THE FIGURATIVE USE OF "SON(S) OF" IN
THE NEW TESTAMENT

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Daniel Ferris Born
May 2016
APPROVAL SHEET

THE FIGURATIVE USE OF "SON(S) OF" IN
THE NEW TESTAMENT

Daniel Ferris Born

Read and Approved by:

__________________________________________
William F. Cook (chair)

__________________________________________
James M. Hamilton

__________________________________________
Jonathan T. Pennington

Date_______________________________
To my beautiful and lovely wife, Jen,
and our four little princesses Dinah, Sophia, Olivia, and Lucy
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Research–Grammar and Lexical Works</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Research–Survey of Commentators</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Brief Word About Grammar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Son(s) of&quot; Phrases Outside the NT</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THE USE OF ΥΙΟΣ PLUS THE GENITIVE OUTSIDE THE NEW TESTAMENT</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in the LXX</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in Other Greek Writings</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A SURVEY OF THE USE OF ΥΙΟΣ IN THE GREEK NT</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew–Introduction</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew–Υἱός Without the Genitive</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew–Υἱός With the Genitive</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark–Introduction</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark–Υἱός Without the Genitive</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark–Υἱός With the Genitive</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannine Literature–Introduction</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannine Literature–Υἱός Without the Genitive</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannine Literature–Υἱός With the Genitive</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Epistles–Introduction</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Epistles–Υἱός Without the Genitive</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Epistles–Υἱός With the Genitive</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews–Introduction</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews–Υἱός Without the Genitive</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews–Υἱός With the Genitive</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrine Epistles</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter | Page
--- | ---
Conclusion | 90

4. THE FATHER-SON RELATIONSHIP IN THE ANCIENT WORLD | 91
Introduction | 91
Defining Terminology and Key Concepts | 91
Kinship and Family in the NT World | 109
Fathers and Sons in the PKG | 114
Figurative "Son(s) of" Phrases in the PKG Context | 121
Conclusion | 126

5. CLASSIFICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FIGURATIVE USE OF "SON(S) OF" IN THE NT | 127
Introduction | 127
Human-Human or Other Non-Divine Personal Beings
Figurative Use | 128
Human-Non-Human Figurative Use | 147
Human-Divine Figurative Use | 176
Conclusion | 184

6. CONCLUSION | 185
Summary | 186
Implications and Further Study | 190
Conclusion | 193

Appendix

LIST OF EVERY OCCURRENCE OF ΥΙΟΣ PLUS THE GENITIVE IN THE NT | 194

BIBLIOGRAPHY | 205
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>The Anchor Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANE</td>
<td>Ancient Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargylia</td>
<td>Donald F. McCabe (ed.), <em>Bargyia Inscriptions. Texts and List</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCH</td>
<td><em>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECNT</td>
<td>Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU</td>
<td><em>Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td><em>Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td><em>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td><em>Corpus Papyrorum Raineri</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBC</td>
<td><em>The Expositor's Bible Commentary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGGNT</td>
<td>Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKM 1</td>
<td>P. Nigdelis and G. Soures (eds.), <em>Epigraphes kato Makedonias</em>, vol. 1, Epigraphes Beroias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD III</td>
<td>G. Daux and A. Salac (eds.), <em>Fouilles de Delphes</em>, vol. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALOT</td>
<td>Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, <em>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Kition</td>
<td>Marguerite Yon et al. (eds.), <em>Kition dans les textes, Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et Corpus des inscriptions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasos</td>
<td>Donald F. McCabe (ed.), <em>Iasos Inscriptions. Texts and List</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>The International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG V,1</td>
<td>W. Kolbe (ed.), <em>Inscriptiones Graecae</em>, V,1. <em>Inscriptiones Laconiae et Messeniae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG VII</td>
<td>Wilhelm Dittenberger (ed.), <em>Inscriptiones Graecae</em>, VII. <em>Inscriptiones Megaridis, Oropiae, Boeotiae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XII,3</td>
<td>Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen (ed.), <em>Inscriptiones Graecae</em>, XII. <em>Inscriptio insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, 3, Inscriptio Symes, Teutulassae, Teli, Nisyri, Astypalaeae, Anaphes, Theriae et Thersiaie, Pholegandri, Meli, Cimoli</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG XII,6</td>
<td>Klaus Hallof (ed.), <em>Inscriptiones Graecae</em>, XII. <em>Inscriptio insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum, 6, Inscriptio Chii et Sami cum Corassis ICariae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK Knidos I</td>
<td>Wolfgang Blümel (ed.), <em>Die Inschriften von Knidos I, Inschriften griechischer Süde aus Kleinasien</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IScM I</td>
<td>D. M. Pippidi (ed.), <em>Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae</em>, vol. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IScM II</td>
<td>Iorgu Stoian (ed.), <em>Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae</em>, vol. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iscr. di Cos</td>
<td>Mario Segre (ed.), <em>Iscrizioni di Cos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td><em>Journal of Biblical Literature</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNT</td>
<td><em>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td><em>Journal of Theological Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEH</td>
<td>Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspin, <em>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Revised Edition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Alfred Rahlfs (ed.), <em>Septuaginta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMA VII</td>
<td>William Moir Calder (ed.), <em>Monuments from Eastern Phrygia, Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</em>, vol. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA27</td>
<td>Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland (eds.), Novum Testamentum Graece, 27th ed. Copyright (c) 1993 Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>New American Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETS</td>
<td>Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (eds.), A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICNT</td>
<td>New International Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDOTTE</td>
<td>Willem A. VanGemeren (ed.), New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGTC</td>
<td>The New International Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.Kellis</td>
<td>K. A. Worp (ed.), Greek Ostraka from Kellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Adlt.</td>
<td>E. N. Adler, J. G. Tait, F. M. Heichelheim (eds.), The Adler Papyri, Greek texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Grenf. II</td>
<td>B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (eds.), New Classical Fragments and Other Greek and Latin Papyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Heid.</td>
<td>Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lond.</td>
<td>F.G. Kenyon et al. (eds.), Greek Papyri in the British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy.</td>
<td>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Tebt. II</td>
<td>B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (eds.), The Tebtunis Papyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKG</td>
<td>Patrilineal Kinship Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNTC</td>
<td>Pillar New Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>F. Preisigke et al. (eds.), Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SbBerlin</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der preussischen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG3</td>
<td>W. Dittenberger et al. (eds.), Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Donald F. McCabe (ed.), Smyrna Inscriptions. Texts and List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJT</td>
<td><em>The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTS</td>
<td>Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM V.2</td>
<td>Peter Herrmann (ed.), <em>Tituli Asiae Minoris, V. Tituli Lydiae, linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti</em>, vol. 2, nos. 826-1414, <em>Regio septentrionalis, ad occidentem vergens</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDNT</td>
<td>Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (eds.), <em>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDOT</td>
<td>G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren (eds.), <em>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNTC</td>
<td>Tyndale New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>Word Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZECNT</td>
<td>Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Examples of negative characterization in the MT and LXX</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Examples of positive characterization in the MT and LXX</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Justin's quotations of biblical uses of ἴος plus the genitive</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Four clarifications regarding kinship and descent</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seven family forms identified by Emmanuel Todd</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. All uses of ἴος plus the genitive in the NT</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While an endless parade of people have supported my personal, academic, and ministerial development in many different ways, a few individuals and groups stand above the rest.

First, my family deserves the most recognition. Jen, you have been a continual source of encouragement in this work. Your willingness to serve me and our family in the midst of it has enabled me to press on to the end. I love, cherish, and appreciate you more than words can describe. Dinah, Sophia, Olivia, and Lucy, you sweet little girls have been as patient as little girls can be with my spending more time writing than playing. It is done now; let the playing commence. Katie, your encouragement and support have helped me achieve this goal. Dad and Mom, you allowed me to waste so much of your money in the early years of my education. I hope you realize now that it was not a waste, but instead a deferred investment. Thank you for raising me well. It saddens me that one of my greatest encouragers did not get to see the finished product. However, what she now sees is much greater.

Second, Believers Church has been a true extended family for us. There is no other place I would rather be than getting to walk alongside you all in our mutual growth in Christ. Jason, Matt, Sean, and Daniel, it is a privilege to shepherd alongside you. Pastoring is a burden I cannot bear alone, and I am thankful that each of you men has shouldered more than enough of it to give me time and energy to finish this work.

Third, my supervisor has been gracious and merciful towards me. Dr. Cook,
thank you for being patient with me and helping me finish the work. Drs. Hamilton, Hellerman, and Pennington, thank you for reading this work and providing valuable insight and feedback to improve it.

Finally, any shortcomings which remain in this work cannot be attributed to a lack of support and encouragement along the way. I have had more than my share and am truly blessed by our great God and Savior Jesus Christ. It is my deepest hope that this work reflects glory on him and our Father.

Daniel Ferris Born
Hannibal, Missouri
May 2016
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In 1982, Bruce Malina wrote the article "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation." He argued that "the understanding and interpretation of any sort of text is ultimately rooted in a social world." For him, "biblical interpretation, like the interpretation of any written language, will be based upon and derived from models of how the world of human beings works (social sciences) and models of the nature and function of language (linguistics)." Even though it has been nearly thirty-four years since the publication of Malina's article, there are still many themes, concepts, and repeated phrases in the NT begging for more thorough study in both the social science and linguistic arenas.

The figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT are one such example. The noun ὄιός occurs 377 times in the Greek NT. In almost eighty percent of those occurrences, the noun is followed by a genitive modifier in a "son(s) of" phrase. Thus, the noun ὄιός occurs far more often with a genitive modifier than without one. The only nouns that are

---

2Ibid., 231.
3Ibid., 232.
4Throughout this work, NA27 is version of the Greek New Testament used. Citations from the LXX are from Alfred Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart:Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935).
5In 301 occurrences, the noun ὄιός has a genitive modifier.
more common in the Greek NT than υἱός are θεός, Ἰησοῦς, κύριος, ἀνθρωπος, Χριστὸς, πατήρ, ἡμέρα, and πνεῦμα. In addition, υἱός occurs more often than many other nouns related to important NT topics such as disciple, faith, grace, and heaven. Despite the fact that this construction is found with such frequency within the Greek NT, it is paid surprisingly little attention from interpreters. Either it is disregarded altogether where it is found or the focus is primarily upon the Semitic use of בֵּן as the linguistic background for the NT phrase. Rarely is the author's employment of father-son language and its meaning within the NT social world analyzed and utilized with any degree of depth.

When interpreters label NT "son(s) of" phrases as Semitic, Hebraic, or Septuagintal, they likely mean one of two things. Either they mean that the NT author's use of υἱός plus the genitive is based on a similar linguistic construction in the MT or LXX, or they mean that the NT author's use of the phrase "son(s) of" is influenced by a Semitic way of thinking. The former option is insufficient for the interpreter who truly seeks to understand the text because it cannot be denied that a strong connection exists between language and thought and language is inseparable from the social context of its communication. Further, for the NT authors, "their whole view of things was penetrated with Hebrew modes of thought." However, in the case of the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT, the second option, without corresponding explanation, is deficient as well. For,

---

6 While word frequency on its own does not make a compelling argument, these facts do provide helpful perspective on how common this construction is in the NT writings.


to interpret texts (units of meaning) from the past, the interpreter has to imagine how meanings functioned, how they operated, how they related to each other in terms of the persons, things, and events of the past that embodied meanings. Models of such operations and relations are, at bottom, models of society, social science models. The point to be underscored is that if interpretation of written language of any sort takes place some domain of reference will be used by the reader. This domain of reference will be rooted in some model of society and of social interaction.9

The deficiency here is seen by considering the domain of reference employed by the reader. Very few, if any, modern readers bring a default domain of reference to the biblical text which is appropriate to its cultural setting: "for all non-Mediterraneans, including all Americans, reading the Bible is always an exercise in cross-cultural communication."10 When the text under consideration includes concepts and institutions which more closely resemble, and yet still differ from, those same concepts and institutions in the reader's own cultural context, the need for an appropriate domain of reference is not as readily apparent.

For example, compare the interpretation of Levirate Marriage texts to the interpretation of the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Both commentators and the average reader of Scripture quickly understand that the concept of Levirate Marriage differs significantly from modern, Western culture's understanding of marriage and the importance of raising up an heir. The interpreter has a framework for marriage and even the death of a spouse, but the dead spouse's brother marrying his widow for the purpose of raising up his heir is foreign and peculiar to contemporary Westerners. They recognize their need to understand this practice in light of its historical social context almost instantly. In fact, most, if not all, readers cannot understand it without such study.


On the other hand, there are the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Even in today's culture, many, if not all, commentators and average readers of Scripture will approach these texts with the assumption that their default domain of reference is more than adequate for arriving an appropriate understanding of them. They understand the role of father and the role of son and bring that understanding to bear in their interpretation of the text. The problem is that their default domain of reference, while it possesses a framework for interpreting the father-son relationship, is the wrong domain of reference to employ when interpreting these texts because the father-son relationship in the text is rooted in a social world which differs dramatically from their own. As a result, NT scholars must do more than simply refer to a Semitic domain of reference in cases such as these. In fact, it is more important in these cases than it is in situations where it is readily apparent to the reader that they need a different domain of reference. Scholars must show the reader the proper domain of reference – show a Semitic understanding of these concepts and institutions – and demonstrate how to interpret the text in light of it. Further, in the case of these "son(s) of" phrases, it will be seen that while the NT use of this phrase might be described as a Semitic idiom, "son(s) of" is readily at home not only in Hebrew but also in non-Jewish, non-Christian Greek writings and even in modern English.\textsuperscript{11} This reality stresses the importance of employing the proper interpretive background in order to arrive at an accurate understanding of all that the NT authors seek to communicate through their use of the father-son relationship in these texts.

\textsuperscript{11}E.g., "son of a gun." In fact, it could likely be found in any culture where the father-son relationship exists and perhaps even those in which the mother-son relationship is more prominent.
Thesis

Because the use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT has been overlooked, unhelpfully focused on identifying or disputing a Semitic background, and failed to be considered against the proper background of the father-son relationship in the ancient world, this study proposes to consider it in depth. It will be shown below that the occurrences of the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT fall into one of three groups: (1) Genetic Identification, (2) Messianic Titles, and (3) Figurative Use. It is this last category of "son(s) of" phrases which especially needs to be given further consideration. The figurative use makes up roughly fourteen percent of the total occurrences of the "son(s) of" phrases constructed using ὑιός plus the genitive in the Greek NT.

The thesis is that the figurative use of "son(s) of" represents the NT author employing the father-son relationship, and what this relationship represents in the ancient world, as a tool to illustrate and explain various concepts and ideas in NT thought. As a result, the father-son relationship in the ancient world must be employed in the interpretation of these figurative "son(s) of" phrases. In some cases, ὑιός plus the genitive is used to describe the intimate relationship that believers share with their heavenly Father. In other cases, the phrase is used to identify, group, characterize, qualify or disqualify, and honor or shame an individual by putting them into relationship with a person, thing, or concept. Failing to understand the importance of genealogical

\[\text{12}\] For further information on these categories and the occurrences within them, see chap. 3.

\[\text{13}\] In chapter 4, the following interpretive categories are drawn from the father-son relationship in the ancient world: Identification, Participation, Submission, Characterization, Succession, Inheritance, and Motivation. Their use in interpretation is demonstrated in chapter 5. For an explanation of these categories, see p. 121 and following.
identification, kinship, and the social implications of the father-son relationship in the ancient world and bring these concepts to bear in interpretation, will result in a failure to understand what the NT authors seek to communicate by using "son(s) of" phrases. While it may seem like a phrase deserving to be overlooked, a correct valuation and understanding of these "son(s) of" phrases will further our understanding of the thought and theology of NT authors and help us to appreciate more fully the relationship in which individual believers participate as sons of our Father in heaven.

**History of Research — Grammar and Lexical Works**

As was noted above, in most works, the figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive is simply overlooked or the focus is primarily upon the MT or the LXX as the proper linguistic background for the phrase. First, this point will be illustrated from research. Second, the few scholars who regard this construction as more than merely Semitic will be examined.  

**Interpreted as Semitic**

*Winer.* Winer identifies the phrase as a Hebraism.  

他又 is a periphrasis (as it is said) for certain concrete adjectives when used as substantives, formed by means of υἱός or τέκνον followed by a genitive of the abstract noun.  

---

14 Again, it is unclear what exactly these scholars mean when they label these phrases as Semitic, Hebraic, or Septuagintal. However, as mentioned above, simple labeling is not enough to assist the interpreter in accurately understanding these phrases.


16 Ibid.
notes only one similar use of υἱός plus the genitive in Greek literature outside the NT.\textsuperscript{17}

**Thackeray.** Thackeray's LXX Grammar makes note of the fact that "υἱός is used to render some idiomatic phrases with Ἰα, but this Hebraism is mainly confined to the literal group: the Hexateuch, Isaiah, and Chronicles generally avoid it."\textsuperscript{18} He goes on to break down the occurrences into two categories: (1) "of age" and (2) "of characteristics, qualities, etc."\textsuperscript{19} Here, he is simply noticing the usage and not commenting on its significance.

**BDF.** BDF classifies υἱός plus the genitive under the heading "genitive of origin and relationship."\textsuperscript{20} Here, they write, without any substantiation, "the use of υἱός in a figurative sense (often) is predominantly a Hebraism."\textsuperscript{21}

**TDNT.** In TDNT, the figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive seems to fall into two categories: "υἱός as a Term for Student" and "υἱός as a Term of Relationship."\textsuperscript{22} Both of these categories are seen to a have a predominantly Semitic background.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{17}Winer cites Epiphanius as having the phrase οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀληθινῆς πίστεως. See ibid., 299.


\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., 41-42.


\textsuperscript{21}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{23}See ibid. p. 8:345, 8:358, and 8:365.
LSJM. LSJM notes that υἱός plus the genitive occurs often in the LXX and explains the occurrences as "Hebraisms with various meanings."\(^{24}\) Luke's υἱός εἰρήνης in 10:6 is relegated to this category. While υἱοὶ θεοῦ is given its own sublisting, LSJM seems to see the figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the Gospels as specific expressions of the LXX Hebraisms in the NT.\(^{25}\)

BDAG. Bauer lists some figurative usages of υἱός plus the genitive under the heading "υἱός with the genitive of thing."\(^{26}\) With BDF, he says that it is probably a "Hebraism in the main."\(^{27}\)

Zerwick. Zerwick writes that υἱός plus the genitive indicates "a certain intimate relation to a person or thing" and "is expressed in a manner not indeed exclusively Semitic, but in our literature certainly prevalently so."\(^{28}\) It is worth noting that while Zerwick clearly points out that this usage is not exclusively Semitic, the use of υἱός plus the genitive follows his discussion on what he calls the "Hebrew Genitive."\(^{29}\) Zerwick does not seem to make a distinction between the uses of υἱός plus the genitive which occur in translations of Semitic originals and those which occur in texts which


\(^{25}\)Ibid.

\(^{26}\)Walter Bauer et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1026. Here, it is worth noting that υἱός plus the genitive is used figuratively not only with a genitive of thing but also with persons.

\(^{27}\)Ibid.


\(^{29}\)Ibid., 14.
were originally composed in Greek.

**Moving Beyond a Solely Semitic Understanding**

Deissmann. Deissmann writes that "circumlocutions by which certain adjectival conceptions are represented by υἱός or τέκνον followed by a genitive" are "very frequent in the early Christian writings."\(^{30}\) He says that they are "due to the more vivid imagination of the oriental, who looked upon any very intimate relationship—whether of connection, origin or dependence—as a relation of sonship, even in the spiritual sphere."\(^{31}\) Deissmann goes on to draw a distinction between those examples of υἱός plus the genitive which occur in translations of Semitic originals and those which occur in texts which were originally composed in Greek. He argues that there are examples within the LXX that do not necessarily need to be regarded as simple Hebraisms. Regarding them and other examples pulled from the Epistles of Paul and Peter, Deissmann writes that "in no case whatever are they un-Greek; they might quite well have been coined by a Greek who wished to use impressive language. Since, however, similar turns of expression are found in the Greek Bible, and are in part cited by Paul and others, the theory of analogical formations will be found a sufficient explanation."\(^{32}\)

For Deissmann then, the uses of υἱός plus the genitive that are found in NT documents which are dependent upon a Semitic original might be best understood as a

---

\(^{30}\)Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901), 166.

\(^{31}\)Ibid., 161.

\(^{32}\)Ibid., 166.
"Hebraism of translation" rather than understanding them as a simple case of a Hebraism or Semitism. Those uses of "son(s) of" phrases found in NT documents which were composed entirely in Greek are not necessarily un-Greek expressions but may arise due to the author's familiarity with such expressions as they are found in the Hebrew Bible, LXX, or, as will be seen below, other Greek writings.

Robertson. Initially, Robertson seems to cite Deissmann approvingly when he says under the "Attributive Genitive" category that "even expressions like υἱοὶ φωτός (1 Th. 5:5) are shown by the inscriptions and coins (Deissmann, Bib. Stud., p. 165) to be not mere Hebraisms, though more frequent in the LXX than the NT because of the Hebrew."33 Later, Robertson again cites Deissmann seemingly favorably but only after he contradicts him by writing that "the use of υἱός or τέκνον with the genitive is exactly like the Hebrew idiom with בֵּן and is extremely common in the LXX and fairly so in the NT."34

Moulton. Moulton notes that use of υἱός or τέκνον with the genitive in a figurative sense is one of the "most characteristically Semitic idioms."35 Moulton lists what he believes fall under this category, and it is worth noting that he fails to list all figurative uses of υἱός plus the genitive.36 In addition, he inexplicably excludes υἱός

---


34Ibid., 651.


36Ibid., 2:441.
πονηροῦ in Matthew 13:38 and υἱός διαβόλου in Acts 13:10. Later, he cites Deissmann and his argument that these phrases as they occur in writings composed in Greek are not necessarily un-Greek. In *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, Moulton cites multiple examples of υἱός plus the genitive from Greek literature outside the New Testament and concludes that while the construction is typically regarded as Hebraistic, it is not un-Greek.

**Danker.** Danker wrote a short study where he recognizes that "son(s) of" phrases in the NT "are usually explained by commentators as Hebraisms or translation-Greek despite the caution given by A. Deissmann and Moulton-Milligan." Danker also highlights the use of υἱός plus the genitive in Menander's *Dyscolos* as further vindication of Deissmann's work. His conclusion is that "the idiom felt at home in both Hebrew and Greek, and therefore the New Testament writers do not hesitate to employ it along with their best literary phrasing."

**History of Research — Survey of Commentators**

Below is a consideration of what various commentators have said about these phrases as they occur in five selected passages taken as examples of how figurative

---


38Ibid.

39James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930), 649. He cites Deissmann on this point.


41Ibid.

42Ibid.
"son(s) of" phrases are used by various authors in the NT. The goal in this introduction is to explore the major commentaries and their understanding of the background of the phrase and how that background is used, or not, to assist in interpreting the figurative use of "son(s) of" in the NT. It will be seen that the insights of Deissmann, Moulton, and Danker have largely been ignored by scholars. Most commentators focus primarily on the so-called Semitic nature of the phrases without sufficient explanation and, other than rare exceptions, those remaining fail to consider with any degree of depth the author's figurative use of "son(s) of" against the interpretive backdrop of the father-son relationship in the ancient world.

οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας (Matt 8:12)

On the phrase οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας in Mathew 8:12, most commentators identify υἱός plus the genitive as a Semitism. Both Luz and Nolland pay surprisingly little attention to the "son(s) of" phrase. France correctly interprets the phrase as referring to “those who should have been included but who are shockingly declared to be consigned to the place of the ungodly;” other than a footnote, however, which refers the

---

43 As is mentioned in the paragraph above, the five passages below simply represent a sampling of the figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Other passages include: Matt 5:9, 45, 9:15, 12:27, 13:38 (twice), 23:15, 31, 27:9; Mark 2:19, 3:17; Luke 5:34, 6:35, 11:19, 16:8 (twice), 20:34, 36 (twice); John 17:12, 19:26; Acts 3:25, 4:36, 13:10, 23:6; Rom 8:14, 19, 9:26; Gal 3:7, 26; Eph 3:5, 5:6; Col 3:6; 2 Thess 2:3; Heb 12:5; 1 Pet 5:13. The interpretation of these phrases will be the focus of chap. 5.


reader to other “son(s) of” phrases, he makes no mention of the specific language
employed and its significance.⁴⁶

υἱός εἰρήνης (Luke 10:6)

Luke's υἱός εἰρήνης in 10:6 is also identified as a Semitism by most
commentators.⁴⁷ Marshall, citing Moulton, Danker, and TDNT, recognizes that υἱός plus
the genitive is "an idiom found in Classical and Hellenistic Greek but also frequent in
Semitic."⁴⁸ Even with this recognition, Marshall does not explore Luke's figurative use of
the father-son relationship here.⁴⁹

υἱοὶ φωτός (John 12:36)

On the phrase υἱοὶ φωτός in John 12:36, commentators are nearly unanimous
in their identification of υἱός plus the genitive as a Semitism.⁵⁰ Bultmann refers to this

---


⁴⁹Similarly, Bock understands the son of peace as one who is a "child of the kingdom who responds to the disciples' offer of peace with reception and hospitality." In addition, he mentions that "son(s) of" phrases can be both positive and negative. But again, there is no deeper discussion of Luke's figurative use of the father-son relationship. See Darrell L. Bock. *Luke 9:51-24:53*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996).

expression in the DSS and Mandaean literature as further demonstration of the Semitic origins of this phrase.\textsuperscript{51}

τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας (Eph 2:2)

Even though Ephesians is not a translation of a Semitic original, commentators are quick to point out the Semitic origins of τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας in Ephesians 2:2.\textsuperscript{52} While he does not draw on Paul's figurative use of the the father-son relationship, O'Brien rightly understands that the "son(s) of" phrase here describes "men and women whose lives are characterized by disobedience."\textsuperscript{53} Bruce nearly overlooks the use of υἱός plus the genitive by only mentioning a literal rendering of the phrase.\textsuperscript{54}

υἱοὶ φωτός | υἱοὶ ἡμέρας (1 Thess 5:5)

The two "son(s) of" phrases in 1 Thessalonians 5:5, υἱοὶ φωτός and υἱοὶ ἡμέρας...


\textsuperscript{51}See Bultmann, Gospel of John, 357n3.

\textsuperscript{52}See Clinton E. Arnold, Ephesians, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010); Markus Barth, Ephesians 1-3, AB, vol. 34 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974); Andrew T. Lincoln, Ephesians, WBC, vol. 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990); and Frank Thielman, Ephesians, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010). Hoehner draws on Deissmann, Moulton, Robertson, and Zerwick, and writes that "the use of υἱός or τέκνον (mostly in the plural) followed by a genitive of the abstract noun is like a Hebrew idiom with תָּנָא, and it is found frequently in the LXX." See Harold W. Hoehner, Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 315.

\textsuperscript{53}Peter T. O'Brien, The Letter to the Ephesians, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 161.

\textsuperscript{54}F. F. Bruce, The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 283.
ἡμέρας, are identified as examples of a Semitism by the vast majority of commentators. Green writes that "children of x' was both a Hebrew and a Greek expression that meant that a person or group of people participated in something or were in close relationship with something." Even though Wannamaker identifies these phrases as Semitic idioms, he notes that "expressions such as 'sons of the day' and 'sons of light' reflect the patriarchal society in which they emerged (ancient Israel) and the one in which they were taken up (the Greco-Roman world)." Unfortunately, despite this recognition, Wannamaker does not explicitly employ their understanding of the father-son relationship in his interpretation of the phrase in this passage.

Conclusion of Commentary
Survey

As can been seen from the above survey, despite the warnings of Deissmann, Moulton, and Danker, the vast majority of major commentaries have for the last fifty-five years continued to fail to recognize any great significance in the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT other than them being influenced by the MT and LXX. In addition, those scholars who attempt to heed their caution fail to explore fully the implications of the NT authors' language.


56Gene L. Green, The Letters to the Thessalonians, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 236. Green is clearly influenced by Deissmann on this point.

57Wannamaker, Epistles to the Thessalonians, 182.
figurative use of the father-son relationship and adopt that framework in their interpretation. It is this lack which this present work endeavors to address.

A Brief Word About Grammar

The purpose of this work is not to consider the grammatical foundation of these "son(s) of" phrases in the NT as they are constructed using υἱός plus the genitive. Instead, this work is focused on the cultural background that should be used in the interpretation of these phrases. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to consider briefly υἱός plus the genitive with respect to its grammatical background. The most frequent grammatical categories suggested for υἱός plus the genitive are the attributive genitive and genitive of relationship.58 Regarding the attributive genitive, Wallace explains that "the genitive substantive specifies an attribute or innate quality of the head substantive."59 Wallace writes that a genitive of relationship is where "the substantive in the genitive indicates a familial relationship, typically the progenitor of the person named by the head noun."60

The use of υἱός plus the genitive in the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT represents somewhat of an overlap between these two categories. They are at the base level genitives of relationship. The genitive noun is indicating a familial relationship wherein the genitive noun is the father of the head noun. This explanation stands even in those occurrences where the familial relationship expressed is figurative. However, as will be

58For the attributive genitive, see Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, 496; and Zerwick, Biblical Greek, 14; for genitive of relationship, see BDF § 162.


60Ibid., 83.
seen in the course of this work – especially in chapters 4 and 5 – a familial relationship also specifies attributes or innate qualities about the head noun. As a result, ὃς plus the genitive should be understood as a genitive of relationship although our understanding of this category should be expanded to include its implicit attributive qualities. Further, while not necessary, the figurative use of ὃς plus the genitive could be seen as a more specialized category: genitive of figurative relationship.

"Son(s) of" Phrases Outside the NT

Chapter 2 will show that the "son(s) of" phrases constructed using ὃς plus the genitive are found both in texts that have a Semitic background and also those which were not directly influenced by the Hebrew language. The figurative use of ὃς plus the genitive is found in Jewish, Christian, and non-Christian documents written by many different authors in both Hebrew and Greek. The survey in chapter 2 and its findings will show that Deissmann, Moulton, and Danker were correct to caution commentators against myopically limiting their interpretation of these phrases to the influence of the Hebrew Bible's בֵּן. Instead, the figurative use of "son(s) of" should be explored using the father-son relationship and its nature, dynamics, and implications in the ancient world as the proper domain of reference for interpretation.

Method

First, this work follows in the footsteps of Deissmann, Moulton, and Danker by demonstrating that "son(s) of" phrases constructed using ὃς plus the genitive are "at home in both Hebrew and Greek."61 This task is accomplished in chapter 2 by exploring

61Danker, "The ὃς Phrases," 94.
its use in Greek works which have a Semitic original and also in those which do not have
a Semitic original. Second, in chapter 3, all of the occurrences of "son(s) of" phrases
constructed using ἴός plus the genitive in the Greek NT are categorized and classified.
Third, by drawing from the fields of cultural anthropology and the social sciences as well
as social scientific studies specifically related to biblical interpretation, chapter 4
examines the function of genealogy and the nature and dynamics of the father-son
relationship in the ancient world in order to develop a framework which can be employed
in the interpretation of the figurative use of "son(s) of" in the NT. Fourth, chapter 5
makes use of the framework developed in chapter 4 to interpret the figurative "son(s) of"
phrases in the NT. This process yields an interpretation which more fully understands
what the NT authors seek to communicate through the figurative use of "son(s) of"
phrases in the NT. Finally, chapter 6 summarizes and concludes the work as well as
drawing out some implications and suggesting areas of further study.
CHAPTER 2

THE USE OF ΥΙΟΣ PLUS THE GENITIVE OUTSIDE
THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

Introduction

The "son(s) of" phrases in the NT are constructed using υἱός plus the genitive. As a result, in order to properly understand how the NT authors use these phrases, it is necessary to consider how this construction functions outside the Greek NT as well. In his work on these phrases, Deissmann writes that "in order to understand this 'New Testament' idiom, it is also necessary to distinguish here between the cases in which this 'periphrastic' υἱός or τέκνον occurs in translations of Semitic originals, and the instances found in texts which were in Greek from the first." ¹ This chapter follows Deissmann's suggestion and first considers how υἱός plus the genitive is used in the Septuagint and then how it is used in texts which do not have a Semitic original.

The Use of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible

Since the majority of the occurrences of υἱός in the Septuagint serve to translate בֵּן where it is found in the Hebrew Bible, before turning to examine the phrase in the LXX, its origins in the MT must be explored. BDB notes that the vast majority of uses of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible refer to the offspring of another.² While בֵּן typically refers

¹Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901), 161.
²BDB, 120.
to male offspring, it can also refer to male and female children, of both human beings and animals. In addition to its typical usage, Haag notes that "when an intimate relationship between two persons or some connection between two things continually exists, this is frequently described in terms of the father-son formula." Thus, outside of its typical identification of the direct male descendant of a father, בֵּן is used to describe the relationship between (1) a person to a group of people or tribe, (2) a person to a geographic location, (3) a person to an academic, professional, or social group, and (4) a person to a thing or concept in a figurative manner. It is these atypical uses which will be considered below.

A Person to a Group of People or Tribe

Since בֵּן was consistently used to refer to differing levels of male descendants such as the immediate male descendant of a father, "son," and the subsequent male descendant of a father's son, "grandson," it is not surprising that it was also used to refer to male descendants farther down the genealogical line. Though this category might appear to be an abnormal use of a בֵּן to the modern reader, for the original audience, it was not. This understanding of sonship across multiple generations is due to their belief that "kinship is participation in one blood, which passes from parent to child and

---

3Gen 3:16, 21:7; Exod 21:5, 22:24 as found in BDB, 121.
4Lev 22:28; Deut 22:6-7; 1 Sam 6:7, 10; Zech 9:9 as found in BDB, 121. Note that it can also refer to the "offspring" of plants, e.g., Gen 49:22.
6These categories have been adapted from ibid., 2:152-53.
circulates in the veins of every member of the family.”

In fact, “there was a very strong sense of solidarity which produced a consciousness of continuous extension crossing the barriers of succeeding generations and uniting the whole group.” Expressions such as "the sons of Esau" (Deut 2:29), "the sons of Lot" (Deut 2:19), and "the sons of Israel" are representative examples of this use of בן in the Hebrew Bible.

A Person to a Geographic Location

Genealogy and geography were often intertwined in the ancient world. Levin writes that "most of the biblical genealogies are not only lists of private people and their lineage, but rather represent clans and families, their geographic diffusion and their administrative or economic structure.” In addition, Levin writes that individuals are referred to as both fathers and sons of a particular place depending on their relationship to the geographic locale. In the MT, see the following examples of this use of בן: "sons of Bethlehem," "sons of the east," "sons of Egypt," "sons of Jericho," and "sons of Zion."

A Person to an Academic, Professional, or Social Group

While this category is typically not considered a figurative use of בן, it should

---


9 See Deut 23:17; Josh 10:20; 2 Chr 13:12 for examples. This expression is frequent in the MT.


11 Ibid., 28.

12 See Ezra 2:21; Jdg 6:3; Ezek 16:26; Ezra 2:34; Ps 149:2.
be regarded as such. Those who are described as sons of a particular teacher, job, or class are not necessarily genetic descendants of those individuals in their group; rather, they are described as "sons" because they figuratively take after their "fathers" in their various academic, professional, and social groups. Thus, one sees "sons of the prophets" refers to those who are their students or disciples. Similar phrases are "son of the nobility," "sons of the gatekeepers," "sons of the singers," "sons of the poor," and "son of the wise." According to Caragounis, this expression has its roots in the Semitic thought "that the teacher-pupil relationship was conceived of as a father-son relationship." 

A Person to a Thing in a Figurative Manner

This category refers to those uses of בֵּן which identify, characterize, and/or qualify a person in terms of the thing to which they are figuratively related as a son. Naturally, it is this category which provides some of the most significant background for the figurative use of ὦιός plus the genitive in the Greek NT. These uses of בֵּן can be better understood by breaking them down into the following subcategories: sonship as destiny, sonship as characterization, and idiomatic uses. The subcategories are examined below.

Sonship as destiny. Here, בֵּן is used to convey figuratively the "destiny to which an individual is doomed or may be subject." It would seem that this figurative use

---

13Chrys C. Caragounis, "בֵּן," in NIDOTTE, ed. Willem A. VanGemeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 1:674. For examples of this phrase, see 1 Kgs 20:35; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7, 15, 4:1, 38, 5:22, 6:1, 9:1. A similar phrase which may refer to those who are not a literal, direct descendant is "sons of the priests" which is found in 1 Chr 9:30, Ezra 2:61, 10:18 and Neh 12:35.

14See Eccl 10:17; Ezra 2:42; Neh 12:28; Ps 72:4; and Isa 19:11 respectively.

15NIDOTTE, 1:674.

16Ibid.
of the father-son relationship is drawing on the notion that sons are qualified to share in the rights, privileges, and status of their father in society.\textsuperscript{17} For example, in general, describing an individual as a "son of a fisherman" would both qualify that individual to serve as a fisherman and also disqualify them from serving in other positions, such as a priest or political leader. These figurative uses describe a son of a specific thing to communicate that they are qualified to receive a specific fate. In the MT, there are the following examples of this use of בֵּן: "son of a beating," "son(s) of death," "sons of the pledges," "son of my threshing-floor," and, likely, "sons of your childlessness."\textsuperscript{18}

**Sonship as characterization.** In the ancient world, a person's lineage served to describe or characterize what kind of person that individual was or would become in society.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, being the son of an honorable father would characterize an individual as being honorable himself. Under this category, individuals are linked figuratively as sons to an attribute or quality which characterizes them in either positive or negative terms. In the MT, there are the following examples of negative characterization: "son(s) of wickedness," "son(s) of malice," "sons of rebelliousness," "sons of tumult," "sons of foolishness," "sons of affliction," "son of the murderer," and "sons of the troops."\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{18}For "son of a beating" see Deut 25:2. For "son(s) of death" see 1 Sam 20:31, 26:16; 2 Sam 12:5; Ps 79:11, 102:21[20]. For "son of the pledges" see 2 Kgs 14:14. For "son of my threshing-floor" see Isa 21:10. For "sons of your childlessness" see Isa 49:20. These examples are also present in the non-exhaustive lists found in *TDOT* and *NIDOTTE*.

\textsuperscript{19}Hood, "Genealogies," 5.

\textsuperscript{20}For "son(s) of wickedness" see Deut 13:14; Jdg 19:22, 20:13; 1 Sam 2:12, 10:27; 1 Kgs 21:10, 13; 2 Chr 13:7. For "son(s) of malice" see 2 Sam 3:34, 7:10; Ps 89:23; 1 Chr 17:9. For "sons of rebelliousness" see Num 17:25. For "sons of tumult" see
"Son(s) of strength or power," "sons of delight," and "sons of oil" are examples of positive characterization.\textsuperscript{21}

**Idiomatic uses.** Some expressions reflect a clear idiomatic use of בֵּן: "son of oil," "son of the dawn," "sons of fire," "sons of the bow," and "sons of the quiver."\textsuperscript{22}

Another frequent idiomatic use of בֵּן is to describe the age of an individual. For example, a person who is one hundred years old would be described as "a son of a hundred years."\textsuperscript{23}

**Summary of the Use of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible**

While בֵּן is most often used in the MT to refer to a direct and immediate male descendant, it is also used in ways which do not fit this strict understanding of the word. As is shown above, it can also identify an individual as a member of a group, as an inhabitant of a geographic locale, or as one who is figuratively related to another person or thing. It is this last group of uses which is of particular interest to the present work and they will be examined below as they are translated into the LXX.

---

\textsuperscript{21}For "sons(s) of strength or power" see Deut 3:18; Judg 18:2, 21:10; 1 Sam 14:52, 18:17; 2 Sam 2:7, 13:28, 17:10; 1 Kgs 1:52; 2 Kgs 2:16; 1 Chr 26:7, 30, 32; 2 Chr 17:7, 26:17. For "sons of the murderer" see 2 Kgs 6:32. For "sons of the troops" see 2 Chr. 25:13.

\textsuperscript{22}See Isa 5:1, 14:12; Job 5:7, 41:20; Lam 3:13 respectively. Each of these uses are cited in both *TDOT*, 152 and *NIDOTTE*, 674.

\textsuperscript{23}See Isa 65:20 for this example and more occurrences can be found in *TDOT*, 153.
The Use of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in the LXX

The inclination of NT scholars to limit the scope of their interpretation of the use of υἱός plus the genitive in the Greek NT to discussions related to the influence of Semitic language may be partly due to the tendency of the LXX translators to render literal translations of many of the בֵּן phrases examined above. In order to better understand the phrases as they occur in the NT, their usage in the LXX will be examined. First, the LXX rendering of the previously discussed uses of בֵּן will be considered according to their categories. Second, uses of υἱός plus the genitive which are not the result of a literal rendering of the Hebrew will be evaluated.

A Person to a Group of People or Tribe

As explained above, kinship in the ANE was understood in strongly collective terms. It was not uncommon to refer to an individual as a son of a patriarchal figure in a previous generation. Thus, in the LXX are found οἱ υἱοὶ Ἡσαυ, τοῖς υἱοῖς Λωτ, and the more frequent οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ as literal translations of the MT.

A Person to an Academic, Professional, or Social Group

Again, this category is typically not identified as a figurative use of υἱός even though it should be considered as such. An individual described in these terms is figuratively identified with his teacher or those whom he follows as if he were a son. For


25 This survey will focus only on those categories which are related to the figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive in the NT.

26 See Deut 2:29; Deut 2:19; and 2 Chr 13:12, respectively.
example, οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν is a literal rendering of the נֵרָי הָעָבְרָה found in the MT. At first glance, υἱὸς ἐλευθέρων in Ecclesiastes 10:17 seems like a poor translation of מַעַל הָרִים; however, HALOT makes it clear that "free" is an acceptable gloss for רָה. In Ezra 2:42, υἱὸς τῶν πυλωρῶν renders "sons of the gatekeepers." In Nehemiah 12:28, οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἐδόντων translates "sons of the singers." In Psalm 71[2]:4, τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν πενήτων renders "sons of the poor." Finally, in Isaiah 19:11, υἱὸς συνετῶν is a literal translation for "sons of the wise."

A Person to a Thing in a Figurative Manner

It is this category which provides some of the most significant background for the figurative use of "son(s) of" in the NT. The translations of the MT examples mentioned above will be discussed below according to their subcategories: sonship as destiny, sonship as characterization, and idiomatic uses.

Sonship as destiny. In the Hebrew Bible, בֵּן is used figuratively to communicate the destiny of an individual. In this case, an individual's destiny is what they inherit as a son. "Son of a beating" in Deuteronomy 25:2 is not translated using υἱός. All the occurrences of "sons(s) of death" are rendered by υἱός plus θανατός or one of its cognates in the genitive. In 2 Kings 14:14, "sons of the pledges" is translated by

28 See Eccl 10:17 and Isa 19:11
29 See HALOT, s.v. "פַּר."
30 The translator here instead opted for ἐστάτω ἕαν ἀξιος ἦ πληγών ὁ ἀσεβὼν.
31 For "son(s) of death" in the LXX see 1 Sam 20:31, 26:16; 2 Sam 12:5; Ps 78:11, 101:21.
the phrase τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν συμμίξεων. LEH explains that this phrase is best translated as "children of mixed marriages" which represents a significant deviation from the meaning of hostages conveyed by the MT. The phrase "son of my threshing floor" in Isaiah 21:10 is not rendered using υἱός plus the genitive. While it is not definitive that Isaiah's "sons of your childlessness" belongs in this category, it worth noting that the translator elects to render the phrase using the following clause: οἱ υἱοί σου οὓς ἀπολώλεκας. Here, the LXX moves away from the "son(s) of" phrase found in the MT: ζυγιναῖοι.

**Sonship as characterization.** This category represents the most common figurative use of בֵּן in the MT. Under this usage, an individual is figuratively related as a son to an attribute or quality which characterizes them in either positive or negative terms. Examples of negative characterization and their translation into the LXX are shown in table 1. Examples of positive characterization and their translation can be found in table 2. As the tables show, many of these examples are translated using υἱός plus the genitive. In only four of these examples is the "son(s) of" phrase replaced by a single noun or adjective.

---

32 See LEH, 582. While this differing translation is certainly intriguing, it is beyond the scope of the present work. What is of particular importance for this work is that the translator still used υἱός plus the genitive.

33 Here, the translator provides an interpretive gloss for the phrase using οἱ ὀδυνόμενοι to express the notion that the son of the threshing floor is one who suffers pain.

34 See NETS: "your sons whom you have lost" (Isa 49:20 NETS).

35 Note also the translation of Mic 1:16 using τέκνον plus the genitive instead of υἱός.

36 If the use of υἱός in this manner is as characteristically un-Greek as some have suggested, then this tendency might be expected to be much more common.
Table 1. Examples of negative characterization in the MT and LXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 13:13[14]</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>παράνοµοι</td>
<td>lawless men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[A] 19:22</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ παρανόµων</td>
<td>sons of transgressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[B] 19:22</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ παρανόµων</td>
<td>sons of lawless men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[A] 20:13</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς Βελιαλ</td>
<td>sons of Belial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[B] 20:13</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ παρανόµων</td>
<td>sons of transgressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 2:12</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ λοιµοὶ</td>
<td>pestilent sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 10:27</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ λοιµοּי</td>
<td>pestilent sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 20[21]:10</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ παρανόµων</td>
<td>sons of transgressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 20[21]:13</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ παρανόµων</td>
<td>sons of transgressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 13:7</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ παράνοµοι</td>
<td>lawless sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 3:34</td>
<td>υἱὸν ἀδικίας</td>
<td>sons of injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 7:10</td>
<td>υἱὸς ἀδικίας</td>
<td>son of injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 88[89]:23</td>
<td>υἱὸς ἀνοµίας</td>
<td>son of lawlessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 17:9</td>
<td>ἀδικία</td>
<td>injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 17:25</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς ἀνηκόων</td>
<td>sons of the disobedient ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 30:8</td>
<td>ἄφρόνων υἱοὶ</td>
<td>sons of fools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov 31:5</td>
<td>τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς</td>
<td>the powerless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 6:32</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ φονευτοῦ</td>
<td>son of the murderer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 25:13</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς δυνάµεως</td>
<td>the sons of the force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The translations in the fourth column are from NETS
Table 2. Examples of positive characterization in the MT and LXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>NETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 3:18</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חָֽיִל</td>
<td>δυνατός</td>
<td>mighty one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[A] 18:2</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֜יִל</td>
<td>υἱοὺς δυνάμεως</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[B] 18:2</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֜יִל</td>
<td>υἱοὺς δυνάμεως</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[A] 21:10</td>
<td>τόν υἱόν τῆς δυνάμεως</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg[B] 21:10</td>
<td>τόν υἱόν τῆς δυνάμεως</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 14:52</td>
<td>בֶּן־חַ֔יִל</td>
<td>υἱὸν δυνάμεως</td>
<td>son of might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 2:7</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֔יִל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ δυνατούς</td>
<td>mighty sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 13:28</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֔יִל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ δυνάμεως</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam 17:10</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֔יִל</td>
<td>υἱὸς δυνάμεως</td>
<td>son of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 1:52</td>
<td>בֶּן־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱוֹν δυνάֲמֵהוֹ</td>
<td>son of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 2:16</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ δυνάμεως</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 5:18</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱוֹν δυνάֲמֵהוֹ</td>
<td>sons of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 26:7</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱוֹי δυνַּטּ</td>
<td>able sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 26:30</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱוֹי δυνַּטּ</td>
<td>able-bodied sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 26:32</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱוֹי δυνַּטּ</td>
<td>able-bodied sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 17:7</td>
<td>בְּנֵי־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν δυνατῶν</td>
<td>sons of the mighty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 26:17</td>
<td>בְּנֵיא־חַ֗יִל</td>
<td>υἱοὶ δυνατοί</td>
<td>mighty sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic 1:16</td>
<td>γεγανάντησαν ὑμᾶς τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου</td>
<td>your pampered children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech 4:14</td>
<td>υἱοὶ τῆς πιότητος</td>
<td>sons of fattiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The translations in the fourth column are from NETS

**Idiomatic uses.** In the LXX, υἱός plus the genitive is also used to translate various idiomatic phrases from the MT. In Isaiah 5:1, "son of oil" is rendered using πίονι and υἱός is left untranslated. "Son of the dawn" from Isaiah 14:12 is also translated without υἱός with the phrase ὁ ἐωσφόρος ὁ πρωί ἀνατέλλων. The two examples from Job are also rendered without υἱός plus the genitive: "sons of fire" is translated with νεόσσοι
Uses of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in the LXX Not Dependent upon בֵּן in the MT

The vast majority of the occurrences of υἱός plus the genitive in the LXX are due to a literal translation of בֵּן in the MT, as has been seen above. These uses are what Deissmann has aptly described as a "Hebraism of translation." However, there are also examples of υἱός plus the genitive in the LXX that cannot be explained on the basis of a literal translation of a Semitic original. These will be considered below in the order in which they appear. Of particular note are the first two examples from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and 1 Chronicles since Thackeray argues that "this Hebraism is mainly confined to the literal group: the Hexateuch, Isaiah, and Chronicles generally avoid it."39

Leviticus 17:8, 22:18 (τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλί). In both of these verses, the phrase "sons of Israel" is supplied for לֵאָרְשִׁי. The "sons of the proselytes" renders גֵּר.

Deuteronomy 32:43 (υἱοὶ θεοῦ). In the MT, the call to rejoice is given to the nations together with God's people. The LXX translator extends this call: "rejoice, Heavens, with him, and let all the sons of God worship him, let the nations rejoice with his people."40

37For "sons of fire" see Job 5:7; for "sons of the bow" see Job 41:20.

38Deissmann, Bible Studies, 165.


40Deut 32:43, LXX (author's translation). Cf. NETS.
1 Samuel 10:26 (υἱὸς δυνάµεων). In the MT, Saul is described as going to his home in Gibeah. The reader is told that הַחַ֖יִל go with him. As was seen above, בְּנֵי־חַיִל is quite common in the MT, but here it is absent. However, the LXX translator renders this verse as if it was present by saying that "with Saoul went sons of power whose hearts the Lord had touched."\(^{41}\)

1 Kings 21[20]:15 (υἱὸν δυνάµεως). Here, הַחַ֖יִל is not even present in the MT, instead it has לֵאַר שֶׁיַיֵּנ. While υἱὸν Ἰσραὴλ would be the most literal rendering, instead the LXX has "son of power."\(^{42}\)

2 Kings 25:18 (υἱὸν τῆς δευτερώσεως). Here, the MT describes Zephaniah as the "second priest." The LXX similarly describes him as a "son of the second order."\(^{43}\)

1 Chronicles 20:4 (τῶν υἱῶν τῶν γιγάντων). This use υἱός plus the genitive translates שֵׁם הַגִּגְאִים. "Rephaim" is often translated using γίγας in the LXX. Here, it is worth highlighting the fact that this is the only time in the LXX υἱός is used to translate יָלִיד.\(^{44}\)

Psalm 79[80]:16 (υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου). This verse in the LXX does not represent a significant deviation, but it is worth noting that the LXX translator supplies a phrase using υἱός plus the genitive when the MT includes only בֵּן.\(^{45}\)

\(^{41}\)1 Kgdms 10:26 NETS.
\(^{42}\)1 Kgdms 21:15 NETS.
\(^{43}\)4 Kgdms 25:18 NETS.
\(^{44}\)Elsewhere it is translated using οἰκογενής in Gen 14:14, 17:12, 13, 27; Lev 22:11; Jer 2:14; ἔκγονος in 2 Sam 21:16, 18; and γενέα in Num 13:22, 28.
\(^{45}\)Cf. "the son whom you made strong for yourself" (Ps 80:15 ESV) and "a son
Proverbs 16:15 (υἱὸς βασιλέως). The MT has בֶּן שָׁם and this phrase is translated as ἐν φωτὶ ζωῆς υἱὸς βασιλέως.⁴⁶ For this occurrence, it is possible, and perhaps likely, that the presence of υἱὸς plus the genitive is due to the LXX translator reading בֶּן instead of בֶּן.

Jeremiah 2:6 (υἱός ἀνθρώπου). Here, the MT simply has בֶּן and the LXX translator made the shift to "a son of man."

Ezekiel 17:12, 18:2 (υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου). Neither בֶּן nor בֶּן are present at the beginning of either of these verses. These two occurrences of υἱὸς plus the genitive have been supplied by the translator.

Uses of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in the LXX Without a Hebrew Text

Finally, there are those examples of υἱὸς plus the genitive in the LXX which do not have a Hebrew text either due to that manuscript being lost or the document being composed in Greek from the start. These will be considered below in the order in which they occur.

Judith 16:6 (υἱοὶ τιτάνων). The author of Judith here is emphasizing the fact that God defeated the enemy of his people "with the hand of a female."⁴⁷ After stating this reality positively, Judith uses a negative statement to explain that he did not use "sons of..."

of man whom you made strong for yourself" (Ps 79:15 NETS).

⁴⁶NETS provides the following translation: "the son of a king is the light of life."

⁴⁷Jdt 16:5 NETS.
the Titans" to overthrow "their mighty one." 

**Judith 16:12 (υἱοὶ κορασίων).** While "sons of girls" seems like it could be a literal, genealogical phrase rather than figurative, it is important to recognize that the manner in which the "sons of girls pierced them through" is described as being ὡς παῖδας αὐτοῦν ἔτιτρωσκον αὐτούς. Thus, it would seem that the author is using both υἱός and παῖς plus the genitive in a figurative sense.

**Tobit 4:12 (υἱοὶ προφητῶν).** "Sons of the prophets" here provides an example of υἱός plus the genitive being used figuratively to identify these individuals as members of an academic, professional, or social group. This phrase was likely well-established because of its presence in the MT as well as its consistent translation into the LXX.

**Proverbs 24:22a (υἱὸς ἀπωλείας).** For Proverbs 24:22a, the LXX reads λόγον φυλασσόμενος υἱὸς ἀπωλείας ἐκτὸς ἐσται δεχόμενος δὲ ἐδέξατο αὐτόν. NETS translates as follows: "A son who keeps the word will be far removed from destruction, for he received it willingly." It seems that instead of taking ἀπωλείας as a genitive modifying υἱός, the NETS translators understand it as being part of a prepositional phrase with ἐκτὸς. This translation is highly improbable considering that when ἐκτὸς is used as a preposition, it always precedes the genitive in both the LXX and the NT. Thus, it is

---

48Jdt 16:6 *NETS.*

49Jdt 16:12 *NETS.*

50Prov 24:22a *NETS.*

51Thus, the son is "far removed from destruction" (Prov 24:22a *NETS.*).

more likely that ἑκτός is functioning as a noun here and that ἀπωλείας should be understood as a genitive modifying νιός: "a son of destruction."\(^{53}\)

**Sirach 45:9 (υἱοῖς λαοῦ αὐτοῦ).** "Sons of his people" here is likely formed on the basis of its somewhat frequent usage in the remainder of the LXX.\(^{54}\) There, it is formed in the translation of a fairly common construction like וֹיֶּנֶּ as found in Numbers 22:5.

**Psalms of Solomon 13:9 (υἱὸν ἀγαπήσεως).** This Psalm promises that the Lord will "admonish the righteous as a beloved son."\(^{55}\) This figurative son of the Lord's will be so characterized by the Lord's love that has been bestowed upon him that he will be considered a son of it.

**Repeated Υἱός Phrases.** There are two phrases which occur with more frequency in LXX writings which are not translations of works found in the MT. "Son(s) of man" occurs in both the singular and plural and in multiple cases. It is found in Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, and the *Psalms of Solomon*.\(^{56}\) "Son(s) of man" is a common phrase in both the LXX and the MT so its usage in these writings is not surprising. The second phrase which is repeated in these writings is "son(s) of God." It too occurs in both the singular and plural and in multiple cases. It is found in both the Wisdom of Solomon

---

\(^{53}\) Cf. John 17:12; 2 Thes 2:3.

\(^{54}\) See Num 22:5; Lev 19:18; Jdg 14:16, 17; 2 Kgs 23:6; 2 Chr 35:5, 7, 12, 13; Jer 17:19, 33:23; Ezek 3:11, 33:2, 12, 17, 30, 37:18; Dan 8:19, 12:1.

\(^{55}\) *Pss. Sol.* 13:9 *NETS.*

\(^{56}\) See Jdt 8:12, 16; Wis 9:6; Sir 17:30, 36:23; *Pss. Sol.* 9:4.
and the *Psalms of Solomon*. This latter use of υἱός plus the genitive is not exceedingly frequent in the LXX.

**Summary of the Use of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in the LXX**

As has been shown above υἱός plus the genitive is used in the LXX primarily to provide a literal translation of בֵּן as it is used in the Hebrew Bible. The translation is generally consistent regardless of the category in which a particular usage might fall. However, the use of υἱός plus the genitive in the LXX is not limited to what Deissmann calls "Hebraisms of translation." Instead, examples where the figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive is not due to a literal translation of בֵּן can be found in both writings which have a Hebrew original and also those which do not. These usages confirm with Deissmann and others that the use of υἱός plus the genitive is not necessarily un-Greek and "it is not at all necessary, in this matter, to have recourse to a Hebraism in every case."

**The Use of Υἱός Plus the Genitive in Other Greek Writings**

In this section, the use of υἱός plus the genitive as it occurs outside of biblical writings will be considered. The focus here will not be on uses of υἱός plus the genitive which are examples of mere genetic identification, instead, the figurative uses of "son(s) of" which are relevant to the present work will be the focus. These uses will be discussed

---

57See Wis 2:18, 5:5; *Pss. Sol.* 17:27.
58See Gen 6:2, 4; Deut 32:43; Ps 28:1, 88:7; Hos 2:1.
59Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 165.
60Ibid., 165.
below and grouped according to the body of literature to which they belong.

**OT Pseudepigrapha**

*1 Enoch.* Enoch uses ὦιός 33 times. In every occurrence except 2, ὦιός is followed by the genitive. Fifteen of these uses of ὦιός are used to identify an individual as a genetic descendant of another individual. The remaining 16 occurrences are found in 5 different phrases: "sons of men," "sons of the earth," "sons of the Watchers," "sons of heaven," and "sons of sexual immorality."  

*Sibylline Oracles.* In SibOr. 3:702, the author refers to the "sons of the great God." In SibOr. 8:217, Jesus is identified as θεοῦ ὦιός.

*Apocryphon of Ezekiel.* In ApocEzek. 2:1, the author uses a familiar LXX phrase: τοῖς ὦιοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ.

*Greek Apocalypse of Ezra.* In GkApEzra. 4:27, there is a reference to ὦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὦιός.

*Apocalypse of Sedrach.* In ApSedr. 1:20, τὸν θεοῦ ὦιός is used. A similar construction is found in ApSedr. 1:20 where θεός is the antecedent to the pronoun in the phrase τὸν αὐτοῦ.

---

61 Those works which are in this category and are also included in the LXX were covered in the discussion of the use of ὦιός plus the genitive in the LXX and will not be included here as well.

3 Baruch. The somewhat common phrase "sons of men" is found in 3Bar. 2:4, 15:3, and 16:1.

Apocalypse of Elijah. In this author's depiction of the apocalypse, Elijah and Enoch descend and pursue the "son of lawlessness." 63

Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. "Sons of men" occurs with some frequency in these writings. It is found in the Testaments of Reuben, Levi, Judah, Zebulun, Asher, and Joseph. 64 Also, in TJos. 15:2, Joseph is identified as a "son of a mighty man." 65

Testament of Abraham. This writing uses both "sons of men" and "son of God." 66

Testament of Solomon. The most frequent use of ὦιός plus the genitive in this writing is the phrase "sons of Israel." 67 This author uses a less common singular ὦιός ἀνθρώπου in TSol. A 5:3. In TSol. A 15:10, there is a reference to the "son of God." Finally, the author uses a seemingly unique version of the phrase "sons of God" in TSol. A 18:16: ὦιοὶ Σαβαὼθ.

Martyrdom of Isaiah. MartIs. 1:3 employs a use of ὦιός plus the genitive to

64For the phrase "sons of men," see TReu. 4:7; TLevi. 2:4, 3:10, 4:1; TJud. 24:1; TZeb. 9:7, 8; TAsh. 1:3; and TJos. 2:5, 5:4.
65ωἰός ἀνδρός μεγάλου.
describe the relationship of individuals to a professional or social group with the phrase υἱός προφητῶν.

_Joseph and Aseneth_. Multiple times in this work, Joseph is described as the "son of God."\(^6^8\)

_Apocalypse of Moses_. In _ApMos_. 3:2, Cain is characterized as being ὀργῆς υἱός.

_4 Baruch_. Throughout _4 Baruch_, the people are referred to as the "sons of Israel."\(^6^9\) In _4Bar_. 9:14, Jesus is identified as τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.\(^7^0\)

_History of the Rechabites_. In _HistRech_. 5:4, the speaker is afraid because he perceives that he is speaking to a υἱός θεοῦ.\(^7^1\) Later, elders among a crowd are described as being like "sons of God."\(^7^2\) The author also refers to the "sons of men" on three occasions.\(^7^3\)

_Prayer of Joseph_. In _PrJos_. 1, the author twice makes reference to the "sons of God."\(^7^4\)

---

\(^6^8\) See _JosAsen_. 6:2, 6, 21:3.

\(^6^9\) See _4Bar_. 1:1, 6:16, 9:30.

\(^7^0\) See also _4Bar_. 9:21 (twice).

\(^7^1\) See also _HistRech_. 16:2.

\(^7^2\) _HistRech_. 6:3.

\(^7^3\) _HistRech_. 8:1, 11:1, 5.

\(^7^4\) See _PrJos_. 1:6, 7.
Philo and Josephus

Philo. Philo's works include numerous occurrences of υἱός plus the genitive. The LXX phrase "the sons of Israel" is found throughout his works. He also refers to humanity as both the sons of Adam and also the sons of men. Philo has multiple uses of υἱός with the genitive of θεός. Finally, Philo seems to include two uses of υἱός plus the genitive similar to those which are found in the LXX and NT. In *Her.* 1.52, Philo has the phrase "son of life." In addition, it is possible *Congr.* 1.42 has a figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive. There, the Greek is τῆς δὲ παλλακίδος ταύτης, ἀναμνήσεως, υἱός ἐστι Μαχείρ. Yonge translates Philo here as saying "the son of the concubine recollection is Machir."

Josephus. In *Ant.* 8.374, Josephus has the phrase τοὺς τῶν ἡγεμόνων υἱούς. It is unclear whether this phrase should be understood as referring to the literal direct male descendants of τῶν ἡγεμόνων or if it should be taken as a use of υἱός plus the genitive to associate an individual with a particular social group. In *Ant.* 9.68, Joram is characterized as ὁ τοῦ φονεύτο υἱὸς. Josephus' phrase is quite similar to Joram's characterization in 2 Kings 6:32 as ὁ υἱός τοῦ φονεύτο. It is intriguing that Josephus does not include any of the more common "son(s) of" phrases such as "sons of the people," "son(s) of men," or

---

75 See Philo's *Leg.* 2.77, 3.133, 3.212, 3.214; *Sacr.* 1.118 (twice); *Det.* 1.94, *Post.* 1.158; *Deus* 1.145; *Plant.* 1.63; *Conf.* 1.93, 1.148; *Migr.* 1.15, 1.54; *Her.* 1.113, 1.117, 1.124; *Congr.* 1.86; *Mut.* 1.207; *Somn.* 1.117; *QE* 2.47.

76 For "sons of Adam," see *Post.* 1.89, 91; *Plant.* 1.59; *Congr.* 1.58. For "son(s) of man/men," see *Conf.* 1.1, 1.142; *Mos.* 1.283.

77 See *Deus.* 1.31; *Conf.* 1.145; *Spec.* 1.318.


79 Ibid., 2:165.
"son(s) of God."

Apostolic Fathers

Clement of Rome. In 1 Clem. 8:3, the author introduces an apparent quotation which includes the phrase τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ. Holmes notes that the quotation is "possibly a loose paraphrase of Ezekiel 33, or from an apocryphal work attributed to Ezekiel."\(^{80}\) Clement also refers to the "sons of men."\(^{81}\)

Epistle of Barnabas. The author instructs his readers to withstand the wicked times as υἱοῖς θεοῦ.\(^{82}\) Also, as are common uses of υἱός plus the genitive in the NT, he refers to Jesus as both the son of God and the son of man.\(^{83}\)

Epistle to Diognetus. In Diogn. 9:4, the author calls Jesus µόνῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Ignatius. In his letter to the Ephesians, he refers to Jesus as both the son of God and son of man.\(^{84}\) Similarly, in his letter to the Romans, Jesus is described as υἱοῦ πατρὸς.\(^{85}\)

Hermas. In HermVis. 3 6.1, Hermas has οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἄνομίας. This phrase is

---


\(^{81}\)See 1 Clem. 61:2.

\(^{82}\)See Barn. 4:9.

\(^{83}\)For "son of God," see Barn. 5:9, 11, 7:2 (twice), 9, 12:9. For "son of man," see Barn. 12:10.

\(^{84}\)See IgnEph. 20:2. See also "son of God" in IgnSmyrn. 1:1.

\(^{85}\)See IgnRom. 1:1.
unique to him among the Apostolic Fathers; however, in its singular form it is present in both Psalm 88:23 and ApEl. B 1:2. Hermas also uses the phrase "son of God" throughout his writings.  

**Polycarp.** Polycarp only uses υἱός plus the genitive once. It is to refer to Jesus as the son of God.  

**Didache.** Like Polycarp, the author's only significant use of υἱός plus the genitive is to call Jesus υἱὸς θεοῦ in *Did.* 16:4.

**NT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**

**Gospel of Thomas.** A Greek fragment of the *Gospel of Thomas* found in P.Oxy. 1.11-21 describes Jesus having compassion ΤΟΙΣ ὙΟΙΣ ΤΩΝ ἈΝΩΝ.

**Gospel of Peter.** The Akhmîm Fragment provides a Greek text of the *Gospel of Peter* which refers to Jesus as υἱὸς θεοῦ four times.

**Protoevangelium of James.** Throughout the Gospel, the author has the phrase "the sons of Israel." In *ProtJas.* 11:3, this work includes υἱὸς ἰὼν in the midst of a sentence similar to Luke 1:32.

---

86For "son of God" see HermSim. 5 5:2, 5, 6:1; HermSim. 8 3:2; HermSim. 9 1:1, 12:1, 2, 6, 8, 13:2, 3, 7, 14:5, 15:2, 4, 16:3, 5, 7, 17:1, 4, 18:4, 24:4, 28:2, 3.  
87MartPol. 17:3.  
89See ProtJas. 1:2, 3:1, 7:2, 9:2, 12:3, 14:1, 15:2, 4, 17:1, 20:2, 23:1.
**Gospel of Nicodemus.** Multiple times in the course of the work, the author identifies Jesus as the Son of God. In *GNic.* 20:4, the author has the phrase υἱὲ τῆς ἀπωλείας. While it is not a use of υἱός plus the genitive, it is worth noting that the author has the phrase τὰ τέκνα τῶν προφητῶν in *GNic.* 15:1.

**Martyrdom of Peter and Paul.** The phrase "son of God" is used throughout this work and is composed of a variety of forms.

**Acts of Peter and Paul.** As is common in these writings, "son of God" is found in multiple passages. In *ActsPetPaul.* 30.1, certain individuals are identified as τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἁβραὰκαὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ.

**Acts of Paul and Thecla.** In *ActsPaulThec.* 6:2, those who receive the wisdom of Jesus Christ are promised that they will be called υἱοὶ ὑψίστου. The same title is applied to Jesus later in *ActsPaulThec.* 29:2. The much more common ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is used in reference to Jesus in *ActsPaulThec.* 42:2.

**Acts of Andrew.** In *ActsAndr.* 12:1, as in other writings of this kind, υἱός plus the genitive is used to identify Jesus as the Son of God. The figurative description "son

---

90 See *GNic.* 1:1, 2:5, 4:5, 9:1, 10:1, 18:1 (thrice), 19:1, 20:1.
91 Cf. Prov 24:22a (LXX); John 17:12; 2 Thes 2:3; *ApPet.* I.2.; *EH* 5.1.48
92 Deissmann makes note of the similar function of these nouns with genitive modifiers. See Deissmann, *Bible Studies,* 161.
94 See *ActsPetPaul.* 35.2, 41.1, 47.2, 52.1, 72.3.
96 See *ActsAndr.*
of death" is used in *ActAndr* 8.6 using the phrase υἱὲ θανάτου.

**Acts of Andrew and Matthew.** This work uses both the phrase "son of God' and "sons of Israel."97

**Martyrdom of Bartholomew.** While this work uses the customary phrase "son of God," it also includes two uses of υἱός plus the genitive which occur with much less frequency.98 Understandably, Jesus is identified as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παρθένου.99 To refer to Adam, the author uses the much more original, yet still comprehensible, τὸν υἱὸν τῆς παρθένου γῆς.100

**Acts of John.** Jesus is identified with his most frequent NT self-appellation υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου.101 In addition, the author refers to Jesus as the "son of God."102

**Acts of Philip.** As well as employing the common "Son of God," Jesus is also described in this work as ὁ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ υἱός.103 In *ActsPhil.* 14.5, Philip is said to have been named a son of thunder by the Lord. Later, in *ActsPhil.* 22.2, a contrast is made between Philip who was a υἱὲ βροντῆς but is now a υἱὲ πρᾳότητος.104 In *ActsPhil.*

---


98 For "son of God" in *MarBarth.*, see 4.3, 10, 13, 5.14, 6.2.

99 For "son of the virgin" in *MarBarth.*, see 4.16, 5.5, 6, 7, 17, 6.8.

100 For "son of the virgin earth" in *MarBarth.*, see 4.16, 5.5, 5.17.


104 The second υἱὲ is implicit in the text and intervening words have been
109.2, the brothers are described as υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. An individual is described as a τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς in ActsPhil. 110.2. In ActsPhil. 123.3, snakes are identified as "the sons of our goddess."  

Acts of Thomas. The phrase "son of God" is used by the author throughout this work. Uncommon titles for Jesus found in this work are τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας υἱόν in ActsThom. 34.7, ὁ τῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας υἱὸς in ActsThom. 10.3, and υἱός βάθους μονογενής in ActThom. 143.4. In ActsThom. 66.5, the speaker describes himself as a υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. Later, the speaker describes his relative as a son of princes and recognizes that he himself is a son of kings. Similarly, Ouzanes is spoken to as a υἱὲ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν γῆν βασιλέως in ActThom. 167.1.

Apocalypse of Paul. The author of this work uses the common "Son of God" as well as the less common υἱὸς θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος in ApPaul. 44. Throughout the work, the author refers to human beings as the "sons of men." He also uses τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ twice in ApPaul. 48.

Apocalypse of John the Theologian. In ApJohn. 16, υἱὸς plus the genitive is used in the phrase "the sign of the Son of man."
Apocalypse of John Chrysostom. In this work, there is an almost exact quotation of the phrase including ιοί Θεοῦ from Matthew 5:9.\textsuperscript{111}

Apocalypse of Peter. In the Akhmîm fragment of ApPet., 1.2 has ιοί τῆς ἀπωλείας.\textsuperscript{112} There are similar versions of this phrase present in Proverbs 24:22a (LXX), John 17:12, and 2 Thessalonians 2:3. In ApPet. 1.3, the phrase τοὺς ιοὺς τῆς ἀνομίας is found.\textsuperscript{113}

Other Early Christian Writings

Eusebius. Eusebius includes a few LXX quotations which contain uses of ιοῦ plus the genitive. Each of these usages have the phrase "son(s) of man."\textsuperscript{114} Eusebius also uses "son of man" in reference to Jesus.\textsuperscript{115} He identifies Jesus as the Son of God seven times.\textsuperscript{116} In EH 4.22.7, he refers to the people as the ιοῖς Ἰσραηλιτῶν. Finally, he negatively characterizes those who blaspheme the Way and commit apostasy in EH 5.1.48 as οἱ ιοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας.\textsuperscript{117}

Clement of Alexandria. In Protrep. 8.1, Clement quotes Paul's use of ιοῦ

\textsuperscript{111}See Apocalypse of John Chrysostom 51. For more information on this work see John M. Court, The Book of Revelation and the Johannine Apocalyptic Tradition (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).


\textsuperscript{113}See also Ps 88:23; ApEl. B 1:2; and HermVis. 3 6.1.

\textsuperscript{114}EH 1.2.25 is a quotation from Dan 7:13, EH 9.11.8 is a quotation from Ps 145:3, and EH 10.4.8 is a quotation from Ps 44:3.

\textsuperscript{115}See EH 1.2.26, 2.23.13.

\textsuperscript{116}See EH 1.13.7, 1.13.15, 2.23.2, 4.15.42, 5.7.3, 7.30.11, 10.4.23.

\textsuperscript{117}Cf. Prov 24:22a (LXX); John 17:12; 2 Thes 2:3; and ApPet. I.2.
plus the genitive from Ephesians 2.2. In Protrep. 27.3, he juxtaposes οἱ τῆς ἀνομίας υἱοί with υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Clement also identifies people as "sons of God" in Protrep. 92.3 and What Rich Man is Saved? 29.1. In both What Rich Man is Saved? and To the Newly Baptized, he identifies Jesus as the Son of God using υἱὸς plus the genitive. In Protrep. 98.4, Clement describes Jesus in a seemingly unique manner using the phrase υἱὸς τοῦ νοῦ γνήσιος. Wilson translates this construction as "the genuine Son of Mind." It would seem that Clement is here using υἱὸς plus the genitive to provide a positive characterization of Jesus. Finally, in Strom. 5.10.63, Clement attributes a quote to an unknown Gospel which has the phrase τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου. The attributed speaker in this text is Jesus and he would seem to be figuratively characterizing his followers as sons of his house.

**Justin Martyr.** Justin has constructions using υἱὸς plus the genitive both that appear to be original to his work and also from biblical quotations. With many other Christian writers, he identifies Jesus as the Son of God. Similarly, he refers to the "son(s) of Jupiter" using various forms of υἱὸς plus Διός. Justin ascribes to Jesus four additional descriptions using υἱὸς plus the genitive. In Dial. Trypho 48.2, Jesus is called

118 See also Protrep. 123.1 where Clement has υἱοὶ ψηφίστου in a LXX quotation from Ps 81:6.

119 See What Rich Man is Saved? 12.1 and To the Newly Baptized 1.6.


121 See Apol. 12.9, 22.1 (twice), 30.1, 31.7, 54.7 (twice), 60.1, 63.10, 14, Dial. Trypho 23.2, 43.1, 45.4, 85.2, 100.4, 5, 101.3, 102.7, 103.8, 108.2, 113.4, 116.2, 117.3, 118.2, 126.1, 128.1, 132.1, 137.2.

122 See Apol. 21.1, 4, 22.3, 53.1, 54.6, 55.1, 64.6, Dial. Trypho 69.2.
In a similar construction in *Dial. Trypho* 115.4, he refers to him as υἱός τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων. Jesus is called the Son of the patriarchs in *Dial. Trypho* 100.2. Finally, in *Dial. Trypho* 126.2, the phrase τοῦ µόνου καὶ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου θεοῦ υἱόν is applied to Jesus. Dods and Reith offer the following translation of this last phrase: "Son of the only, unbegotten, unutterable God." In addition to these phrases, Justin includes twenty-six uses of υἱός plus the genitive which are quotations from biblical texts. These occurrences are shown in table 3.

As table 3 shows, Justin almost always mirrors the text of the LXX or Greek NT. In only three instances does he deviate from the LXX. In *Dial. Trypho* 131.1, he quotes Deuteronomy 32.8 where the LXX translator opted for ἄγγέλων θεοῦ, even though the MT has לֹּא נָבָנ. Thus, he seems to correct what may be an avoidance of υἱός plus the genitive by the LXX translator. In *Dial. Trypho* 13.4, Justin quotes Isaiah 53.3. He supplies a construction using υἱός plus the genitive when neither the MT has בֵּן nor the LXX has υἱός. The same phenomenon occurs at *Dial. Trypho* 87.6 where he quotes Psalm 67.19. Again, neither the MT nor the LXX have a corresponding "son(s) of" construction.

**Epiphanius.** Winer notes that Epiphanius uses the phrase οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀληθινῆς πίστεως. However, Epiphanius employs a host of various uses of υἱός plus the genitive: sons of Israel, sons of truth, sons of men, sons of the Father, sons of the holy church of Israel.

---


124 See Thackeray, *Grammar*, 41. He notes that the Hexateuch generally avoids υἱός plus the genitive.

Table 3. Justin's quotations of biblical uses of υἱός plus the genitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apol. 33.5</td>
<td>υἱός υψίστου</td>
<td>Luke 1:32</td>
<td>υἱός υψίστου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apol. 35.11</td>
<td>υἱόν υποζυγίου</td>
<td>Matt 21.5</td>
<td>υἱόν υποζυγίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apol. 51.9</td>
<td>υἱός ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>Dan 7:13</td>
<td>υἱός ἀνθρώπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 13.4</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>Is 53:3</td>
<td>πάντας ἀνθρώπους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 31.1, 3</td>
<td>υἱός ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>Dan 7:13</td>
<td>υἱός ἀνθρώπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 34.3</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
<td>Ps 71:1</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 34.3</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν πενήτων</td>
<td>Ps 71:4</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν πενήτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 38.3</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>Ps 44:3</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 59.2</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>Exod 2:23</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 61.4</td>
<td>υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>Prov 8:31</td>
<td>υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 64.6</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
<td>Ps 71:1</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 64.6</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν πενήτων</td>
<td>Ps 71:4</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν πενήτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 76.4</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>Matt 8:12</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 76.7</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>Mark 8:31</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 79.2</td>
<td>υἱός ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>Dan 7:13</td>
<td>υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 81.1</td>
<td>ὁ νέος υἱὸς ἐκατόν ἑτῶν</td>
<td>Is 65:20</td>
<td>ὁ νέος υἱὸς ἐκατόν ἑτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 86.6</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῶν προφητῶν</td>
<td>4 Kgs 6:1</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῶν προφητῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 87.6</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>Ps 67:19</td>
<td>ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 100.3</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>Mark 8:31</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 120.6</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>Matt 8:12</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῆς βασιλείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 122.1</td>
<td>υἱοὶ γεέννης</td>
<td>Matt 23:15</td>
<td>υἱοὶ γεέννης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 124.1-3</td>
<td>υἱοὶ υψίστου</td>
<td>Ps 81:6</td>
<td>υἱοὶ υψίστου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 127.1</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>Gen 11:5</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 131.1</td>
<td>υἱοὺς Αδάμ</td>
<td>Deut 32:8</td>
<td>υἱοὺς Αδάμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 131.1</td>
<td>υἱὸν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>Deut 32:8</td>
<td>ἀγγέλων θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial. Trypho 140.4</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>Matt 8:12</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοί τῆς βασιλείας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
God, sons of the devil, sons of God, sons of the day, and sons of the Most High.  

**Classical Greek Writings**

*Apollonius Rhodius.* In *Argon.* 4.1383, the author uses the phrase υἱὲς ἀνάκτων. Seaton translates this phrase as "sons of kings." 

*Aristophanes.* In *Peace* 1.1291, Trygaeus says the following to the son of Lamachus: "Oh! oh! I could indeed have sworn, when I was listening to you, that you were the son of some warrior, who dreams of nothing but wounds and bruises, of some Bulomachus of Clausimachus." In the Greek, the explicit "son of" phrase is κλαυσίµαχος τινὸς υἱός. LSJM explains that there is a word play here: the word κλαυσίµαχος means "rue-the-fight" and is a parody of the name Lamachus which means "ready-for-fight." Thus, it would seem that Aristophanes is using this wordplay featuring υἱός plus the genitive to characterize negatively the son of Lamachus. Similarly, in *Frogs* 1.22, he characterizes an individual as a drunkard by calling him "son of Wine-

---

126 These are all found in Epiphanius, *Panarion,* Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, accessed December 9, 2014, [http://www.tlg.uci.edu/](http://www.tlg.uci.edu/). For sons of Israel, see 1.190.14, 2.247.24, 2.396.8, 2.397.3, 3.430.28. For sons of truth, see 1.365.23, 2.299.2, 2.349.9, 3.105.13, 3.377.6, 3.411.3. For sons of men, see 1.375.13. For sons of the Father, see 2.66.31, 2.67.26. For sons of the holy church of God, see 2.378.9, 3.97.28, 3.211.22, 3.497.12. For sons of the devil, see 3.101.18, 3.101.22, 3.103.5. For sons of God see 3.167.21, 3.167.23, 3.263.26, 3.274.11, 3.285.10. For sons of the day, see 3.192.2. For sons of the Most High, see 3.324.20


130 See LSJM, s.v. "κλαυσίµαχος."
Aristotle. He uses the phrase οἱ τῶν βασιλέων υἱεῖς in Pol. 3.1227a and οἱ τῶν ἰπχόντων υἱοί in Pol. 5.1310a. These uses of υἱός plus the genitive do not necessarily refer to the literal genetic descendants of kings and rulers. Instead, they may figuratively identify these individuals as members of a specific social group.

Athenaeus. Athenaeus has two uses of υἱός plus the genitive worth highlighting here. First, in Deipnosophistae 3.4, he has the phrase γαίης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν. This phrase is also found in Homer's Odyssey 11.576. Yonge translates this phrase as "son of the all-glorious Earth." In Deipnosophistae 3.77, Athenaeus quotes a poem written by the epicure Archestratus about flour and rolls. In it, he uses the phrase σεμιδᾶλεος υἱόν. Yonge glosses this phrase as "son of finest flour."

Demosthenes. While Demosthenes' use of υἱός in Against Boeotus 2.27 appears to be merely an example of genetic identification, it is conveyed using υἱός plus

---


135 See ibid., 3.77
the genitive in an apparently stylistic manner: τὸν τῆς τεθνεώσης υἱόν.136

Diodorus Siculus. In Library 17.93, the qualification and characterization aspects of genealogy in the ancient world are clearly seen when a certain king is said to be "an utterly common and undistinguished character."137 This description is ascribed to him because he was thought to be a son of a barber. The Greek phrase is κουρέως υἱόν.138

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In AntRom. 4.64, it seems that he uses υἱός plus the genitive to describe figuratively the relationship between a student and his teacher or to identify this individual as a member of a professional or social group. The Greek phrase is ὁ τοῦ µάντεως υἱός.139 Cary translates this phrase as "the soothsayer's son" but in the same passage there is a reference to the "prodigy to the soothsayer."140 In AntRom. 13.1, he identifies members of a higher social class using the phrase τοὺς υἱεῖς τῶν εὐγενεστάτων. Cary provides "the sons of the most prominent families" as a translation.141


Euripides. Both in Danker’s article and in BDAG, attention is drawn to the similarity between the use of ιός plus the genitive and the use of θυγάτηρ plus the genitive in Hec. 425.142 There the phrase is ὦ τῆς ἀώρου θύγατερ ἀθλίας τύχης.143 Buckley translates this phrase as "O daughter of an untimely and unhappy fate."144

Herodotus. In Hist. 8.77.1, Herodotus has the phrase ὑβρίος υἱόν.145 Godley translates the phrase as "son of insolence."146

Homer. The Iliad 16.449 has the following use of ιός plus the genitive: ιίες ἀθανάτων.147 This construction is quite similar, albeit opposite in meaning, to ιός θανάτου which is found in the LXX.148 The Odyssey 11.576 has the phrase Γαίης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν which is also found in Athenaeus' Deipnosophistae.149

142Deissmann also says "W. Schulze has also directed the author’s attention to the ιός τύχης in the Tragedians, and filius fortunae in Horace." Deissmann, Bible Studies, 166.


148For "son(s) of death" in the LXX see 1 Sam 20:31, 26:16; 2 Sam 12:5; Ps 78:11, 101:21.

Julian the Emperor. In *Contra Galilaeos*, Julian has the following phrases using υἱός plus the genitive: "sons of men," "sons of Israel," "son(s) of God," and "sons of Adam." However, these phrases are clearly dependent upon biblical texts.

Maximus of Tyre. In his *Dissertationes* 2.5.17, he has the phrase τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θανάτου.

Menander. Danker highlights Menander's use of υἱός plus the genitive in his article on these phrases. Danker provides the following phrase from Menander's *Dyscolos* as recovered in P Bodmer IV: υἱὸς ὀδόννης. Danker correctly assesses that this phrase represents a significant parallel to the phrases in John 17:12, 2 Thessalonians 2:3, and Ephesians 5:6.

Plato. While Plato does not have any significant constructions using υἱός plus the genitive, Deissmann highlights his similar use of ἐκγόνος. He cites ἐκγόνον τῆς ζωγραφίας from *Phaedr.* and ἐκγόνος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ from *Rep.* Similar examples from Plato are πολλῶν ἐτέρων τεχνῶν ἐκγόνον in *Statesmen* 288d, ἐκγόνον ὃβρεως in *Laws* 3.691c, and ἐκγόνοις μὲν θεῶν in *Timaeus* 40d.

---


153 Ibid.

154 Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 165.
Plutarch. In Plutarch's *Regum*. 82, he identifies Pompey as the son of a flute player using ὤιὸς αὐλητοῦ.\(^{155}\)

Polybius. In *Hist.* 36.4, Polybius uses ὤιὸς plus the genitive to identify certain individuals as members of a professional or social group. He uses the phrase τοὺς ὤιοὺς τῶν ἐκ τῆς συγκλήτου καὶ τῆς γερουσίας.\(^{156}\) Shuckburgh translates this construction as "sons of members of the Hundred or the Senate."\(^{157}\)

Procopius. In *de Bellis* 4.10, he uses the phrase γῆς ὤιὸν which would appear to be translated as "son of earth."\(^{158}\)

Inscriptions and Coins

Deissmann writes that "in the impressive style of speech on inscriptions and coins we find ὤιὸς in a number of formal titles of honour such as ὤιὸς τῆς γερουσίας, ὤιὸς τῆς πόλεως, ὤιὸς τοῦ δήμου, ὤιὸς Ἀφροδισιέων."\(^{159}\)

Ἀφροδισιέων. Sterrett found this inscription on a large round pedestal in a cemetery. He writes that "Waddington places this inscription in the last years of Nero's


\(^{159}\) Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 166.
reign, about 54 AD. Moulton-Milligan notes that this inscription was also found at Magnesia. Moulton-Milligan lists this occurrence of the inscription as υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως; however, it is missing the definite article as in the occurrence found by Sterrett and Waddington. Waddington makes note of this phrase on a coin honoring Emperor Trajan. He writes that it can mean that an individual has been adopted by a city, is a distinguished citizen worthy of honor, or perhaps refer to the children of those who died in service to their country. A very similar expression is found in a reconstruction suggested by Bosch: υἱόν τῆς μητροπόλεως. This phrase is quite common in inscriptions.

υἱός δήμου. This inscription is also quite common. It has been found at Bargylia, Cos, Iasos, Smyrna, and other locations.


161 James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930), 649.

162 See Otto Kern, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1900), 122.


164 See no. 263, Emin Bosch, Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1967), 325.

165 See IG V,1 65, IG V,1 551, IG VII 106, CID 4:139, CID 4:140, FD III 3:181, SIG 813B, EKM 1 119, IG X,2 253, IGBulg.1[2] 114, IscM I 207, IscM II 103, I.Kition 2039. This list is not exhaustive.

166 See Bargylia 1, SbBerlin (1901.1) 483.4, Iscr. di Cos EV 219, Iasos 226, Smyrna 99.
υἱὸν βουλῆς δήμου γερουσίας. This was found at Pamphylia.\textsuperscript{167} A very similar inscription was found in the Aegean Islands: υἱὸς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου.\textsuperscript{168}

υἱός τῆς πατρίδος. Kern provides an example of this phrase from an inscription found in Magnesia from the time of Vespasian.\textsuperscript{169}

υἱὸς πόλεως καὶ γερουσίας, ευεργέτα τῆς πατρίδος. Paton and Hicks highlight three inscriptions that contain this identical phrase which employs υἱός plus the genitive.\textsuperscript{170}

υἱος θεοῦ. In \textit{IG XII},3.174.2, the Emperor uses this phrase to refer to himself.\textsuperscript{171} The phrase is also present in the inscriptions found at Knidos.\textsuperscript{172} An analogous phrase is found in MAMA VII, no. 579: υἱὸς Δίου διακόνου.\textsuperscript{173} Similarly, in \textit{TAM V,2}, Caesar is referred to as Αρτέμιωνος υἱός.\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{BCH} 7 (1883) 263,5.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{IG XII},6 1:310.

\textsuperscript{169} Kern, \textit{Die Inschriften}, 125. This inscription is also cited in Moulton-Milligan and BDAG.

\textsuperscript{170} W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, \textit{The Inscriptions of Cos} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891), 132-33. This work is cited is Deissmann as well.

\textsuperscript{171} \textit{IG XII},3 174, The Packard Humanities Institute: Searchable Greek Inscriptions, accessed December 8, 2014, \url{http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main?url=oi%3Fikey%3D75685}. This inscription is also referenced in both LSJM and Moulton-Milligan.

\textsuperscript{172} IK Knidos I 42, IK Knidos I 44.


τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ. This phrase is used to refer to the students of Asclepius.\textsuperscript{175}

υἱοὶ λαοῦ. Keil and von Premerstein's journeys yielded this phrase on an inscription found near modern Ideli.\textsuperscript{176}

υἱὸν Ἑλλάδος. Dittenberg writes that this term has a similar meaning and function to υἱὸς τοῦ δήµου.\textsuperscript{177}

\textbf{Papyri and Ostraca}

υἱὸς θεοῦ. Moulton-Milligan notes that this phrase is used in the papyri to refer to the Emperor.\textsuperscript{178} BGU II 543.3 is dated around 27 BC and has the phrase θεοῦ υἱὸν.\textsuperscript{179} The phrase in this same word order is found in P.Tebt. II 382.21.\textsuperscript{180} P.Grenf. II 40.4, from AD 9, has θεοῦ υιοῦ.\textsuperscript{181}

\textbf{Miscellaneous phrases.} P.Lond. 6.1915 has the phrase υιοὶ τοῦ οὐρανίου

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{175}SIG\textsuperscript{3} 1169, 12. It is also cited in BDAG, s.v. υἱός.
\item \textsuperscript{176}See J. Keil and A. von Premerstein, \textit{Bericht über eine dritte Reise,} DenkschrWien 57.1 (Vienna: A. Hölder, 1914), no. 78.
\item \textsuperscript{177}SIG\textsuperscript{4} 854, 2. Cf. ibid., n. 8. This phrase is also cited in NIDOTTE, 671.
\item \textsuperscript{178}In addition to the examples discussed below, see P.Heid. 7.396, BGU I 174.2, P.Oxy. 22.2338.45, P.Adl. 7.3,
\item \textsuperscript{179}For the Greek text, see BGU II 543.3, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, \url{http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;2;543}. This example was also cited in Moulton-Milligan.
\item \textsuperscript{180}For the Greek text, see P.Tebt. II 382.21, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, \url{http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.tebt;2;382}. This example was also cited in Moulton-Milligan.
\item \textsuperscript{181}For the Greek text, see P.Grenf. II 40.4, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, \url{http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.grenf;2;40}. This example was also cited in Moulton-Milligan.
\end{itemize}
πατρὸς ἡμῶν which is likely dependent upon the similar saying from Matthew 5:45.\textsuperscript{182} O. Kellis 179 has only the following phrase: υἱὸς τῆς τρόφου.\textsuperscript{183} It seems that this phrase is identifying an individual as a son of the nurse. P.Cair.Masp. 2.67147 has the phrase τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ μελισσέως.\textsuperscript{184} Here, a group of individuals are being identified as sons of the beekeeper. It is unclear whether they are actual genetic descendants or are instead being figuratively identified as members of this group. P.Cair.Masp. 1.67058 Kol. 8 seems to have a reference to the son of the keeper of records with the phrase υἱὸς τοῦ ἀκτοαρίου.\textsuperscript{185} The phrase ὡς υἱὸς τῶν θησαυρῶν in SB 1.4309 appears to be referring to a son of plundering.\textsuperscript{186} P.Oxy. 49.3471 has the phrase υἱοὶ ἱερέων καὶ ἱεροεθνῶν which refers to the sons of priests and priestly stock.\textsuperscript{187} There is a reference to τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ in P.Sarap. 80.\textsuperscript{188} Finally, due to the degradation of the text, it is unclear whether the phrase υἱὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας in CPR 8.22 represents a use of υἱός plus the genitive which would closely parallel similar uses in the NT.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{182}For the Greek text, see P.Lond. 6.191, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lond;6;1915.


\textsuperscript{186}SB 1.4309, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;1;4309. LSJM has this occurrence listed under ληΐς.


\textsuperscript{188}P.Sarap. 80, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.sarap;;80. LSJM glosses as royal or kingly, s.v. βασίλειος.

Conclusion

This survey shows that ὦἱός plus the genitive is used in a variety of "son(s) of" phrases, some more common than others, in both documents with clear Semitic influence and also documents which do not have direct Semitic influence. Moulton, Deissmann, and Danker were correct to recognize that this construction is by no means "un-Greek" because their examples represent merely a small fraction of this phrase's usage outside the biblical texts. In the next chapter, the use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT will be examined and categorized.
CHAPTER 3
A SURVEY OF THE USE OF ΥΙΟΣ IN THE GREEK NT

Introduction
The figurative use "son(s) of" in the NT is found in phrases which are constructed using υἱός plus the genitive. As a result, this chapter will seek to provide an exhaustive survey of how the noun υἱός is used in the NT. As was mentioned in chapter 1, υἱός is used 377 times in the Greek NT. In nearly 80 percent of these occurrences, υἱός is found with a genitive modifier.¹ In order to understand the figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive, it will be helpful to consider these uses against the more typical usage of the word by the NT authors. The occurrences of υἱός will be considered below and grouped according to the author and then categorized further for clarity.

Matthew—Introduction
The Gospel of Matthew contains 89 uses of υἱός. This number accounts for just under 24 percent of all the occurrences of υἱός in the Greek NT. Matthew has the highest number of uses of υἱός in the Greek NT.² Seventy-eight of Matthew’s 89 uses of υἱός include a genitive modifier. Thus, his Gospel employs υἱός plus the genitive at a

¹ In 301 out of 377 occurrences, υἱός is found with a genitive modifier.
² While Matthew does have the highest number of uses of υἱός, 1 John, 2 John, and Galatians have a higher frequency of occurrences of υἱός with respect to their overall word counts. First John has 22 occurrences of υἱός out of 2141 words, 2 John has 2 occurrences of υἱός out of 245 words, Galatians has 13 occurrences of υἱός out of 2230, while Matthew has 89 occurrences of υἱός out of 18346 words.
relatively high frequency. These uses will be discussed below and grouped according to whether they occur with or without a genitive modifier. Then, the occurrences of ὕιός with a genitive modifier will be further subdivided into the following three groups: (1) genetic identification, (2) messianic, (3) and figurative uses.\(^3\)

**Matthew—Ὕιός without the Genitive**

As mentioned above, there are only 11 occurrences of ὕιός without a genitive modifier in Matthew's Gospel. In Matthew 1:21, 1:23, and 1:25, ὕιός is used to refer to the male child to which Mary will give birth. While this occasion certainly represents atypical circumstances, it is safe to assume that ὕιός is being used here according to its normal usage of referring to a direct male descendant. In Matthew 10:37, Jesus uses ὕιός to refer to the male children in a family. It is used alongside of θυγάτηρ here. Similarly, in Matthew 21:38, Jesus uses ὕιός in a parable to refer to the direct male descendant and heir of a vineyard owner. Matthew 17:26 contains a use of ὕιός which might be best categorized as ὕιός plus an implicit genitive since it is referring back to the sons of kings in 17:25. Finally, there are the uses of ὕιός in Matthew 11:27 (3), 24:36, and 28:19, where it is used to refer to Jesus as the Son. Like Matthew 17:26, in these cases it would seem that τοῦ θεοῦ is an implicit genitive modifier.

**Matthew—Ὑιός with the Genitive**

**Genetic Identification.**

Fifteen of the 78 uses of ὕιός plus the genitive in Matthew fall into this category. Here, the focus of the writer is on identifying individuals on the basis of

---

\(^3\)These categories will be explained in the course of this chapter. In addition, the figurative use will be the focus of chap. 5.
genealogy. Many of these uses contain subtle nuances informed from the ancient world's understanding of the father-son relationship. These nuances will be discussed in chapter 4.

**Using proper nouns.** In Matthew 1:20, Joseph is identified as a genetic descendant of David. In Matthew 20:20, 26:37, 27:56, James and John are distinguished from any other James and any other John by being genetically linked with their father, Zebedee. Finally, in Matthew 23:35, Zechariah is genetically identified as the υἱοῦ Βαραχίου.4

**Using pronouns.** Most often, pronouns in the genitive case modify υἱός simply to provide a more specific form of genetic identification. Thus, the mother of James and John refers to υἱοί μου in Matthew 20:21 and Matthew describes them as τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῆς in Matthew 20:20. Jesus directs people to consider how any father would treat his own son in Matthew 7:9. A father beseeches Jesus to have mercy on μου τὸν υἱόν in Matthew 17:15. Similar uses are found in Matthew 17:25, 21:37, and 22:2.

**Other uses.** In Matthew 13:55, Jesus is relationally identified not with his adoptive father by name, but instead with his adoptive father by his profession. There he is called ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός. In Matthew 21:5, there is a case of non-human genetic identification. The phrase υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου is used to refer to the foal of a donkey.

**Messianic**

As would be expected from a Gospel, 53 of the 78 uses of υἱός plus the

---

genitive in Matthew are found in this category. Under this category of uses, Jesus is identified with various titles and attributions which uniquely relate to him as God's Messiah.

**Son of Abraham.** In the first verse of Matthew's Gospel, Jesus is identified as one who is qualified to inherit God's promises to Abraham. Matthew does this by calling him a υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.

**Son of David.** Not only is Jesus identified as one who is qualified to inherit God's promises to Abraham, but Matthew also identifies him as υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ in Matthew 1:1. Jesus is identified as the Son of David 8 times in Matthew. The phrase is always applied to him by others.⁵

**Son of God.** Jesus is identified as the Son of God 9 times in Matthew's Gospel. Like the phrase υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ, θεοῦ υἱός is always a title that is attributed to Jesus by others. It is particularly intriguing that it is more often on the lips of those opposed to him than those of his followers.⁶

**Son of Man.** This title is, by far, the most common phrase in this category. It occurs 30 times in Matthew's Gospel which make up about one third of all the occurrences of υἱός in his Gospel. While the phrases υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ and θεοῦ υἱός are always ascribed to Jesus by others, this phrase is only used by Jesus to refer to himself.⁷ This

⁶See Matt 4:3, 6, 8:29, 14:33, 16:16, 26:63, 27:40, 43, 54.
⁷See Matt 8:20, 9:6, 10:23, 11:19, 12:8, 32, 40, 13:37, 41, 16:13, 27, 28, 17:9, 12, 22, 19:28, 20:18, 28, 24:27, 30 (twice), 37, 39, 44, 25:31, 26:2, 24 (twice), 45, 64. 63
tendency in the interchanges between Jesus and the disciples in 16:13-16 and Jesus and the high priest in 26:63-64 is particularly interesting. In the first case, Jesus asks the disciples a question regarding himself with τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Peter answers with ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ. In the second case, the high priest asks Jesus a question using ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ and Jesus answers using τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Using pronouns. The most common use in this category is when God the Father refers to Jesus using ὁ υἱός μου and similar phrases in Matthew 2:15, 3:17, and 17:5. In Matthew 22:42 and 22:45, the phrases τίνος υἱός and υἱός αὐτοῦ are used by Jesus to refer to the Son of David in his dialogue with the Pharisees.8

Figurative Uses

Finally, there are those uses of υἱός in Matthew which are of a figurative nature and have prompted the present work. These occurrences account for 10 of the 78 uses of υἱός plus the genitive in Matthew's Gospel. It is these uses which are the focus of later chapters.

Sons of God. In Matthew 5.9, those who are peacemakers are promised that they will be called υἱοὶ θεοῦ. The peacemakers are not being promised that they become literal genetic descendants of God but rather they are figuratively promised that they will enjoy a relationship with him similar to that of a father with a son.9 Similarly, in Matthew 5:45, Jesus exhorts his followers to love their enemies and pray for their persecutors so that they may be υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑµῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

8These usages are the closest Jesus comes to identifying himself as the Son of David in Matthew's Gospel.

9Naturally, there may be a hint or glimpse of adoption present in the text.
Sons of the kingdom. This phrase is used in both Matthew 8:12 and 13:38; however, it refers to two distinct groups. In Matthew 8:12, Jesus applies it ironically to refer to those who should have been included in the kingdom of God but who are in fact excluded. In Matthew 13:38, Jesus, in explaining a parable, uses this phrase to refer to those who belong to God's kingdom. In both cases, οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας is used figuratively to identify those individuals that are, or should be, in a relationship with God's kingdom that is similar to the father-son relationship.

Sons of the bridal chamber. In Matthew 9:15, Jesus uses the phrase οἱ υἱοί τοῦ νυμφῶνος to identify the wedding guests. Clearly, these individuals are not the literal descendants of the bridegroom. Instead, they are figuratively described as the sons of the bridal chamber.10

Sons of the Pharisees. The phrase "sons of the Pharisees" does not occur in Matthew's Gospel. However, by referring to οἱ υἱοὶ ὑµῶν in his dialogue with the Pharisees in Matthew 12:27, the phrase has this meaning. While it is certainly possible, that Jesus is referring to the literal, direct male descendants of those to whom he is speaking who also happen to cast out demons, it seems much more likely that Matthew is conveying Jesus' words to the reader using a common figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive to describe the relationship between students and their teachers, to identify an individual as a member of an academic, professional, or social group, or to refer generally to their kinsmen as the sons of Israel.11

10 See the discussion of this phrase in chap. 5.

Sons of the evil one. In Matthew 13:38, in the same parable where Jesus identifies the good seed as οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, he identifies the weeds as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. It is particularly interesting that it is human beings who are being figuratively identified as sons of the evil one rather than demons or fallen angels who are also mentioned in this passage.

Son of hell. A similar phrase to οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ is υἱὸν γεέννης in Matthew 23:15. Here, Jesus identifies the converts of the scribes and Pharisees as children of hell. In addition, he forms a comparative statement which also identifies the scribes and Pharisees as children of hell themselves. This figurative identification highlights the relationship the scribes and Pharisees have with γέεννα.

Sons of those who murdered the prophets. While Jesus could certainly know whether or not those to whom he was speaking were literal descendants of ancestors who murdered prophets, it is much more likely that he is figuratively identifying the scribes and Pharisees with the phrase υἱοὶ τῶν φονεθσάντων τοὺς προφήτας in Matthew 23:31. The fact that Jesus says they are testifying against themselves makes this point clear. What they say and what they do reveals their true, albeit figurative, lineage.

Sons of Israel. The last figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive in Matthew is found in Matthew 27:9. In this verse, Matthew cites Zechariah in reference to the thirty pieces of silver Judas was paid for the betrayal and later returned. However, the phrase υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ is not found in Zechariah 11:13. Matthew here is using the phrase to identify the individuals who financed the betrayal. This phrase could be understood as functioning within the normal semantic range of υἱός. It is often used to describe the
relationship of a person to a group of people or tribe. However, it also possible that this phrase is an intentional figurative use of οἱός plus the genitive whereby he is figuratively linking the individuals who paid for the betrayal with the literal οἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ who sold their own brother into slavery.

**Mark–Introduction**

Mark uses οἱός 35 times in his Gospel. Of those 35 occurrences of οἱός, all but 2 are found with a genitive modifier. Thus, compared to the rest of the NT, Mark employs οἱός plus the genitive with great frequency. Below, the 2 uses of οἱός without the genitive will be considered. Then, the occurrences of οἱός with a genitive modifier will be discussed according to the following three subdivisions: (1) genetic identification, (2) Messianic, (3) figurative uses.

**Mark–Οἱός without the Genitive**

As mentioned above, Mark has only 2 uses of οἱός without the genitive. While there are far fewer uses in this category in Mark, they are similar to the occurrences of this category in Matthew's Gospel. In a parable in Mark 12:6, the direct male descendant of a vineyard owner is aptly identified as a οἱὸν ἀγαπητόν. In Mark 13:32, Jesus identifies himself as ο οἱός. Here, as in Matthew, τοῦ θεοῦ is likely implicit.

**Mark–Οἱός with the Genitive**

Genetic Identification

Six out of Mark's 33 uses of οἱός plus the genitive are found in this category. As in other writings, these are examples of Mark identifying an individual on the basis of his genetic lineage.
Using proper nouns. In Mark 6:3, Jesus is identified according to his genetic relationship to his mother: ὁιός τῆς Μαρίας. As in Matthew, Mark 10:35 distinguishes οἱ ζεβεδαίου from any other James or John on the basis of their genetic lineage. As is implicit in his transliterated name, Bartimaeus is genetically identified with the phrase ὁιός Τιμίας in Mark 10:46.

Using pronouns. In both Mark 9:17 and 12:6, a father identifies his male descendant using the phrase τὸν ὁιόν μου.

Using other phrases. In Mark 3:28, the common genetic lineage that all men and women share with one another as fellow human beings is highlighted using the phrase τοῖς ὁιίς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.\textsuperscript{12}

Messianic

Seventy-five percent of Mark's 33 uses of ὁιός plus the genitive fall into this category. These represent various titles and attributions which uniquely apply to Jesus as God's Messiah.

Son of David. As was common in Matthew's Gospel, ὁιὲ Δαυὶδ is twice found on the lips of Bartimaeus calling out for healing in Mark 10:47 and 10:48. While Son of David was not a title Jesus used in reference to himself in Matthew, in Mark 12:35, he does so, albeit in a veiled saying, when he asks how the scribes can say that the Messiah is the ὁιὸς Δαυὶδ.

Son of God. Again, as was the practice in Matthew, Jesus never refers to

\textsuperscript{12}It is possible that this "son(s) of" phrase is used figuratively to establish a link between each human referent and Adam. However, here, it is not understood as such.
himself with this title. In some manuscripts of Mark 1:1, Mark refers to his work as the Gospel of Jesus Christ the υἱοῦ θεοῦ.\(^{13}\) This phrase is on the lips of demons in Mark 3:11 and 5:7. Finally, Jesus is referred to as υἱὸς θεοῦ in Mark 15:39 by the centurion at his cross.

**Son of Man.** Fourteen out of the 25 messianic uses of υἱὸς plus the genitive are comprised of Jesus' favorite self-appellation. As in Matthew, this phrase is only found in Mark's Gospel on the lips of Jesus.\(^{14}\)

**Son of the Blessed One.** In Mark 14:61, during his interrogation of Jesus, the high priest, employing circumlocution, asks Jesus if he is the ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ. While this title in reference to Jesus seems to be unique to Mark's Gospel, there are similar constructions using µακάριος found in the papyri in reference to earthly fathers who are also mentioned by name. There, the expression is quite common. For example, BGU 1.255 has the following four phrases: υἱὸς τοῦ µακαρίου Ἡλία, υἱὸς τοῦ µακαρίου Σαλαµίνου, υἱὸς τοῦ µακαρίου Πέτρου, and υἱὸν τοῦ µακαρίου Μηνᾶ.\(^{15}\)

**Using pronouns.** These uses make up 3 of the 25 messianic uses of υἱὸς plus the genitive. Two of the occurrences are found in Mark 1:11 and 9:7 where God the

---

\(^{13}\)Metzger notes that their committee had difficulty making a decision regarding this variant. He says that "the combination of B D W al in support of υἱοῦ θεοῦ is extremely strong, it was not thought advisable to omit the words altogether, yet because of the antiquity of the shorter reading and the possibility of scribal expansion, it was decided to enclose the words within square brackets." See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 62.

\(^{14}\)See Mark 2:10, 28, 8:31, 38, 9:9, 12, 31, 10:33, 45, 13:26, 14:21 (twice), 41, 62.

\(^{15}\)BGU 1.255, Papyri.info, accessed December 9, 2014, [http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;1;255](http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;1;255).
Father uses the pronoun μου to identify Jesus as "my son." The last use is found in Mark 12:37 where the Messiah's relationship to David is expressed using the phrase αὐτοῦ υἱός.

Figurative Uses

Mark's Gospel contains only 2 figurative uses of υἱός plus the genitive. He employs these phrases much less than Matthew in his Gospel—both in overall total and frequency.\(^6\)

**Sons of the bridal chamber.** As in Matthew, this same idiomatic phrase is found on the lips of Jesus in Mark 2:19. Again, the phrase οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος is not referring to the literal genetic descendants of the bridegroom. Instead, it is figuratively describing them as sons of the bridal chamber.

**Sons of thunder.** The phrase υἱοὶ Βροντῆς in Mark 3:17 represents a translation and, perhaps, interpretation of the name βοανηργές which Jesus gave to the sons of Zebedee. It would seem here that Jesus is employing a figurative use of "son(s) of" to characterize these two brothers and describe potential behavioral tendencies which were evidently reminiscent of a thunderstorm.


The related documents of Luke and Acts will be considered together since they demonstrate collectively Luke's typical usage of υἱός. The word υἱός in its various forms is found in Luke-Acts 98 times. His works make up approximately 25 percent of the overall occurrences of υἱός in the NT. He uses υἱός plus the genitive 81 times in Luke-\(^{16}\)Matthew has 10 figurative uses out of 78 overall uses. Mark has only 2 out of 33. Matthew uses υἱός in a figurative manner roughly twice as often.
Acts. These account for roughly 83 percent of the 98 occurrences of the word in Luke-Acts. In Luke, υἱός plus the genitive is used 62 times while in Acts it is used only 19 times. First, Luke's use of υἱός without the genitive in Luke-Acts will be discussed. Second, his use of υἱός with a genitive modifier will be considered according to the following three categories: (1) genetic identification, (2) messianic, (3) figurative uses.

**Luke-Acts—Υἱός without the Genitive**

In Luke-Acts, υἱός is found without a genitive modifier in 17 occurrences. As expected, the majority of these uses align with the typical usage of υἱός to refer to the direct male child of an individual.\(^\text{17}\) This typical usage becomes clear when Luke relates the details of Moses' sonship to Pharaoh's daughter. In Acts 7:21, Luke records Stephen as saying that she ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν. Specifically, he says that "she brought him up for herself as a son."\(^\text{18}\) As is evident in the biblical narrative, Moses was not her direct male descendant, but she brought him up as if he was in fact her υἱόν. The remaining 3 uses of υἱός without the genitive are used in reference to Jesus as the Son and they are all found in Luke 10:22. As in Matthew and Mark, the genitive θεοῦ seems implicit here.

**Luke-Acts—Υἱός with the Genitive**

**Genetic Identification**

This category accounts for 27 of the 81 uses of υἱός plus the genitive in Luke-Acts. Here, Luke is primarily concerned with identifying an individual on the basis of his

---


\(^{18}\)BDAG explains that εἰς with the accusative case can replace the predicate accusative. He lists this occurrence as an example. See BDAG, s.v. "εἰς."
genetic lineage and possibly distinguishing him from other individuals with a common name.


Using pronouns. Not only are individuals genetically identified using proper nouns in the genitive case in Luke-Acts, they are also connected to their genetic lineage using pronouns. There are 10 such occurrences in Luke-Acts. Nine of these simply identify an individual as "my son," "your son(s)," or "his son." In addition, Luke genetically identifies Mary's relationship to Jesus by referring to him as τὸν ὑιὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον in Luke 2:7.

Messianic

Forty-one, or over half, of the 81 occurrences of ὑἱός plus the genitive in Luke-Acts are found within this category. These phrases are comprised of various titles and

---

attributions that are applied to Jesus by himself and others. They serve to identify him as God's promised Messiah.

**Son of David.** As in the parallels in Matthew and Mark, the blind man calls out to Jesus as υἱὲ Δαυίδ in both Luke 18:38 and 18:39. While "son of David" is usually a title applied to Jesus by others, in Luke 20:41, as in Mark, Jesus refers to himself as the Δαυίδ υἱόν in a cryptic manner.

**Son of God.** Jesus is referred to as the Son of God 6 times in Luke-Acts. As has been the established pattern from Matthew and Mark, this title is always on the lips of others in reference to Jesus. In Luke 1:35, the angel promises Mary that he will be called the Son of God. Often, the phrase is applied to Jesus by demonic opposition.²³ Jesus' accusers ask him at his trial if he is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 22:70. Finally, in Acts 9:20, Paul preaches that Jesus is the Son of God.

**Son of Man.** This phrase accounts for 26 of the 41 total messianic uses of υἱός plus the genitive in Luke-Acts. Son of Man is the title which has thus far only been applied to Jesus by himself. In Luke's Gospel, that tendency remains the same. The phrase is used twenty-five times and all but one of those occurrences are on the lips of Jesus.²⁴ A possible exception is found in Luke 24:7 where Jesus is quoted to the women at the tomb by the two men in dazzling clothing. While this usage of Son of Man does not seem to be a true exception since it is in a quotation of Jesus' own use of the phrase, there is an exception to the typical pattern of its usage in Acts. In Acts 7:56, Stephen declares

---

²³See Luke 4:3, 9, 41.

that he sees the heavens opened and τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου standing at the right hand of God.

**Son of the Most High.** There are 2 such phrases in Luke's Gospel. In Luke 1:32, the angel promises that Jesus will be called υἱὸς ὑψίστου. Similarly, in Luke 8:28, a man under extreme demonic influence recognizes Jesus' divinity and refers to him as υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου.


**Figurative Uses**

There are 13 figurative uses of υἱός plus the genitive in Luke-Acts. Nine are found in Luke and 4 are found in Acts. These figurative uses make up approximately 16 percent of the overall occurrences of υἱός plus the genitive in Luke-Acts.

**Sons of the Bridal Chamber.** In Luke 5:34, Jesus explains to the disciples of John that his own disciples do not fast because they are sons of the bridal chamber. As a result, they are closely connected to the joy associated with a newly established marriage and fasting would not be appropriate.
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**Sons of the Most High.** In Luke 6:35, Jesus calls his followers to love their enemies, do good, and lend generously. He promises them reward and that they will be called νἱοὶ ὑψίστου. Thus, Jesus' followers are promised a similar relationship with his Father since he too is a νἱὸς ὑψίστου.25

**Son of peace.** When Jesus sends out seventy of his followers in Luke 10, he instructs them to pronounce peace upon the houses they enter. The response in that house is contingent upon whether a νἱὸς εἰρήνης is there. It would seem that Jesus is using νἱός plus the genitive to characterize positively those who show hospitality to his followers as peaceful individuals.

**Your sons.** While there is debate about the proper referent of the phrase οἱ νἱοὶ υἱῶν, it does seem likely that this is figurative "sons of" phrase.26 It is not referring to the literal male descendants of the people to whom Jesus is speaking. Instead, he is figuratively identifying the pupils or group members of the scribes and Pharisees as their "sons."

**Sons of this age.** The phrase οἱ νἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου is used in both Luke 16:8 and 20:34. In both cases, it seems to refer to those who are defined or characterized by the present age apart from the influence of the kingdom of God in it. In each occurrence, it stands in contrast to those who would be characterized by their discipleship to Christ.

**Sons of light.** A similar juxtaposition is constructed using a contrasting "son(s)
of" phrase. In Luke 16:8, the phrase τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς is contrasted with "sons of this age." Here, the "sons of light" would seem to be those who are characterized by their adherence to the kind of life God requires of them. A similar phrase is found in John 12:36.

**Sons of God.** In Luke 20:36, Jesus is recorded as using υἱός plus the genitive in two separate phrases to describe the kind of life people would participate in by virtue of the resurrection. The first phrase is υἱοὶ θεοῦ. With this phrase individuals are being figuratively described as God's sons in order to illustrate the relationship that God's people will have with him because of the resurrection.

**Sons of the resurrection.** The second use of υἱός plus the genitive in Luke 20:36 is in the phrase τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοί. The people partaking of the resurrection can be described as sons of God because they are sons of the resurrection. Their relationship with God results from their figurative sonship to the resurrection.

**Sons of the prophets and the covenant.** In Acts 3:25, Peter addresses the people as οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης. Here, Peter seems to be figuratively linking them as sons to the history of God's interactions with them as a people. While it might be possible that they are in fact literal descendants of the prophets, these individuals are certainly not literal descendants of the covenant itself. However, they have inherited God's history of redemption of his people and are, figuratively, sons of it.

**Son of encouragement.** In Acts 4:36, Barnabas' nickname is translated and possibly interpreted by the phrase υἱός παρακλήσεως. As is evident from what can be seen of Barnabas' lifestyle in the book of Acts, he was one who was characterized by
encouragement. Thus, he is figuratively described as a son of encouragement.

**Son of the devil.** Luke records a figurative use of ὄιός plus the genitive in a conversation Paul has with Elymas in Acts 13:10. Elymas had been opposing them and seeking to turn people away from the faith. Paul responds by rebuking him and in his rebuke, he figuratively calls Elymas ὄιὲ διαβόλου.

**Son of the Pharisees.** The last figurative use of ὄιός plus the genitive in Luke-Acts is found on the lips of Paul at his trial before the council in Acts 23. In 23:6, he describes himself as a Pharisee and a ὄιὸς Φαρισαίων. This does not have to be understood as Paul stating that his literal father was a Pharisee but could instead be referring to his tutelage in the Pharisaic tradition.\(^{27}\) Thus, this usage would be similar to other uses where the student-teacher relationship is figuratively described in father-son or parent-child terminology.

**Johannine Literature—Introduction**

In John's writings, ὄιός is used 87 times.\(^{28}\) Of these 87 occurrences, 60 are found with a genitive modifier. The breakdown of these occurrences into his various writings is as follows: 37 in his Gospel, 16 in 1 John, 1 in 2 John, and 6 in Revelation. There are not any uses of ὄιός in 3 John. First, the uses of ὄιός without a genitive modifier in the Johannine writings will be considered. Then, John's use of ὄιός with the genitive will be discussed according to the categories employed thus far.


\(^{28}\)Under this heading, all the writings traditionally understood to have been written by John the son of Zebedee will be included: the Gospel of John, the Epistles of John, and the Revelation of John.
Johannine Literature–Υἱός without the Genitive

On 27 occasions in the Johannine Literature, υἱός is used without a genitive modifier. John uses υἱός without a genitive modifier at a higher frequency than the rest of the NT. In the Synoptic Gospels, υἱός is used 30 times without a genitive modifier. Of these 30 occurrences, 70 percent have been to denote a male child. There have only been 9 cases where Jesus is identified using υἱός without the genitive. John's use of υἱός without the genitive represents a reversal of this Synoptic tendency. He uses υἱός without the genitive to refer to Jesus 24 times. He only uses υἱός alone with its typical meaning 3 other times across all the Johannine literature. However, it is worth noting that when υἱός is used in reference to Jesus, especially in John's writing, there is almost always an implicit "son(s) of" phrase: θεοῦ or τοῦ πατρός.

Johannine Literature–Υἱός with the Genitive

Genetic Identification

This category accounts for 14 of John's 60 uses of υἱός plus the genitive. Here, he is seeking to identify specific individuals on the basis of their genetic heritage and possibly distinguish them from others.

Using proper nouns. In John 1:42, Jesus refers to Simon Peter as ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου. In John 1:45 and 6:42, Jesus is identified as being the one who is ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ. For υἱός used with reference to Jesus see John 3:16, 17, 35, 36 (twice), 5:19 (twice), 20, 21, 22, 23 (twice), 26, 6:40, 8:36, 14:13, 17:1; 1 John 2:22, 23 (twice), 24, 4:14, 5:12; 2 John 1:9.

For the use of υἱός with reference to a male child see John 8:35; Rev 12:5, 21:7.

---

29 There are only eleven in Matthew, two in Mark, seventeen in Luke-Acts, seven in the Pauline Epistles, and twelve in Hebrews.

30 For υἱός used with reference to Jesus see John 3:16, 17, 35, 36 (twice), 5:19 (twice), 20, 21, 22, 23 (twice), 26, 6:40, 8:36, 14:13, 17:1; 1 John 2:22, 23 (twice), 24, 4:14, 5:12; 2 John 1:9.

31 For the use of υἱός with reference to a male child see John 8:35; Rev 12:5, 21:7.
The remaining three occurrences in this category are references to the sons of Israel. In Revelation 7:4 and 21:12, υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ seems to be referring to the actual twelve sons of Jacob. In Revelation 2:14, the phrase τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ is a broader reference to all the descendants of Jacob.

Using pronouns. Pronouns are used in John's Gospel to identify various individuals as the genetic descendants of others using phrases such as "his son(s)," "your son," and "our son." 32

Messianic

As might be expected from his use of υἱός without the genitive, approximately 68 percent of John's uses of υἱός plus the genitive are focused on identifying Jesus as the Messiah. This percentage decreases to approximately 62 percent in the Synoptic Gospels. In another contrast with the Synoptic Gospels, the phrase Son of David is not applied to Jesus in the Johannine Literature. It was applied to him 14 times in the Synoptic Gospels.

Son of God.

This use of υἱός plus the genitive accounts for 17 of the occurrences in this category. While this phrase is most often applied to Jesus by others in the Johannine Literature, it is also, in contrast to the Synoptics, applied to Jesus by himself in John's Gospel. Four times he makes references to himself as the Son of God using υἱός plus the genitive. 33 He is also referred to as the Son of God by John the Baptist, Nathaniel, Martha, the Jewish religious leaders, an angel in Revelation, and John

32 For these uses see John 4:5, 12, 46, 47, 50, 53, 9:19, 20.

himself. In the case of the Jewish religious leaders in John 19:7, they are merely acknowledging that υἱὸν θεοῦ ἐαυτὸν ἐποίησεν.

**Son of Man.** This phrase represents one-third of the 43 messianic uses of υἱὸς plus the genitive. As has been the pattern, the usage of this phrase in the Johannine Literature stands in contrast to how the phrase is used in the Synoptic Gospels. In the Synoptic Gospels, the phrase is only used by Jesus to refer to himself. In John's writings, however, it is attributed to him by others. In John 12:34, the crowd uses the phrase twice in their response to Jesus. While the phrase is not directly applied to Jesus, they ask τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. In Revelation 1:13 and 14:14, John describes Jesus in his vision as one who has the appearance ὁμοίων υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων. The remaining 11 occurrences of the phrase Son of Man in John's writing are used by Jesus for self-identification.

**Son of the Father.** In the greeting of 2 John 1:3, Jesus is referred to as Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς.

**Using Pronouns.** In John 17:1, Jesus refers to himself in a prayer to the Father as σου τὸν υἱόν. John refers to Jesus as the Son of God 9 times in 1 John using the pronoun αὐτός in the genitive case.

---


35 As was noted above, it is found on the lips of Stephen in Acts 7:56.


37 See 1 John 1:3, 7, 3:23, 4:9, 10, 5:9, 10, 11, 20.
Figurative Uses

There are only 3 figurative uses of υἱός plus the genitive in the Johannine writings. These occurrences account for only 5 percent of John's 60 uses of υἱός plus the genitive. The figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive in the Synoptic Gospels accounts for 13 percent of their overall use of the construction. While John employs υἱός plus the genitive figuratively with less frequency, his use of it still remains significant for the present discussion.

**Sons of light.** In John 12:36, Jesus exhorts his listeners to believe in the light that they may become οἱ υἱοί φωτὸς. Here, these individuals, due to their belief, will become so characterized by τὸ φῶς that they will be related to it as a son is to his own father. A similar phrase is found on the lips of Jesus in Luke's Gospel.  

**Son of destruction.** In John 17:12, Jesus refers to Judas Iscariot as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπώλειας. Here, the "son of" phrase is used to characterize the kind of destiny Judas is qualified to inherit. The noun ἀπώλεια is also found in υἱός plus the genitive phrases in Proverbs 24:22a (LXX), GNic. 20:4, ApPet. 1:2, EH 5.1.48, and 1 Thessalonians 5:5.

**Your son.** In John 19:26, Jesus tells Mary that, following his impending death, she is to consider the Beloved Disciple as her son. While this occurrence could be an example of genetic identification where Jesus is telling her to view him as if he were her own male child, there do also seem to be some figurative elements at work within Jesus' redefinition of their relationship.

---

Pauline Epistles–Introduction

In his Epistles, Paul uses υἱός 41 times.\(^{39}\) It is found in Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, and 2 Thessalonians. Of these 41 occurrences in Paul's Epistles, 34 are examples of υἱός plus the genitive. Below, the 7 uses of υἱός without the genitive will be discussed and followed by a consideration of how υἱός with the genitive is used in Paul's writings.

**Pauline Epistles–Υἱός without the Genitive**

As mentioned above, υἱός is only found without the genitive 7 times in the Pauline Epistles. In 1 Corinthians 15:28, Paul refers to Jesus as ὁ υἱὸς. Here, as in the Gospels and Acts, the genitive θεοῦ seems implicit. In Romans 9:9, Paul quotes Genesis regarding God's promise that Sarah would give birth to a son. Paul also refers to Abraham's δόο υἱοῦς in Galatians 4:22. However, Paul's most frequent use of υἱός without the genitive is to refer to believers as the sons of God. He uses various constructions to express implicitly the phrase υἱοὶ θεοῦ. Three of these occurrences are found in Galatians 4 while the other is in 2 Corinthians.\(^{40}\)

**Pauline Epistles–Υἱός with the Genitive**

**Genetic Identification**

Six of Paul's 34 uses of υἱός plus the genitive belong to this category. Here, Paul is using υἱός plus the genitive to identify an individual on the basis of his lineage.\(^{39}\)

\(^{39}\)Under this heading, all uses of υἱός in all the writings traditionally understood to have been written by Paul the Apostle will be included: Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, 1-2 Thessalonians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.

\(^{40}\)See 2 Cor 6:18; Gal 4:6, 7 (twice).
**Using proper nouns.** In Romans 9:27, 2 Corinthians 3:7, and 2 Corinthians 3:13, Paul uses some variation of the phrase sons of Israel. In each case, he does not seem to be referring to the immediate twelve male children of Jacob. Instead, he is using the phrase, as was common, to refer to Jacob's descendants—the people of Israel.

**Using pronouns.** The remaining 3 uses of ὥς plus the genitive for genetic identification are all found in Galatians 4:30. The first occurrence in this verse is in the phrase τὸν ὥν αὐτῆς. Here, Paul is quoting Genesis 21:10, and the reference to "her son" is to Hagar's son Ishmael.

**Using other phrases.** While the last 2 occurrences of ὥς plus the genitive in Galatians 4:30 could be considered figurative uses, it seems as if genetic identification is what both the author of Genesis and Paul have in mind. Sarah is expressing her opinion that the ὁ ὥς τῆς παιδίσκης is not qualified to share in the inheritance with τοῦ ὥο τῆς ἐλευθέρας. This phrase, "the son of the free woman," is not present in Genesis 21:10 in either the MT or the LXX. In both cases, Sarah declares that the son of Hagar will not partake in the inheritance "with my son Isaac." Thus, τοῦ ὥο τῆς ἐλευθέρας may be Paul's own creation.

**Messianic**

As has been the case in the rest of the NT thus far, Paul uses ὥς plus the genitive to identify Jesus in messianic terms. Sixteen of Paul's 34 uses of ὥς plus the genitive are found in this category. These amount to 47 percent of the overall occurrences of ὥς plus the genitive in the Pauline Epistles. This percentage is much lower than both the 62 percent in the Synoptic Gospels and the 68 percent in the Johannine Literature.
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Son of God. The Apostle Paul refers to Jesus as ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός 4 times in his Epistles.41

Using pronouns. In addition to being identified as the Messiah using the phrase, Son of God, Jesus is referred to by Paul in messianic terms 10 times using υἱός plus the pronoun αὐτός in the genitive case. Nine of these 10 cases are simple references to Jesus as "his Son" with θεός being the antecedent of the pronoun.42 The remaining occurrence, in Colossians 1:13, has an additional modifier and will be discussed below. In Romans 8:3, Paul identifies Jesus as God's own Son with the reflexive pronoun in the phrase τὸν ἐαυτοῦ υἱόν.

Using other phrases. In Romans 8:32, Paul uses the phrase τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ to emphasize the reality that God did not spare his own Son on the cross but instead freely gave him up. In Colossians 1:13, Paul identifies Jesus as God's Son using υἱός and the pronoun αὐτός in the genitive case. However, on this occasion, he includes another modifier in the phrase in order to specify the nature of the relationship that Jesus enjoys with his Father: τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ.

Figurative Uses.

There are 12 uses of υἱός plus the genitive in a figurative manner in the Pauline Epistles. These occurrences represent approximately 35 percent of the overall uses of υἱός plus the genitive in Paul's writings. This percentage is significantly higher than both the 13 percent found in the Synoptic Gospels and also the 5 percent found in the Johannine

---

41Rom 1:4; 2 Cor 1:19; Gal 2:20; Eph 4:13.

42For "his son" see Rom 1:3, 1:9, 5:10, 8:29; 1 Cor 1:9; Gal 1:16, 4:4, 4:6; and 1 Thes 1:10.
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Sons of God. Paul uses the phrase "υἱοὶ θεοῦ" or some variation of it 3 times in his Epistles.\(^{43}\) In each case it is a description of the relationship that those who have placed their faith in Christ enjoy with his Father. Similarly, in Romans 9:26, Paul draws from Hosea 1:10 and includes its phrase "υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος". The LXX here represents a literal translation of the MT which has "ךל א"י נב.

Sons of Abraham. In Galatians 3:7, Paul argues that those who believe are "υἱοὶ Αβραὰμ". Here, he seems to be figuratively identifying the new people of God as those who are now qualified to share in the inheritance of God's promises to Abraham. It is no longer simple genetic identification but is instead faith in Christ that makes an individual a "υἱὸς Αβραὰμ".

Sons of disobedience. In Ephesians, Paul twice refers to the "sons of disobedience."\(^{44}\) It is likely that he uses the same phrase in Colossians as well.\(^{45}\) The genitive noun in each of these occurrences is "ἀπειθείας". Here, Paul characterizes those

\(^{43}\)Rom 8:14, 19; Gal 3:26

\(^{44}\)See Eph 2:2, 5:6.

\(^{45}\)On the variant in Col 3:6, Metzger explains that "it is exceedingly difficult to decide whether the words ἐπὶ ... ἀπειθείας were added in most witnesses by copyists who recollected Eph 5:6 (where no manuscript omits the words), or whether they are absent from π.46 B cop\(^{a}\) eth\(^{m}\) and several Fathers (Clement Cyprian Macrobius Ambrosiaster Ephraem Jerome) because of an accident in transmission. In view of (a) the very widespread testimony supporting the longer reading (\(\gamma\) A C D\(^{ textual}\) F G H K L P almost all minuscules it vg syr\(^{p,h}\) cop\(^{b}\) goth arm eth\(^{ap}\) Clement Chrysostom \(q\)l) and (b) the inconcininity produced by the shorter reading with the following ἐν οἷς, as well as (c) the impression that καὶ ὑμεῖς in ver. 7 assumes a previous mention of unbelieving Gentiles, a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words in the text but to enclose them within square brackets in order to indicate a measure of doubt as to their genuineness in Colossians." Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 557.
who reject God and live in disobedience toward him by using the father-son relationship in a figurative manner.

**Sons of men.** When Paul explains that the mystery of Christ has been revealed to the apostles and prophets by the Spirit in Ephesians 3:5, he also states that this mystery was not made known in former generations to the "sons of men." The phrase Paul uses here is τοῖς υιοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Rather than highlighting their common genetic ancestry with this phrase, Paul seems to be emphasizing the collective ignorance they share as the heirs of humanity.46

**Sons of light and sons of day.** While John's Gospel contains a phrase similar to υἱοὶ φωτός, Paul's use of the phrase continues with καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας in 1 Thessalonians 5:5. Here, Paul is arguing that God's people should be so characterized by the light and the day that it is fitting to describe them as if they were sons of light and sons of day. The final phrase likely should be understood as containing υἱός as the implicit noun linked with νυκτὸς and σκότους. There are possible similarities between this verse and a corrupted line in CPR 8.22 that contains the phrase υἱὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας.47

**Son of destruction.** In 2 Thessalonians 2:3, Paul refers to an individual who will be revealed before the day of the Lord. This individual is identified as ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας. The phrase "son of destruction" was used by Jesus to refer to Judas Iscariot in John 17:12. It is attested outside the NT as well.48 Similar to the

---

46 It is also possible that this phrase simply represents genetic identification.
48 See Prov 24:22a (LXX); GNic. 20:4; ApPet. 1:2; EH 5.1.48.
case of Judas, Paul seems to use this "son(s) of" phrase figuratively to describe this
eschatological man of lawlessness and communicate to the reader that his relationship to
destruction will be like that of father to son.

Hebrews—Introduction

The author of Hebrews uses ὃιός 24 times. These occurrence are equally
divided into 12 which have a genitive modifier and 12 which do not. The uses of ὃιός
without a genitive modifier will be discussed initially. Then, the uses of ὃιός plus the
genitive will considered according to their categories.

Hebrews—公益活动 without the Genitive

As mentioned above, the author of Hebrews uses ὃιός without the genitive in
12 verses. Six of these occurrences are made with reference to Jesus as Son. As has been
the case in other writings, it seems that there is a implicit θεοῦ in these uses as well. In 5
of the remaining 6 occurrences, ὃιός is used to describe the relationship of God's people
to him as sons. These occurrences also seem to carry an implicit θεοῦ. The final use of
ὁιός without the genitive is found in the second half of Hebrews 12:7. While the first half
of Hebrews 12:7 contains a use of ὃιός in the preceding group, the latter half of the verse
has ὃιός referring simply to a hypothetical son of a hypothetical father. The point of the
verse is that just as any father would discipline a son, so also does God discipline his
sons.

49 See Heb 1:2, 5, 8, 3:6, 5:8, 7:28.
50 See Heb 2:10, 12:5, 6, 7, 8.
Hebrews–υἱός with the Genitive

Genetic Identification

This category is home to 5 of the 12 occurrences of υἱός plus the genitive in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Hebrews 2:6, the author cites Psalm 8:5 and includes the genetic use of "son(s) of" found in both the MT and the LXX. Here, the phrase υἱός ἀνθρώπου simply represents the genetic solidarity of all human beings in an idiomatic form. In Hebrews 7:5, the author refers to τῶν υἱῶν Λευί. Here, the genetic identification also includes aspects of qualification as it is referring to Levi's descendants who were those that were qualified to serve in the priestly office. In Hebrews 11:21, the author genetically identifies Ephraim and Manasseh as τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ. In the next verse, Hebrews 11:22, the author refers to Joseph's prophecy regarding the Exodus in Genesis 50:24. The author of Hebrews calls it the Exodus of τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. Finally, the author uses υἱός plus the genitive in Hebrews 11:24 to explain that Moses refused to be genetically identified as the son of the daughter of Pharaoh.

Messianic

There are 6 uses of υἱός plus the genitive to identify Jesus in messianic terms. These occurrences account for 50 percent of the author's use of υἱός plus the genitive. As in other writings, these messianic identifications using υἱός plus the genitive are construed using both common phrases and also pronouns.

Son of God. Jesus is referred to as the Son of God 4 times by the author of Hebrews. Three of these occurrences simply identify him as the Son of God.51 In the remaining occurrence in Hebrews 7:3, Melchizedek is said to be like τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ in

51See Heb 4:14, 6:6, 10:29.
that "he is without father or mother or genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life" (Heb 7:3, ESV).

**Using pronouns.** The 2 occurrences in the Epistle to the Hebrews which identify Jesus as the Messiah using pronouns are found in the midst of OT quotes. Both in Hebrews 1:5 and Hebrews 5:5, the author quotes Psalm 2:7 which has the phrase υἱός μου.

**Figurative Uses**

There is only 1 figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Hebrews 12:5, the author has a quotation from Proverbs 3:11. There the LXX simply has υἱέ while the MT has בְּנִי. The author of Hebrews has the phrase υἱέ μου. This use of υἱός plus the genitive is figurative because while the author of the Proverb is referring to his own male child, or possibly to a student, the author of Hebrews seems to be placing this quotation on the lips of the Lord and figuratively identifying the individual who has faith as a υἱός θεοῦ.

**James**

The Epistle of James only has 1 use of υἱός. In James 2:21, James constructs a phrase using υἱός plus the genitive for the purpose of genetic identification. Here, Isaac is identified as being the direct genetic descendant of Abraham using the phrase τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.

**Petrine Epistles**

The Epistles of Peter contain 2 uses of υἱός and both of them possess a genitive modifier. In 1 Peter 5:13, in his final greetings to his audience, Peter relays greetings
from the church and from Mark. In his reference to Mark, he calls him ὁ υἱός μου. Since it does not seem that Mark was Peter's genetic descendant, this is likely a figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive akin to those examples where a student is figuratively described as the son of his teacher. The other use of υἱός plus the genitive in the Petrine Epistles is found in 2 Peter 1:17 in what appears to be a reference to the transfiguration. In the verse, Peter repeats what was said by the Father regarding Jesus at the event: ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.

Conclusion

Throughout the NT, υἱός without a genitive modifier is used with some frequency in four major categories: (1) to refer to a child, typically male, (2) to refer to a non-direct descendant, typically male, (3) to refer to Jesus as the Son with θεοῦ implicit in the text, and (4) to refer to God's people as sons with θεοῦ implicit in the text. When υἱός is used with a genitive modifier, these occurrences fall into one of three categories: (1) genetic identification, (2) messianic identification, and (3) figurative uses. It is the figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive that will be the major focus of remaining chapters. All the uses of υἱός plus the genitive as categorized in this chapter's survey are shown in table A1 in appendix 1.

---

52 This would be similar to passages where Paul refers to Timothy and Titus as "my child." See 1 Cor 4:17; 1 Tim 1:2, 18; 2 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4
CHAPTER 4

THE FATHER-SON RELATIONSHIP
IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

Introduction

This chapter seeks to illustrate the background behind the figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT as well as propose a framework for their interpretation. In order to interpret properly the figurative use of the father-son relationship by the NT authors, the nature and dynamics of the typical father-son relationship in the social world of these authors must be explored. Naturally, this relationship must be examined as it is situated within the larger kinship system of the ancient world. First, major concepts such as kinship, descent groups, family, and the function and significance of genealogy will be defined and discussed. Second, the dominant kinship system of the NT's social world will be explained. Third, those aspects of the kinship system and familial life which are specific to the father-son relationship itself will be noted. Finally, a framework for interpreting the figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT will be constructed from this background and presented.

Defining Terminology and Key Concepts

Hellerman notes that "the universality of family – consisting of highly valued relationships with those to whom we are related by birth or marriage – ironically hinders, rather than enhances, our ability to appreciate some of the most important values
obtaining in kinship constructs that differ from our own." Similarly, Hanson writes,

While families are a universal phenomenon, they are configured in a multitude of ways, are controlled by different mechanisms, and serve different functions. Even though humans universally construct relationships with those to whom they are related by birth or marriage, "family" is a notion constructed differently in different cultures. Therefore it is perhaps the easiest set of relationships to misconstrue when observing another culture. If we look at the family ethnocentrically it is easy to confuse a cultural pattern with a biological one.²

As a result of this potential for misconstrual and misunderstanding, in order to have a coherent discussion of concepts such as kinship, family, and genealogy within the context of distinct cultures which each utilize different linguistic terms, it will be helpful to define the terminology that will be used in the course of this exploration of these concepts in the NT world.³

**Kinship**

**Basic concept.** Kinship is a universal feature of all societies. A primary reason for this universality is biological. Howard explains that this biological factor results from the fact that "human infants are helpless and depend on the care of others for a prolonged period, and bonds arise among people in relation to these conditions."⁴ However, even though kinship arises due to biological factors, "the ways kinship is used and defined are determined by sociocultural considerations."⁵ According to Malina, "kinship refers to the

---


³In this section, the goal is simply to define terminology. Defining a social reality, such as polygyny, is not the same as condoning it.


⁵Ibid., 187.
patterns of such social norms that regulate human relationships which are based directly upon the experiences of birth and the birth cycle, from the womb, through developmental stages, to death." Hanson expands upon Malina's explanation by saying that it is "an abstraction relating to the network of relationships based upon birth (either real or fictive) and marriage, and it forms one of the four foundational social domains which social scientists analyze." It is important to recognize that kinship refers to both the network of relationships and the social norms which regulate them. In addition, the concept of kinship extends to cover both real, such as consanguineal or affinal, kinship and fictive or pseudo-kinship. Kinship is the broader category which governs all manner of relationships and practices such as family, marriage, genealogy, descent, inheritance, and adoption. As expressed by Hanson, kinship is one of the four foundational social domains along with politics, economics, and religion. These four domains do not function in isolation from the others; rather, there is interaction between them and even embedding. As such, any consideration of kinship in a society should explore its interaction with the other three domains. Finally, the kinship systems of various societies are evaluated on the basis of the following characteristics: (1) the extent of recognition of consanguineal and affinal relationships for social purposes, (2) the classification and grouping of relatives in social groups, (3) the customs and norms which govern behavior within the context of familial relationships in daily life, (4) the rights and obligations which are brought about

---


through kinship, and (5) the linguistic forms which are used to communicate the various levels and/or categories of kin.9

**Descent groups.** The study of descent groups is a sub-discipline of the field of kinship studies. Goody writes,

> In the majority of preindustrial societies, kinsfolk are more than a narrow category of persons linked to an individual actor by filiation and siblinghood. They constitute a series of social groups that dominate the domestic organization and the process of socialization, the use and transfer of property, the settlement of disputes, religious activities such as ancestor worship, and certain political relationships.10

Due to the widespread influence of kinship on social life, the structure and enlistment of kin groups is a highly important aspect of the kinship system of a society. According to Goody, most comparative sociologists have accepted Rivers' distinction between inheritance, succession, and descent.11 Inheritance is focused on the transmission of property, succession relates to the transmission of an office, and descent is concerned with the transmission of membership in the kin group.12 These rights can be transmitted to the younger generation in the following ways: (1) agnatic transmission, received exclusively from paternal kin, (2) uterine transmission, received exclusively from maternal kin, (3) bilateral inclusive or ambilateral transmission, received from both paternal and maternal kin sources, and (4) bilateral exclusive or utrolateral transmission,

---


received from either the paternal or maternal kin. In general, the rights of inheritance, succession, and descent are all transmitted in the same manner within a particular kinship group.

**Unilineal descent groups.** In order to be a unilineal descent group, a kin group must recruit through either the paternal or maternal kin, either through agnatic or uterine transmission, and all the members of the kin group must be related to one another through a common unilineal ancestor. Under this category, kin groups are identified as being either patrilineal or matrilineal depending on whether descent is traced through the father or the mother. It is important to note that kin groups can adhere to agnatic or uterine transmission and not be a unilineal descent group if they do not all trace their lineage to a common ancestor.

**Cognatic kin groups.** These kin groups are found in societies which do not have unilineal descent groups. Cognatic kin groups are "based upon ties traced unrestrictedly, through both males and females at one time, or restrictedly through one parent or the other, with the particular selection depending upon nonkinship factors." Keesing notes that cognatic kin groups trace descent "from an ancestor or ancestress through a series of links that can be male or female, or any combination of the two." This last category is quite broad including descent that is traced through both unilineal

---


15 Ibid., 406.

and nonunilineal ancestors.\textsuperscript{17}

Keesing helpfully draws four distinctions between the concepts of kinship and
descent. The conceptual differences between these two cultural principles serve to clarify
and set apart seemingly overlapping terms. They are laid out in table 4.

Table 4: Four clarifications regarding kinship and descent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Descent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Defined with reference to an individual</td>
<td>1. Defined with reference to an ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ego) or pairs of individuals.</td>
<td>(or ancestress).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Universally important.</td>
<td>2. Culturally recognized only in some societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Normally bilateral, from the standpoint</td>
<td>3. Connects (through relatedness to a common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an ego.</td>
<td>ancestor) only a limited class of ego's relatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kinship relationships are relative; you</td>
<td>4. Descent status is, in a sense, absolute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are a son or a nephew only in relation</td>
<td>You are, or are not, a member of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to some particular person.</td>
<td>particular descent group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Keesing, \textit{Kin Groups}, 21

\textbf{Pseudo kinship.} Pseudo-kinship is comprised of relationships "in which
persons are described or addressed by kin terms (or terms derived from the idiom of kin)
but do not stand in such a relationship by virtue of the principles, however they happen to
be conceptualized, of descent or marriage."\textsuperscript{18} While kinship status is typically restricted in

\textsuperscript{17}Keesing, \textit{Kin Groups}, 17.

\textsuperscript{18}Julian Pitt-Rivers, "Kinship: Pseudo-Kinship," in \textit{International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences}, ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 408. While Pitt-Rivers makes a clear line of demarcation between pseudo-kinship as a broad category and fictive kinship as a rather specific subset, other authors seem to use these two terms as near synonyms. For example, see Dennis C. Duling, "Matthew 18: 15-17: Conflict,
a society to relationships of a consanguineal or affinal nature, "these do not determine a relation of pseudo-kinship, which depends always upon the individual will of, at least, the initiator." Pitt-Rivers recognizes three distinct types of pseudo-kinship:

1. There is, first of all, the figurative use of kin terms, which may be little more than a convention of speech or which may, on the other hand, designate a status within the society or within a specific context.
2. There are also customs whereby a person is given the status of kin by attribution rather than by birth – and this is commonly called "fictive" or "artificial" kinship.
3. There are also institutions which, in some ways, resemble kinship and are named by analogy with it, yet which possess a separate nature and accord a distinct status.

Under the first category falls any use of a kin term such as "father" or "son" to describe the relationship that exists between two persons or to stress a certain aspect of the particular kin term which is figuratively utilized. Pitt-Rivers notes that these figurative usages of kinship terms "are mere expressions of attitude, part of the common currency of personal relations. They imply a quality of behavior rather than a status, fraternity rather than the relationships of sibling." For Pitt-Rivers, the second category – fictive kinship – does convey actual kinship status. In Western civilizations, adoption falls into this category. While not a member of the kinship group based on genealogical or genetic lines, an adopted child becomes kin through legal means and enjoys the same social


Ibid.

It is important to note that this particular aspect of pseudo-kinship is typically focused on figuratively describing the relationships between two or more persons using kinship terminology. As such, pseudo-kinship or fictive kinship does not exactly correspond to the figurative "son(s) of" phrases which describe the relationship between a person and a thing or concept using father-son kinship terms.

Ibid.
status in the kinship group as biological children. The last category is focused on the various forms of ritualized pseudo-kinship such as blood brotherhood and ritual coparenthood.  

**Hsu's hypothesis.** Hsu recognized that because "kinship plays such a basic part in the upbringing of the human individual, and has such a universal place in every human society," it will not be found to be irrelevant to developments in society and culture. Hsu found that one relationship within a kinship system can be influential to the degree that it extends to all other relationships and shapes the entire kinship system. There are several terms which are vital to understanding Hsu's work: "dyad," "attribute," "dominant dyad," and "dominant attribute." "A dyad consists of two linked persons." In the typical nuclear family, there are eight basic dyads present: husband-wife, father-son, mother-son, father-daughter, mother-daughter, brother-brother, brother-sister, and sister-sister. "The term 'attribute' refers to the logical or typical mode of behavior and attitude intrinsic to each dyad." Further, "the intrinsic attributes of each dyad are the basic ingredients and determinants of the interactional patterns between parties of that dyad." However, it is with the notion of dominance that Hsu's work on kinship and culture

---


25 Ibid.

26 Ibid., 8.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid., 9.
stands out from that of others:

No nuclear family would seem to give equal prominence to all its basic dyads. What actually occurs is that in each type of nuclear family one (or more) takes precedence over all the others. When a dyad is thus elevated above others, it tends to modify, magnify, reduce, or even eliminate other dyads in the kinship group. Such a dyad is designated in our hypothesis as the dominant dyad while others in the system are non-dominant dyads.

Thus, the attributes of the dominant dyad are represented by the term "dominant attributes" and the attributes of the non-dominant dyads are "non-dominant attributes."

"In each form of nuclear family, the dominant attributes so influence the non-dominant attributes that the latter tend to converge in the direction of the dominant attributes. The dominant attributes prevail over and give shape to all the non-dominant attributes."

Hsu's hypothesis is as follows: "The dominant attributes of the dominant dyad in a given kinship system tend to determine the attitudes and action patterns that the individual in such a system develops toward other dyads in this system as well as towards his relationships outside of the system."

Family

The family is an institution that is found in all human societies. While there is a conflict and debate regarding what exactly constitutes a family, the reality of its widespread nature in varying societies is almost universally accepted. In addition to the controversy regarding what comprises a family, there are two additional complications

30 Hsu, "Hypothesis," 9.
31 Ibid., 10.
32 Ibid.
associated with a discussion of the concept of family in the biblical world. First, there is the reality of social and cultural changes across the timeline of the biblical narrative. In addition, the nature of the family in both the Israelite and Greco-Roman worlds must be considered. Second, there are the various linguistic terms that are used by each group to describe familial relationships. Moreover, these terms often are not consistently and accurately translated into English versions of the Bible.\textsuperscript{34} In order to prepare for the exploration of the family in both the Israelite and also the Greco-Roman cultures, it will be helpful to precisely define the most common of the various groups and categories which are commonly identified using the English word "family" with or without modifiers.

**Domestic groups.** A domestic group is a "group of people who habitually share a common dwelling and a common food supply."\textsuperscript{35} These groups often vary in size and stability. While it is possible to describe such groups as "family," this attribution is unhelpful because of the reality that "domestic groups may be made up of individuals between whom no kinship ties exist, and, conversely, members of one family may be distributed over two or more domestic groups."\textsuperscript{36} Smith asserts that these groups can be referred to using the term "household."\textsuperscript{37}

**Biological family.** Smith explains that "in Euro-American societies the basic


\textsuperscript{35}Smith, "Family," 302.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid.
model of kinship and family ties is that of biological relatedness and sexual intercourse, so that kin and familial relations are thought of in terms of physical descent or sexual relations.\footnote{Smith, "Family," 302.} Certainly, this basic model varies in other societies and it does not exclude the development of concepts such as adoption or fictive kinship, but it does express the notion that "family" at perhaps its most basic level is formed on the basis on biological descent. However, the concept of family cannot be restricted merely to biological relation.

**Nuclear family.** This term is "most frequently used to refer to a group consisting of a man, a woman, and their socially recognized children."\footnote{Ibid., 303.} It is also termed the "elementary," "simple," or "basic" family. The term is used to identify specific groups and the qualifying word "nuclear" implies that "this is the unit out of which more extensive family groups are built or grow."\footnote{Ibid.} While the nuclear family is typically its own domestic group in contemporary American society, it is not necessary for it to exist in isolation. Instead, it "may be contained within more extensive groups provided it is given some recognition."\footnote{Ibid.}

While it was previously accepted in general that the nuclear family was a universal human social group, either as the sole familial form or as the foundational unit upon which more complex forms of the family are constructed, this consensus is not conclusive. Instead, Levy and Fallers "have suggested that a distinction should be made

\footnote{Smith, "Family," 302.} \footnote{Ibid., 303.} \footnote{Ibid.} \footnote{Ibid.}
between the nuclear family as a concrete group and the 'nuclear-family relationship complex.' The nuclear-family relationship complex would be comprised of the following relationships: husband-wife, father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, mother-daughter, brother-sister, brother-brother, and sister-sister. Smith argues that "if one asserts that the nuclear-family relationship complex is institutionalized in all human societies—instead of speaking of the universal occurrence of nuclear family groups—then it is possible to account for the normal development of children brought up in groups that are not nuclear families in the restricted sense." Thus, a working definition which aims at understanding the nuclear family in terms of the relationship complex of which it is comprised can be expressed as follows: the social group composed of those exercising the traditional roles of father, mother, and child(ren) typically, though not necessarily, within the same domestic group.

**Compound family.** Smith defines the compound family as a "concrete group formed through the amalgamation of nuclear-family units or parts of them." Thus, in

---

42 Smith, "Family," 303.

43 Here, there is a correlation to Hsu's notion of dominant and non-dominant dyads.

44 Smith, "Family," 303. On this issue, not a few scholars point to Malinowski's work among the Australian and Trobriand Islands which demonstrated that the typical nuclear-family father role is often taken up by the mother's brother in matrilineal societies. See Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (New York: Shocken Books, 1963).

45 Father and mother in this definition are to be understood in terms of the social role these individuals exercise and these identifiers do not necessarily indicate that these individuals fill these same roles in the biological family. As mentioned above, in some matrilineal societies which do not acknowledge a genetic father role, the mother's brother would fill the social role of father even though he is not the biological father.

46 Smith, "Family," 304. Howard separates compound families into two separate categories: polygynous family groups and polyandrous family groups. While this distinction is helpful, it restricted the understanding of compound families in such a way
some societies, compound families result from polygyny. In these societies, the
compound family is composed of the man, his multiple wives, and the children of his
multiple wives. Compound families can also be formed by the marriage of a man and a
woman who both have previously dissolved marriages and the children resulting from
them. The dissolution of marriage in these cases could be the result of either divorce or
death.  

Joint families. Here, Smith cites the handbook Notes and Queries on
Anthropology for the explanation that "a joint family exists when 'two or more lineally
related kinsfolk of the same sex, their spouses and offspring, occupy a single homestead
and are jointly subject to the same authority or single head." While it may seem as if
joint families are simply a combination of multiple nuclear families, "joint families
generally arise, exist, and persist because they carry out activities more extensive than
would be possible for a nuclear-family group." These joint families grow by their
younger members bringing their spouse in instead of setting up a separate, independent
domestic group. Smith notes that in the joint families of some societies nuclear-family
groups are readily discernible inside the joint family, while in others the entire joint
family blends together as one.

Extended family. Extended families are simply dispersed iterations of the joint

---

47Smith, "Family," 304.
48Ibid. See also British Association for the Advancement of Science, Notes and
49Ibid.
family. While extended families do not live together in the same dwelling, they often live in close proximity and regularly participate in common activities. Smith writes that "the concept of extended family really exhausts the usefulness of the word 'family' for this kind of empirical classification, since an extended family is already a short lineage and can be discussed in terms of lineage theory, or it is a kindred and may be analyzed as such." 

**Family development cycle.** Howard delineates three main phases on family development. The first phase is expansion. This phase begins with marriage and ends when the last child is raised to the reproductive age. There is a high level of dependency of the children on their parents during expansion. The second phase is dispersion and fission. This phase begins with the first marriage of a child and ends when the last child is married. The final phase is replacement. In the phase, the parents die and are replaced by the children and their families in the social structure. The manner in which the parents are replaced depends on whether the society prefers primogeniture or ultimogeniture. Primogeniture refers to the practice of societies in which the oldest child, or oldest male child, inherits most or all of the property. Ultimogeniture refers to the practice of societies in which the youngest child, or youngest male child, remains in the parental household and inherits their property.

---

50 Smith, "Family," 304.
51 Ibid.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
**Todd's typology of family forms.** Hanson highlights the typology of family forms developed by Emmanuel Todd as a tool which is useful for studying family forms cross-culturally. Todd identified seven family forms based on permutations of the following variables: spousal choice (determined by customs, parents, or individual choice), spousal relationship (exogamy or endogamy), division of inheritance (equality or unequal shares), and cohabitation of married sons with their parents. These seven forms can be seen in table 5.

**Genealogy**

**Form.** Hanson sees genealogy as "a particular subgenre of the genre 'list.'" Whether this list of kin relationships is oral or written, it may either be transmitted in a simple list form or embedded in a larger narrative. For Israel especially, "kinship was a major organization principle, and for this reason genealogies, which use the idiom of kinship, became an important means of expressing all sorts of social, political, and religious relationships." Genealogies are segmented, linear, or a combination of both. Segmented genealogies identify more than one member of the kinship group per generation. As a result, these "seldom extend beyond four or five generations, even in written form." Linear genealogies are typically longer as they "are simply lists of names connecting an individual to an earlier ancestor by indicating the kinship relationships that

---

56 Hanson, "Kinship," 67.
57 Hanson, "Kinship," 67.
59 Ibid.
60 Hanson, "Kinship," 68.
Table 5: Seven family forms identified by Emmanuel Todd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Form</th>
<th>Spousal Choice</th>
<th>Spousal Relationship</th>
<th>Inheritance Division</th>
<th>Sons living with parents</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exogamous Community Family</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Exogamous</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ancient Rome, China, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Family</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Exogamous</td>
<td>Unequal–one son inherits</td>
<td>Yes, heir only</td>
<td>Germany, Japan, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Nuclear Family</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Exogamous</td>
<td>Equal, delineated by rules</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>northern France and Italy, Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Nuclear Family</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Exogamous</td>
<td>No definite rules</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>US, UK, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endogamous Community Family</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Endogamous</td>
<td>Equal, delineated by rules</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ancient Israel, Muslim countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetrical Community Family</td>
<td>Parents or Custom</td>
<td>Restricted Endogamous</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>southern India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomic Family</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Endogamous possible</td>
<td>Equality in theory, flexible in practice</td>
<td>Rejected in theory, accepted in practice</td>
<td>Indonesia, Philippines, native South Americans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the data in this table is found in Hanson, "Kinship."

tie all of the names together." These genealogies only identify one member of the kinship group per generation.

**Function.** The obvious primary function of a genealogy, especially a segmented genealogy, is to communicate and describe the relationships between individual members of a kinship group:

---

61 Wilson, "Genealogy," 930.
At the level of the family, both the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the genealogy are important. Horizontally, people on the same genealogical level are related to each other as equals, while vertically people are ranked hierarchically according to the level of the genealogy which they occupy. Segmented genealogies are thus both statements of equality and statements of inequality.\(^62\)

However, according to Wilson, linear genealogies only serve "to ground a claim to power, status, rank, office, or inheritance in a earlier ancestor."\(^63\)

They are used to preserve tribal homogeneity or cohesion, interrelate diverse traditions, acknowledge marriage contracts between extended families, legitimate fictive kinship, maintain ethnic identity and so on. But above all else, genealogies are honour claims. They seek to establish social status (ascribed honour) and thereby provide the all-important map for proper social interaction.\(^64\)

Hood's work on genealogies includes a helpful delineation of "six basically representative functions of genealogy in antiquity."\(^65\) These six functions are (1) identification, (2) organization, (3) magnification, (4) characterization, (5) qualification, and (6) motivation and inspiration.\(^66\) Identification serves to identify one individual by his relationship, whether literal or fictive, to another individual. Organization is concerned with the use of genealogical data to classify individuals based upon familial or tribal lines.\(^67\)

Magnification focuses on the use of genetic lineage as a source of family honor or pride.\(^68\)

---

\(^{62}\)Wilson, "Genealogy," 931.

\(^{63}\)Ibid.


\(^{66}\)Ibid., 1-9.

\(^{67}\)Ibid., 2.

\(^{68}\)While Hood discusses magnification as its own category, it is best to see it as a subset of characterization. Neyrey, Malina, and others have shown the close relationship in the ancient world between the character an individual possessed and the honor and shame he experienced in society. See Jerome H. Neyrey, Honor and Shame in
Characterization, which leads to the increase or decrease of one's status in society, highlights the fact that an individual's lineage describes, based upon that lineage, what type of person he will become in society. Indeed, genealogy "tells us not only who the genealogical subject is, but what kind of person we should expect him to be." Qualification is the aspect of genealogy which means that based upon an individual's birth, he attains various rights and privileges in society. Finally, the function of motivation and inspiration is to describe the tendency of genetic lineage to motivate or inspire an individual in the ancient world to imitate or follow the lives of those who have preceded him in his lineage.

Metaphor. Wilson notes that "in societies such as early Israel, where kinship is a basis for organizing the society, the language of genealogy, which has its origins in the need to represent actual kinship ties, is used metaphorically to express other social relationships where real kinship is not involved." Further, he writes that "if a genealogy can be used to relate members of an actual family, then it can also be used to express the political relationships between families that are not actually related to each other." The same is true for other social and religious relationships as well. Thus, the metaphorical

---

69 Hood, "Genealogies," 5.
70 Rohrbaugh, "Legitimating Sonship," 188. Emphasis original.
72 Ibid., 8.
73 Wilson, "Genealogy," 930.
74 Ibid., 931.
use of genealogical idiom would seem to overlap with the first category of pseudo-kinship outlined by Pitt-Rivers – "the figurative use of kin terms, which may be little more than a convention of speech or which may, on the other hand, designate a status within the society or within a specific context."75

**Kinship and Family in the NT World**

As noted above, kinship in the ancient world is a broad category that is comprised of "a series of social groups that dominate the domestic organization and the process of socialization, the use and transfer of property, the settlement of disputes, religious activities such as ancestor worship, and certain political relationships."76 Indeed, the kin group "is the most significant in-group. Kin share common qualities and make enemies because of these qualities."77 Kinship is the focal point of Mediterranean society.78 Further, Malina writes that:

Persons are so embedded in groups that the group and the individual are in large measure co-extensive, both psychologically and in every other way. Collectivistic cultures may be defined as cultures in which persons understand themselves as parts of groups or collectivities such as family, tribe, or nation. Individuals are defined by the groups to which they belong and do not understand themselves as having a separate identity. They are motivated by group norms rather than individual needs or aspirations, and strenuously avoid articulating personal goals or giving them priority over the goals of the group.79

This collectivistic identity stands in stark contrast to the individualism of most modern

76Goody, "Descent Groups," 401.
78Ibid., 50.
Western societies. As a result, the kinship system in the ancient Mediterranean world is considerably different than the American kindred system of family relationships.\textsuperscript{80} Table 6 illustrates the major distinctions between kinship in the ancient world and modern American society.

Table 6: Kinship in first-century Judea and twentieth-century U.S. contrasted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>First-century Judea</th>
<th>Twentieth-century U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family form</td>
<td>Endogamous community (multigenerational)</td>
<td>Absolute nuclear (dual generational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal choice</td>
<td>Controlled by custom and parents</td>
<td>Free choice by couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage strategy</td>
<td>Endogamous (ideal)</td>
<td>Exogamous (required by law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding endowment</td>
<td>Formal: dowry, indirect dowry, and bridewealth</td>
<td>Informal: family gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple lives with</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom's parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance distribution</td>
<td>Oldest son: double Other sons: single Daughters: dowries</td>
<td>No inheritance rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data in this table is found in Hanson, "Kinship," 64

Finally, in recent history there have been numerous works on the family in its Jewish, Greek, and Roman social contexts.\textsuperscript{81} Nonetheless, while there are undoubtedly

\textsuperscript{80}Hellerman, Ancient Church as Family, 27.

aspects which are unique to the social norms and kinship descent group structures of each
culture, it seems best to conclude with Blickenstaff that "as a social construct, the
definition of 'family' varies across geographical, class, and economic lines but not (at
least in the first century) across 'ethnic' lines. Differences between Jewish and Gentile
families of a similar class apparently did not exist." Cohen consistently shares a similar
report from the essays in his volume:

The Jewish family in antiquity seems not to have been distinctive by the power of
its Jewishness; rather, its structure, ideals, and dynamics, seem to have been
virtually identical with those of its ambient culture(s)... The Jewish values and
expectations governing parent-child relationships were entirely consonant with, and
almost indistinguishable from, those of Greco-Roman society... Philo's fundamental
conception of the parent-child relationship is consonant with, and almost
indistinguishable from, that of Greco-Roman society.

As a result, the major components of the predominant kinship system in the
Mediterranean world will be discussed below.

Descent Group Structure

The main kinship system in the Mediterranean world is a unilineal descent

---

Interpretation 52, no. 2 (1998): 117-29. On the Greek family, see W. K. Lacey, The
Family in Classical Greece, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life (Ithaca, NY: Cornell
University Press, 1968); J. K. Campbell, Honour, Family, and Patronage (New York:
Oxford University Press, 1964); and Ernestine Friedl, Vasilika: A Village in Modern
Greece, Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston,
1962). On the Roman family, see Suzanne Dixon, The Roman Family (Baltimore: The
Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Beryl Rawson, The Family in Ancient Rome:
New Perspectives (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986); Beryl Rawson, Marriage,
Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); and Beryl
Rawson, "The Roman Family' in Recent Research: State of the Question," Biblical

Blickenstaff, While the Bridegroom Is with Them, 114. She makes note of
Dixon's caveat that the source literature on this subject "is predominantly a record of the
norms of the upper class." See Dixon, The Roman Family, 17. Cf. also Jeffers, "Jewish
Rome did not differ much from family life among pagan Romans among the lower
classes at the time. The key differences probably were a stronger emphasis on religious
education along with heightened ethical demands."

Cohen, Jewish Family in Antiquity, 2-3.
group. Specifically, it is patrilineal. Hellerman identifies this kinship system as a patrilineal kinship group or PKG.\textsuperscript{84} Simply put, "an individual must possess the patriarch's blood to be part of the family."\textsuperscript{85} Within the PKG, the rights of inheritance, succession, and descent are all agnatically transmitted.\textsuperscript{86} A strict agnatic or patrilineal recruitment strategy means that it is only those individuals who can trace their lineage to the patriarch through direct male heirs who can claim to be a true member of the kinship group.\textsuperscript{87} It is through this agnatic line of male descent that property, office, and group membership pass from one generation to the next. The collectivist culture of the PKG extended even to these rights – they were viewed as belonging to the patriline as a whole and needed to be preserved as such.\textsuperscript{88}

**Marriage Strategy**

The marriage strategy within the PKG is where there is some distinction between Jewish, Greek, and Roman families. As was shown in Tables 6 and 7 above, in Ancient Israel, the preferred marriage strategy was endogamy.\textsuperscript{89} However, in the Greek


\textsuperscript{85} Hellerman, *Ancient Church as Family*, 30.

\textsuperscript{86} See above, p. 94, for Rivers' differentiation of these three rights.

\textsuperscript{87} Hellerman has two helpful diagrams outlining the recruitment strategies of both the American kindred group system and the PKG. See Hellerman, *Ancient Church as Family*, 28-29.

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 57.

\textsuperscript{89} Endogamous marriage here does not mean that they married within the same
and Roman family, exogamy was the norm. Hellerman explains the reasons behind either choice: "for descent group societies, a good marriage is one that enhances the honor and position of the extended family. Endogamous marriages strengthen the kin group from within by keeping resources within the group. Exogamous marriages serve to build alliances with other families."\textsuperscript{90}

\textbf{Residential Configuration}

The residences of the PKG were patrilocal – "sons are generally kept as close to their father's house as possible."\textsuperscript{91} "Members of the patrilineal kinship group live together (patrilocal residence): fathers, sons, and unmarried daughters – along with the father's wife and the wives of his sons."\textsuperscript{92} Malina writes that typically, only the eldest son remained in the father's home: "in the first-century world, adult male children normally remained within or close by the parental household, while females were married out. Usually the firstborn male will inherit his father's house; hence he remains in the household, with his married brothers living nearby."\textsuperscript{93}

\textbf{PKG Family Structure}

The most common PKG domestic group was a joint family. This joint family shared a common dwelling and a common food supply. They would have been both a nuclear or even extended family. Rather, it was endogamous marriage to the "closest kin allowable by law or custom." See Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, \textit{Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches}, The Family, Religion, and Culture, ed. Don S. Browning and Ian S. Evison (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 42.

\textsuperscript{90}Hellerman, \textit{Ancient Church as Family}, 31.

\textsuperscript{91}Ibid., 32.

\textsuperscript{92}Ibid., 57.

producing and a consuming unit.\textsuperscript{94} As expressed above, "a joint family exists when 'two or more lineally related kinsfolk of the same sex, their spouses and offspring, occupy a single homestead and are jointly subject to the same authority or single head."\textsuperscript{95} Thus, it is a combination of nuclear families. These nuclear families band together because they can be more productive together than apart. While in some societies, nuclear families have clearly defined lines within the joint family, in the PKG the joint family blended as one unit under the authority of the patriarch. The extended family would live nearby and likely share some common activities within the domestic group. Malina describes the typical household:

In the Mediterranean world, the household might include father, mother, the firstborn son and his family, along with other unmarried children. These would live in close proximity, perhaps even sharing the same courtyard with other married sons and their family. This sort of family tends to be the effective social, residence, consumption, and production unit.\textsuperscript{96}

With respect to Todd's family types as outlined by Hanson in table 5 above, the typical PKG family was either an Endogamous or Exogamous Community Family. The Jewish PKG would have been typically endogamous while the Greco-Roman PKG would have been typically exogamous. However, in either of these cultures, there may be some variance from these typical social norms for the elevation of the honor and status of the family in their society.

**Fathers and Sons in the PKG**

As would be expected from a *patrilineal* kinship group, the father-son relationship is the dominant dyad. In fact, Frederik Barth writes that "one could make a

\textsuperscript{94}Hellerman, *Ancient Church as Family*, 57.

\textsuperscript{95}Smith, "Family," 304.

very good case for the father-son relationship as the dominant relationship in most Middle Eastern kinship systems."97 The father-son relationship as the dominant dyad is especially the case "where political life is structured by patrilineal descent groups and productive resources are held collectively by patrilineal groups."98 Here, "the importance of the father-son relationship is overwhelming" and "the family system can be characterized as patrilocal and patriarchal."99 Malina notes "in the first-century Mediterranean, nearly the entire emphasis is on the male line of descent."100 Father-son dominance is also evident in the NT: "the relationship that is most spoken of in the New Testament texts is that between father and son."101

Hsu explains that the "basic attributes of the father-son dyad are continuity, inclusiveness, asexuality, and authority."102 Continuity simply means that "the relationship is continuous because every father is a son, and every son, in the normal course of events,


98 Barth, "Role Dilemmas," 90.

99 Ibid.


101 Moxnes, "What Is Family?," 34.

102 Hsu, "Hypothesis," 13.
is a father. Therefore every father-son dyad is but a link in an everlasting chain of father-
son dyads."¹⁰³ The father-son relationship is inclusive because fathers often have more
than one son and, as a result, the dyad is tolerant toward sharing with others.¹⁰⁴ Asexuality
is an attribute of the father-son dyad because this relationship has nothing to do with sex.
The attribute of authority expresses the important notion that the father understands that
he is in authority over the son and the son understands that he is under the authority of his
father.

Barth notes that these attributes are clearly expressed in the structure of the
PKG: "the attributes of continuity, inclusiveness, authority, and asexuality have
institutional correlates in patrilineality, joint property and responsibility, paternal
authority, and incest taboos embracing the spouses of close agnates."¹⁰⁵ These attributes
are "continually expressed and confirmed in etiquette summarized under the heading of
respect behavior by the son towards the father."¹⁰⁶ Specifically, authority and continuity
are seen to be major attributes with a significant influence on the surrounding culture and
social world of the PKG.¹⁰⁷

Authority

For the father in the culture dominated by the father-son dyad, authority is
directly related to honor and shame. "The honor of a father, elder, patriarch depends to a

¹⁰³Hsu, "Hypothesis," 13.
¹⁰⁴Ibid. Inclusiveness can be seen more clearly when contrasted to its opposite.
The husband-wife dyad is typically exclusive in Western culture. The husband has one
wife and vice versa. This relationship is intolerant toward sharing with others.
¹⁰⁵Barth, "Role Dilemmas," 90.
¹⁰⁶Ibid.
¹⁰⁷See Hsu, "Hypothesis," 14 and 24.
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very great extent on his being able to impose his will upon the members of the entire family."\textsuperscript{108} But it is not solely the honor of the father that is at stake, but the honor of the entire kinship group. Malina explains that "social groups, like the family, village, or region, possess a collective honor in which the members participated."\textsuperscript{109} Further, "the head of the group is responsible for the honor of the group with reference to outsiders, and symbolizes the group's honor as well. Hence members of the group owe loyalty, respect, and obedience of a kind which commits their individual honor without limit and without compromise."\textsuperscript{110}

The honor of the son is inextricably linked to this collective honor as well. Thus, submission to authority is understood as the "obedience that a son owes his father."\textsuperscript{111} Indeed, "family loyalty – doing whatever is necessary to uphold the honor of the family in public – is the quintessential Mediterranean value."\textsuperscript{112} A son who did not submit to the authority of his father would bring shame on himself, his father, and his entire kinship group. Obedience, discipline, and respect are non-negotiable demands placed on the son in the father-son dyad of the PKG.\textsuperscript{113}


\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{111} Moxnes, "What Is Family?," 34.

\textsuperscript{112} Rohrbaugh, "Legitimating Sonship," 186. This loyalty is valued so highly because "family honor determines everything. It determines who can marry whom, who will do business with whom, who will eat with whom, even who can initiate a conversation. For this reason, aspersions cast on lineage, that is on family honour, are the most serious insults the Middle East has to offer. They are considered vulgar in the extreme." See ibid.

\textsuperscript{113} Barth, "Role Dilemmas," 91.
Because of this mutual respect for and commitment to the collective honor of the PKG, the father's authority over the son is generally expressed not in brutal power or dominance, but rather "by conviction on the part of the subordinates of the superior's right, duty, or privilege to exercise authority just as it is their right, duty, or privilege to obey it."\(^{114}\) In addition to family honor, the continuous nature of the father-son dyad also contributes to this conviction since sons see themselves as those who will wield the same authority in the future.\(^{115}\) Hsu explains the accepted nature of the attribute of authority in the father-son dyad:

> Nurtured in this attribute, both the father and the son are attuned to its necessity. The superior does not have to disguise his power because he knows this is his due, and the subordinate has no need to disguise his obeisance since it is not necessary to be ashamed of it. Authority and compliance to authority are therefore carried out openly and elaborately with no qualms on either side.\(^{116}\)

Due to this acceptance, "the individual reared in the father-son dominated system will have no resentment against benevolent authority; in fact, he will love it."\(^{117}\)

**Continuity**

As stated above, continuity in the father-son dyad is due to the fact that in the normal course of events each son will become a father. In the PKG, because the father-son relationship is the dominant dyad, this transition from son to father includes the concepts of inheritance, succession, and descent. Inheritance is focused on the transmission of property, succession is focused on the transmission of an office, and descent is focused on the transmission of membership in the kinship group and all that

\(^{114}\)Hsu, "Hypothesis," 13.

\(^{115}\)Ibid.

\(^{116}\)Ibid., 24.

\(^{117}\)Ibid.
this membership entails.

**Inheritance.** Typically, in the NT world, it was the firstborn son who would inherit his father's house.\(^{118}\) The eldest son would remain in his father's house for this very purpose. While the dowry can be understood as a pre-mortem inheritance, the inheritance of property and wealth at the death of the male head of the family was a right given only to sons in the PKG.\(^{119}\)

**Succession.** In the PKG, succession involves the transmission of the father's station or position in society to the son. In the case of succession, the focus is mostly on his profession. In addition, it potentially includes the transmission of the father's office as the head of the PKG upon his death to his eldest son.

The father's station or position is transmitted because "males follow the occupation of their father and remain in the same inherited social status."\(^{120}\) Indeed, "what a person's parents did for a living usually determined what that person did: farmers' children became farmers, potters' children became potters."\(^{121}\) This transmission of profession is not simply based on the preference of the father, instead it is an aspect of their society: "membership in the craftsmen's guilds of the preindustrial society was normally based on kinship, just as membership in the elite classes derived from birth."\(^{122}\)


\(^{119}\)For the notion of dowry as a pre-mortem inheritance, see Hanson, "Kinship," 73.


\(^{121}\)Hanson, "Kinship," 76.

\(^{122}\)Malina, *New Testament World*, 123. This correspondence between the father-son relationship and the way society functions is likely a case of what Hsu discusses when he explains that kinship systems play a significant part in social and cultural
However, more than his profession will be transmitted to the son who succeeds his father as head of the PKG. Moxnes explains that a son is transmitted "not only the property of his father, but also his role and authority upon his death." This aspect of transmission is the ultimate expression of the continuous nature of the father-son dyad in the PKG: the son who was previously under the authority of his father becomes the bearer of that same authority.

**Descent.** The concept of descent is concerned with transmission of membership in the kinship group. It is by being a descendant of his father that a son gains admittance to the PKG. However, for the members of the PKG, membership in the group meant more than simply sharing a common name. It was directly linked to the shared honor a PKG possessed. Malina explains that "honor, both ascribed and acquired, is often symbolized by blood (one's blood relations, group) and name. A good name fundamentally means adequate honor to carry on the social interactions necessary for decent human existence." Collective honor, family honor resulted from shared blood. Honor was transmitted "via birth. An honour status is ascribed the day one is born and is derived from the standing one's family has – and has always had – in the village (honour as status or precedence). Because it is derived from birth, all members of the family, both male and female, have the same general honour rating, though significant differences could also occur within families (birth-order is an obvious example)."

---

123 Moxnes, "What Is Family?" 34.
inherited from the father. 126 "In publicly acknowledging a boy to be his son, that is a member of his genealogical tree, a father not only accepted responsibility for him and made him his heir, he determined his status (honour) in the community as well." 127

This status determination has a dramatic effect on society. Members of this society were expected to act in accordance with their predetermined status in it. 128 Membership in a PKG provided an "all-important map for proper social interaction." 129 Indeed,

ancestry both signified and determines character. Thus in the New Testament we are told: 'Cretans are always liars, vicious brutes, lazy gluttons' (Tit. 1:12); 'Judeans have no dealings with Samaritans' (John 4:9); nothing good can 'come out of Nazareth' (John 1:46). Such stereotyping worked because antiquity believed the dictum: Like father like son. 'Son of' thus tells us not only who the genealogical subject is, but what kind of person we should expect him to be. 130

Figurative "Son(s) of" Phrases in the PKG Context

In the course of this analysis of kinship, family, and genealogy in general, as well as the examination of the father-son dyad in the specific context of the PKG, numerous functions of these concepts and relationships have emerged. The task now is to channel this analysis into a framework for the interpretation of the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. First it must be recognized that any "son(s) of" phrase ought to be understood as a genealogical statement. This classification is true whether the "son(s) of" phrase is literal or figurative and whether the phrase is found in isolation or in a series of "son(s)
of” constructions. Second, because these phrases are genealogical statements, the categories outlined by Hood above should at the very least have some level of incorporation into the final framework for interpretation. Third, in each occurrence of a figurative "son(s) of" phrase, the human referent plays the role of son.131 As a result, the interpretive framework should employ at minimum the major attributes at work in the father-son dyad – authority and continuity. Here, these should emphasize the role of the son in the attribute. It is with these statements in mind that the following interpretive categories are proposed: Identification, Participation, Submission, Characterization, Succession, Inheritance, and Motivation.132 These seven categories will be explained below.

Identification

Under Hood's functional classifications, identification is performing a genealogical statement's simplest function – to indicate who an individual is and who they are not. John was the son of Zebedee; he is not any other John. For the figurative uses of "son(s) of," identification is still at work. A son receives his identity from his father and is distinguished from others because of it. For example, a "son of light" is identifiable by his relationship to light. In addition, it is clear that he is not a "son of darkness." Thus, whether literal or figurative, identification describes both who a son is and who he is not.

131 In effect, the reader self-identifies with the "son" and not the "father."

132 Just as with Hood's six functions of genealogy, these are not mutually exclusive and there is likely to be some overlap between the categories.
**Participation**

This category has most in common with Hood's Organization. However, it acknowledges that membership in a kinship group is much more than being organized into a list of names transmitted through the written or spoken word. Instead, it incorporates the concept of descent whereby membership in the PKG is transmitted from father to son. The son's participation as a member of the kinship group will result in him bringing either honor or shame upon his family. Thus, it would also include Hood's magnification – participation as a member of the PKG would evoke pride in the individual as he shares in the collective honor of his kinship group. Figuratively, participation as a "son" not only establishes a link with a "father" but also with fellow "sons." Participants in this fictive kinship group possess a collective honor that they acquire at membership. Their participation in the kinship group has the potential to enrich the group's honor or diminish it.

**Submission**

As noted above, authority is a major attribute of the father-son relationship. It is an innate aspect of the father-son dyad in the PKG. Both parties welcome it. Submission is not seen as a duty, but something in which the son can delight. This category is represented to a degree in Hood's motivation. However, here, it expresses not a desire to "live up to" one's ancestors, but rather an expectation of both the kinship group and the social world that the son will remain loyal, obedient, and respectful to his father. Figuratively, the "sons of the kingdom" are expected to live by kingdom ethics. They live in submission to the demands of the kingdom and its King.
Characterization

For Hood, this category captures the ancient world's notion that genealogy represented for an individual, and to the rest of society, "what sort of person he was." Thus, a "son(s) of" phrase is descriptive of who the son is because of his father. Figuratively, the son is characterized by whatever or whoever is his father. A son of the devil, for example, shares his father's character. This category is also related to the category of submission – a son with his father's character will be both ready and able to do what his father wishes. Likewise, the son's character and actions reveal his true lineage.

Succession

As expressed above, succession is focused on the transmission of office from father to son. This transmission included his profession, and, in some cases, the son's succession as the head of the PKG upon his father's death. Hood's qualification is closely related to this category. Being a son of a particular father brings with it important qualifications in the ancient world. The son is qualified to succeed the father in his office or profession. Figuratively, the "sons of those who murdered the prophets" reveal that they are truly their father's sons when they continue their father's opposition to God's appointed messenger.

Inheritance

Being a son of a father – a future father in the patriline – meant that the son enjoyed the privilege of sharing in his father's inheritance. His father's wealth and

---

\(^{133}\) Hood, "Genealogies," 5.

\(^{134}\) Cf. Rohrbaugh, "Legitimating Sonship," 188.
property would be passed on to him. Under Hood's classification system, inheritance is only perhaps included under qualification. But even there, inheritance plays a minimal role in comparison to its significance in the NT world. Here, inheritance represents what will be passed on from father to son, whether good or bad. Figuratively, when the NT authors describe believers as sons of God, they are reinforcing the idea that, as sons, believers have obtained and share in an inheritance with Christ.

**Motivation**

While Hood has a similar category, motivation here is different. For him, motivation conveys the idea that genealogy can motivate an individual to imitate or follow the lives of his ancestors. It encourages them to "live up to" their lineage. Here, motivation is focused not on the past, but rather, on the present. As such, it will overlap with both participation and submission. As a member of the PKG, the son both possesses and shapes the collective honor of the family. His actions have the power to increase the PKG's collective honor or bring them shame. For a son, his most significant impact on family honor is found in his submission and loyalty to his father. His disobedience would shame the entire PKG. Thus, as a son, he would be motivated, and even delighted, to do his father's will. Figuratively, this category will function similarly to submission: the sons of the kingdom will live by kingdom ethics in obedience to the King. However, this category exists to emphasize what likely would have been evident to the original readers: the obedience of a son to a father was typically not a reluctant or resentful product of the relationship. Rather, it was given joyfully and willingly to him. Sons should be motivated to obey their father simply because he is their father.

---

135 Pilch, "Beat His Ribs," 104.
**Conclusion**

Kinship language must be interpreted with an understanding of how these terms and concepts functioned in the ancient world – their social context. Kinship, family, and genealogy play a major role in any society. This major role is even more significant in the PKG of the NT world. The NT authors would not employ father-son language idly in a culture in which the father-son relationship is the dominant dyad. This relationship took a specific form, possessed specific attributes, and functioned to shape the son's life in specific ways. The framework presented above takes the form, attributes, and functions of the father-son relationship in the PKG context into account and will enable a much more accurate and thorough interpretation of the figurative use of these "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. The next chapter is devoted to this venture entirely.
CHAPTER 5
CLASSIFICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE
FIGURATIVE USE OF "SON(S) OF" IN THE NT

Introduction

Of the 301 uses of υἱός plus the genitive in the NT, forty-two of these occurrences were classified in chapter 3 as figurative uses. These forty-two "son(s) of" phrases figuratively relate human individuals to human or other non-divine personal beings or groups, non-human objects or concepts, and even God as Father. While the first category may have a degree of overlap with the concept of pseudo-kinship, the last two categories do not.¹ The first of these latter categories lies outside the realm of pseudo-kinship because it describes the relationship between persons in kinship terms. On the other hand, this category includes the figurative description of an individual using the idiom of genealogy to relate him or her to a concept or thing. In the second of these categories, a figurative description of the relationship between human beings and our Creator cannot be described in purely sociological or anthropological terms. Here, theology must be brought into the discussion. By exploring the father-son relationship in

¹Pseudo-kinship is helpfully summarized and presented by Pitt-Rivers: "(1) There is, first of all, the figurative use of kin terms, which may be little more than a convention of speech or which may, on the other hand, designate a status within the society or within a specific context. (2) There are also customs whereby a person is given the status of kin by attribution rather than by birth – and this is commonly called "fictive" or "artificial" kinship. (3) There are also institutions which, in some ways, resemble kinship and are named by analogy with it, yet which possess a separate nature and accord a distinct status." See Julian Pitt-Rivers, "Kinship: Pseudo-Kinship," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 408. For more information, see the discussion of Kinship in chap. 4.
the ancient world, chapter 4 developed a framework of interpretation to apply to these figurative "son(s) of" phrases. Here, the categories of Identification, Participation, Submission, Characterization, Succession, Inheritance, and Motivation will be used to interpret the figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. It will be shown that using these categories will provide a more holistic and accurate understanding of these phrases than simply relying on a singular aspect or a myopic understanding of the father-son relationship.

**Human-Human or Other Non-Divine Personal Beings Figurative Use**

As stated above, this category is an aspect of pseudo-kinship whereby kinship terminology is used figuratively in order to describe a non-kin relationship. In the case of the figurative uses in this category, the relationships between unrelated individuals are described using father-son kinship terminology. While the individuals are not truly father and son, their relationship possesses the typical qualities of kinship which results in the figurative description using this terminology.

**Sons of the Pharisees**

On two separate occasions, NT authors refer to the sons of the Pharisees using υἱός plus the genitive. These occurrences are found in Matthew 12:27, as well as its parallel in Luke 11:19, and Acts 23:6.² While in both of these cases, the "son(s) of"

---

²Cf. Robert Shirock "Whose Exorcists Are They? The Referents of oi υἱοί ὑμῶν at Matthew 12.27/Luke 11.19," *JSNT* 46 (1992): 41-51. Shirock argues that "your sons" has Jesus' disciples as the referent. According to him, it would then carry a meaning of "your kinsmen." While it is possible for υἱός to have this meaning, Shirock's argument is not compelling. On p. 49, he asks "Is it not likely that, he looked as his accusers, pointed to the disciples (twelve of them? seventy [-two] of them?) and said, 'And if I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them?' Why should we search for unknown Jewish exorcists in the background when there are known, reputed, kingdom-of-God exorcists standing before us in the scene?" The answer to his first question is a
phrase could refer to the literal male descendants of Pharisees, it seems best to understand them as belonging to a common usage for "son" in both Hebrew and Greek – depicting the relationship of a person to an academic, professional, or social group. However, even phrases in this standard category will yield better interpretations using the suggested framework to explain the use of father-son terminology. In these passages, the pupils or disciples of the Pharisees are οἱοί.

In the Synoptic pericope, Jesus responds to accusations that his exorcism ministry is empowered by Satan himself. In his response, he asks "If I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they will be your judges" (Matt 12:27 ESV). Jesus' argument here is ad hominem – he is appealing to the fact that the Pharisees could also be linked to exorcists. In this case, the "son(s) of" phrase functions in reverse. Rather than illustrating who the son is by means of linking him to his father, it is the fathers – those currently opposing Jesus – who are identified by a reference to their sons. Since they are the figurative fathers of their students, they collectively participate in the activities of their sons. The Pharisees would refrain from attributing the exorcisms of their followers to Beelzebul because doing so would implicate themselves as well. For, they share a collective honor as members of the same

fictive kin group. Further, the students of the Pharisees are either performing exorcisms in submission to their figurative fathers, which would add credence to Jesus' retort, or they are not in submission to their fathers. Both scenarios would result in shame being cast upon themselves – the disobedience of a son is shameful for the entire kinship group – and, on the other hand, if the sons are simply executing their fathers commands but are performing their works by means of demonic empowerment, as the Pharisees themselves imply against Jesus, this activity would be shameful as well. Similarly, if they malign the character of their students in this manner, they do the same to themselves since their sons possess the character that they themselves have passed on to their students as their figurative fathers. Since sons succeed their fathers into a predetermined profession in the ancient world, more weight is given to Jesus' argument. The followers of the Pharisees only do what their figurative fathers have done. If the sons cast out demons by Beelzebul, how much more the fathers who have trained them in their craft? While motivation typically describes the sons being delightfully motivated to do the will of the father, here it carries more weight because the focus is on the father. Again, it is likely that these followers of the Pharisees are doing the work of exorcism at the behest of their figurative fathers. They delight to do this work. If their work is evil, then the Pharisees will have polluted the role of figurative father as benevolent authority with their own malevolence. This admission will certainly not be made by them and, as a result, Jesus' response is logically compelling – the Pharisees own followers cast out demons, if the explanation for Jesus' exorcism ministry is that it is empowered demonically, theirs is as well. The Pharisees cannot grant this premise without implicating themselves in it, so they must concede that both the exorcism ministry of Jesus and that of their own followers are not
necessarily demonic in nature. Jesus uses their figurative understanding of the father-son relationship to vindicate his ministry before his disciples and the crowds. This logic of his runs much deeper than a simple metaphor for close association.

In Acts 23:6, the Apostle Paul refers to himself as a υἱὸς Φαρισαίων. This self-description is not surprising since Paul elsewhere identifies himself as a Pharisee. As was mentioned above, this use of υἱὸς could be identifying a literal male descendant as is common for the term; Paul could be describing his father and grandfather as Pharisees with this phrase. However, from the context, it seems much more likely that Paul is using this phrase to emphasize the pseudo-kinship bond in which he participates with the other Pharisees present for they too are υἱοὶ Φαρισαίων.  

Paul's reference to Pharisaism and the resurrection was a plea that the other Pharisees would recognize not only that they shared a common belief, but more importantly that they shared a common intellectual heritage. Thus, Paul identified himself with the Pharisees and verbally recognized their common participation in the same pseudo-kinship group. While Paul's belief in Jesus the Messiah was a point of separation, his belief in the resurrection, in contrast to the Sadducees, was in full submission to the Pharisaic instruction he had received. Further, by identifying himself as a member of their fictive kin group, Paul was appealing to the fact that he and the other Pharisees present shared a collective honor. Any shame brought upon Paul was effectively brought against the entire figurative kinship group because they share a common character as υἱοὶ Φαρισαίων. In addition, by appealing to their fellow fictive sonship, Paul is motivating the Pharisees to come to his aide against those who might

---

⁴Cf. Peterson: "This is not necessarily a claim that his father was a Pharisee, but more generally could mean that his upbringing and education were in the Pharisaic tradition." See David G. Peterson, The Acts of the Apostles, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 616.
challenge their honor, namely, the Sadducees. As a result, the Pharisees defend their
collective honor: "We find nothing wrong in this man. What if a spirit or an angel spoke
to him?" (Acts 23:9 ESV).

**Sons of Those Who Murdered the Prophets**

In Jesus' seventh woe against the scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23:31, he
denounces them as υἱοὶ τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας. While υἱός here could be
referring to the literal male descendants of these prophet murderers, based on the context,
especially the phrase "brood of vipers" in verse 33, it seems best to conclude that Jesus is
using this figurative "son(s) of" phrase to describe the scribes and Pharisees using father-
son terminology. Although scholars are correct to recognize the element of
characterization present in this use of father-son language, this "son(s) of" phrase
expresses more than simple negative characterization.5

In employing this phrase against the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus is saying that
instead of being identified as those who honor the tombs of the prophets, the Jewish
religious leaders should be identified with their murderers. Indeed, in their rejection of
Jesus, they are demonstrating their own participation in this figurative kinship group of
prophet murderers. For the reader who is familiar with the father-son relationship in the
ancient world, this "son(s) of" phrase brings with it an element of foreshadowing in
Matthew's narrative. By describing the scribes and Pharisees as sons of those who
murdered the prophets, the language implicitly describes them as those who submit to

those who murdered the prophets. As sons, they will do what their figurative fathers have
done. Their fathers' work, however sinister, will be theirs as well. Thus, it would have
been understood that they too would oppose the messenger of God in their day – Jesus.
As true sons of their fathers, they would not even shrink back from murder in their
pursuit of silencing their opposition. Their sinister lineage likewise reveals their true
character. Not only do they oppose Jesus in submission to their figurative fathers, but also
because their actions flow out of the character they have had passed down to them from
their prophet-murdering fathers. Similar to the idea of submission, with regard to
succession, this "son(s) of" phrase describes how these sons are negatively qualified to be
those who stand in murderous opposition to God's chosen messenger. Finally, Jesus'
denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees must not be understood as a mere heaping up of
guilt. Rather, it is a call for them to turn from their ways, repent, and recognize the reality
that Messiah has come. Jesus' figurative use of the father-son relationship bears witness
to this fact. If it was simply evidence of negative characterization it would merely be a
damning phrase. But instead, motivation is found alongside the characterization. While
motivation normally functions to encourage individuals to live up to their past and
present kin and thereby increase the collective honor of their kinship group, here,
motivation functions ironically. This "son(s) of" phrase should motivate his hearers not to
live up to their lineage. They should forsake participation in the long line of those who
have opposed the messengers of Yahweh and instead embrace his message in the hope
that he can provide them with a new kinship and a better inheritance.
Sons of Israel

While this "son(s) of" phrase occurs multiple times in the NT, the occurrence in Matthew 27:9 is the only time in the NT the phrase appears to be used figuratively.6 No small amount of scholarly discussion surrounding Matthew 27:3-10 has been devoted to Matthew's OT quotation and its attribution to the Prophet Jeremiah. However, very little attention has been paid to Matthew's substitution of υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ at the end of his quotation from Zechariah. Moo claims that Matthew provides this substitution for the Hebrew pronominal suffix as "a modification required because of the lack of an antecedent for the pronoun."7 Davies and Allison argue that Matthew is "targumizing" Zechariah.8 Unfortunately, France relegates a reference to Goulder to a footnote.9 Goulder writes that Matthew's substitution of υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ has "an eye on the pricing of Joseph by the sons of Israel at Judah's behest in Genesis."10 While Moo's explanation of why Matthew adds in this "son(s) of" phrase is plausible grammatically, it does not explain why Matthew chose to express his thought using father-son language. Goulder's suggestion, however, explains both the addition and the choice of father-son language.

6Contra Davies and Allison who write that "'Sons of Israel' appears only here in the NT and is not common in the OT (Gen 42:5; Deut 23:17; 1 Chr 2:1; cf. T. Sol. 15:14)." W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, The Gospel according to St. Matthew, ICC (New York: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 3:570n51. However, this statement is a gross oversight. The phrase occurs at least 685 times in the OT and 13 times in the NT. In addition, there are the examples from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha mentioned above in chap. 2.


8Davies and Allison, Matthew, 3:570.

9France, Matthew, 1044n36.

10M. D. Goulder, Midrash and Lection in Matthew (London: SPCK, 1974), 447. However, citing Goulder on this point should not be seen as an endorsement of his main thesis in Midrash and Lection in Matthew.
Matthew is using this "son(s) of" phrase figuratively to link the Jewish religious leaders with Joseph's brothers in a manner that dovetails with the overall typological emphasis of the verse. This explanation of ὦἱῶν Ἰσραήλ is based on four conclusions: (1) Matthew's selection of this particular phrase, (2) its typological connection to the Zechariah and Jeremiah passages, (3) its conceptual link with Joseph typology, and (4) its fit with Matthew's overall purpose in this passage.

First, it must be recognized that Matthew refers to the Jewish religious leaders as "sons of Israel" only here. If he was simply looking for a substitute because the pronoun from Zechariah would lack an antecedent, one would expect him to connect the quote to the Jewish religious leaders using a phrase that is much more familiar to him. In addition, if Matthew left the original pronoun, it would not be without antecedent in the passage and most readers would make the connection easily. This change for him does not appear to be a random selection of a term to refer to these leaders who had his Savior killed but rather an intentional choice to communicate a specific point.

Second, establishing a figurative link between the Jewish religious leaders and the eleven sons of Israel who sold their brother into slavery fits with the overall typology of the passage. Carson, following Moo et al., writes that "the quotation appears to refer to Jeremiah 19:1–13 along with phraseology drawn mostly from Zechariah 11:12–13." Carson explains the connection to Zechariah as follows: "in both instances Yahweh’s shepherd is rejected by the people of Israel and valued at the price of a slave. And in both instances the money is flung into the temple and ends up purchasing something that

---

pollutes." The connection to Jeremiah is that the field is "a symbol of death and the destruction of the nation about to be buried as 'foreigners.'" Further:

Matthew sees in Jeremiah 19 and Zechariah 11 not merely a number of verbal and thematic parallels to Jesus’ betrayal but a pattern of apostasy and rejection that must find its ultimate fulfillment in the rejection of Jesus, who was cheaply valued, rejected by the Jews, and whose betrayal money was put to a purpose that pointed to the destruction of the nation.

In this verse, Matthew is attempting to link the Jewish religious leaders to this perpetual pattern of rejection experienced by God's chosen instruments. He establishes this link not only by quoting Zechariah and referring to Jeremiah but also by alluding to the eleven sons of Israel.

Third, Joseph typology is closely related to the overall thematic pattern emphasized by the Zechariah and Jeremiah passages. Matthew 27 would not be the only passage in the NT where this connection is made. In Acts 7, Stephen's speech sees Joseph's rejection of his brothers as the beginning of a pattern of rejection that includes Moses and, ultimately, Jesus. Further, there are other connections in the Passion narrative to Joseph:

Just as Joseph was sold for 20 shekels of silver (Gen 37:28), so also Jesus was sold for a sum of silver, 30 pieces (Matt 27:14–16). Just as Joseph’s brothers, sons of Israel, sold Joseph into the hands of Ishmaelite-Midianite traders (Gen 37:28), so the nations gathered together against Jesus (Acts 4:25–27; cf. Ps 2:1–2). Joseph's brothers had stripped him of the special coat his father gave him (Gen 37:23), and

---

12 Carson, Matthew, 564.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid., 566.

15 Hamilton has established Joseph's validity as a type of the Messiah. The argument will not be rehashed here. See James M. Hamilton, "Was Joseph a Type of the Messiah? Tracing the Typological Identification between Joseph, David, and Jesus," SBJT 12, no. 4 (2008): 52–77.

16 Hamilton, "Was Joseph a Type," 63.
Jesus too was stripped of his seamless robe (Matt 27:28; John 19:23). In addition, the thirty pieces of silver correspond to the Joseph account not only in that they made up a sum of silver, but also in that just as Joseph was sold into slavery, thirty pieces of silver "was the price of a slave and representative of how God’s prophet is valued by an apostate people." Matthew links the Jewish religious leaders to the eleven sons of Israel to show that Jesus was rejected and sold for the price of a slave in a similar manner – by those who should have been brothers to him.

Fourth, understanding this "son(s) of" phrase as a figurative link between the Jewish religious leaders and Joseph's brothers who sold him into slavery fits with Matthew's purpose in this passage. France explains that it exists "to show that even in the betrayal of the Messiah and in the fate of his betrayer Scripture continues to provide the pattern, even to the most incidental details." The chief priests and the elders are merely the latest iteration of an opposition party that should have accepted instead of rejected God's servant. Matthew wants to demonstrate that regarding the opposition of the sons of Israel, "God intended it for good to accomplish what is now being done, the saving of many lives" (Gen 50:20 NIV).

Thus, υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ is used figuratively here to identify the Jewish religious leaders who rejected their brother and sold him into slavery. They are not only members of the same kinship group as genetic descendants of Jacob but are fellow participants in the dishonorable act of betraying a member of their own group. Their deception and scheming shows that they are truly like their figurative brothers and do what they have

---

17 Hamilton, "Was Joseph a Type," 68.
18 Carson, Matthew, 566n9.
19 France, Matthew, 1038.
learned from their father. While the chief priests and elders should have been those with
the character to lead the people in their worship of Yahweh, instead it is the one whom
they have rejected who will lead the people to salvation. It is the reader who receives the
motivation from this "son(s) of" phrase. Matthew's figurative language should help them
to see the heinous acts of the Jewish religious leaders for what they are and cause them to
accept the One whom these sons of Israel have rejected. Further, the reader would not
want to find himself or herself counted as a member of this particular figurative kinship
group.

Sons of the Devil

On two separate occasions in the NT, people are figuratively referred to as
son(s) of the devil or evil one. These are found in Matthew 13:38 and Acts 13:10. These
occurrences will be discussed individually.

The phrase οἱ υἱοί τοῦ πονηροῦ occurs in Jesus' explanation of the Parable of
the Weeds in Matthew 13 in juxtaposition to οἱ υἱοί τῆς βασιλείας. Jesus explains that the
weeds are the sons of the evil one and that the enemy who sowed them is the devil. So,
the evil one in mind here clearly is the devil. Due to the nature of this phrase's occurrence
in the explanation of a cosmic parable, it does not seem likely that Jesus has any specific
human beings in mind as its referents. Rather, it would seem to be a general term
referring to those who oppose God, his people, and his work in the world.

Nonetheless, it is important to recognize what the figurative use of the father-
son relationship might tell us about this group. Those who are the enemies of God and his
kingdom are identified as sons of the evil one – the devil. As such, they are participants in
a figurative kinship group which can trace its intertextual lineage all the way back to the
seed of the serpent in Genesis 3:15.\textsuperscript{20} They are members of that group who have long opposed God and his people and who bear the collective dishonor that results. Rather than living in submission to their heavenly Father, these individuals submit themselves to the father of lies. The character of these sons is made evident by the substantival adjective that names their father. Like him, they too are πονηροί. Contrary to the υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας who will have the King and his kingdom as their inheritance, the sons of the evil one will share in his inheritance. Their inheritance will result in weeping and gnashing of teeth as they and the rest of their kin are thrown into the fiery furnace to be eternally consumed. In a culture which believes that a good name is of the utmost importance, the motivation of this text is clear: no reasonable individual would want to bear the attribution "son of the evil one." Nor would they want to participate in the collective shame of this figurative kinship group or share in their damned inheritance. The motivation here is an obvious warning that functions as a call to repent and to submit to the loving rule of the heavenly Father and the norms of the kingdom of heaven.

In Acts 13:10, Paul identifies Elymas as υἱὲ διαβόλου. Elymas is a magician and a false prophet. Bock points out that "the text's description of Bar-Jesus adds a note of irony, as the first opponent of Paul and Barnabas is a false prophet named 'son of Jesus/Joshua.'"\textsuperscript{21} Thus, his opposition to the missionary activity of Paul and Barnabas reveals where his true lineage lies. In fact, his ironic name may have led to Paul's figurative use of this "son(s) of" phrase.


In employing the vocative to describe Elymas as son of the devil, it is clear that Paul is addressing him in this manner. For Paul, Elymas' identity is son of the devil. As above, his membership and participation in this figurative kinship group is illustrated by his actions. His opposition to Paul and Barnabas, his leading the Proconsul away from the faith, his all-encompassing deceitfulness and villainy, his hatred of all righteousness, and his continual corruption of the ways of the Lord all demonstrate that Bar-Jesus truly is seed of the serpent. It is no surprise that this son of the devil is described by Luke as a false prophet, for he lives in submission to his father – the father of lies. Paul's description of Elymas' character in verse 10 is a comprehensive rebuke to one who has inherited his virtue from the thief who steals, kills, and destroys. Elymas' actions not only demonstrate submission to his father and an inherently evil character but also a demonic office for which he qualifies as a member of this figurative kinship group. Paul's figurative use of the father-son relationship here serves to motivate Elymas, the Proconsul, and the readers of Acts. Elymas is encouraged to recognize who he truly is and repent. However, the form of Paul's question "you will not stop making crooked the straight path of the Lord, correct?" does not imply much hope for repentance on the part of Elymas. The Proconsul, however, is effectively called to repentance by Paul's Spirit-filled words and he responds with faith. The readers of Acts are motivated to recognize that their membership lies in one of two pseudo-kinship groups; they are either sons of their heavenly Father or, with Elymas, sons of the devil.

**Sons of Abraham**

In Galatians 3:7, Paul uses the phrase οἱ Ἐβραῖοι. While the verbal form in

---

22See BDF § 427.
this verse is ambiguous, Schreiner argues that Paul is using an imperative to exhort the Galatians to recognize a truth that they have overlooked or misunderstood. He expounds this truth as follows:

What is required to be part of Abraham's family, to be counted as his sons? Not circumcision or the other works required by the law. Those who belong to Abraham's family believe just as Abraham did, for Abraham lived before the law was even given. Therefore, his faith was constituted him as righteousness before God. The Galatians, then, do not need to be circumcised to be Abraham's sons. They are already his children if their faith is in Christ Jesus.

Those who have the same faith that Abraham had are identified as figurative members of his kinship group. Recognizing that they are participants in Abraham's kinship group is more focused on a removal of shame or dishonor rather than emphasizing their share of the group's collective honor. Paul is using this phrase – which may have belonged to his opponents and been used by them to distinguish between those who had the honor of being children of Abraham and those who did not – to communicate that they need not be ashamed of their non-Abrahamic lineage, their uncircumcised flesh, or their lack of law-keeping. Instead, they need to recognize that their faith has already made them participants in and partakers of the collective honor that comes from being a true son of Abraham. As true sons of their father, those who are of faith both submit to their father and succeed him as they "believe the same way as Abraham." As sons, they simply do what their father has done. Here, the dominant note of characterization is that the sons of

---


24 Ibid.


Abraham will be characterized by their faith. For Paul, it is clear that these sons share in their father's inheritance: "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise" (Gal 3:29 ESV). Their figurative kinship resulting from faith qualifies them to inherit alongside those who might, in addition to the sole requirement of faith, also happen to be genetic descendants of Abraham. Paul motivates his audience by means of the imperative. He wants them to recognize the truth that faith is what is required; not law-keeping, not circumcision, not the ability to demonstrate a claim to patrilineal Abrahamic descent. Paul is motivating the Galatians to have faith, to trust in Christ.

**Sons of Men**

In Ephesians 3:5, Paul refers to human beings as τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Paul is saying that the mystery of the gospel "was not made known to the sons of men in other generations as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph 3:5 ESV). Arnold writes that "Paul uses a Semitic expression that Gentiles unfamiliar with the Scriptures of Israel would be hard pressed to understand. The expression itself simply means human beings." Two issues are present here and must be explored. First is the assumption that understanding this "son(s) of" phrase would prove problematic for Gentiles unfamiliar with the Hebrew Bible. It was shown above in chapter 2 that "son(s) of" phrases, both literal and figurative, are not absent in Greek literature. Thus, while a Gentile might be unfamiliar with ἄνθρωπος as the genitive noun modifying υἱός, they would not be unable to understand its basic meaning.


28 However, Gentiles would certainly be much less prepared to understand this
of a patrilineal kinship group, they would have been well-versed in the father-son relationship and the figurative use of kinship terms; as a result, they would be adequately prepared to interpret the phrase as it occurs here. The second issue with Arnold's statement is the notion that this expression "simply means human beings." While it is certainly possible, within the semantic domain of this phrase, that this expression is a simple reference to human beings, Paul's use of it here does not seem so simple. First, the only other NT occurrence of this phrase when υἱός is plural is found in Mark 3:28. However, in Mark it is clearly dependent upon Aramaic as it is found on the lips of Jesus. If Paul wanted simply to refer to human beings he could have easily chosen a more common and simple expression to communicate just that. Second, elsewhere in Ephesians, Paul has employed υἱός and the concept of sonship to communicate significant theological truths. It does not seem likely that Paul would risk confusing his readers regarding the concept of sonship in order to make an idle reference to humanity. Third, the notion that this phrase is simply a reference to humanity must be avoided because of what this "son(s) of" phrase figuratively communicates through Paul's use of the father-son relationship.

Multiple commentators have argued that there is antithetical parallelism phrase than those familiar with the Hebrew Bible. Hopefully, this sentiment is what Arnold was trying to express.

29Arnold, Ephesians, 189. Emphasis added.

30For this phrase when υἱός is plural, see Gen 11:5; 1 Kgdms 26:19; 2 Kgdms 7:14; 3 Kgdms 8:39; 2 Chr 6:30; Ps (LXX) 4:3, 10:4, 11:2, 9, 13:2, 20:11, 30:2, 32:13, 35:8, 44:3, 48:3, 52:3, 56:5, 57:2, 61:10, 65:5, 88:48, 89:2, 106:8, 15, 21, 31, 113:24, 144:12, 145:3; Prov 8:4, 31; Jer (LXX) 39:19; Ezek 31:14; Dan 3:82; Dan (TH) 2:38, 3:82; Mic 5:6; Joel 1:12; Mark 3:28; 1 Esd 4:37; Jdt 8:12; Wis 9:6; Sir 36:23; Odes Sol. 8:82; and Pss. Sol. 9:4.

present in the text emphasizing a contrast between (1) other generations and now, (2) was not made known and has been revealed by the Spirit, and (3) to the sons of men and to his holy apostles and prophets.\textsuperscript{32} Thus, they claim that the third contrast is emphasizing the distinction between all humanity in former generations and the holy apostles and prophets to whom the mystery of Christ has been revealed. However, these scholars risk missing the forest for the trees. Paul's overarching point is not the contrast but the reality that the mystery of Christ has now been revealed. Further, this glorious revelation has been made not only to his holy apostles but also through them. Paul reveals this mystery to his readers in the very next verse: "that the Gentiles are fellow heirs, members of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (Eph 3:6 ESV).

Undeniably, the concept of sonship is intimately related to the ideas of inheritance and pseudo-kinship expressed in this revealed mystery. The significant contrast is not ultimately between general humanity and a select few who have received the revelation of this mystery, but instead the same contrast Paul has been emphasizing elsewhere in Ephesians: the adopted sons of God and the sons of disobedience, the beloved children of the Lord and the children of wrath. The glorious mystery is that before the revelation of Christ every human being was simply a son of man, but now, the sons of men can become sons of God by faith in Christ.

By identifying these individuals with no knowledge of the mystery of Christ as \textit{τοὶς υἱοῖς τῶς ἀνθρώπων}, Paul is emphasizing who they are not – \textit{υἱοὶ θεοῦ}. In Ephesians, it would seem that these sons of men participate with the rest of unredeemed humanity as

\textsuperscript{32}For example, see Peter T. O'Brien, \textit{The Letter to the Ephesians}, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 231; and Andrew T. Lincoln, \textit{Ephesians}, WBC, vol. 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 177.
sons of disobedience and children of wrath. These sons live in submission to their fallen humanity; they live in the passions of their flesh and carry out the desires of the body. Rather than being like the sons of God who are characterized by their imitation of their Father, they are characterized by their similarity to their demonic father – the prince of the power of the air. The phrase highlights not only the sons of men from former generations but those sons who succeed them in the present. They are ignorant of the mystery of Christ and not partakers of the promise. Instead of being fellow heirs with those who have faith in Christ, these sons of men share an inheritance with the children of wrath. Finally, the motivating element of this phrase is clear. No member of Paul's audience would want to be identified as a son of disobedience, a child of wrath, or a son of unredeemed humanity. Instead, they would by faith press into the revealed mystery that they can be adopted sons of God and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel.

Your Son

In John 19:26, Jesus uses the phrase ὁ υἱός σου to redefine the nature of the relationship between his mother and the Beloved Disciple. The transferring of filial obligation is cast in fictive kinship terms. Carson explains that the words employed by Jesus "are reminiscent of legal adoption formulae, but such formulae would have been cast in the second person."³³ Köstenberger writes that Mary "almost certainly was widowed and probably in her early fifties with little or no personal income."³⁴ As a result,


³⁴Andreas J. Köstenberger, John, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 549.
she would have been dependent on Jesus as her eldest son. Here, he is seen making provision for her care in obedience to the moral commands of the OT Law.\textsuperscript{35} Thus, this "son(s) of" phrase is used figuratively to establish a fictive or artificial kinship as expressed by Pitt-Rivers and outlined in chapter 4.\textsuperscript{36} Since this is a fictive mother-son relationship rather than that of father-son, the same interpretive categories do not apply.\textsuperscript{37}

My Son

In 1 Peter 5:13, Peter describes John Mark in figurative kinship terms using the phrase ὁ ὦἱός μου. While their pseudo-kin relationship is well in keeping with a typical use of ὦἱός plus the genitive to describe the relationship of a student to his teacher, it still represents a figurative use of the father-son relationship. John Mark is figuratively identified as Peter's son to emphasize the closeness of their relationship. This relationship is not surprising since Peter likely would have been a fixture in John Mark's life since the early days of the church when they met in his home.\textsuperscript{38} By referring to him in figurative kin terms, Peter is acknowledging that John Mark and he participate in a collective honor due to the nature of their relationship. While the nature and dynamics of John Mark's submission to Peter would have likely differed from the typical father-son relationship, there seems to be a functional distinction between Peter's pseudo-kin relationship to

\textsuperscript{35}Köstenberger, \textit{John}, 549. Köstenberger explains that she was entrusted to the Beloved Disciple's care instead of the care of one of his brothers due to their unbelief; ibid. Cf. 1 Tim 5:3-16.

\textsuperscript{36}See pp. 96-97 above.

\textsuperscript{37}For a brief discussion of the nature and dynamics of the mother-son relationship see Joseph H. Hellerman, \textit{The Ancient Church as Family} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 33.

\textsuperscript{38}See Acts 12:12.
Silvanus as brother and John Mark as son.\textsuperscript{39} Although it is purely speculative, it may be more than coincidental that Mark's seemingly impulsive behavior hinted at in Acts is faintly reminiscent of a less-sanctified Peter. Perhaps, John Mark has inherited some of his character traits from his figurative father. Succession is not as evident in the pseudo-father-son relationship of Peter and John Mark as it is in Paul's relationship to Timothy and Titus. However, the idea is certainly present in the figurative use of father-son relationship even without an explicit letter passing on Peter's ministry to John Mark. While there may have been some transmission of property from mentor to mentee, inheritance is not a major aspect of this pseudo-kin relationship.\textsuperscript{40} Motivation is neither explicit nor implicit in this text, the figurative father-son relationship is not the focal point of Peter's thought; it is merely a more thorough identifier of John Mark to his readers.

**Human-Non-Human Figurative Use**

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, this category lies outside the strictly defined bounds of pseudo-kinship because it is not directly related to pseudo-kinship at all. While pseudo-kinship typically describes the relationship between persons in kinship terms, these uses of the father-son relationship describe the relationship between a person and a concept or object using "son(s) of" phrases. Here, individuals are identified as sons of personified places, things, and abstract concepts. These figurative uses of "son(s) of" appear to be more problematic for commentators based upon the very little that is said about them. This lack of interpretation and explanation is likely due to the difficulty in arriving at a robust understanding of how an individual might relate to

\textsuperscript{39} See 1 Pet 5:12.

\textsuperscript{40} Potential examples of transferred property may have been parchments, codices, tools related to a tent-making skill, etc.
light, for example, as a son relates to a father. However, a more thorough interpretation and explanation can be found by utilizing the interpretive categories outlined at the end of chapter 4.

Sons of the Kingdom

The phrase οἱ υἱοί τῆς βασιλείας is found twice in the Gospel of Matthew. Its first occurrence is found in Matthew 8:12. In this passage, Jesus is describing the eschatological messianic banquet in which many will come from east and west and feast with the patriarchs of old. However, despite this implicit inclusion of the Gentiles, Jesus explains that the sons of the kingdom will not be allowed to attend. Instead, the opposite is true, they will be thrown into the outer darkness where they will experience the agonizing torment that accompanies eternal punishment. The phrase is used ironically; the true sons of the kingdom would never be barred entrance to the great feast celebrating the kingdom's final consummation. Rather, their exclusion reveals that they are not, in fact, true sons of the kingdom.

The Jews, and especially the Jewish religious leaders, are those who should have been most closely connected to expectantly waiting for the coming of God's kingdom. They should have been celebrating the arrival of the King of the Jews who announced the nearness of the kingdom of heaven. Instead, their opposition to God's Kingdom and his King warrants this ironic identification as the sons of the kingdom who are outcasts. Rather than bringing with it collective honor, the irony of their exclusion reveals that are figurative participants in the collective shame of all those who stand in opposition against God and his people. Despite their feigning of submission to the ways of God, Jesus reveals in this ironic designation that they do not live in submission to the
norms of his kingdom. Their lack of submission reveals their true identity. Similarly, they do not demonstrate the character cultivated by the virtues of Christ's kingdom. Their character demonstrates their lack of true citizenship in it. If they were truly sons of the kingdom, they would be the true successors of the patriarchs Jesus mentions at the table in the kingdom. Their exclusion reveals that they instead follow in the footsteps of those who have stood against his kingdom. These false sons of the kingdom do not share in its inheritance. They do not enjoy the bounty of the king, his feast, or the new heavens and the new earth. Their inheritance is gravely depicted by Jesus as weeping and gnashing of teeth. The motivation inherent in this figurative father-son language is clear – the listener and the reader does not want this ironic identification to be true of them. They should press into Christ for assurance that they are true sons of the king and that they will not be excluded from the final celebration of his kingdom's consummation.

The second occurrence of οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας is found in Matthew 13:38. The phrase occurs in Jesus' explanation of the Parable of the Weeds. The sons of the kingdom are equated to the good seed and are juxtaposed with οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. As in the explanation of that phrase above, it needs to be recognized that this phrase occurs in the explanation a cosmic parable. As a result, it is unlikely that Jesus has any specific human referents in mind. Rather, it would seem to be a general term referring to those who live in obedient submission to the king – the one who sowed them – and the norms of his kingdom.

The good seed here is identified by the close nature of their relationship with the kingdom. As its figurative sons, they participate in the collective honor of this pseudo-kinship group which is composed of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. These
sons live their lives striving toward full submission to their King and the ethics of his kingdom. While the distinction between the sons of the kingdom and the sons of the evil one is not initially apparent, their character is revealed with time. Those who are truly sons of the kingdom are those whose lives are characterized by it and its norms. While they will not succeed the King, they do follow others in a lengthy procession of those who have expectantly awaited the inauguration of God's kingdom. These sons inherit an eternal life in the kingdom with her King. The motivation of this text is twofold. First, there is the positive motivation for the individual to live his or her life in submission to the King and the ethics of his kingdom with the result that he or she will inherit all the blessings of a true son of the kingdom. Second, there is the negative motivation for the individual not to live the kind of life which results in him or her sharing in the inheritance of those with whom the sons of the kingdom are juxtaposed – the sons of the evil one.

**Sons of the Bridal Chamber**

The phrase οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφώνος is found in Mark 2:19 as well as the parallels of Matthew 9:15 and Luke 5:34. This phrase is found in the first of three illustrations that Jesus gives in answer to the question of the disciples of John the Baptist. Scholars are quick to point out the idiomatic nature of this "son(s) of" phrase. Many NT scholars follow Jeremias and his remarks that this Semitic phrase is a slavishly literal rendering of הבנה ליקין from rabbinic literature. Neusner translates this phrase as "members of the

---

1Luke has the head noun in the accusative case because it is functioning as the subject of the infinitive: τοὺς υἱους τοῦ νυμφώνος.

2Luke provides a fourth illustration.

wedding." The Hebrew word חֻפָּה is used in the MT to refer both to a canopy and to a bridal chamber. The "son(s) of" phrase is understood idiomatically to refer to the guests at a wedding. However, both the translation of Neusner and the "wedding guests" of most modern English translations lose the nuance of this phrase. Literally, this phrase is not describing the relationship of these sons to a personal father. Instead, they are sons of the chamber itself. They are sons of the chamber in which the marriage was consummated. Thus, the phrase connotes not simply their attendance at the wedding, but rather, the emphasis lies on a particular aspect of the wedding celebrations – the ecstatic joy resulting from a marriage newly consummated.

In the Synoptic Gospels, this "son(s) of" phrase brings forth the same imagery. Here, Jesus is asked about why his disciples do not fast. His answer comes in the form a rhetorical question beginning with the particle μη which assumes a negative answer. Thus, he is making a declarative statement: the sons of the bridal chamber cannot fast as long as the bridegroom is with them. Many commentators note that fasting would be inappropriate because it does not fit the joyous nature of wedding festivities. In fact, the

---


45 See Ps 19:5; Isa 4:5; Joel 2:16.

46 So ESV, NET, HCSB. Cf. "guests of the bridegroom," NIV and "attendants of the bridegroom," NASB.

47 This word "evolved in postbiblical Judaism to designate the tentlike temporary structure under which wedding ceremonies were conducted, in the Old Testament itself, however, it appears to refer rather to the room (tent) in which the marriage was consummated." See Raymond B. Dillard, "Joel," in The Minor Prophets, ed. Thomas E. McComiskey (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1992), 283. Cf. Duane A. Garrett, Hosea, Joel, NAC, vol. 19A (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1997), 349.

48 See BDF § 427.

49 For example, see France, Matthew, 356: "The festivities in connection with a wedding, which usually went on for several days, are a symbol of joy and celebration...
Talmud reference above specifically frees those celebrating at a wedding from specific cultic requirements that might conflict with the festivities. However, this "son(s) of" phrase extends the metaphor past the simple celebratory nature of a wedding. Jesus' disciples are being specifically linked to the bridal chamber – the locus of marital consummation. This particular bridal chamber is the place of no ordinary consummation. Rather, it represents the reality that the King's consummation with his bride has begun.

John the Baptist, as the ὁ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου, attests to this reality and the disciples have their role as well – they are the "sons of the bridal chamber."\textsuperscript{50}

These sons cannot fast because they are to be closely identified with the joy that comes forth from the bridal chamber. Later, they will fast, but that is only while they await the final consummation of this metaphorical marriage. As sons, the disciples not only bear witness to the joy of the bridal chamber, but participate and share in it as they celebrate the newly consummated marriage. Here, submission means that joy is not only the appropriate response, but the only honorable response. As sons, they must celebrate and μὴ δύνανται νηστεύειν. Characterization is what has lead to this question being asked of Jesus. The sons of the bridal chamber are characterized by joy and celebration while the disciples of John the Baptist and the Pharisees fast. While Jesus' description of his disciples as sons of the bridal chamber makes it clear that the consummation has begun, he also explains that "the days will come when the bridegroom is taken away from them, fasting does not fit naturally into such a setting."

\textsuperscript{50} Jeremias on the role of the "best man" which is attributed to John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel: "At the wedding they conducted the bridegroom to the bride, though their main task was to superintend the sexual intercourse of the young couple. Hence the φωνὴ τοῦ νυμφίου of Jn. 3:29 is probably the call of the bridegroom from the bridal chamber for the friend who customarily fetches the signum virginitatis." See Jeremias, "νύμφη, νυμφίος," 4:1101.
and then they will fast" (Matt 9:15 ESV). Thus, these sons will be forced to wait for the
day in which they will again take up the role of celebrants and finally receive their joyous
inheritance upon the marriage's final consummation. However, in the moment, as Jesus
linked them with the bridal chamber, his disciples were motivated not to feel the shame
and guilt cast upon them for not fasting but instead to revel in the joyful celebration that
the Lamb has come to take his bride and inaugurate his kingdom.

**Son of Gehenna**

In Matthew 23:15, Jesus refers to a hypothetical convert of the scribes and
Pharisees as a υἱὸν γεέννης. However, his comparative διπλότερον ύμων draws them
into the identification as well. Certainly, this figurative "son(s) of" phrase will function
similarly to οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ in Matthew 13:38. In this second woe to the scribes and
Pharisees, Jesus is warning them that their proselytizing is actually harming those they
are seeking to convert. While they think they are traveling across land and sea doing the
work of God, they are instead doing the work of Satan. Jesus uses this "son(s) of" phrase
figuratively in an attempt to warn them out of their hypocritical stupor to true faith in
God.

These individuals are identified as sons of Gehenna. The translation of
Gehenna as "hell" in most modern English translations represents the virtually
synonymous connection between these two terms. This connection between hell and
Gehenna is due to the prophetic judgment pronounced upon the Valley of Hinnom –
גֵּיא־הִנֹּם – and its frequent figurative use in apocalyptic literature from second century BC

51BDAG notes a possible connection between this phrase and בֵּית יְהוָה in the
Babylonian Talmud, Rosh Ḥa Shanah 17a. See BDAG, s.v. γέεννα.
Thus, the identification is not so much with the physical, or spiritual, location but rather with the associated judgment. These individuals are sons of eschatological judgment. As sons, they participate in the figurative kinship group marked by their identification with this eschatological judgment. Further, not only they participate in this group, but also those who have proselytized them. Together, they share in the collective dishonor of this condemned group. It is their submission to the ways of the scribes and Pharisees that has converted them into sons of Gehenna rather than sons of God. Their hypocritical law-keeping does not result in worship of Yahweh but instead is revealed to be in keeping with the previous acts of heinous idolatry associated with their figurative father. The kind of character implied by this phrase is exemplified in its North American contemporary term "hellion." They have the character which merits judgment and punishment. Here, succession functions not only to show how the son does what his figurative kin before him have done, but also to show the progression of dishonoring evil within the kinship group. First, Jesus calls not only their converts sons of Gehenna but the scribes and Pharisees as well. They are both members of this fictive kin group and, as a result, they both do what their fictive father does. In their case, the work is idolatry and meriting judgment. Second, as is emphasized in the genealogical progression of evil from Cain to Lamech, these proselytes are twice the son of Gehenna when compared with the preceding generation. Carson explains that this phrase likely refers to the notion that these converts will be so committed to their teacher's instructions that the students will

---


"out-Pharisee" the teacher.\textsuperscript{54} As sons of Gehenna, their inheritance is bleak. The OT prophets make it clear that the Valley of Hinnom will be renamed the Valley of Slaughter because of the impending judgment.\textsuperscript{55} Jesus' message is one of warning to the scribes and Pharisees, and their converts as well. The call is for them to realize that they are barring entrance to the kingdom of heaven not only for themselves but also for their followers. They need to repent and turn from their idolatry as they flee the impending judgment. The motivation is for the individual to heed the woe and so reveal himself or herself to be a true child of God rather than a son of Gehenna.

\textbf{Sons of Thunder}

In Mark 3:17, Mark provides the reader with an expansive identification of James and John. They are sons of Zebedee and \textit{βοανηργές}. BDAG notes that Boanerges appears to be a transliteration of \textit{רֶגֶשׁ בְּנֵי} which would mean son of commotion.\textsuperscript{56} Stein argues that \textit{βοανηργές} should be understood "as a rough transliteration into Greek of 'sons of thunder.'"\textsuperscript{57} Guelich, however, claims that "either Mark's translation offers a traditional meaning of the underlying Semitic phrase that is lost to us or it simply represents an attempt to clarify an obscure, if not corrupted, \textit{βοανηργές}."\textsuperscript{58} Regardless of

\textsuperscript{54}Carson, \textit{Matthew}, 479.

\textsuperscript{55}See Jer 7:32, 19:6.

\textsuperscript{56}BDAG, s.v. \textit{βοανηργές}.

\textsuperscript{57}Robert H. Stein, \textit{Mark}, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 172. See also John T. Rook, "'Boanerges, Sons of Thunder' (Mark 3:17)," \textit{JBL} 100, no. 1 (1981): 94-95. Rook argues that based upon a transliteration convention which rendered ayin with gamma, the resulting phrase would be \textit{רעש בני} or "sons of the quaking heavens." Ibid., 94.

the origin of the phrase, Mark seems to provide the reader with a figurative "son(s) of" phrase as an explanation – ὑἱοὶ βροντῆς. In order to explain that they are named βοανηργές, Mark refers to James and John as sons of thunder.

Thus, they are identified not only as literal sons of Zebedee, but also as figurative sons of thunder. Βροντῆ is used elsewhere in the LXX and NT both literally – to refer to actual sounds of thunder – and figuratively – to refer to thunderous power or speech. Here, it is probable that they are being identified with the figurative connotation of βροντῆ rather than with the literal, physical event as it occurs in nature. Since sons of thunder are not a common figurative collective in Scripture, participation is not a major factor in this "son(s) of" phrase. However, at the very least, James and John participate together as ὑἱοὶ βροντῆς. Perhaps, aspects of submission are bound up in the notion that their figurative father has a thunderously powerful nature. Many scholars make a connection between the character of these figurative sons and that of their father. Stein notes that it "seems to reveal the temperament of these two brothers."

Likewise, France concedes that while there is not a wealth of information in the NT writings regarding the character of James and John, "their hasty and violent reactions" in Mark 9:38 and Luke 9:54 seem to confirm what Stein suggests. Thus, their character is like their figurative father – sudden and forceful. While not exactly succession, in some sense, these two attempt to do the work of their figurative father in Luke 9:54 when they seek Jesus' approval to call down fire from heaven. The only motivation in this phrase is subtle: the

---

59See Pss 76:19, 103:7; Sir 32:10, 40:13, 43:17; Amos 4:13; Isa 29:6; Rev 4:5, 8:5, 11:19, 16:18; and Job 26:14; John 12:29; Rev 6:1, 10:3, 4, 14:2, 19:6 respectively.

60Stein, Mark, 172.

recurring theme that actions reveal an individual's true lineage. Jesus figuratively identified them on the basis of who they were and their actions confirmed their identity.

**Son of Peace**

When Jesus sends out the seventy-two in Luke 10, he instructs them to pronounce peace upon each house they enter. He says their peace will either return to them or remain resting upon a υἱὸς εἰρήνης. Klassen emphasizes the surprising uniqueness of this phrase considering the prominence of both "son(s) of" phrases and the concept of peace.\(^{62}\) Scholars typically argue for one of three understandings of this phrase: (1) the son of peace is a person who is peaceful, especially in their response to the disciples, (2) the son of peace is one who is destined for peace, (3) the son of peace is one who is a fellow disciple already.\(^{63}\) Klassen pushes for a more mediating position by arguing that "the child of peace is one who has been born of peace and is also destined for the peace of others."\(^{64}\) Unfortunately, even his position fails to account for all that is implicit in the figurative use of "son(s) of" in this phrase.

Their identification as a son of peace does in fact mean that these individuals are peaceful persons. As sons of peace, they participate in the figurative kin group made of those characterized by peace. Their feet are guided in the way of peace and, because of

---


\(^{64}\)Klassen, "Child of Peace," 501.
God's pleasure, peace has been pronounced upon them. Klassen does well to glean the aspect of submission in this "son(s) of" phrase:

The term 'Son of Torah' comes closest perhaps to the term 'Son of Peace'. For the son of the Torah is one who dedicates himself to the study of the Torah and in that way becomes one learned in Torah. So it is likely that Jesus, when he asked his disciples to go out to gather the sons of peace, was sending them out to identify with those in Galilee who were bent on pursuing peace.

Further, the son's reception of the disciple's pronouncement of peace displays the son's submission to his figurative father. Certainly, those who are so closely identified with peace and live in submissive pursuit of it will have the character of a peaceful person. Their peaceful actions as well as peace-making actions will reveal that they truly are sons of peace. Succession is evident in the very nature of the peace they have received and accepted. It is a message of peace. Just as the very disciples who pronounced upon them received it from someone else, namely Jesus, so too will they turn and announce this peaceful message of good news to others. Inheritance conveys the notion that they are destined for peace, as has been argued by others. Their status as sons of peace means that they will inherit the fully restored shalom of the new creation. Finally, the implicit motivation for Theophilus, and any other reader, is to receive the message of peace being pronounced upon him by Luke. Following his reception of it, as a true son of peace, he will pass on the peaceful message to other sons of peace who have yet to be revealed.

**Sons of this Age**

In Luke's Gospel, he records Jesus referring to a group as οἱ υἱοί τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου on two separate occasions. In Luke 16:8, the phrase "the sons of this age" is

---

juxtaposed with the phrase "the sons of light" which will be discussed below. In Luke 20:34, the phrase stands in opposition to those identified as sons of God and sons of the resurrection. Likewise, these phrases will be discussed below. In the first occurrence, the phrase is found in Jesus' explanation of the parable of the dishonest manager. Their description as sons of this age, as well as their juxtaposition with the sons of light, identifies them as unbelievers. Jesus is saying that the sons of this age deal in a manner more shrewd than that of his own people. His conclusion is that the sons of light should be even more diligent in light of the future – the age to come – which is awaiting them.

In the second occurrence, Luke 20:34, the implicit contrast between the sons of this age and the sons of the age to come that was seen in 16:8 is made explicit. In his answer to the challenge from the Sadducees, Jesus explains that while the sons of this age marry and are given in marriage, those who are of the resurrection age – the sons of the resurrection – neither marry nor are given in marriage. While the Sadducees seek to equate what happens in this age to what will happen in the age to come, Jesus "poses a contrast between conditions in this life and the next, and elaborates the status of those who participate in the resurrection as sons of God. In this way Luke brings out more clearly the difference between the two ages and stresses that not all men qualify for life in the new age."67

By referring to unbelievers as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, Jesus is not only identifying who they are, but also who they are not. They are those whose lives are closely related to and determined by the present age. They are not those who will be in any way in close relation to the age to come. Thus, a clear line of demarcation is being

made between unbelievers and believers regarding their participation in and qualification for the age to come. The sons of this age are full participants with those who are solely linked with the present age. They are old creations rather than new and members of the fictive kinship group associated with the old order. While being a son of light, son of God, or son of the resurrection brings with it a great amount of collective honor, a corresponding dishonor is shared by all the sons of this age. The sons of this age live not only in this present age but also for this present age. Their focus is only on their own selfish pursuits with no thought to what is awaiting them at the end of this age. These fictive sons live in blind submission to the god of this age. As a result of their kinship to this age, they continue to live as the old man and are characterized by sins like sexual immorality, impurity, passion, evil desire, covetousness, anger, wrath, malice, slander, obscene talk, and deceitfulness. The sons of this age beget more sons of this age. While the sons of the age to come are being renewed in the image of their creator, the sons of this age continue to reproduce their own broken, corrupt image. Their inheritance stands in stark contrast to the sons of the resurrection; it is eternal, eschatological death. In Luke 16:8, Jesus' motivation is that his followers – the sons of light – would see that if even the sons of this age can diligently work and plan for such a broken future, how much more should they be diligently working for and hoping in the age to come. While Jesus' response to the Sadducees in Luke 20:34 is to demonstrate how very different the present age is from the age to come, the motivation of the figurative "son(s) of" phrase is quite similar. His audience should see the stark contrast between the sons of this age and the

68 See 2 Cor 4:4.
69 See Col 3:5-9.
sons of the resurrection and desire to be numbered among the latter.

**Sons of Light**

The phrase "sons of light" is found in two different constructions in the NT. The first construction – τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς – is found in Luke 16:8. The second occurrence of this construction – υἱοὶ φωτός – is found in John 12:36 and 1 Thessalonians 5:5. Many scholars have made note of the similar usage of this phrase in the Dead Sea Scrolls.70 There is dualism present in each of these occurrences. As has been mentioned above, the explicit dualism in Luke 16:8 is between the sons of light and the sons of this age. In both John 12:36 and 1 Thessalonians 5:5, the typical light-darkness dualism is present. In all three passages, followers of Jesus are the intended referents of the sons of light. In Luke, Jesus is giving and explaining the parable of the dishonest manager to his disciples. In his explanation he explains that the sons of this age – unbelievers – more diligently and shrewdly plan for their future than the sons of light – his followers, the people of God. In John, Jesus is speaking to a crowd and encourages them to believe in the light – himself – that they might become sons of light. In 1 Thessalonians, Paul describes his fellow believers as sons of light and, as will be discussed below, sons of day.

In all three passages, identification serves both to establish who these sons are and also who they are not. As a result, while the light-darkness dualism is explicit in two of these passages, it is implicit in all three phrases. By identifying them as sons of light

---

Jesus, in Luke and John, and Paul, in 1 Thessalonians, make a clear, albeit implicit in the Gospels, line of demarcation between the sons of light and the sons of darkness. In each case, identification leads into participation as it clarifies who is in the community and who is not: "It clearly distinguishes those who belong to the community of faith from those outside, who are part of the darkness to be judged and condemned when the Lord Jesus comes." As participants in the sons of light, they share in the collective honor of those who walk in the light. Similarly, "Their participation in the light and in the day has clear moral implications." However, it is important to note that obedience is expected because they are sons and not so that they might become sons: "since we belong to the day, let us be sober" (1 Thes 5:8 ESV). As sons, they delightfully submit to the ethics of their figurative father. The υἱοὶ φωτός emulate the character of the one who is the true light – the one in whom there is no darkness at all. By walking in the light, these sons not only have the character of the light, but also do his work. Thus, the NT refers both to the Messiah and the sons of light as the light of the world. Because of their standing as sons, it is clear that the Father has qualified them "to share in the inheritance of the saints in light" (Col 1:12 ESV). Finally, the motivation of these phrases is twofold. First, there is the call of the light of the world: "believe in the light, that you may become sons of light" (John 12:36 ESV). Second, there is the motivation toward an obedient submission

71Charles A. Wanamaker, The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 182.


73Similarly, Carson writes that "a 'son of light' displays the ethical qualities of 'light', and has become a disciple of the 'light'. However, Carson could put greater emphasis on the fact that it is faith which makes a son or disciple of the light and the ethics follow from the "becoming". See Carson, John, 446.

74See John 8:12 and Matt 5:14.
in keeping with their true identity. While, it is not a "son(s) of" phrase using υἱός,

Ephesians 5:8-12 expresses this aspect of the motivation perfectly: "For at one time you were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light (for the fruit of light is found in all that is good and right and true), and try to discern what is pleasing to the Lord. Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. For it is shameful even to speak of the things that they do in secret" (Eph 5:8-12 ESV).

**Sons of Day**

Closely related to the phrase υἱοὶ φωτός is the phrase υἱοὶ ἡμέρας which is also found in 1 Thessalonians 5:5. In this verse, these two "son(s) of" phrases stand parallel to one another. In addition, there are two implicit "son(s) of" phrases – "of the night, of the darkness" – which complete a chiastic structure. While it is quite tempting to see υἱοὶ ἡμέρας as merely synonymous to υἱοὶ φωτός, such an interpretation would overlook Paul's use of ἡμέρα in the surrounding verses. Instead of simply referring to the daytime or daylight, the sons of the day are connected to ἡμέρα κυρίου. They are beneficiaries by faith of the new life in the present and those who wait with hope for the full and final dawning of that future day when the Lord returns.

Paul identifies both who these sons are – ἡμέρας – and also who they are not – νυκτὸς. Again, ἡμέρα in the context of this passage is closely connected to the day of the Lord. Therefore, these sons are identified as sons of ἡμέρα κυρίου. As such, they are beneficiaries by faith of the new life in the present and those who wait with hope for the full and final dawning of that future day when the Lord returns.


"those who in the present time participate in the new era of God’s order that is now being inaugurred." 78 Further, they participate in their figurative kinship group by being those who await the day of the Lord with hope and expectation. 79 Collectively, these sons belong to the day of the Lord. 80 Their standing as sons brings with it the responsibility of submission as is made evident by the imperatives which begin in verse 6. 81 In this case, their submission to the moral imperatives placed upon the sons of the day results in them being characterized by sobriety and wakefulness. While the concept of succession is not as clear for υἱοὶ ἡ ἡµέρας as it was for υἱοὶ φωτός above, there is some sense of it in the idea that these sons are not only sons of the day of the judgment but those who will in some way participate in the work of judgment. 82 The inheritance of all the sons of the day is made clear by Paul in verses 9-10: "God has not destined us for wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us so that whether we are awake or asleep we might live with him" (1 Thes 5:9-10 ESV). Here, Paul is motivating the Thessalonians with regard to the day of the Lord. They need neither to worry about being ill-prepared nor be insecure about the implications of its coming for themselves. They are not of the darkness nor of the night; rather, they are sons of light and sons of the day. Their identity has been changed. They are awake and need to walk as those who are of the day. The day of the Lord is a day of hope for them because they belong to it. Rather than fear its coming, they should long for that day's arrival as children long for the return

78 Green, Thessalonians, 236.
79 Wanamaker, Thessalonians, 182.
80 Cf. Ibid.
81 Cf. Green, Thessalonians, 237.
of their father.

**Sons of the Resurrection**

The phrase ὀι τῆς ἀναστάσεως is found Luke 20:36. It is linked to two other sons of phrases. First, it is presented as the opposite of οἱ ὦιοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in verse 34. Second, it is connected causally to υἱοί θεοῦ — they are sons of God because they are sons of the resurrection.83 In this passage, Jesus is answering the challenge from the Sadducees. In the course of his answer, Jesus explains that while the sons of this age marry and are given in marriage, those who are of the resurrection age — those who are sons of God because they are sons of the resurrection — neither marry nor are given in marriage. Thus, these latter two "son(s) of" phrases are provided by Jesus as a figurative reference to those who will be partakers of the coming resurrection age.

Identification again serves the purpose both of indicating who these individuals are and also who they are not. They are the sons of resurrection — those who will partake of the age to come. They are not the sons of this age — those who have judgment alone waiting for them in the age to come. While the focus of Jesus' response is on the Sadducee's question regarding marriage, his figurative identification of believers as sons of the resurrection provides further information about the relationship of believers to the resurrection. As sons, "they participate in the age to come and have an immortal life."84 It is through their union with Christ in both his life and death that believers walk in this new kind of life (Rom 6:4-5). Just as they have borne the broken image of the man from the dust, they will bear the fully restored image of the man from heaven (1 Cor 15:49).

83Stein, *Luke*, 503. The phrase υἱοὶ θεοῦ will be discussed below.

Believers' participation in the resurrection means that they submit to the moral implications of the new life they are "raised up" to walk in. Because they have been raised up, the sons of the resurrection must submit themselves "to God as those who have been brought from death to life... as instruments for righteousness" (Rom 6:13 ESV). As a result of such submission, they will be those who are characterized by the new life in them. They will have "put on the new self, created after the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness" (Eph 4:24 ESV). The sons of the resurrection will succeed Christ who is the firstfruits of those who will follow after him in the resurrection (1 Cor 15:20-23). Certainly, the sons of the resurrection share in an eternal inheritance which is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading. They become qualified to share in this inheritance by being "born again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Pet 1:3 ESV). As was seen in the discussion of οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, Jesus' response to the Sadducees demonstrates the stark contrast between the present age and the age to come. Those listening to him or reading his words should see the great divide between the sons of the resurrection and the sons of this age and be motivated to be numbered among the former.

**Son of Destruction**

The phrase ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας is found twice in the NT. In John 17:12, the phrase is on the lips of Jesus in his high priestly prayer as a reference to Judas Iscariot. In 2 Thessalonians 2:3, the phrase is used by Paul in apposition to ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνοµίας.  

---

86Similar phrases are found in Prov 24:22a (LXX); ApPet. 1.2; and EH 5.1.48. Cf. τέκνα ἀπωλείας in Isa 57:4.
The term ἀπώλεια is typically used in the NT to indicate eschatological condemnation.\(^87\)

While most scholars attempt to limit these phrases to a reference to character, or destiny, or both, there is much more implicit in the use of a "son(s) of" phrase.\(^88\)

In the first passage, Jesus identifies Judas Iscariot as a son of eschatological condemnation. With this grave identification, Jesus also specifies who he is not. Judas Iscariot has not been kept back from perishing. He is not counted as one of Jesus' faithful followers. He has not been numbered among the redeemed people of God. As a son of destruction, he participates along with his figurative kin in a "a typology of evil personages seeking to thwart God’s sovereign purposes across the sweep of salvation history."\(^89\) The son of eschatological condemnation and all his pseudo-kin are the seed of the serpent. While Scripture emphasizes the reality that his betrayal and perishing is mysteriously part of God's redemptive plan, the son of destruction also submits to another. Judas, as a son of destruction, submits to the one who always seeks to cause ἀπώλεια.\(^90\) The majority of information in the NT regarding Judas' character is closely associated with his betrayal of Jesus, however, the fact that "he was a thief, and having charge of the moneybag he used to help himself to what was put into it" certainly reveals that he truly was a son of eschatological condemnation (John 12:6 ESV). As a successor to the ultimate son of destruction, Judas is seen in the NT doing his work. He is a thief

\(^87\) Carson, John, 563; and Köstenberger, John, 494.

\(^88\) For example, see Gerald L. Borchert, John 12–21, NAC, vol. 25B (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2002), 198; Carson, John, 563; and Köstenberger, John, 494.

\(^89\) Köstenberger, John, 494.

\(^90\) Cf. John 10:10. In Jesus' description of the thief's activity, the cognate of ἀπώλεια, ἀπόλλυμι is used.
and his betrayal of Jesus leads to the killing of the Messiah. Judas Iscariot, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, inherits what he has wrought in the world – destruction, eschatological condemnation. The motivation of this "son(s) of" phrase is likely a form of negative motivation for those disciples who have been kept in his name and guarded. They hear and, later, read Jesus' words and are motivated to work out their sonship with fear and trembling rather than being deceived by the father of lies who duped Judas into his own eschatological destruction.

In the second passage, 2 Thessalonians 2:3, Paul further identifies the man of lawlessness as the son of destruction. This man of lawlessness is thereby closely identified with the destruction that Satan attempts to bring about in God's creation. As was mentioned above, these sons of eschatological condemnation participate together in a lengthy line of figurative kin who have opposed God's redemptive work to their own destruction. Thorough their participation, they share in a collective dishonor. In verse 9, Paul explains to whom this son of destruction submits. It is none other than the Destroyer himself. It is according to his power that this son arrives. Likewise, this son's character is in keeping with the one who destructively empowers him. He "opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God" (2 Thes 2:4 ESV). His character is defined by prideful self-worship and opposition to God. Here, it is evident that ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας not only descends from the one who destroys, but also causes others to become

---

91 John 12:6; Matt 20:18.
92 Wanamaker, Thessalonians, 245.
93 See p. 166n86 above.
sons of destruction themselves. The son of destruction does his father's work and reproduces it. The son of eschatological condemnation receives his inheritance when he is killed by the breath from Jesus' mouth and brought to nothing – his inheritance is his own destruction (2 Thes 2:8). This "son(s) of" phrase serves to motivate the Thessalonians to take comfort as the beloved family of the Lord who have been chosen as his firstfruits (2 Thes 2:13). They do not need to fear this son of destruction or those who come before or after him for they themselves are not being destroyed but instead have been chosen, called, saved, loved, and eternally comforted with the hope that they will receive glory, and not condemnation, upon the appearance of Jesus' coming (2 Thes 2:13-17).

**Sons of the Prophets and the Covenant**

In Peter's speech in Acts 3, he refers to his listeners as ὁι υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης. While ὁι υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν by itself could be an example of a human-human "son(s) of" phrase, the addition of καὶ τῆς διαθήκης means that this "son(s) of" phrase fits instead in the current category. Instead of referring to the descendants of the prophets and heirs of the covenant, this construction is a figurative "son(s) of" phrase in which Peter is describing the relationship of his hearers to the prophets and the covenant.

---

94 His works lead to others being destroyed. Notice Paul's use of ἀπόλλυμι, the cognate of ἀπώλεια, in verse 10.

95 Contra Culy and Parsons who argue that "the conjoined genitive nouns clearly function differently. The first denotes relationship while the second is descriptive. This distinction necessitates using two separate terms to render υἱοὶ in English." See Martin M. Culy and Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2003), 62. However, this argument is based on the presupposition that (1) υἱός here is referring to these individuals as descendants (2) προφητών is referring to the people rather than the body of their writings, and (3) τῆς διαθήκης does not denote relationship. Even if (2) is true, υἱός does not necessarily describe a literal father-son relationship between two persons and τῆς διαθήκης can absolutely function in relational terms since this "son(s) of" phrase is likely used figuratively.
in father-son terminology.

He identifies his listeners as sons of both the prophets and the covenant. They are identified not as sons of those who rejected and murdered the prophets but instead are those who have borne witness to the fulfillment of their prophetic speech. Likewise, they are not sons of those who have transgressed and broken the covenant, but instead are those who have seen firsthand the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham. They are participants in this figurative kinship group by being both those who receive the prophetic message and covenantal promises and also those announce the fulfillment to others and thereby pass on the promised blessing. They share in collective honor rather than being those who are shamefully destroyed from among the people for failing to listen to God's Prophet. Their submission is to God himself as they receive his message through the prophets and believe that he will keep his promises to his people. In addition to reception and belief, they heed the word of his anointed messengers and seek to be a blessing to the nations in keeping with the covenant. Their submission to the Author of the prophets and the covenant results in their imitation of his character which undergirds them. They turn from wickedness because he hates wickedness. They are a blessing because they have been blessed by him. Their role as sons of the prophets and the covenant is succeeding them in their work. They continue to announce the coming of the Promised One. Only for them, it is no longer a forward-looking announcement but is instead the heralding of the fulfillment of their figurative fathers in Jesus the Christ. As the sons of the prophets and the covenant, they are their true heirs. Through their faith in the one who fulfills the prophets and who is the 'yes' to all of the covenant's promises, they become heirs alongside him. Peter uses this "son(s) of" phrase as a means to
motivate his hearers to believe the good news and repent. He longs for God to bless every one of his listeners by turning them from their wickedness toward faith.

**Son of Encouragement**

In Acts 4:36, Luke provides the phrase υἱὸς παρακλήσεως as an explanation of the name Barnabas. Luke's Greek explanation of his transliteration of Aramaic poses very similar problems to Mark's explanation of βοανηργές as νιόι βροντῆς. While various solutions have been proposed, a clear consensus has not be reached:

All sorts of conjectures have been suggested, such as Bar-nabi (son of a prophet), or Bar-nawha (son of refreshment), or Bar-nebo (son of the pagan god Nebo), or Bar-menahem (son of consolation). Obviously the last suggestion fits best, but there is no way one can derive nabas from menahem. Scholars who make this suggestion assume that Luke confused Barnabas with the Manaen whose name is listed along with his in Acts 13:1, but this is grasping at a straw.  

While the etymological origin of Joseph's second Aramaic name which was given to him by the Apostles remains undecided, Luke provides the reader with a "son(s) of" phrase as an explanation of his name.

Barnabas is further identified as a υἱὸς παρακλήσεως. He is the son of encouragement or exhortation. While this "son(s) of" phrase is unique to this verse, as a son of encouragement, Barnabas is a member of a figurative kinship group whose collective honor is bound up in their lifting up of others. The son of encouragement submits to the kin group's mandate to be continually encouraging and building up the group. In the book of Acts, Barnabas certainly reveals that his true identity fits well this nickname given to him by the Apostles:

---

He was the encourager, the advocate, the paraklete par excellence of all the characters in Acts. When the Christians in Jerusalem shied away from Paul after his conversion, Barnabas interceded and introduced him to them (9:26f.). When Paul refused to take Mark on his second missionary journey, Barnabas took up for Mark (15:36–39). When the Christians of Jerusalem became concerned over the orthodoxy of the Antiochene Christians in their witness to Greeks, Barnabas again served as intercessor, saw the gracious work of the Antiochene Christians, and encouraged them (11:20–23). Indeed, 11:24 well sums up the portrait of this "Son of Encouragement": "He was a good man, full of the Holy Spirit and faith." 97

Further, Luke provides a concrete example of his encouraging nature in the next verse: Barnabas "sold a field that belonged to him and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet" – he gave of himself for the building up of others (Acts 4:37 ESV). While the Apostle Paul is never referred to as a γιος παρακλήσεως, Barnabas' initial ministry to him following his conversion likely would have had a profound effect upon his own ministry which would follow. Later, Paul tells the Thessalonians that they themselves know how, when he was with them, he encouraged and exhorted them as a father with his children (1 Thes 2:11-12). Certainly, a son of encouragement encourages and builds up others so that they too become γιοι παρακλήσεως. While there is an absence of information regarding what happens to Barnabas after he and Paul part ways in Acts 15, it is intriguing that the prime example of Barnabas' encouraging acts is the sale of his property. The inheritance of a son from his father was particularly focused on the transmission of property in the ancient world. Thus, it is possible that Barnabas sells his inheritance from his literal father with the result that he is shown to be a figurative son of encouragement. Luke's inclusion of Joseph's second name and his property sale likely serves to motivate Theophilus and other readers toward similar encouraging acts rather that being deceitfully self-serving like Ananias and Sapphira.

Sons of Disobedience

This "son(s) of" phrase occurs twice in Ephesians and, probably, once in Colossians. In Ephesians, it is found as τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας in 2:2 and as τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας in 5:6. In Colossians 3:6, the phrase is also τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας.

However, its inclusion in the text is debated. In the UBS4 Greek New Testament, the entire phrase – ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας – is included in brackets which mean that the presence of these words in the text are marked by the editors as disputed. Metzger notes that this reading is assigned a "C" rating which "indicates that the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text."98 He explains the decision regarding this text as follows:

It is exceedingly difficult to decide whether the words ἐπὶ ... ἀπειθείας were added in most witnesses by copyists who recollected Eph 5.6 (where no manuscript omits the words), or whether they are absent from Ἱ B copa eth99 and several Fathers (Clement Cyprian Macrobius Ambrosiaster Ephraem Jerome) because of an accident in transmission. In view of (a) the very widespread testimony supporting the longer reading (Ἀ C D34d F G H K L P almost all minuscules it vg syrph b copga goth arm eth99 Clement Chrysostom a l) and (b) the inconcinnity produced by the shorter reading with the following ἐν οἷς, as well as (c) the impression that καὶ οὕτως in ver. 7 assumes a previous mention of unbelieving Gentiles, a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words in the text but to enclose them within square brackets in order to indicate a measure of doubt as to their genuineness in Colossians.99

Both English translations and modern commentators are likewise uncertain. The KJV, NKJV, HCSB, NRSV, NASB, NET, and TEV include the phrase; the TNIV, RSV, ESV, and NLT omit it.100 Similarly, Dunn and Wright argue to include the phrase; Harris, Moo, and O'Brien omit it.101 While it is certainly possible that this phrase was inserted by

---


99 Ibid.

100 Douglas J. Moo, The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 259.

101 See James D. G. Dunn, The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 210n4; N. T. Wright, Colossians and Philemon, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 135n1;
scribes due to its presence in Ephesians 2:2 and 5:6, it should tentatively be considered as original. First, as Metzger argues in his points b and c above, including the phrase fits the grammatical context better than its exclusion. Second, the inclusion of a "son(s) of" phrase here is in keeping with Pauline thought. The connection between Colossians 3:6, Ephesians 2:2, and Ephesians 5:6 is not limited to this phrase alone. In both Ephesians 2 and 5, Paul is making a similar argument to what he is writing about in Colossians 3 – he is talking about the distinct, fundamental shift that has taken place in believers between who they were before Christ redeemed them and who they are now as a result of his redemption of them. In Ephesians 2, Paul explains that they once walked in trespasses and sins, submitted to the same evil spirit to which the sons of disobedience now submit, and were, in their very nature, children of wrath. For Paul, their former way of living is figuratively described using father-son language – they were sons of disobedience and their disobedient sonship, if it continued, would have necessitated an outpouring of wrath – as it will for those who now remain in their former state. Similarly, in Ephesians 5, Paul speaks of various sins that are out of place among the children of light. He insists that it is because sins such as these that "the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience" (Eph 5:6 ESV). Again, the distinction between their former and new life is expressed using father-son language and their former disobedient sonship merits the outpouring of the wrath of God. In Colossians 2, Paul is emphasizing how their new life should be distinct from their old life as a result of being raised with Christ. In explaining the various sins that characterized their old way of life, Paul explains that is on account of

these that the wrath of God is coming upon the sons of disobedience (Col 3:6). Thus, with
the "son(s) of" phrase in the text, the same major themes are present just as they are in
Ephesians 2 and 5 – the contrast between their old way of life and their new life in Christ
is underscored and the disobedient sonship that characterized their old life results in the
wrath of God.

In each of these passages, Paul identifies unbelievers as sons of
disobedience.\textsuperscript{102} Not only are they those who are related to disobedience as a son is to a
father, but they are not those who can be identified as sons of obedience.\textsuperscript{103} As sons of
disobedience they participate in a pseudo-kinship group alongside all others who follow
the course of the world and submit to the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:2). These
sons of disobedience do such awful works of darkness, they not only bear collective
shame, but it is shameful even to speak of the deeds they do in secrecy (Eph 5:12). In
Ephesians 2, Paul explains that these sons of disobedience live in submission to the
broken patterns of this fallen world and its would-be ruler. "Their behavior has been
determined by the powerful influence of society's attitudes, habits, and preferences."\textsuperscript{104}
Further, Paul is describing the work of Satan as an "evil supernatural activity whereby he
exercises a powerful, compelling influence over the lives of men and women."\textsuperscript{105} Instead
of living in submission to God and his loving rule, the sons of disobedience submit to
Satan. Their character is fully bound up in the identity of their figurative father.

\textsuperscript{102}Even though Paul is referring to the former way of life of believers in Eph 2,
they were unbelievers then, so the identification would apply.

\textsuperscript{103}Cf. τέκνα ὑπακοῆς in 1 Peter 1:14.

\textsuperscript{104}O’Brien, \textit{Ephesians}, 159.

\textsuperscript{105}Ibid., 161.
Disobedience is who they are. The sons of disobedience are earthly, in darkness, dead, and enslaved to their fleshly desires which they carry out in rampant wickedness. These sons of obedience are neither the first nor the last. They follow the course of this world – its course has been shaped by their figurative ancestry. In sin, they reproduce themselves – both literally and figuratively. The sons of disobedience share in an ominous inheritance – the wrath of God is what is coming to them. In addition, Paul makes it clear that they have "no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God" (Eph 5:5 ESV). The motivation is quite simple: Paul wants his audience to see the stark contrast between the old life and the new. For those who are still entrenched in their disobedient sonship, the desire is for them to be made alive and be remade as obedient children. For those who are being made new, the desire is for them to heed the imperatives which are given as a result of the new identity he has given them: "be imitators of God, as beloved children" (Eph 5:1 ESV).

**Human-Divine Figurative Use**

Nine of the forty-two figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT describe the relationship of believers to the Creator in father-son terms. These nine human-divine figurative uses are found in Matthew, Luke, Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews. The most common "son(s) of" phrase in this category is υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ; it is found in five passages.\(^{106}\) The other four phrases are slight or, in some cases, moderate variations which all have the same basic meaning. In Matthew 5:45, Jesus encourages his followers toward obedience that they might live as υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑµῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. In a parallel passage, Luke

\(^{106}\)Matt 5:9; Luke 20:36; Rom 8:14, 19; and Gal 3:26. The head noun is in the genitive in Rom 8:19 and each noun has the article: τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.
6:35 has Jesus issuing a promise to those disciples who love their enemies: they will be 
υἱοὶ υψίστου. In Romans 9:26, Paul quotes Hosea 2:1 (LXX) which includes the phrase 
υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος. Finally, in Hebrews 12:5, the author applies Proverbs 3:11-12 to the 
concept of divine sonship. These phrases will be grouped and discussed below in the 
following categories: Human-Divine Figurative Use in the Gospels, Human-Divine 
Figurative Use in the Pauline Epistles, and Human-Divine Figurative Use in Hebrews.

Human-Divine Figurative Use in 
the Gospels

Four of the nine phrases in this category are found in the Gospels. In the first 
three phrases – Matthew 5:9, Matthew 5:45, and Luke 6:35 – it is the believer's imitation 
of God as their Father that shows that they are truly sons. In Matthew 5:9, it is their 
peacemaking which results in them being recognized as υἱοὶ θεοῦ. While in the OT, Israel 
was God's son, now the title "belongs to the heirs of the kingdom who, meek and poor in 
spirit, loving righteousness yet merciful, are especially equipped for peacemaking and so 
reflect something of their heavenly Father's character. 

In both Matthew 5:45 and 
Luke 6:35, Jesus' followers love their enemies that they might be υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς υµὸν 
to ἐν οὐρανοῖς and υἱοὶ υψίστου. Marshall, commenting on Luke, explains the question
when interpreting these phrases:

It is not clear whether the next clause is to be regarded as epeexegetic of the thought of reward. If so, the promise of divine sonship is a reward for faithful service; those who love will enjoy God’s fatherly love and care. The next clause, however, and v. 36 both suggest that the point is that the disciples will show themselves to be God’s children by their imitation of his character. Probably this thought is primary, but the idea that those who show themselves to be God’s sons will receive his fatherly blessing cannot be excluded.  

Similarly, Nolland writes that "the link with the example of God is best respected by taking the thrust of the text to be: 'By loving enemies you will be acting in the proper family manner (like father, like son)'. Marked by this family likeness, one’s actions will be good works that 'glorify your Father in heaven' (5:16)."  

The disciples do not love their enemies so that they can become sons; rather, because they are sons, they must imitate their Father. Finally, in Jesus' response to a question from the Sadducees in Luke 20, he explains that "those who are considered worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead . . . are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" (Luke 20:35-36 ESV). Here, the focus is eschatological – while followers of Jesus are already sons of God, their sonship to him will not be fully consummated until they are with him in the new creation.  

Resurrection completes their sonship.  

In Matthew and Luke, these "son(s) of" phrases are used figuratively to identify believers as sons of God. Thus, they are members of his family and are not members of the pseudo-kinship group associated with those who are not the people of God – the seed of the serpent. As his sons, they participate as members in a figurative

---

kinship group and share in a collective honor. It is through their imitation of their figurative Father that they bring honor to him (Matt 5:16). As sons, they obey their Father. These sons must be merciful because their Father is merciful (Luke 6:36). They do not submit that they might become sons, but because they are sons. They show their true lineage by their obedience and their character. As sons of God, they should strive toward having his perfect character (Matt 5:48). The call in Matthew 5 and Luke 6 for his sons to love their enemies is fully grounded in God's common grace poured out on even his enemies. It is through their submission to and imitation of their Father that they do his work in the world. Certainly, these sons will never succeed their figurative Father by taking his place as is customary in the concept of succession. However, although not in every way or sense, they do what he does. As sons of God, they await their inheritance which Luke 20 indicates will come in its fullness with their own resurrection from the dead. They will be fully and finally remade as sons of God. Mysteriously, their inheritance as sons is the completion or perfection of their own sonship. The motivation in the first three of these passages is for the sons of God to be who they are. They are sons of God and as such, they must pursue and make peace and actively love their enemies. In Luke 20:36, although the main focus of the passage is the debate with the Sadducees, the motivation for Theophilus and other readers is to have expectant hope in the coming completion of their sonship to God which will be theirs by means of the resurrection from the dead.

**Human-Divine Figurative Use in the Pauline Epistles**

On four occasions, Paul uses a "son(s) of" phrase to refer to God's people as sons of God. As would be expected, Paul's use of ἴοι θεοῦ is closely related to his
concept of υἱοθεσία. Thus, in Pauline thought, these figurative "son(s) of" phrases are often examples of figurative uses of fictive or artificial kinship. While other studies have drawn meaning and implications from Paul's use of υἱοθεσία, here the focus will be on the meaning and implications of his figurative use of υἱός plus the genitive.

In each of these passages, Paul uses the phrase "sons of God" to identify believers. They are members of his family and are not those who have no relationship with him. In Romans 8:14, it is those who are led by the Spirit who truly are sons of God. In Romans 8:19, Paul explains that all of creation is eagerly anticipating the future glorification of God's people – his sons. In Romans 9:26, Paul quotes Hosea who prophesies of the day – in which Paul is now writing – when the Gentiles will no longer be identified by God as "not my people" but instead will be known as his sons. In Galatians 3:26, it seems that "Paul's opponents are making kinship or sonship to Abraham a prerequisite for the Galatians' inclusion into the community, a theme Paul merges with a newly redefined kinship or sonship to God through Jesus Christ." Thus, υἱοὶ θεοῦ serves to identify the people of God and not, exclusively, the genetic descendants of Abraham. As sons of God, they participate in the fictive family of God which is the

---

114 Adoption is present in the context of each of these references to the sons of God.

115 See n1 above and the discussion of kinship in chap. 4.

116 Naturally, Paul's adoption metaphor cannot be explored fully here. For a helpful and thorough study, see Trevor J. Burke, Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006).


118 Burke, Adopted, 112.

119 See also the discussion of υἱοὶ Ἀβραὰμ above.
church. They share in a collective honor and partake of God's promises together. The collective participation believers experience is especially seen in Galatians 3:26: "in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith."\textsuperscript{120} In addition, these sons of God participate as sons alongside the Son of God (Rom 8:17). As sons of God, they submit to him by being led by his Spirit. "The leading of the Spirit in Romans 8:14 refers to the Spirit’s governing authority in one’s life that is manifested in human obedience."\textsuperscript{121} This conclusion is based primarily on the passive form of \(\textit{ἄγω}\) which refers to the sons of God being controlled or governed by the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{122} These sons submit to God as Father by putting to death the deeds of their flesh under the empowering leadership of his Spirit.

The prime characteristics of the sons of God are those related to new life in Christ which has been and is being wrought in them by the Spirit of adoption who leads them. They no longer live as those who are enslaved to the flesh but instead live as free sons who present their members to God as instruments for righteousness. As was seen above, the \(\textit{υἱοὶ θεοῦ}\) never succeed their Father by becoming \(\textit{θεός}\). However, these sons do pattern themselves after their obedient elder Brother by seeking to be conformed into his image. In fact, their progressive conformance to him results in them sharing in both his suffering and also his glorification (Rom 8:17). The sons of God wait expectantly for the inheritance they will share in as his sons. In Romans, Paul says that they are "heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, provided [they] suffer with him in order that [they] may also be glorified with him" (Rom 8:17 ESV). In Galatians, he says that they are heirs of the promises of God to Abraham (Gal 3:29). While they experience some foretastes of

\textsuperscript{120}Gal 3:26, ESV. Emphasis added.

\textsuperscript{121}Schreiner, \textit{Romans}, 423.

\textsuperscript{122}Ibid., 422.
their inheritance now – for example, they relate now to God as Father – similar to any son, much of their inheritance lies in the future. Along with the rest of creation, the υἱοί θεοῦ wait with eager anticipation for "the revelation of God’s children, that is, their future glorification." In Romans 8:14, Paul is motivating the sons of God to live as sons of God. If they are truly sons of God, they will be led by the Spirit. If they are led by the Spirit, they will put to death the deeds of the body. Essentially, he is calling for them to live as sons of God and not as slaves to sin. In Romans 8:19, Paul is motivating the Romans toward endurance in the face of the brokenness of the current creation by reminding them of the glorious consummating fulfillment that is coming as the inheritance of the sons of God. In Romans 9:26, Paul is seeking to motivate his national brothers to recognize his spiritual brothers as a fulfillment of the promise of God to Hosea. In Galatians 3:26, Paul is motivating the Galatians to see that they are already sons of God, and sons of Abraham, through faith in Christ. They do not need to pursue or manufacture kinship to Abraham – the Spirit of God has already made them sons and heirs in Christ.

**Human-Divine Figurative Use in Hebrews**

In Hebrews 12:5, the author includes the phrase υἱέ θου in a quotation from Proverbs 3:11-12. In this passage, the author is encouraging his audience toward endurance in Christian living. In his encouragement, he teaches them about God's fatherly discipline of his sons. He reminds them that, through Scripture, God addresses

---

123 Schreiner, *Romans*, 435.
124 See n107.
125 The author is referred to using a masculine pronoun merely due to
them as sons (Heb 12:4). O’Brien notes that Scripture does not address them as sons as if they were sons but instead because they are sons.126 The quotation is seen as "God's personal word to those who enjoy sonship through the mediation of Jesus."127 His personal word for them is to encourage them to see his discipline not as a mark against their sonship but for it.

With the quotation from Proverbs attributed to an address from God, ὦἱὲ μου is used to identify believers as God's sons. As his sons, they participate and share in their sonship with all their figurative kin. In this passage, their participation as sons is specifically linked to sharing in the Lord's discipline of his sons. In fact, if they do not participate in the discipline, it is because they are not true sons (Heb 12:8). As these sons have submitted to their earthly fathers, so also they must be subject to God as their Father (Heb 12:9). Their submission need not be begrudging. Even as they learned to love the benevolent authority of their earthly father, they will delight in the always good and loving rule of their heavenly Father. The purpose of his fatherly discipline is so that they might share also in his holy character and produce the peaceful fruit of righteousness (Heb 12:10-11). As has been seen in the discussion of this category in the Gospels and in the Pauline Epistles, the sons of God never succeed him by taking his place. However, they do follow Jesus – their elder brother – by, in some ways, doing what he has done.128

128See, for example, Heb 13:12-13.
Because of their endurance brought about by their Father's discipline of them as sons, they will inherit glory along with their many brothers because Jesus destroyed the devil and his power through his death. He has freed those whom he is not ashamed to call his brothers from Satan's enslaving grasp. The author seeks to motivate believers to welcome rather than fear the Lord's discipline. They should see it not as punishment but instead as the action of a loving father who truly desires what is best for them. Rather than destroying them, his discipline will keep them back from destruction and result in their full status and standing as sons with him in the new creation.

**Conclusion**

The interpretative categories of Identification, Participation, Submission, Characterization, Succession, Inheritance, and Motivation which were drawn from the PKG of the biblical world result in a much more well-rounded and robust interpretation of these figurative uses of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Most interpreters simply choose one aspect of the father-son relationship, such as characterization or destiny, and base the interpretation of these phrases on that sole criteria. Even then, they rarely link that criteria to the father-son terminology which was intentionally chosen by the author. Here, it has been shown that the relationship as a whole, as expressed in these seven functions of the father-son relationship, is a much more suitable framework for interpreting these phrases and others like them. In addition, this framework remains consistently applicable across the diverse category lines drawn above – Human-Human or Other Non-Divine Personal Beings, Human-Non-Human, and Human-Divine.

129Heb 2:10, 14.
130Heb 2:11, 15
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The goal of this work is to demonstrate that the figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT represents the author utilizing the father-son relationship, and what this relationship represents in the ancient world, as a tool to illustrate and explain various concepts and ideas in NT thought. As a result, the father-son relationship in the ancient world must be employed in the interpretation of these figurative "son(s) of" phrases. In fact, failing to understand the importance of genealogical identification, kinship, and the social implications of the father-son relationship in the ancient world and bring these concepts to bear in interpretation, will result in a failure to understand what the NT authors seek to communicate by using "son(s) of" phrases. An accurate and robust understanding of these "son(s) of" phrases will further our understanding of the thought and theology of the NT authors and help us to appreciate more fully the relationship in which believers participate as sons of our Father in heaven.

Certainly, if every commentator included all their knowledge of each word, phrase, or theological idea that occurred in the text, the shelves of seminary libraries would quickly swell beyond their capacity. As such, it is understood that scholars cannot thoroughly explain every word or phrase in every text. However, this work seeks to elevate the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT into the discussion which is included in even the briefest of commentaries. May they no longer be overlooked and may their discussion be
no longer limited to their dependence or lack of dependence upon a Semitic original. The average reader, and even preacher/teacher, of Scripture depends upon NT scholars to give them the relevant information he or she needs to be able to understand accurately and deeply the biblical text in front of them. The reader needs NT scholars to bridge the gap between his or her own limited domain of reference – that of modern Western society – and the domain of reference of the NT author. This work seeks both to highlight this need and also to address it as it relates to the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT.

**Summary**

Chapter 1 began by arguing along with Bruce Malina that "the understanding and interpretation of any sort of text is ultimately rooted in a social world"¹ Further, "if interpretation of written language of any sort takes place some domain of reference will be used by the reader. This domain of reference will be rooted in some model of society and of social interaction."² The problem for the modern reader is that his or her domain of reference differs starkly from the NT author's domain of reference with respect to the "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. This problem is exacerbated by the lack of helpful attention paid to these phrases in grammatical and lexical works, monographs, and commentaries. Thus, this work was prompted and its plan for addressing this problem was laid out in chapter 1.

Chapter 2 focused on the use of "son(s) of" phrases outside the NT. This chapter included a wide-ranging survey encompassing the use of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible, "son(s) of" phrases in the LXX, as well as the use of υἱός plus the genitive in Classical


²Ibid., 233.
Greek, the OT and NT apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, other early Jewish and Christian writings, coins and inscriptions, and the papyri and ostraca. This survey showed that "son(s) of" phrases such as those present in the NT writings are found in both texts which have a Semitic background and also those which were not directly influenced by the Hebrew language. The figurative use of "son(s) of" is found in Jewish, Christian, and non-Christian documents written by many different authors.

Chapter 3 provided a survey of the use of υἱός in the NT as it is the noun behind the "son(s) of" phrases. There are 377 occurrences of υἱός in the NT and nearly 80 percent of these occurrences are found in a "son(s) of" phrase. The chapter progressed by surveying each author's use of υἱός. For each author, the usage of υἱός is broken down and categorized. First, the use of υἱός outside of "son(s) of" phrases is considered. Next, the "son(s) of" phrases present in each author's work are examined. This latter group is broken down into three categories: (1) genetic identification, (2) messianic, and (3) figurative uses.

Chapter 4 served two major purposes within the work. First, it sought to explore the father-son relationship in the social context of the NT. In order to provide a proper foundation for this discussion, the chapter initially surveyed major concepts such as kinship, family, and the function and significance of genealogy both in general and in the ancient Mediterranean world. Second, it sought to distill the major features of the father-son relationship as explored in the ancient world into an interpretive framework which can be utilized in understanding what the NT authors seek to communicate in their figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. It is this framework which can serve as the proper domain of reference in the interpretation of these phrases. The key aspects of
the father-son relationship employed in this framework as outlined at the end of chapter 4 are Identification, Participation, Submission, Characterization, Succession, Inheritance, and Motivation.

Identification refers to the simplest function of a genealogical statement: to indicate who an individual is and who they are not. Participation includes the idea that membership in the patrilineal kinship group (PKG) is transmitted from father to son. As a result, the son's participation in the PKG brings his family either honor or shame.

Submission relates to what is an often overlooked aspect of the father-son relationship with respect to these "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. It expresses the expectation of the PKG and also the larger social world that the son will remain loyal, obedient, and respectful to his father. Characterization reflects the ancient world's notion that genealogy represented for an individual, and to the rest of society, what kind of person he was.

Succession is focused on the transmission of the father's office to the son. Often, this transmission included his profession and, perhaps, his leadership of the PKG. Inheritance refers to the reality that when a father died, his wealth and property – inheritance – would be passed on to his son. Finally, motivation is comprised of the ancient world's understanding that the son's actions have the power to increase the PKG's collective honor or to bring them shame. He both possesses and also shapes the collective honor of the family. As such, the son would be motivated, and even delighted, to live in a way that brings honor, and not shame, upon his family.

Chapter 5 both employed and also tested the interpretive framework developed in chapter 4. It was shown that the categories of Identification, Participation, Submission, Characterization, Succession, Inheritance, and Motivation provide the reader with a much
greater understanding of what the NT authors seek to communicate through their use of figurative "son(s) of" phrases. The resulting interpretations are not only more thorough and robust than those found in commentaries on these phrases, but they are entirely in keeping with the theological point being made by the NT author in these passages. In fact, they often make the author's point even more impactful because the reader is finally equipped with a more accurate understanding of what the author is communicating with these "son(s) of" phrases. For example, consider again the following sample of points made in chapter 5.

A holistic interpretation of the father-son relationship as outlined in chapter 4, yields a greater understanding of the figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. It explored more fully Jesus' logic when referring to the "sons of the Pharisees" in Matthew 12:27. Similarly, it explained why the Pharisees were so quick to rush to Paul's defense when he employed the phrase in Acts 23:6. In the case of υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ in Matthew 27:9, it was shown that while this "sons(s) of" phrase is often used literally in the NT, this occurrence indeed functions figuratively. Matthew uses this "son(s) of" phrase to identify figuratively the Jewish religious leaders as those who rejected and sold their brother into slavery. It showed that τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων in Ephesians 3:5 is not simply a stylistic reference to humanity but is instead emphasizing a contrast in sonship woven throughout Paul's letter. In Mark 2:19 and its parallels, it explained that Jesus' description of his followers as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νῦµος is focused not primarily on their close relationship to Jesus, but instead on the "at-handedness" of the Kingdom of Heaven. Their joy is connected to the nearness of its consummation and that its celebration has already begun. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the interpretive framework in chapter 4 assists
believers in arriving at a deeper understanding of their own sonship to their Father in heaven.

**Implications and Further Study**

The first and most obvious implication of this study is that the ancient world's understanding of the father-son relationship must serve as the foundation when interpreting these figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Even if the framework in chapter 4 is not accepted as presented, these phrases cannot continue to be examined so myopically by interpreters. Broader categories are needed than merely considering these phrases against comparatively simple notions of "sonship as destiny" or "sonship as characterization."

The second implication of this study may be one of its most important contributions – how it might be applied to the Messianic "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. While the scope of this work was limited to the figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT, the interpretive categories put forth for their interpretation may be found to be quite helpful in arriving at a more holistic understanding of the "son(s) of" phrases applied to Jesus Christ in the NT.

As a brief example, Jesus is referred to as the "son of God" in the NT. He is closely identified with God as his Father. He participates and shares in a collective honor and glory with God as his Son. In the Gospels, Jesus is seen doing the will of the Father as the perfectly submissive Son. As the Son of God, Jesus receives his character from his Father. He is revealed to be the true Son of God as he demonstrates himself to be perfect even as his Father in heaven is perfect. He is holy as his Father is holy. Succession is
evident when the Son is seen in the Gospels doing his Father's work. The NT authors make it clear that, as the Son of God, Jesus partakes of his Father's inheritance. Jesus is seen throughout the NT as the perfect Son who is the exemplar of one who delights to do his Father's will.

The third implication of this study and similar studies is that there remains in the NT many other phrases and concepts which merit a corresponding exploration. For example, this present study would certainly have merit when interpreting similar phrases such as uses of τέκνον plus the genitive or occurrences of non-human sonship such as "brood of vipers." In addition, a study exploring more thoroughly the father's side of the father-son relationship would surely further the believer's understanding of who God has revealed himself to be to him or her. Likewise, applying this framework to figurative "son(s) of" phrases in other writings such as the MT, LXX, or Dead Sea Scrolls would likely yield similar results.

A fourth implication of this study is what it might yield when applied to some of the more recent debate regarding the topic of sanctification and sonship. At times, there has seemed to be a wedge being driven between sonship and obedience. This disconnect is due to the modern interpreter's approach to both sonship and obedience. The modern world possesses a suspicion of and even resentfulness to authority and, as a

\[\text{For example, see John 4:34, 5:17, 10:37, and 14:10.}\]

\[\text{E.g. Rom 8:17; Heb 1:2.}\]

\[\text{For example on τέκνον plus the genitive see Rom 8:16, 21, 9:7, 8; 1 Cor 4:14, 17; 2 Cor 12:14; Gal 4:19, 28, 31; Eph 2:3, 5:8; Phil 2:15; 2 Tim 2:1; Phlm 1:10; 1 Pet 1:14; 2 Pet 2:14; 1 Joh 3:1, 2, 10, 5:2; 2 Joh 1:1, 4, 13; 3 Joh 1:4; and Rev 2:23. For "brood of vipers," see Matt 3:7, 12:34, 23:33; Luke 3:7.}\]

\[\text{A further, more specialized study could even include the application of some of this work's conclusions to the Messianic "son(s) of" phrases in the NT.}\]
result, obedience is not often offered delightfully. Obedience is seen as servitude whereas sonship is seen as a loving, and, especially, liberating relationship. However, this exploration of the father-son relationship as it was understood in the ancient world shows that there was not a disconnect between sonship and obedience in the minds of the NT authors. In fact, they may have employed this relationship with such frequency because it intertwines these two ideas. As mentioned above, "the individual reared in the father-son dominated system will have no resentment against benevolent authority; in fact, he will love it." This understanding of the relationship between sonship and obedience certainly has implications for this debate and further study in this area is needed.

A final implication and need for further study is that this work is limited in that it attempts an exhaustive and simultaneously focused look at the figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Due to this work's method, further study is needed on both a wide-angle approach and at the microscopic exegetical level. For example, each of the figurative "son(s) of" phrases covered here deserves further exploration and consideration of how the interpretations outlined in chapter 5 connect to the author's overall message and theology in their writings. Additionally, because this study focused on the "son(s) of" phrases as they occurred in constructions using ὕιός plus the genitive, it did not explore how the interpretive framework developed in chapter 4 might apply to other uses of the father-son relationship in the NT.8


8E.g., exploring what this framework, or a similar one, might yield in a discussion of Paul's concept of adoption.
Conclusion

While at first glance, these "son(s) of" phrases in the NT seem to be simply a style of speaking that is different than that of the modern reader, instead they represent a significant difference of thought. These "son(s) of" phrases are constructed and used figuratively because of the prominence of the father-son relationship in the ancient world and all that comes to the author's mind when it is considered. As a result, this relationship and its nature, dynamics, and implications must serve as the primary background when interpreting these phrases. Without such an understanding, the reader and scholar alike will miss out on what the NT authors are seeking to communicate through their use. This work has attempted to steer readers around that pitfall by presenting a framework which will yield much greater understanding of what the NT authors mean when they use "son(s) of" phrases figuratively.
APPENDIX

LIST OF EVERY OCCURRENCE OF ΥΙΟΣ PLUS THE GENITIVE IN THE NT

Table A1. All uses of υιοζ plus the genitive in the NT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt 1:1</td>
<td>υιοῦ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 1:1</td>
<td>υιοῦ Αβραάμ</td>
<td>son of Abraham</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 1:20</td>
<td>υιὸς Δαυίδ</td>
<td>son of David</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 2:15</td>
<td>τὸν υἱόν μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 3:17</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς μου ὁ ἁγαπητός</td>
<td>my beloved son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 4:3</td>
<td>υιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 4:6</td>
<td>υιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 5:9</td>
<td>υιὸι θεοῦ</td>
<td>sons of God</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 5:45</td>
<td>υιοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς</td>
<td>sons of your Father in heaven</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 7:9</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:12</td>
<td>οἱ υιοὶ τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>sons of the kingdom</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:20</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:29</td>
<td>υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:6</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:15</td>
<td>οἱ υιοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος</td>
<td>sons of the bridegroom</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:27</td>
<td>υιὸς Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 10:23</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 11:19</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 12:8</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 12:23</td>
<td>ὁ υιὸς Δαυίδ</td>
<td>the Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 12:27</td>
<td>οἱ υιοὶ ὑμῶν</td>
<td>your sons</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 12:32</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 12:40</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 13:37</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 13:38</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>the sons of the kingdom</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 13:38</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ</td>
<td>the sons of the evil one</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 13:41</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 13:55</td>
<td>ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός</td>
<td>the son of the carpenter</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 14:33</td>
<td>θεοῦ υἱός</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 15:22</td>
<td>υἱὸς Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 16:13</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 16:16</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος</td>
<td>Son of the Living God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 16:27</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 16:28</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 17:5</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἅγαπητός</td>
<td>my beloved Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 17:9</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 17:12</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 17:15</td>
<td>μου τὸν υἱόν</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 17:22</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 17:25</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῶν</td>
<td>their sons</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 19:28</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:18</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:20</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν Ζεβεδαίου</td>
<td>the sons of Zebedee</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:20</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς</td>
<td>her sons</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:21</td>
<td>οἱ δύο υἱοὶ μου</td>
<td>my two sons</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:28</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:30</td>
<td>υἱὸς Δανίηδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 20:31</td>
<td>υἱὸς Δανίηδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 21:5</td>
<td>υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου</td>
<td>son of a donkey</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 21:9</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 21:15</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 21:37</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 21:37</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν µου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 22:2</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 22:42</td>
<td>τίνος υἱός</td>
<td>Whose son?</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 22:45</td>
<td>υἱός αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 23:15</td>
<td>υἱὸν γεέννης</td>
<td>son of hell</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 23:31</td>
<td>υἱοί τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας</td>
<td>sons of those who murdered the prophets</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 23:35</td>
<td>υἱὸς Βαραχίου</td>
<td>son of Barachiah</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 24:27</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 24:30</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 24:37</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 24:39</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 24:44</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 25:31</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 26:2</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 26:24</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 26:37</td>
<td>υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου</td>
<td>sons of Zebedee</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 26:45</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 26:63</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 26:64</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 27:9</td>
<td>υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 27:40</td>
<td>υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 27:43</td>
<td>θεοῦ υἱός</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 27:54</td>
<td>θεοῦ υἱός</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 27:56</td>
<td>τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου</td>
<td>the sons of Zebedee</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1:1</td>
<td>υἱὸθεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1:11</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός</td>
<td>my beloved Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 2:10</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 2:19</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος</td>
<td>sons of the bridegroom</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 2:28</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 3:11</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 3:17</td>
<td>υἱοὶ βροντῆς</td>
<td>sons of thunder</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 3:28</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>the sons of men</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:7</td>
<td>υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ύψίστου</td>
<td>Son of the Most High God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 6:3</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας</td>
<td>the son of Mary</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 8:31</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 8:38</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 9:7</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός</td>
<td>my beloved Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 9:9</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 9:12</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 9:17</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 9:31</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:33</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:35</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου</td>
<td>the sons of Zebedee</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:45</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:46</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου</td>
<td>the son of Timaeus</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:47</td>
<td>υἱὲ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 10:48</td>
<td>υἱὲ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:6</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:35</td>
<td>υἱὸς Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:37</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ υἱὸς</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 13:26</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:21</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:21</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:41</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:61</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ</td>
<td>Son of the Blessed</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:62</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:39</td>
<td>υἱὸς θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 1:16</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν Ἰσραὴλ</td>
<td>the Sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 1:32</td>
<td>υἱὸς υψίστου</td>
<td>Son of the Most High</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 1:35</td>
<td>υἱὸς θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 2:7</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 3:2</td>
<td>τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν</td>
<td>son of Zechariah</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 3:22</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός</td>
<td>my beloved Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:3</td>
<td>υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:9</td>
<td>υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:22</td>
<td>υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ</td>
<td>son of Joseph</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:41</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 5:10</td>
<td>υἱοὶς Ζεβεδαίου</td>
<td>sons of Zebedee</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 5:24</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 5:34</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφαῖον</td>
<td>sons of the bridegroom</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 6:5</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 6:22</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 6:35</td>
<td>υἱοὶ υψίστου</td>
<td>sons of the Most High</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:34</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:28</td>
<td>υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου</td>
<td>Son of the Most High</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:22</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:26</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:35</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς μου</td>
<td>my Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:38</td>
<td>τὸν υἱόν μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:41</td>
<td>τὸν υἱόν σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:44</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:58</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 10:6</td>
<td>υἱός εἰρήνης</td>
<td>son of peace</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 11:19</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν</td>
<td>your sons</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 11:30</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:8</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:10</td>
<td>τὸν υἱόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:40</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 15:19</td>
<td>υἱὸς σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 15:21</td>
<td>υἱὸς σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 15:24</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 15:25</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 15:30</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 16:8</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου</td>
<td>sons of this age</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 16:8</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός</td>
<td>sons of light</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:22</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:24</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:26</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:30</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 18:8</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 18:31</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 18:38</td>
<td>υἱὲ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 18:39</td>
<td>υἱὲ Δαυίδ</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 19:9</td>
<td>υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ</td>
<td>son of Abraham</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 19:10</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:13</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν μου τὸν ἁγαπητὸν</td>
<td>my beloved son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:34</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου</td>
<td>sons of this age</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:36</td>
<td>υἱοὶ θεοῦ</td>
<td>sons of God</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:36</td>
<td>τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ</td>
<td>sons of the resurrection</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:41</td>
<td>Δαυὶδ υἱὸν</td>
<td>Son of David</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:44</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ υἱός</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 21:27</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 21:36</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:22</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:48</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:69</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:70</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεου</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 24:7</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:34</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεου</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:42</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου</td>
<td>the son of John</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:45</td>
<td>υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ</td>
<td>son of Joseph</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:49</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεου</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 1:51</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 3:13</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 3:14</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 3:18</td>
<td>τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the only Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:5</td>
<td>υἱῷ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:12</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his sons</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:46</td>
<td>οὗ ὁ υἱὸς</td>
<td>whose son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:47</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱὸν</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:50</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:53</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 5:25</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 5:27</td>
<td>υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 6:27</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John 6:42</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ</td>
<td>the son of Joseph</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 6:53</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 6:62</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 8:28</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 9:19</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς ὑμῶν</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 9:20</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν</td>
<td>our son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 9:35</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 10:36</td>
<td>υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 11:4</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 11:27</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 12:23</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 12:34</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 12:36</td>
<td>υἱοὶ φωτὸς</td>
<td>sons of light</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 13:31</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 17:1</td>
<td>σου τὸν υἱὸν</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 17:12</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας</td>
<td>the son of destruction</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 19:7</td>
<td>υἱὸν θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 19:26</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς σου</td>
<td>your son</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 20:31</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:17</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ υμῶν</td>
<td>your sons</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 3:25</td>
<td>οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης</td>
<td>sons of the prophets and the covenant</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:36</td>
<td>υἱὸς παρακλήσεως</td>
<td>son of encouragement</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 5:21</td>
<td>τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:16</td>
<td>τῶν υἱῶν Ἑμωρ</td>
<td>the sons of Hamor</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:23</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:37</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:56</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἁνθρώπου</td>
<td>the Son of Man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 9:15</td>
<td>υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 9:20</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 10:36</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:10</td>
<td>υἱὲ διαβόλου</td>
<td>son of the devil</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:21</td>
<td>υἱὸν Κίς</td>
<td>son of Kish</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:26</td>
<td>υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ</td>
<td>sons of the family of Abraham</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:33</td>
<td>υῖός μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 16:1</td>
<td>υἱὸς γυναικὸς Ἰουδαίας</td>
<td>son of a Jewish woman</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 19:14</td>
<td>Σκευᾶ ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ</td>
<td>seven sons of Sceva</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 23:6</td>
<td>υἱὸς Φαρισαίων</td>
<td>son of Pharisees</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 23:16</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς Παύλου</td>
<td>son of Paul's sister</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 1:3</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 1:4</td>
<td>υἱὸς θεοῦ</td>
<td>Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 1:9</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 5:10</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 8:3</td>
<td>τὸν ἐαυτοῦ υίον</td>
<td>his own Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 8:14</td>
<td>υἱοὶ θεοῦ</td>
<td>sons of God</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 8:19</td>
<td>τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>sons of God</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 8:29</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 8:32</td>
<td>τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ</td>
<td>his own Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 9:26</td>
<td>υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος</td>
<td>sons of the Living God</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 9:27</td>
<td>τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 1:9</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor 1:19</td>
<td>ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor 3:7</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor 3:13</td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 1:16</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 2:20</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 3:7</td>
<td>υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ</td>
<td>sons of Abraham</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 3:26</td>
<td>υἱοὶ θεοῦ</td>
<td>sons of God</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 4:4</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 4:6</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 4:30</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς</td>
<td>her son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 4:30</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης</td>
<td>the son of the slave</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 4:30</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας</td>
<td>the son of the free</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph 2:2</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας</td>
<td>the sons of disobedience</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph 3:5</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>the sons of men</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph 4:13</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph 5:6</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας</td>
<td>the sons of disobedience</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col 1:13</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἡγάπης αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his beloved Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col 3:6</td>
<td>τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας</td>
<td>the sons of disobedience</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess 1:10</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess 5:5</td>
<td>υἱοὶ φωτός</td>
<td>sons of light</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess 5:5</td>
<td>υἱοὶ ἡμέρας</td>
<td>sons of day</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Thess 2:3</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας</td>
<td>the son of destruction</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 1:5</td>
<td>υἱός μου</td>
<td>my Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 2:6</td>
<td>υἱός ἀνθρώπου</td>
<td>son of man</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 4:14</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 5:5</td>
<td>υἱός μου</td>
<td>my Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 6:6</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 7:3</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 7:5</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν Λεων</td>
<td>the sons of Levi</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 10:29</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 11:21</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν Ἰωσήφ</td>
<td>the sons of Joseph</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 11:22</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 11:24</td>
<td>υἱὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Φαραώ</td>
<td>son of Pharaoh's daughter</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb 12:5</td>
<td>υἱός μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jas 2:21</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his son</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet 5:13</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός μου</td>
<td>my son</td>
<td>Figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet 1:17</td>
<td>ὁ υἱός μου</td>
<td>my Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 1:3</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 1:7</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 3:8</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 3:23</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 4:9</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 4:10</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 4:15</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:5</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:9</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:10</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεου</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:10</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:11</td>
<td>τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>his Son</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:12</td>
<td>τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:13</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεου</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:20</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John 5:20</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεου</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 John 1:3</td>
<td>τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς</td>
<td>the Son of the Father</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 1:13</td>
<td>υἱὸν ἄνθρωπου</td>
<td>son of man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 2:14</td>
<td>τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>the sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 2:18</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>the Son of God</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 7:4</td>
<td>υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 14:14</td>
<td>υἱὸν ἄνθρωπου</td>
<td>son of man</td>
<td>Messianic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev 21:12</td>
<td>υἱὸν Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>sons of Israel</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

THE FIGURATIVE USE OF "SON(S) OF" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Daniel Ferris Born, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016
Chair: Dr. William F. Cook

The figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases in the NT represents the author employing the father-son relationship, and what this relationship represents in the ancient world, as a tool to illustrate and explain various concepts and ideas in NT thought. As a result, the father-son relationship in the ancient world must be employed in the interpretation of these figurative "son(s) of" phrases. Failing to understand the importance of genealogical identification, kinship, and the social implications of the father-son relationship in the ancient world and bring these concepts to bear in interpretation, will result in a failure to understand what the NT authors seek to communicate by using "son(s) of" phrases.

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to this topic and a history of how linguists and commentators have approached these phrases in the past. There are very few scholars who have sought to employ the father-son relationship in their interpretation of these phrases and their figurative use.

Chapters 2 and 3 survey the use of these phrases inside and outside the NT. Chapter 2 includes the use of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible, "son(s) of" phrases in the LXX, as well as the use of υἱός plus the genitive in Classical Greek, the OT and NT apocrypha and
pseudepigrapha, other early Jewish and Christian writings, coins and inscriptions, and the papyri and ostraca. Chapter 3 surveys the use of υἱός in the NT.

Chapter 4 explores the father-son relationship in the social context of the NT in order to distill the major features of the father-son relationship into an interpretive framework which can be utilized in understanding what the NT authors seek to communicate in their figurative use of "son(s) of" phrases. Chapter 5 employs this framework in the interpretation of the figurative "son(s) of" phrases in the NT. Chapter 6 concludes the work, discusses its implications, and recognizes the need for further study in certain areas.
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