεν ὁ ποιῶν κόσμους, ἀλλ' εἰς ὅδε μονογενής οὐρανός γεγονώς ἔστιν καὶ ἔτ' ἔσται, uses μονογενής with εἰς ὅδε to strengthen the εἰς, so that the sense is "one and only." The meaning is not that this heaven is unique in kind. Procl. (→ n. 1) takes μονογενής in the sense of unique. For further instances of the use in cosmological speculations cf. Bultmann J., 48. In the magic pap. μονογενής often occurs in invocation of the deity, Preisigke Sammelbuch, 4324, 15: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ θεός, ὁ μονογενής, R. Wünsch, *Antike Fluchtafeln*<sup>2</sup> (1912), 4, 34: ὀρκίζω σε τὸν θεὸν . . . τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀναφανέντα, Preis. Zaub., IV, 1585: εἰσακούσόν μου, ὁ εἰς μονογενής, here in the sense of incomparable or only-begotten, not alone in its kind. In 1 Cl., 25, 2 the fabulous bird, the Phoenix, is μονογονές ὄπάρχον, "unique." In Wis. 7:22 the πνεῦμα in wisdom is νοερόν ἄγιον μονογονές, "intelligible," "holy," "incomparable." μονογενοῦς ἀφ' αἵματος in Eur. Hell., 1685 (doubtful reading, the other is ὁμογενοῦς) means "of one blood." The adv. μονογενώδως (in a way found only once) occurs in Periplus Maris Rubri (ed. H. Frisk [1927]) (1st cent. B.C.), 56, cf. 11: πέπερι μονογενώδως ἐν ἐνὶ τόπῳ (singly in one place) . . . γεννώμενον πολῶ.

<sup>6</sup> In the -γενής in μονο-γενής and related words the stem is γενεσ- (cf. γένος), Debr. Griech. Wortb. § 140. In accordance with the strict meaning of γένος, -γενής always denotes derivation, cf. the Lat. *unigenitus* from *gigno*, *genitum*, which takes μονογενής in this way. μονογενής is an exception in its use by grammarians for one gender, Apollon. Dyscol. De Adverbis (in Grammatici Graeci, I, 1 [1878, ed. R. Schneider]), p. 145, 18 (cf. διγενής, Eustath. Thessal. Comm. in Il., 150, 27 and τριγενής). [This is a later ref. back to the most common type of compounds with adj. and noun, μονο-γενής "of one gender" (γένος = grammatical gender) like λευκώλενος etc. Debrunner.] The later philosophical use of γένος for kind, cf. Plat. Parm., 129c, does not arise in respect of γενής in μονογενής etc. There is no attestation for this sense later, though it has been fostered by the rendering "unique" when the refs. to class and manner are confused, and widespread misunderstanding has been caused (cf. the German *einzigartig*). It is true, of course, that μονογενής does not always carry a ref. to descent or birth, → n. 5.



soul. The transl. is possible on the basis of the general use of μονογενής for "unique," "unparalleled," "incomparable."<sup>7</sup>

The LXX also renders ἡγ by ἀγαπητός, Gn. 22:2, 12, 16; Jer. 6:26; Am. 8:10; Zech. 12:10. Hence the question arises how far μονογενής has the sense of "beloved"? Undoubtedly an only child is particularly dear to his parents.<sup>8</sup> One might also say that the ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός of Mk. 1:11; Mt. 3:17; Lk. 3:22 and Mk. 9:7; Mt. 17:5 is materially close to the ὁ μονογενής υἱός of Jn., esp. as the Messianic Son of God is unique and without par. as such. But there is a distinction between ἀγαπητός and μονογενής. It is a mistake to subsume the meaning of the latter under that of the former. μονογενής is not just a predicate of value. If the LXX has different terms for ἡγ, this is perhaps because different translators were at work. Philo calls the λόγος, not μονογενής, but πρωτόγονος, Conf. Ling., 146 etc. μονογενής is not a significant word for him.<sup>9</sup> Joseph has μονογενής in the usual sense of "only born."<sup>10</sup> There is a striking use of μονογενής in Ps. Sol. 18:4: "Thy chastisement comes upon us (in love) as the first born and only begotten son." With this may be compared 4 Esr. 6:58: "But we, thy people, whom thou hast called the first born, the only begotten, the dearest friend, are given up into their hands." After πρωτότοκος (Ex. 4:22) μονογενής denotes an intensifying. It is most unlikely that the sense here is simply that of ἀγαπητός.

## B. The Use in the New Testament.

1. In the NT μονογενής occurs only in Lk., Jn. and Hb., not Mk., Mt. or Pl. It is thus found only in later writings. It means "only-begotten." Thus in Hb. Isaac is the μονογενής of Abraham (11:17), in Lk. the dead man raised up again at Nain is the only son of his mother (7:12), the daughter of Jairus is the only child (8:42), and the demoniac boy is the only son of his father (8:42).<sup>11</sup>

2. Only Jn. uses μονογενής to describe the relation of Jesus to God. Mk. and Mt. have ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός; Pl. uses τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱόν at R. 8:3; τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ at R. 8:32, and πρωτότοκος at R. 8:29; Col. 1:15, 18, but not μονογενής. The further step taken by Jn. to describe Jesus corresponds to the fact that believers who as children of God are called υἱοὶ θεοῦ — the same word as is applied to Jesus — in Mt., Pl. etc., are always called τέκνα θεοῦ in Jn., 1:12; 11:52; 1 Jn.

<sup>7</sup> At ψ 24:16 יִשׁ יִשׁרִי יִשׁרִי is rendered ὅτι μονογενής καὶ πτωχός εἰμι ἐγώ. This is an unfortunate transl. based on the mistaken belief that here, too, ἡγ should be rendered μονογενής. It is incorrect, however, to understand μονογενής in the sense of lonely, like a man without brothers or sisters, with emphasis on the misfortune of being an only child. In ψ 67:6 ἡγ is transl. μονότροπος (living by oneself, alone, cf. Eur. Andr., 281). [A has μονογενής here, cf. Gn. 22:2 (Σ μόνος); Σ Gn. 22:12; \*ΑΣ Jer. 6:26; Prv. 4:3 \*ΑΣΘ μονογενής but the LXX ἀγαπώμενος. Philo follows LXX in his quotation of the verse in Ebriet., 84. Bertram.]

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Mk. 12:6: ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱόν ἀγαπητόν.

<sup>9</sup> Following Plato in the Timaeus, Philo calls the world the son of God. He can speak of two sons, the younger and sensual, the older and intelligible, Deus Imm., 30-32. Cf. on this J. Leisegang, *Angelos*, 1 (1925), 27-31, also the notes in his translation, *Schriften d. hell.-jüd. Lit.*, IV (1923), 78 f. Leisegang does not have μονογενής in his Index, presumably because it does not occur. In Ebr., 30 Philo described this world as τὸν μόνον καὶ ἀγαπητόν αἰσθητόν υἱόν of God and ἐπιστήμη. Since this expression recurs in Deus Imm., 4 in the form τὸ ἀγαπητόν καὶ μόνον... ἔγγονον (the beloved and only progeny, used of Isaac as the son of Abraham), it was presumably Philo's way of stating the NT μονογενής. Jn.'s use of μονογενής thus shows the difference between him and Philo.

<sup>10</sup> Ant., 1, 222 = Gn. 22:2; Ant., 5, 264 = Ju. 11:34, cf. Schl. J., 26. These refs. make it unlikely that Jos. used μονογενής in the sense of unique.

<sup>11</sup> In their par. to Lk. 8:42; 9:38 Mk. and Mt. do not have this added touch of pathos.

3:1, 2, 10; 5:2, while υἱός is reserved for Jesus. Jn. emphasises more strongly the distinction between Jesus and believers and the uniqueness of Jesus in His divine sonship. It is not that Jesus is not unique in this sonship for Mt., Pl. etc. also. His Messiahship proves this. But Jn. puts it in an illuminating and easily remembered formula which was taken up into the baptismal confession and which ever since has formed an inalienable part of the creed of the Church.<sup>12</sup> Το μονογενής as a designation of Jesus corresponds the fact that God is the πατήρ ἴδιος of Jesus, Jn. 5:18; for ἴδιος means to be in a special relation to Jesus which excludes the same relation to others.<sup>13</sup>

μονογενής occurs in Jn. 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 Jn. 4:9. What is meant is plainest in Jn. 3:16 and 1 Jn. 4:9. Because Jesus is the only Son of God, His sending into the world is the supreme proof of God's love for the world. On the other side, it is only as the only-begotten Son of God that Jesus can mediate life and salvation from perdition. For life is given only in Him, Jn. 5:26. But the fact that He is the only-begotten Son means also that men are obligated to believe in Him, and that they come under judgment, indeed, have done so already, if they withhold faith from Him, 3:18. μονογενής is thus a predicate of majesty. This is true in Jn. 1:18. Here we are to read ὁ μονογενής υἱός.<sup>14</sup> As the only-begotten Son Jesus is in the closest intimacy with God. There is no other with whom God can have similar fellowship. He shares everything with this Son. For this reason Jesus can give what no man can give, namely, the fullest possible eye-witness account of God. He knows God, not just from hearsay, but from incomparably close intercourse with Him. In 3:16, 18; 1 Jn. 4:9; 1:18 the relation of Jesus is not just compared to that of an only child to its father. It is the relation of the only-begotten to the Father. Similarly in Jn. 1:14: δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, His glory is not just compared with that of an only child; it is described as that of the only-begotten Son. Grammatically both interpretations are justifiable.<sup>15</sup> But the total usage of

<sup>12</sup> No significance is to be attached to the fact that before Irenaeus μονογενής occurs only in Just. Dial., 105; Mart. Pol., 20, 2; Dg., 10, 2 (Bau. J.,<sup>3</sup> on 1:14). Cf. the bibl. in Bultmann J., 47.

<sup>13</sup> Pl. speaks of ὁ ἴδιος υἱός, Jn. of πατήρ ἴδιος.

<sup>14</sup> The only readings to call for consideration are (1) ὁ μονογενής υἱός and (2) μονογενής θεός. (1) is attested by the old Syriac, sy<sup>c</sup> (no sy<sup>s</sup>) sy<sup>h</sup> and the Lat., Hipp. (Contra Noetum [MPG, 10], 5), the Lat. fathers from Tert., the Gk. from the 4th cent. The oldest attestation of (2) is in the Valentinians, Iren. Haer., I, 8, 5, Cl. Al., Exc. Theod., 6, 2, later Cl. Al., Orig. etc. Not very clear is the reading of Iren., who has *unigenitus filius* in III, 11, 6; IV, 20, 6, and *unigenitus deus* in IV, 20, 11. Very important is the fact that Hipp. read (1). For this proves that it does not come from the Lat. transl. (1) alone gives a non-artificial sense. υἱός fits best with εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός. (2) can only mean "an only-begotten God"; to render "an only-begotten, one who is God," is an exegetical invention. It can hardly be credited of Jn., who is distinguished by monumental simplicity of expression. An only-begotten God corresponds to the weakening of monotheism in Gnosticism. It derives from this, and came into the Egyptian texts by way of its influence on the theology of Alexandria. The original was preserved in the Western text (cf. also 1:13). On this whole matter cf. the exhaustive discussion of the tradition in Zn. J., 703 ff. and Bultmann J., 55 f., who also supports (1). W. Bauer's preference for (2) corresponds to his attempt to relate John's Gospel as closely as possible to Gnosticism.

<sup>15</sup> Though ὡς can introduce a comparison, it can also introduce a solid fact, cf. Mt. 14:5: ὡς προφήτην, which does not mean "like a prophet" (which he is not), but "as one of the prophets" (because he is one), R. 1:21: οὐχ ὡς θεόν ἐδόξασαν, not: "They have not worshipped him as a god," but: "They have not worshipped him as the God he is," R. 3:7: ὡς ἁμαρτωλός κρίνομαι, "as a sinner." 1 C. 3:1; 4:1; 7:25; 8:7; Hb. 3:5, 6. It makes no difference that the ὡς μονογενοῦς in Jn. 1:14 has no article. In all the verses in which ὡς introduces a fact the noun is without article, cf. esp. Hb. 3:6: ὡς υἱός, "as the Son he is."



μονογενής is very emphatically against taking ὡς μονογενοῦς as a mere comparison.

In Jn. 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 Jn. 4:9 μονογενής denotes more than the uniqueness or incomparability of Jesus. In all these verses He is expressly called the Son, and He is regarded as such in 1:14. In Jn. μονογενής denotes the origin of Jesus. He is μονογενής as the only-begotten.

What Jn. means by ὁ μονογενής υἱός in detail can be known in its full import only in the light of the whole of John's proclamation. For ὁ μονογενής υἱός is simply a special form of ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ. When Jn. speaks of the Son of God, he has primarily in view the man Jesus Christ, though not exclusively the man, but also the risen and pre-existent Lord. The relation of the pre-existent Lord to God is that of Son to Father. This comes out indisputably in 17:5, 24. Jesus is aware that He was with God, and was loved by Him, and endowed with glory, before the foundation of the world. This is personal fellowship with God, divine sonship. It is true that neither in the prologue, nor 8:58, nor c. 17 does Jn. use the term "son" for the pre-existent Lord. But He describes His relation to God as that of a son.<sup>16</sup> To maintain that in Jn. the pre-existent Lord is only the Word, and that the Son is only the historical and risen Lord,<sup>17</sup> is to draw too sharp a line between the pre-existence on the one side and the historical and post-historical life on the other. In Jn. the Lord is always the Son. Because He alone was God's Son before the foundation of the world, because the whole love of the Father is for Him alone, because He alone is one with God, because the title God may be ascribed to Him alone, He is the only-begotten Son of God.

It is not wholly clear whether μονογενής in Jn. denotes also the birth or begetting from God; it probably does, Jn. calls Jesus ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Jn. 5:18.<sup>18</sup> Though many will not accept this, he here understands the concept of sonship in terms of begetting. For him to be the Son of God is not just to be the recipient of God's love. It is to be begotten of God. This is true both of believers and also of Jesus.<sup>19</sup> For this reason μονογενής probably includes also begetting by God.<sup>20</sup> To be sure, Jn. does not lift the veil of mystery which lies over the eternal begetting. But this does not entitle us to assume that he had no awareness of it. Johannine preaching and doctrine is designed to awaken faith, 20:30 f., not to give full and systematic knowledge. Hence it does not have to dispel all mysteries.

Büchsel

<sup>16</sup> One can hardly argue from expressions like "God sent his Son," 3:17; 1 Jn. 4:9, 10; cf. Jn. 3:16, since here the term "son" might be used proleptically, with ref. only to the man. But we see from 1 Jn. 4:14: "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," that by His sending He who was already the Son became the Saviour, so that there is no room for doubt that the pre-existent Lord was already the Son. The fact that Jn. also uses ὁ λόγος for the pre-existent Lord gives us no right to assume that this λόγος was for him a power of God standing in an impersonal relation to Him.

<sup>17</sup> Zn. J., cf. also H. J. Holtzmann, *Theologie des NT*, II (1897), 436, n. 1.

<sup>18</sup> On the problems of this verse and the various attempts to avoid the only satisfactory solution cf. F. Büchsel on 1 Jn. 5:18.

<sup>19</sup> Jn. 1:13 (cf. Zn. J., *ad loc.*) probably reads, not οἱ ... ἐγεννήθησαν, but δὲ ... ἐγεννήθη.

<sup>20</sup> That the idea of begetting could be used of the relation of the Messiah to God in Judaism may be seen from ψ 2:7: σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, and ψ 109:3: ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐξεγέννησά σε, cf. also Prv. 8:25: γεννᾷ με (wisdom). One should not refer the μονογενής to the virgin birth of Jesus (Zn. J., 82), for the pre-existent as well as the historical Jesus is the Son of God.