

ἀγαπητός.¹

I ἀγαπητός,² verbal adjective from ἀγαπάω, and so properly *worthy of love, loveable*: Origen *in Io. xx 23* [on viii 4] ἀξιά ἔστιν τὰ ἀγαπητὰ τοῦ ἀγαπᾶσθαι . . . τὰ ἀγαπητὰ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἀγαπᾶται: Basil *Hom. in Ps. xliv* [xlv] (on the title ὁδὴ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ) τὸ κυρίως ἀγαπητὸν ὁ θεός, . . . οὐ τοῦ τυχόντος ἔστιν εἰς τὸ τέλειον χωρῆσαι ἀγάπης καὶ τὸν ὄντων ἀγαπητὸν ἐπιγνῶναι, *Hom. in Ps. cxiv* [cxvi] on v. 1 πάντα αὐτῷ [i. e. to the Psalmist] ἀγαπητὰ διὰ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ἀγάπην.

II But probably the consciousness of this shade of meaning may have been confined to scholars like Origen and Basil: its regular use in Christian Greek from the beginning is *beloved*, and the word was, since ἀγάπη was the characteristic Christian virtue, the habitual designation—as an alternative to ἀδελφοί, or in combination with it—of Christians for one another. The N.T. use of it with proper names alone ‘Persis the beloved’, ‘To Gaius the beloved’ (Rom. xvi 12, 3 Jo. i) tended indeed to disappear (for one reason of this from the later fourth century onwards see Theodoret, **V ad fin.**): but in combination with a noun or noun and possessive pronoun (e. g. Dion. Alex. *Ep. ad Basiliem* τῷ ἀγαπητῷ μου νῦν καὶ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συνλειτουργῷ . . . ἀγαπητὲ νύέ μου, Feltoe 94. 1, 105. 7) it was always common, and in addressing Christians or the Christian community, whether in sermons or in letters, the use of the vocative ἀγαπητέ, ἀγαπητοί was as regular after N.T. as in the N.T. books; e. g. Clem. *ad Cor.* has it seventeen times.

III *Only, unique*: especially *Only Son*. This was the proper use of ἀγαπητός in classical Greek: primarily of children ‘an only child’, but

¹ It is intended to publish from time to time in the JOURNAL drafts of articles on some of the more important words to be included in the proposed Lexicon of Patristic Greek. They will be contributed by different writers, but will not always be signed: nor will the arrangement and method be quite as compendious as will be necessary in the Lexicon itself. But it is greatly hoped that readers of the JOURNAL will contribute criticisms of such articles, or additional material amplifying or rectifying the original article. Communications should be addressed to the care of the editor of the Lexicon, Pusey House, Oxford.

² With regard to pre-Christian usage, it may be noted that in classical Greek the word ἀγάπη is unknown (though ἀγάπησις is found in the Platonic “*Oros*”, in Aristotle *Metaphysics* i 1 and in the fragments of the Stoic Chrysippus), and that ἀγαπάω means mainly ‘to be contented with’ (cf. VI below): ἀγαπητός would therefore properly be ‘what one has to be contented with’, and so ‘all that one has’, and then finally ‘the exclusive object of interest or affection’.

not exclusively. Thus Pollux *Onomasticon* iii 2 καλοῦτο ἄν νιός ἀγαπητὸς ὁ μόνος ὃν πατρὶ ἡ μητρί ὥσπερ καὶ ἀγαπητὴ θυγάτηρ καὶ μονογενὴς καθ' Ἡσίδον: Hesychius *Lexicon* s.v. ἀγαπητόν· μονογενῆ, κεχαρισμένον. And so we find in Aristotle *Politics* ii 4 (1262 b) δύο γάρ ἔστιν ἂν μάλιστα ποιεῖ κήδεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ φιλέν, τό τε ἰδιον καὶ τὸ ἀγαπητόν: *Eudemian Ethics* iii 6. 3 (1233 b) οἷον εἰς γάμον δαπανῶν τις τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, πλούσιος ὅν, δοκεῖ πρέπειν ἑαυτῷ τοιαύτην κατασκευὴν οἷον ἀγαθοδαιμονιαστὰς ἔστωντι: *Rheticus* i 7. 41 καὶ τὸ ἀγαπητὸν καὶ τοὺς μὲν μόνον, τοῖς δὲ μετ' ἄλλων διὸ καὶ οὐκ ἵση ζημία, ἄν τις τὸν ἐτερόφθαλμον τυφλώσῃ καὶ τὸν δύν ἔχοντα, ἀγαπητὸν γάρ ἀφύργῃ, where the argument appears to be exactly parallel to Nathan's parable of the one ewe lamb—'other people have more lambs (or more eyes, or what not), my client had only one.' This use passed into LXX, e.g. Gen. xxii 2, 12, 16 (in v. 2 Cyprian's Bible had 'filium tuum illum unicum', but v. 16 'dilectissimo'), Jud. xi 34 (A and Lucian), Am. viii 10, Zach. xii 10, Jer. vi 26, Tob. iii 10 ¶: it must have been known to St Paul when he substituted in Rom. viii 31 τοῦ ἰδίου νιόν for τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ νιόν of Gen. xxii 16: it is the natural meaning of ἔνα ἔσχεν νιόν ἀγαπητὸν in the parable of the husbandmen, Mk. xii 6, Lk. xx 13 (cod e 'filium meum unicum'), and in Hermas *Sym.* v. 2. 6 τὸν νιόν αὐτὸν ὃν ἀγαπητὸν εἶχε καὶ κληρόνομον': and it is an open question whether ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός in the Gospel narratives of the Baptism and Transfiguration should not be interpreted in this sense, cf. Daniel Heinsius *Exercitationes sacrae ad N. T.* (Leyden, 1639) on Mk. i 11. The following quotations will at least suggest that such was the dominant exegesis in the early Church. So expressly Athanasius: *Or. c. Ar.* iv 24 καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ περὶ Υἱοῦ πολλὰ λέγεται, οἷον . . . φδὴ ὥπερ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ [Ps. xliv (xlv) tit.], καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ [Is. v 1] . . . ἔσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνι μογ . . . τὸ δὲ ἀγαπητὸς τίς ἄν εἴη ἡ νιός μονογενῆς . . . ταῦτὸν γάρ ἔστιν τό τε μονογενὲς καὶ τὸ ἀγαπητόν, ὡς τὸ Οὗτός ἔστιν ὁ γίνος μογ ὁ ἀγαπητός· οὐ γάρ δὴ τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην σημάναι θέλων εἴπε τὸ ἀγαπητός (ἴνα μὴ τοὺς ἄλλους μισεῖν δόξῃ) ἀλλὰ τὸ μονογενὲς ἐδήλου ἵνα τὸ μόνον ἔξι αὐτὸν εἴναι αὐτὸν δεῖξῃ. καὶ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ γοῦν σημάναι θέλων δὲ ὁ Λόγος τὸ μονογενές φησι Προσένεγκε τὸν γίνοντον ἀγαπητόν· παντὶ δὲ δῆλον ἐκ τῆς Σάρρας μόνον εἴναι τὸν Ἰσαάκ: *ib.* iv. 29 τὸ δὲ ἀγαπητὸν καὶ Ἐλληνες ἵσασιν οἱ δεινοὶ περὶ τὰς λέξεις, ὅτι ἵσον ἔστιν τῷ εἰπεῖν μονογενῆς φησι γάρ Ὁμηρος [*Od.* ii 365] . . . μόγνος ἐών ἀγαπητός . . . δὲ ἄρα μόνος ὃν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγαπητὸς λέγεται. Other fathers who bring ἀγαπητός into collocation with μονογενῆς (as in Jud. xi 34 [A Lucian] of Jephthah's daughter, αἵτη μονογενῆς αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ πλὴν αὐτῆς), and therefore presumably interpret the one by the other, are: Iren. *Haer.* iv 5. 3 (of Abraham) τὸν ἰδίον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν

¹ This is apparently the true reading: cf. the Latin version 'quem carum et heredem habebat'.

παραχωρήσας θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, ὥα καὶ ὁ θεὸς εὐδοκήσῃ . . . τὸν ἵδιον μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὸν νῦν θυσίαν παρασχεῖν. Eus. *eccl. theol.* i 10 (68. 15) ὁ ἀληθῶς νὺὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἄτε δὴ ἐκ πατρὸς ἀποτεχθεὶς, εἰκότως καὶ μονογενῆς καὶ ἀγαπητὸς χρηματίσειν ἀν τοῦ πατρός, and *ib.* i 20 (86. 8), ii 7 (104. 23), ii 20 (129. 27), c. *Marcell.* i 1 (2. 14); cf. *eccl. theol.* ii 14 (118. 6) λόγον μὲν ὄντα καθ' ὃ . . . θεὸν δὲ καὶ μονογενῆ καθ' ὃ μόνος ἀληθῶς ἦν νὺὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ, νὺὸς γνήσιος ὄντως καὶ ἀγαπητός, τῷ αὐτοῦ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα ἀφωμοιωμένος, and apart from any christological reference *laud. Const.* xiii 6, 7 (238. 12, 17) τὰ μονογενῆ καὶ ἀγαπητὰ τῶν τέκνων κατασφάττειν . . . ἔθυον τὰ ἀγαπητὰ καὶ μονογενῆ τῶν τέκνων. *Ap. Const.* iii 17. 4 X. ὁ μονογενῆς θεὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς νὺός, cf. viii 12. 31. Greg. Nyss. *de deitate Fili et Sp. S.* (ii 905) (of Abraham) λάβε μοί, φησι, τὸν γίόν σογ τὸν ἀραπτόν τὸν μονογενῆ. ὅρα τὰ κέντρα τοῦ λόγου, πῶς κεντεῖ τοῦ πατρὸς τὰ σπλάγχνα . . . καὶ νῦὸν ἀγαπητὸν καὶ μονογενῆ καλῶν;¹ So probably Serapion πάντας πρὸς ἑαυτὸν διὰ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου νιὸν ἔλκων in his εὐχῇ προσφόρου (*J. T. S.* i 105), his ordinary phrase being τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Ι. Χ. Both interpretations of ἀγαπητός are apparently combined by St Basil (*in Ps. xliv [xlv] tit.*: partly quoted above): ἀγαπητός τῷ πατρὶ μὲν ὡς μονογενῆς, τῇ κτίσει δὲ πάσῃ ὡς πατήρ φιλάνθρωπος καὶ ἀγαθὸς προστάτης, τὸ αὐτὸν δέ ἐστιν τῇ φύσει καὶ ἀγαπητὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν διότι καλῶς ὡρίσαντο ἡδη τινὲς ἀγαθὸν εἶναι οὐν πάντα ἐφίεται [*Aristotle Ethics* i 1]: and by St Chrysostom *Hom. xii in Mt.* (iii 17) 162 C φωνῇ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος κηρύζοντο τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὴν ἀξίαν . . . ἡ λέγουσα ὄψτος ἐστίν ὁ γίός μογ ὁ ἀγαπητός, 165 οὐν γὰρ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ νῦὸς θεοῦ κατασκενάσας καὶ ἀγαπητούς οὔτως ἔλκει πρὸς ἐκείνην τὴν ληξίν ἡμᾶς. There does not indeed appear to be any trace of ἀγαπητός = μονογενῆς in Origen; his comment on Matt. xvii 5 ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς φωνὴ μαρτυροῦσα τῷ νιῷ ὡς ἀγαπητῷ καὶ εὐδοκητῷ, *In Matt. Tom.* xii § 42, suggests that he interpreted ἀγαπητός and εὐδοκητός as on the same plane, and if this is the right interpretation it perhaps covers the similar phrase in St Polycarp's prayer *Mart. Pol.* 14 ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός σου Ι. Χ. πατήρ, though Origen himself of course often interprets quite independently of the exegetical tradition.

IV In pseudoecclesiastic Christian (and in Jewish?) writings ὁ ἄγαπη-*mένος* (see under ἄγαπά) seems to be used as a title of Messiah *The Beloved*, and ἀγαπητός may have followed suit from the apparent

¹ These passages seem amply sufficient to shew that μονογενῆς and ἀγαπητός are used as equivalent or as exegetical the one of the other (and one might perhaps add to them *Ep. ad Diognetum* 8. 11 διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ παιδός, 10. 2 τὸν νιὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ); and if so, there would remain no ground for the suspicion expressed by Dr Hort (*Two Dissertations* p. 49 n.) that some of the writers cited read both words in their LXX text of Genesis.

identity of meaning of the two words: see Dr J. Armitage Robinson's note in his *Ephesians* [1903] pp. 229-233, who would further equate the ὁ γιός μογ ὁ ἀγαπητός of Mt. xvii 5 with the ὁ γιός μογ ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος of Lk. ix 35. So the *Ascension of Isaiah* iii 13 ἐξέλευσις τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἔβδομου οὐρανοῦ (L 'adventum dilectissimi de septimo caelo'), iv 3 οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ. *Acta Philippi* 19 (Bonnet 10. 21-25) ὁ πάτερ ἄγιε . . . πέμψον σου τὸν ἀγαπητὸν νιὸν Ι. Χ. ἐλέγχαι τὸν ἀπιστον ἀρχιερέα, ἵνα τὸ σὸν ὄνομα ἐν τῷ ἀγαπητῷ Χριστῷ δοξασθῇ. This class of writings is more likely to have been influenced by Jewish, and less by classical, usage than were the fathers cited under III: and therefore it may well have interpreted ὁ ἀγαπητός, ὁ νιὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, of Christ in a different sense to that predominantly found in the fathers.

V ἀγαπητή, and less frequently ἀγαπητός, a *spiritual lover*: not apparently till after the middle of the fourth century: used in Latin also, e.g. Jerome *ep.* xxii 14 'unde in ecclesiis **agapetarum** pestis introit? unde sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum? immo unde novum concubinarum genus? unde meretrices univirae?' Epiph. *Haer.* lxiii 2 κατηγοροῦσι τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰς ἀγαπητὰς λεγομένας συνεισάκτους γυναικας κεκτημένων: *ib.* lxxviii 11 (of the Virgin as commended to St John) μὴ τοῦτο στραφῇ εἰς βλάβην τισι καὶ δόξωσιν ἐν τούτῳ λαμβάνειν πρόφασιν συνεισάκτους καὶ ἀγαπητὰς ἐπικαλούμενας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπινοεῖν. Greg. Naz. *Epigram.* xx (Epigrams x-xx are on the same subject: x, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi contain the word) 7 τῶν Χριστῷ ζώντων καὶ τερπομένων ἀγαπητᾶς | μή πον τοὺς μεγάλους αὔρα φέρει καμάτους. | ἡ πῦρ ἡὲ πυρὸς σημῆνα τοὺς ἀγαπητοῖς· | τὴν εἰκαζομένην φεύγετε σωφροσύνην. *ib.* xviii 3 Χριστὸν ἔχεις ἀγαπητόν, ἀπόπτυσον ἄνδρας ἀπαντας. Ps-Athanasius *Syntagma Doctrinae ad Monachos* [ed. Bened. ii 361 B] μὴ ἔχειν γυναῖκα συνεισάκτου, καθάπερ τινὲς ἀγαπητὰς ἐπέθειτο αὐτᾶς ὄνόματα. Basil (?; the treatise was first published from a Florence MS in 1763: Migne, xxx 811) *Sermo de Contubernalibus* 2 εἰ [Πέτρος] εἶχεν ἀγαπητήν (sc. ἀδελφὴν γυναικα of 1 Cor. ix 5), καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἐκείνου ἔχεσιν ἐπακολουθοῦμεν, 4 ἀγαπητὴ γὰρ ἡτα διὰ Χριστὸν ἔως τοῦ χαίρειν, τι πολλάκις τις κόρη τοῦ ιδίου γονένσι μὴ ἐξυπηρετησαμένη . . . αὕτη σπουδαία εἰς τὸν ἀγαπητὸν εὑρέθῃ.¹ Theodoret *in ep. ad Philem.* 2 ἀγαπητὴν ὠνόμασε τοῦ Φιλήμονος τὴν ὄμοζυγα ὡς τῇ πίστει κοσμουμένην. θαυμαζέτω δὲ μηδεὶς εἰ προσπταίουσι νῦν τινες τῷ προστήματι τούτῳ οἱ γὰρ κακῶς κεχρημένοι τῷ πράγματι τῇ προσηγορίᾳ τὴν λοιδορίαν προσῆψαν, πάλαι δὲ σεμνὸν τὸ ὄνομα καὶ ἀξιέπαινον ἦν. John Scholasticus *Nomocanon* tit. xxiv, quoting

¹ For completeness' sake it may be as well to add from this same tract a record of a synonym for ἀγαπητή, namely ἀγαπητρίς, *de Contubernalibus* 2 ἡ τῶν ἀγαπητρίδων, λέγω δῆ, μανία. [In pseudo-Chrysostom *in Ps.* xcii 2 (ed. Bened. v 622 E) Εἴη . . . δρακοντιάλων συρισμάτων ἀγαπητρία—another, unknown form—the sense is not quite the same.]

Const. ix tit. 1 (*Novellae vi cap. 6*) τὰς [διακονίσσας] μὴ ἔχειν ἐν τάξει δῆθεν ἀδελφῶν ἢ συγγενῶν ἢ τῶν καλονυμένων ἀγαπητῶν συνόντας.

VI The neuter ἀγαπητόν and adverb ἀγαπητῶς had already in classical Greek the technical signification ‘it must be accepted, acquiesced in’, ‘one must be content’. So *Josephus Bell. Iud.* i 5, quoted in *Eus. H. E.* iii 6. ΙΟ ίκετεύόντων . . . μεταδοῦναι τι μέρος αὐτοῖς ὃν κυνδυνεύσαντες ἡνεγκαν οὐδὲ ὅτιον μετέδοσαν, ἀγαπητὸν δὲ ἦν τὸ μὴ καὶ προσαπολέσθαι σεσυλημένον. *Origen in Io. x 43* (ii 22), the greater blessing is Blessed are your eyes for they see . . . ἀγαπητὸν δὲ καὶ τὸν ὑποδεέστερον λαβεῖν μακαρισμὸν λέγοντα Μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἴδοντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες. *Eus. dem. ev. viii* 2 p. 388 τοῖς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων . . . εἰς τὸ ἐφικτὸν ἀρετῆς χωρίσασιν ἀγαπητὸν ἀτίοις χρηματίσαι . . . ἀτίων δὲ ἀγιος τίς ἀν κυρίως ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὄνομασθείη; *Chrysostom* frequently (especially in an apodosis, joined to *πλὴν* ἀλλά, or with *τέως*): *Hom. in ep. ad Rom.* 1 (426 A) τοσαύτην ἀπονείματε σπουδὴν τῇ τῶν λεγομένων ἀκροάσει ὅσην τῇ τῶν χρημάτων συλλογῇ· εἰ γάρ καὶ αἰσχρὸν τοσαύτην ἀπαιτήσαι παρ' ὑμῶν μόνην, πλὴν ἀλλ' ἀγαπητόν, ἀν τοσαύτην γοῦν διδώτε: *Hom. in ep. I ad Cor.* xxxiii (307 E) δεῖ τοίνυν συγκαταβαίνειν . . . τὸ τέως ἀγαπητὸν ἦν τὸ τὸν σταυρὸν τοὺς ἀκούοντας μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῆναι. For ἀγαπητῶς *Basil (?) Comm. in Isai. 472* Ε ἐπτὰ γυναικες [iv 1] . . . πνεύματα . . . ἀπέρο οὐκ ἔχοντα φέταναπάντεται [ix 2], ἀγαπητῶς τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Κύριον ἀνθρώπου λαβόμενα ποιεῖ τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα (where the Benedictine text is wrong both in punctuation and translation). And so sometimes ‘barely’, ‘scarcely’, *Basil Hom. in Hexaemeron* iii 1 οὐ λέληθε με ὅτι πολλοὶ τεχνῖται τῶν βανάσσων τεχνῶν, ἀγαπητῶς ἐκ τῆς ἐφ ἡμέραν ἐργασίας τὴν τροφὴν ἑαυτοῖς συμπορίζοντες, περιεστήκασιν ἡμᾶς, οἱ τὸν λόγον ἡμῶν συντέμονοιν, ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ τῆς ἐργασίας ἀφέλκωνται.

(*The following note has been kindly contributed on the subject of the above article.*)

The collection and arrangement of the meanings of ἀγαπητός render it possible to conjecture something as to the affiliation or genealogy of the meanings discriminated in this article, possibly even to cast some light upon the motives which determined the choice of ἀγάπη to signify the peculiar relation of the Christian to his brethren in the new community. It is generally supposed that before its appropriation to such use the word or its cognates must have already conveyed some sense of a distinctive quality in the emotion so named, e.g. some special intensity or purity of the affection. But it has always been difficult or impossible to verify this line of descent, and the known facts as to pre-Christian use do not support it. As is pointed out, the word ἀγάπη itself does not occur in pre-Christian writers, and the discussion must turn upon the earlier meanings of ἀγαπᾶν, ἀγαπητός, &c. The pedigree of the meanings, which is suggested by the study of the history of these words, is somewhat surprising. The earliest meaning is that of contentment or acquiescence, and there is no evidence of a gradual introduction of either warmth or purity. Or rather, both do come in, but as it were silently and incidentally, and it is hard to say how late even in Christian usage the original sense may have

persisted or been prominent. In any case the dominant element in the meaning was for long not that of any peculiar quality or intensity in the feeling, but rather that of some uniqueness in the object towards which the feeling was directed or with which the relation subsisted. Hence, while δάγαντρος may be translated 'the beloved', it rather denotes than connotes or 'means' that. What is prominent in the conception is the uniqueness of the relation to such a unique object, the quality of the feeling being consequential upon that. This implies the selection or singling out from many of the object, and what is emphasized is the *dilectio* rather than the *amor* or *caritas*. Thus the ἀγαπήτος is rather 'the chosen' than 'the beloved' (= ἐκλελεγμένος), and this accords with sense IV in the article and is the most probable source of sense V. No doubt as time went on the feature of uniqueness in the object and the relation became obscured, while that of the character of the feeling came to the fore, but precisely when this change is to be dated it is hard to say. Perhaps our tendency is to date it too early, and Athanasius's words seem to indicate that the memory of it was a point of fine scholarship. Still it would probably be an error to suppose that in Christian use it had been almost entirely forgotten. The use of εὐδοκητός as an equivalent does not help us much, for it too has somewhat of the same ambiguous or double sense : it sometimes means 'what one ought to be, or is, contented with'.

It may be worth while to add that the change is helped by the natural appropriateness of the word to the relation of the one wife to the one husband, and the growing elevation of the idea of true marriage under Christian influence. The problem of interest is the question why the word was selected to signify the new and higher relation of the members of the Christian community to one another, and the scantiness of the evidence leaves the answer largely to conjecture. But in any case it must have been suggested by something in non- or pre-Christian use, and it seems probable that the development was as above conjectured.

The posteriority of the simpler noun ἀγάπη to its larger cognates has parallels in many languages, e.g. Latin *pugna* from *pugnare*, French *appel* from *appeler*, German *wach* from *wachen*. Clearly the formation has assisted the change of emphasis from the object or relation to the emotion, and from the ground of the affection to the affection itself. That change reacts upon the cognate verb and its verbal adjective.

Finally, occasion may be taken to ask whether the word μονογενῆ did not originally mean 'sole of, or in, its kind', the association with 'begetting' being later, and, as it were, incidental to special uses of it.