

times of human beings. Abraham had several other begotten sons. Ishamel was not his only begotten son. That onlybegotten is an error. Wycliffe when he made his translation back in the 15th cnetury he said, the only son. Now I don't like "only Son" but I like it much better than only begotten because Jesus never was begotten, he always was. Some people in early Christian days tried to get around that by saying, He is always being begotten. Now what that means I don't know, how he's always being begotten! Hodge says neither does anybody else~~25~~ know what it means -- only-begotten; it's a philosophical idea with no Biblical warrant. It is the only one of its kind, and that's why some have translated it as "unique" and unique is good, but neither exactly gives it. But only begotten is not good.

The Hebrew is a correct translation, and there also it means Isaac was the child of promise. He was Abraham's only son in the sense in which he was the son, and Jesus is God's only son in the sense in which God is a son, but we who believe in Christ have been begotten to a living hope, we are all begotten sons of God, all believers in Christ. He is not the only begotten, but He is the only one of a kind. It is not monogenao, one begotten; but monogennes, one class, one of a kind. So it is difficult to translate ^{into} the English because we don't have a word to give it exact. But as you see the NIV of the NT has had great effort expended on making the style good. Now whether that has detracted from the meaning, I don't know. I hope not. I have worked on the OT passage, and said now this means this. But somebody has said, Yes, but that does not sound good. Look here,