

Bringing Many Sons to Glory: The Theological Intersection of Sonship and Resurrection in Redemption and Christology—Part 3

Andrew T. Minnick¹

The first two parts of this journal article found in Paul’s writings that Christ’s resurrection was a literal begetting into ontological Adamic sonship in fulfilment of the OT messianic expectation. This reclamation of Adam’s filial status and the material part of its nature was prototypical of the restoration of the material part of our filial nature by conformity to the body of Christ by resurrection. Paul encapsulates this prototypical relationship in the literal meaning (“first to be born”) of the *πρωτότοκος* title (Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18). Although Paul dedicates no single passage to the expounding of this ontological-sonship-by-resurrection Christology (Rom 8 is the closest that he comes), it is evidently the Christological framework within which his mind operated when discussing related matters of Christology. And Paul formulated his anthropology within a framework of a two-stage, new-creation experience of sonship—regeneration pertaining to the inner man presently, and resurrection pertaining to the body in the future. In other words, it has become evident that Paul had a full-orbed theological system of the intersection of sonship and resurrection, both for us and prototypically for Christ, even though he never devoted a passage of Scripture to systematically laying out that theology.

The second part of this article called for an improved methodology in the study of the theological intersection of sonship and resurrection. Employing a biblical-theological strategy, it traces this intersection from the OT through the NT. In tandem with the progressive revelation of Scripture, it then progressively synthesizes a Scripture-wide systematic theology of that intersection. In employing this methodology, we have discovered that there is actually a necessary middle step between the biblical theology—examining the explicit teachings of each human author—and the systematic theology—synthesizing those explicit teachings into a system that attempts to map the thinking of the divine Author. This middle step could be called the “small-a author systematic theology”: in the absence of a passage dedicated to explicit teaching on a theological topic, we attempt to synthesize the human author’s scattered teachings on that topic and map his system of theology that underlies what he did write. To this point this study has synthesized Paul’s “small-a author systematic theology” of the intersection of sonship and resurrection. The final step of our methodology (in this third part of the article) is to do the same with the other NT authors, (1) asking if anything they write calls into

¹ Andrew Minnick is the Director of Academics and Enrollment at BJU Seminary and adjunct faculty for BJU School of Religion. This article (including [part 1 in JBTW 1/2](#) and [part 2 in JBTW 2/1](#)) summarizes his dissertation: “Bringing Many Sons to Glory: A Biblical-Theological Investigation of the Intersection of Sonship and Resurrection and Its Implications for Filial Christology, Including the Christological Significance of the *Πρωτότοκος* Title” (PhD diss., BJU Seminary, 2020). Limited space precludes most of the material in the dissertation, principally (1) additional exegesis to further substantiate the positions/conclusions set forth, and (2) interaction with and refutation of alternative positions. Both the curious and the skeptical reader are invited to read the dissertation in full. Additionally, this third part of the article assumes prior reading of [part 1](#) and [part 2](#) from the previous issues of *JBTW*.

question our understanding/synthesis of Paul’s theological system and (2) searching for their contributions to our progressive understanding/synthesis of the divine Author’s theological system of the intersection of sonship and resurrection.

John’s Writings

Far from having disparate models of sonship, Paul and John are actually tracing the single sonship motif from the OT. Consequently, their filial framework is the same two-stage, new-creation experience of sonship—regeneration of the inner man now, and resurrection of the body in the future. And they develop the same Adamic-sonship-by-resurrection Christology.

The Christology of Revelation 1:5

John opens the revelation of the eschaton (1:1) in 1:5 with a statement almost identical to Colossians 1:18, ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν (“firstborn of [from] the dead ones”), and last-Adam Christology permeates this phrase and its surrounding context. First, the context presents Jesus as the resurrected Christ (1:7, 18). Second, this resurrected Christ consequently reclaims Adamic rule in fulfilment of the OT messianic expectation (“throne,” 1:4; “ruler,” 1:5; “dominion,” v. 6; and v. 7 quoting Dn 7:13–14 and the everlasting rule given to the messianic Son of Man; cf. “son of man,” Rv 1:13).²

Third, this resurrected messianic ruler is the Son of God. Of the three titles in Revelation 1:5—“witness,” “firstborn,” and “ruler”—καί joins only the last two, indicating a close connection: it is the πρωτότοκος who is the ruler. The phrase “the firstborn of the dead” (v. 5) is basically identical to Colossians 1:18 and so indicates here also that the filial status and Adamic reign came by resurrection.³ Per the Granville Sharp rule, “Father” (v. 6) is superfluous and so is integral to John’s message.⁴ The Daniel 7:13 allusion (Rv 1:7) was Christ’s response at his trial to the command, “Tell us whether You are the Christ [Messiah], the Son of God” (Mt 26:63–64). In short, John is using πρωτότοκος in the same technical sense as Paul—encapsulating the Christology of begetting into Adamic sonship by resurrection and subsequent dominion, all as the realization of the OT messianic expectation.

Fourth, this resurrection, rule, and sonship of Christ are prototypical. Both the πρωτο- prefix of πρωτότοκος and the substantive genitive plural “of the dead ones” (cf. Acts 13:30; Rom 1:4; 8:11; 1 Cor 15:12, 20; Col 1:18) promise additional future begettings by resurrection. Beyond being made alive himself, the πρωτότοκος has “the keys” to release others from “death and Hades” (v. 18; cf.

² OT verse numbering in this article will follow that of the English Bible rather than that of the LXX. Unless otherwise noted, all English Scripture is taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. www.Lockman.org

³ The only element in Colossians 1:18 missing here is the preposition ἐκ, the ablative sense of which is still captured here by the genitive of separation.

⁴ See Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 271.

20:13; Jn 5:21–29), and the *πρωτότοκος* “has made us to be a kingdom” (v. 6), which 5:10 makes clear is our earthly rule (cf. 2:26–27; 3:21; 20:4–6; 22:5).

The OT Background of Revelation 1:5—Psalm 2, Psalm 89, and Isaiah 55

This Christology in Revelation 1:5 and its context is drawn from Psalm 89 because *ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός* (“the faithful witness”) is taken from Psalm 89:37 in the LXX, and both *πρωτότοκος* and “ruler of the kings of the earth” are found in Psalm 89:27. Evald Lövestam sees “the faithful witness” as also being the realization of the expectation of a “witness” (also note “leader and commander”) in Isaiah 55:4. Noting that both Psalm 89:27 and Isaiah 55:4 are promises made to David, he concludes, “The fulfillment of the promise to David is connected to the resurrection of Christ.”⁵ Accordingly, the role of the witness in Isaiah 55:4 is part of the “faithful mercies” of the Davidic Covenant (v. 3) that Paul considered in Acts 13 to include resurrection life (see the discussion of Acts 13 in the first part of this article). Lövestam goes on to observe that “firstborn” (Rv 1:5) corresponds with the sonship of Psalm 2:7, and “ruler of the kings of the earth” (Rv 1:5) is the realization of Psalm 2:8, another psalm that is a meditation on the Davidic Covenant.⁶ It is evident that Revelation 1:5 is the realization of the OT messianic expectation, concentrated in the Davidic royal line and covenant in Psalm 2, Psalm 89, and Isaiah 55, all of which look back to 2 Samuel 7.⁷

Previous tracing of the trajectories of these Christological motifs in Revelation 1 found that they travel back through the Davidic Covenant to their origin in Adam’s creation and fall. In the first place, because Psalm 89 is a meditation on the Davidic Covenant, the sonship of verse 26 and of *πρωτότοκος* in verse 27 is the sonship of 2 Samuel 7:14, which is the expected Son from David’s line who would reclaim Adam’s filial status. Further, because *πρωτότοκος* (בְּכוֹר) is the object of *τίθημι* (תָּתַן), verse 27 is speaking of the Father’s act to impart that filial status.⁸ And both Paul and John look back on the *πρωτότοκος* title and see in it a prediction of the Messiah’s begetting into Adamic sonship by resurrection. In the second place, Psalm 89 also speaks of the *πρωτότοκος* exercising dominion, most evidently in the parallelism in verse 27. Again, of the three titles in Revelation 1:5, *καί* joins only the second (*πρωτότοκος*) and third (“ruler of the kings of the earth”), mimicking the Hebrew parallelism in Psalm 89:27 that establishes the close connection between the lines. The primary

⁵ *Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13, 32–37. With an Appendix: “Son of God” in the Synoptic Gospels*, trans. Michael J. Petry, Coniectanea Neotestamentica (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1961), 46–47.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 48. He further observes that in D^{sy^{hmg}}, Acts 13:33 extends the quotation of Psalm 2:7 to also include verse 8. G. K. Beale points out that in Revelation “kings of the earth” designates not God’s people but rather the enemies of God, both human and super-human, whom Christ defeats (6:15; 17:2; 18:3, 9; 19:19; cf. 16:14), though some do turn to Christ (21:24). *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 336. Accordingly, Psalm 2:9–12 reveals that those ruled in verse 8 are enemies of God’s Son.

⁷ Beale concludes that because of the resurrection, “John views Jesus as the ideal Davidic king on an escalated eschatological level, whose death and resurrection have resulted in his eternal kingship and in the kingship of his ‘beloved’ children (cf. 1:5b), which is developed in 1:6” (336).

⁸ The LXX also contains the same emphatic *ἐγώ* (here *καὶ ἐγώ* by crasis; אֲנִי in the Hebrew) as found in Psalm 2:7, which is the Father emphasizing his role in the second half of the verse (“I myself was the one who begot you”) in producing the filial status in the first half of the verse (“You are My Son”).

function of the *πρωτότοκος* is therefore dominion, fulfilling the Davidic Covenant's expectation of a forever-reigning Adamic Son.⁹ It is evident that the Davidic dynasty's attempt to reclaim Adam as captured in Psalm 89 is the background of Paul and John's use of the *πρωτότοκος* title.¹⁰ The Christology of Adamic sonship and dominion that they capture in the title (Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Rv 1:5) is the fulfillment of the messianic expectation of sonship and dominion captured in the title by Ethan in Psalm 89:27 hundreds of years earlier.

The Christology of Revelation 3:14

Each of the designations for Christ in the introductions to the letters to the seven churches (Rv 2–3) expands on something Christ says or on one of his depictions in Revelation 1. And because *ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς* (“the faithful witness”) from 1:5 is repeated in 3:14 (identically, except for the addition of *καὶ ἀληθινός* [“and true”] in 3:14), Beale concludes that “*ἡ ἀρχή* [‘the Beginning’] of the creation of God” (3:14) is expanding the meaning of “*πρωτότοκος* of the dead, and *ὁ ἄρχων* [‘the ruler’] of the kings of the earth” (1:5).¹¹

Beale's observation is corroborated by Paul's use of *ἀρχή* and *πρωτότοκος* synonymously (in apposition) in Colossians 1:18 to speak of Christ's role as *πρωτότοκος* of the new creation by resurrection (v. 15; see the discussion of Col 1 in the second part of this article). For John as for Paul, *ἀρχή* communicates both temporal primacy (evident in the parallel with *πρῶτος* in Rv 22:13) and dominion (evident in the cognate relationship of *ἀρχή* in 3:14 to *ἀρχῶν* in 1:5).¹² Evidently, *ἀρχή* in 3:14 is expanding the Adamic themes of *πρωτότοκος* (both temporal primacy and dominion, as drawn from Ps 89:27) and *ἀρχῶν* (dominion) from 1:5. Beale summarizes the expansion of 1:5 in 3:14: “Christ as ‘firstborn from the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth’ in 1:5 is interpreted in 3:14 as the sovereign inaugurator of the new creation.”¹³

The OT Background of Revelation 3:14—Exodus 4:22, Isaiah 43, and Isaiah 65

John's expansion of 1:5 in 3:14 deepens our understanding of the OT background of the *πρωτότοκος* title because in 3:14 he draws upon additional OT passages (beyond Psalm 89) that anticipated the new creation to come in the *πρωτότοκος*. Specifically, Isaiah 43 and 65 are the OT

⁹ Lövestam comments, “The expression ‘the firstborn’ (בְּכוֹר, LXX: *πρωτότοκος*) in Ps. 89:28 contains the idea of the king's unique position of power from the attribute of being God's son” (13).

¹⁰ See James Scott for a helpful discussion of the connection of Romans 8:29 to Psalm 89:27, centering on the *πρωτότοκος* title, and noting the allusion to Psalm 110 in Romans 8:34. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992), 252–56.

¹¹ *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 336–38. Beale includes a helpful history of the interpretation of Revelation 3:14.

¹² Louw and Nida list *ἄρχων* and *ἀρχή* in the same lexical entry. Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida, eds., “*Ἀρχων, Ἀρχή*,” *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 478.

¹³ *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 339. Regrettably, Beale is aware of only two commentators who see “creation of God” as a reference to the new creation and one who sees it as referring both to the first and the new creations (338n60).

backdrop of the three titles 3:14 applies to Christ—“the Amen,” “the faithful and true Witness,” and “the ἀρχή of the creation of God.”

Regarding the first title, “the Amen,” Beale gives seven lines of evidence that John draws it from Isaiah 65:16, and thus the “creation of God” (Rv 3:14) is the new creation of Isaiah 65:17–25.¹⁴ Note that in verse 9 God’s new-creation plans include filial status (“I will bring forth offspring from Jacob”) as the basis for inheriting the new creation, both for the Messiah (“an heir of My mountains from Judah”) and, through him, for all of God’s people as his servants (“even My chosen ones shall inherit it, and My servants will dwell there”).

The second title, “the faithful and true Witness,” also has a rich OT background, not only in Psalm 89:37 as noted above, but as Beale recognizes also in Isaiah 65:16 and significantly in 43:10–13 and the Isaianic theme of Israel as God’s servants/witnesses (v. 10). They were to witness first to God’s deliverance and forming of the nation in the exodus (vv. 1–3, 12–13, 16–18; cf. 44:6–8), which Isaiah repeatedly calls the ἀρχή (41:4; 43:9, 13; 48:8, 16; 51:9; 63:16, 19), thus establishing God’s existence as the sole deity ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (“from the beginning,” 43:13; 44:8, LXX). But second, the exodus is portrayed as a new creation, and so the original creation (from Gn 1–2) is also therefore called the ἀρχή (Is 40:21; 42:9; 44:8; 45:21; 48:16; cf. “Creator of Israel” in 43:7, 15, 21, who “makes a way through the sea” in v. 16, an allusion to the exodus).¹⁵ Third, the things announced ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (44:8) to which Israel was to witness included future things (44:6–8). The nearer future event was restoration from exile, which was a new exodus (43:4–7, 14–17) and thus a new creation (vv. 18–21; note the parallel language with 65:17).¹⁶ But ultimately Isaiah 65 expects a new exodus and new creation yet to come (v. 17; parallel language with 43:18–19) with the eschatological promise of the gift of the Spirit who brings the water of life (44:3; cf. 43:18–21; Rv 22:1, 17).

Here is the background to John’s (and Paul’s in Col 1:18) application of the third title, the ἀρχή, to Christ in Revelation 3:14—though Israel as the servants/witnesses failed (Rom 2:24), Christ succeeded as Isaiah’s expected capital-S Servant (42:1; 49:3, 5–7; 53:11) and “the Amen, the faithful and true Witness” to himself as the ἀρχή, the one from whose resurrection the ultimate new exodus-new creation flows. In Revelation 3:14, “ἡ ἀρχή of the creation of God” is expanding the filial title “πρωτότοκος of the dead” (1:5) because the expectation of the return from exile also includes filial language (Is 43:6; 44:2), only this time God will bring Israel out of exile *because* the nation was *already* made God’s child in the original exodus (Ex 4:22; Dt 32:18; Is 44:24; 63:16; Hos 11:1). The nation was an attempt (the epitome of which was the Davidic kings) to reclaim the sonship and dominion

¹⁴ Ibid., 340–42. These lines of evidence include the observation that these two are the only passages in Scripture that use “Amen” as a name.

¹⁵ Ibid., 336–37, 342. Seyoon Kim demonstrates that Judaism thought of the exodus and Sinai as being a second creation. *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007), 189, 236, 261.

¹⁶ See Scott Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises*, The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 202–05. Hahn notes portrayal of the return from exile as a new exodus throughout the prophets (Is 11:11–16; 43:16–20; 51:10–11; Jer 16:14–15; Ez 20:34–37; Mi 7:12, 15; Zec 10:8–9). Specifically, he notes the repeated juxtaposition of the new exodus motif with the restoration of David in Jeremiah 23:5–8 and with the restoration to Zion throughout the OT (Is 35:8–10; 51:9–11; 52:8–12; Jer 23:5–8; Ez 20:33–40; 34:23–28).

given to Adam at his creation, and it is in that sense that her original exodus, her new creation and ἀρχή, was her begetting into sonship (Ex 4:22; Dt 32:18; Is 44:24; 63:16; Hos 11:1; cf. Jer 31:7–9), making her God’s πρωτότοκος (Ex 4:22).¹⁷ Exodus 4:11 (in conjunction with Is 43–44 and 65) is yet another layer of the OT background of the πρωτότοκος title applied by John to the last Adam here in Revelation 1:5 (and by Paul in Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18) and expanded in 3:14—the Messiah’s success as the πρωτότοκος and ἀρχή of the ultimate new creation grows not only out of the typological failure of Israel’s Davidic kings to reclaim Adamic sonship and dominion (Ps 89:27) but also out of the collective typological failure of the nation (Ex 4:22) of whom the kings were merely the federal head.

Revelation 21–22

These final chapters of Scripture envision the realization of the new creation of the new heavens and the new earth, centered in the new Jerusalem. In Revelation 21, the presence of God descends (21:3), reminiscent of Eden (Gn 3:8). Death is abolished and the “first things have passed away” (21:4; cf. Is 43:18) as God “makes all things new” (21:5; cf. Is 43:19; 65:17). The water of life without cost is given (21:6; cf. Is 43:18–21; 44:3–4; Col 3:1–4; Rv 22:17), which in these passages is connected to the inauguration of the age of the Spirit flowing from Christ’s resurrection. Also, in Isaiah 55:1–5, the water given without cost is part of the “faithful mercies shown to David,” which includes Christ’s resurrection life (Acts 13:34). Accordingly, the sonship of the Davidic Covenant is given to the overcomer (21:7, quoting 2 Sm 7:14), who on that basis “will inherit these things,” a reference in context to the new Jerusalem (cf. Is 65:9). Revelation 2:26–27 quotes Psalm 2:8–9 (cf. Rv 3:21) to show that the overcomer’s reigning inheritance is sharing in the Messiah’s Davidic filial reign. This reign is Christ’s because of his Davidic/Adamic sonship imparted by resurrection’s begetting (Ps 2:7; cf. Acts 13:33). Thus will be realized God’s purpose to “make all things new” (Rv 21:5, quoting Is 43:18–19) in the new creation.

In Revelation 22, the water of life comes from the throne of God and of the Lamb (22:1), and the invitation to drink is universal (22:17). From this water grows the tree of life (22:2) from which Adam was banned (Gn 3:22–24). The curse is removed (22:3; cf. Gn 3:17–19), fellowship with God is restored (22:3–5a), and God’s people will reign unendingly (22:5b). In short, God’s race of reigning sons will be re-created.

¹⁷ The parallel use in Exodus 4:22 of “firstborn” for Israel and for Pharaoh’s first son indicates a filial meaning of the term when used for Israel. The Midrash on Psalm 2 sees one passage from the Law, one from the Prophets, and one from the Writings as being the “decree of the LORD” in Psalm 2:7. From the law, Exodus 4:22 is cited. William Braude, trans., *The Midrash on Psalms* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 1:40. See also Scott, 189–49; Brendan Byrne, *Sons of God—Seed of Abraham: A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background*, *Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifcae in Res Biblicas* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979), 84; Allen Mawhinney, “Υιοθεσία in the Pauline Epistles: Its Background, Use and Implications” (PhD diss., Baylor University, 1982), 62–65, 138; Trevor Burke, *The Message of Sonship: At Home in God’s Household*, *The Bible Speaks Today: Bible Themes Series*, ed. Alec Motyer, John Stott, and Derek Tidball (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2011), 38–39, 47, 104–05; Beale, 447, footnotes 30–31; Matthew Vellanickal, *The Divine Sonship of Christians in the Johannine Writings*, *Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifcae in Res Biblicas* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1977), 10; and John Schmitt, “Israel as Son of God in Torah,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24 (2004): 73.

1 John 3:1–2

Though an overt or full-orbed theology of sonship is not John’s agenda here, three considerations demonstrate that John was thinking in the same framework of present (v. 1) and future (v. 2) sonship as did Paul. First, the tension of $\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$. . . $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\pi\omega$ (“now . . . not yet,” v. 2) does introduce the same two-stage filial process found in Paul. John taught that present sonship is by birth/regeneration (Jn 1:12–13), and accordingly he is speaking here to those who have been “born” (1 Jn 3:9). But for John, like Paul, the present stage of sonship is a harbinger that guarantees the future stage, for his argument in verses 1–10 is that those now begotten by God should purify themselves in expectation. Although John does not speak of this future stage as filial in so many words, the parallel of the forms of $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$ through both sides of the tension indicates that they are two stages of a single filial framework, and the omission of filial terminology on the future side of the tension is merely ellipsis. In the present ($\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$), we are not only called children, but actually “ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ [children]” (v. 1) and “now $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ children” (v. 2). In the future ($\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\pi\omega$), “ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ [elliptical predicate: ‘children]’” (v. 2). The visible property of this sonship also straddles the tension (present: “see,” v. 1; future: “not appeared as yet what we will be,” v. 2), further indicating two stages of a single framework. There is, however, not only continuity between the two sides of the contrast but also discontinuity between the “now” and the “not yet,” indicating that present sonship is in some sense incomplete, for it is held distinct from a full, consummate form that is yet to come. John’s exhortation in verses 1–10, that those who are begotten of God should purify themselves in expectation, is evidently riding on the same filial argument as Paul’s exhortation of encouragement in Romans 8: the harbinger of current sonship by birth guarantees future, consummate sonship.

Second, John shares Paul’s view that sonship is ontological. Present sonship goes beyond mere declaration (“we would be called,” v. 1) and is what “we are . . . now we are” (vv. 1–2).¹⁸ In the context, John is speaking of those born of God and therefore God’s seed is in them (v. 9).¹⁹ Further, being born of God produces a nature different from the nature of the Devil’s children (v. 10; cf. Jn 8:39–47). Although in the context moral transformation is immediately the filial ontology in view, terminology here confirms what was found in Revelation—that John regards physical ontology by the new creation of resurrection to also be a part of the nature of sons of God.²⁰ Here conformity to Christ (“like him,” v. 2b) caused by “see[ing] Him” “when He appears” suggests the bodily conformity to Christ that is explicit in Philippians 3:21 and 1 Corinthians 15. Further, the dual use of $\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\omega$ (“appear,” or reflecting the passive voice “be revealed,” v. 2) for both Christ’s bodily return and our

¹⁸ See Colin Kruse, *The Letters of John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 115.

¹⁹ Also note in John 1 the same progression from declaration (“the right to become children of God,” v. 12) to its basis of ontological birth (“who were born . . . of God,” v. 13). Further, John parallels begetting by God with begetting by human parents by way of the “not . . . but” construction: “born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God” (v. 13). Our sonship is in John’s mind no mere legal declaration but rather the result of ontological birth.

²⁰ D. Edmond Hiebert connects this passage with Romans 8:29 and Philippians 3:21 to show that John is speaking about conformity to the image of Christ, which includes both moral and physical likeness. *The Epistles of John: An Expository Commentary* (Greenville: BJU Press, 1991), 138.

resurrection highlights the parallel between Christ's body (which "we will see") and our future filial ontology by resurrection.

Third, this dual use of *φανερώω* for Christ's return and our resurrection also suggests the causal relationship between Christ's appearing and our future filial ontology. This causal relationship is cemented in verse 2 by *ἐάν* ("if") plus the subjunctive *φανερωθῆ* (literally translated "he should appear"): future ontological filial status is completely dependent upon Christ's appearing as our prototype.²¹ In conclusion, John was thinking in the same filial framework as Paul: the two-stage process of restoration of sonship—regeneration and resurrection—and its accompanying physical ontology, all by conformity to Christ.

Hebrews

The Book of Hebrews self-identifies as an exhortation (13:22) to be faithful to Christ who finished our faith (2:1; 3:12; 4:1, 11, 14; 6:1, 9–12; 10:22–23; 12:1–3). To that end, the Christology of the book demonstrates that the faith Christ finished is superior to the old Mosaic Covenant because Christ is a superior High Priest to Aaron and his descendants.

Hebrews 7

Hebrews 7:28 is the summary conclusion of the chapter's argument for the superiority of Christ's priesthood: the Mosaic Covenant appointed men, but the oath of God appoints a Son. It has been found that sonship of God qualifies man for dominion, and now Hebrews 7 adds another role for which sonship of God is a qualification—priesthood. It was found that the image of God in a living body enabled Adam to rule and thus man's death is his ultimate failure to rule (Gn 3:17–19), the epitome of which was the Davidic kings' failure to live forever. In the same vein, the Levitical priests also failed because they too were "weak" (Heb 7:28; cf. v. 18) in that they died (vv. 8, 23), and this failure necessitated the coming of a Priest who will live forever (vv. 16, 24–25). God's answer to the mortality of the Levitical priests was to appoint "a Son" who was "made perfect forever" (v. 28).²² Evidently, the author of Hebrews, like Paul, regarded everlasting life to be a corollary of sonship, and it is for that reason that sonship is a prerequisite to successful priesthood (v. 28). Within that framework, the perfection mentioned in v. 28 would appear to be resurrection's imparting to Christ life in an undying body.²³

²¹ Note the emphasis on Christ's material humanity elsewhere in 1 John (1:1–3; 4:2, 13).

²² Just as the failure of Israel's Davidic kings and thus the expectation of Israel's coming ruler could be summed up in the one word *Son*, so the contrast of Hebrews 7:28 shows that "Son" sums up what the Levitical priests lacked for successful priesthood. This comprehensive use of *Son* is evident in 3:5–6, where it sums up Christ's superiority over Moses, a "servant" (cf. Gal 4:1–7). Similarly, in Hebrews 4:14 "Son" encapsulates the greatness of our High Priest, the entire OT priestly messianic expectation, everything that Moses and Israel could not be, but that Christ can be and is. Hahn observes that the intersection of priesthood and sonship runs through Hebrews (4:14; 5:5, 8, 10; 7:3, 28) (302).

²³ The question in v. 11 (why replace Levi?) is answered succinctly in v. 11 (Levi could not bring "perfection" to anyone; cf. v. 19) but then answered more fully in verses 12–28 by the extended contrast between the dying Levitical priests and the ever-living Son-made-Priest who was himself first "made perfect forever" (v. 28). The need is not only for a priest who is perfect but for one who can bring perfection to others. The author of Hebrews repeatedly emphasizes not

The sole OT passage cited here to prove this superiority of Christ over Levi is Psalm 110:4 (quoted in Heb 7:17, 21), which teaches that Christ’s priesthood is perpetual (“forever”) because it is after the order of Melchizedek. Actually, it is with this Christology that Hebrews 7 opens in verses 1–3. There Melchizedek “remains a priest perpetually” (v. 3; cf. “lives on,” v. 8) because he was “made like the Son of God” (ἀφωμοιωμένος is a divine-passive, antecedent-perfect-tense participle of cause), which sonship the rest of the chapter then argues to be the prerequisite for successful priesthood. Specifically, Melchizedek was made like the Son of God in the biblical record: though lineage of other characters is clearly established in order to trace who was of the promise (e.g., Isaac and not Ishmael, Jacob and not Esau), incredibly a prominent character, Melchizedek, appears suddenly and vanishes without any record of lineage or posterity! Although Melchizedek was a man and thus not timeless in actual existence, God breathed out the book of Genesis such that Melchizedek was made timeless in his literary portrayal (no record of lineage or posterity), making him a type of Christ’s unending life.²⁴ Melchizedek’s being *portrayed* to be timeless as a *literary* reality made him “like the Son of God” because it was an imitation of Christ being *made* timeless as an *ontological* reality (v. 16), which Hebrews 7 is presenting as a corollary of sonship.²⁵

These concepts of eternal life as a corollary of sonship and consequently sonship as a prerequisite to priesthood are not novel in Hebrews 7. Working backwards through Hebrews uncovers an argument of which these concepts in Hebrews 7 are merely the culmination.²⁶

what Christ had before the incarnation, but what he did not have before the incarnation and claimed in his humanity (indeed, often *re*-claimed things Adam lost). Tracing the use of γίνομαι (“became”) through Hebrews reveals a string of acquisitions in his humanity (1:4–6; 2:17; 5:5, 9; 6:20; 7:15–16; 7:22). In this vein the “made perfect” terminology speaks of the acquisition of perfection of certain elements of his human nature, specifically life in a glorified body. David Moffitt also sees in “arises” (7:15) a reference to Christ’s resurrection. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, vol. 141 of *Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, ed. M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 201–02. William Milligan comments, “Only one text in that Epistle makes direct mention of the Resurrection of our Lord [here a footnote points to Heb 13:20], and even there it is incidentally introduced; but the whole epistle presupposes His Resurrection. It is the Risen and Ascended Lord who is its great theme throughout, the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, both Priest and King ‘forever.’” *The Resurrection of Our Lord* (London: Macmillan, 1913), 128.

²⁴ Although v. 3 speaks of the absence of both “beginning of days” and “end of life,” it is the latter that the author develops throughout Hebrews 7 as typological of Christ (vv. 3, 8, 16–17, 24–25). See Kevin Oberlin, “Jesus Christ: Our High Priest Forever” (Sermon, BJU Chapel, Greenville, SC, March 11, 2015); Mark Minnick, “Messianic Precedents of Melchizedek’s Priesthood” (Sermon, Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Greenville, SC, February 7, 2016); and Francis Durrwell, *The Resurrection: A Biblical Study*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960), 139. If Melchizedek was timeless in actual existence, then contrary to the message of Hebrews, he did not die, and there are two immortal High Priests.

²⁵ Note the choice of ἀφομοιώ (“to make like”) for Melchizedek (v. 3) in distinction from γίνομαι (“to become”) for Christ (v. 16).

²⁶ G. B. Caird overviews how the argument of Hebrews progressively builds toward Hebrews 7, particularly as pertaining to Christ’s appointment to sonship. He observes that the author of Hebrews often makes assertions, leaves them temporarily hanging while he addresses other topics, and then return to expand or prove them later. For example, 2:17 and 3:1 assert that Christ is High Priest, which is expounded much later (4:14–16; 5:1–10; 7:1–28). “Son by Appointment,” *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, 1, ed. William C. Weinrich (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984), 73–81.

Hebrews 5:1–10

Hebrews 7's assertion of Christ's appointment to Melchizedekian priesthood continues the discussion of 5:1–10.²⁷ The thesis of 5:1–5a is that Christ's priesthood was by God's, not Christ's, appointment.²⁸ Verse 5a gives two potential accusations of Christ acting by his own appointment—Christ's glorifying himself and Christ's becoming High Priest (by implication, by his own initiative). And verses 5b–6 individually answer each accusation with an OT text showing that it was God, not Christ, who did that specific action. Because Psalm 110:4 directly proves that it was God, not Christ, appointing Christ to be High Priest, the begetting in Psalm 2:7 was God, not Christ, glorifying Christ by resurrection.

Several considerations confirm this observation. First, in Acts 13:33 Paul says that the begetting of Psalm 2:7 was fulfilled in Christ's resurrection, and previous study of the term “glory” (Heb 5:5) found it often speaks of resurrection's transformation of the material part of the ontological image of God. But second, the Christology of this observation is the basis on which the argument of Hebrews 7 is built: sonship of which everlasting resurrection life is a corollary is the qualification of successful priesthood (v. 28). And here in 5:5, the purpose infinitive *γενηθῆναι* (“to become”) separates the glorification from becoming priest as two distinct events, the first qualifying Christ for the second.²⁹

In summary, in 5:1–10 the author is supporting the argument of Hebrews 1–7 by teaching from Psalm 2:7 that resurrection (glorification, Heb 5:5a) begot Christ into sonship (v. 5b) and corollary eternal life, thereby qualifying him for eternal priesthood.³⁰ This understanding of Psalm 2:7 and this Christology is assumed in Hebrews 5 and 7 because it was established in Hebrews 1–2.

²⁷ Hebrews 5:12–6:20 is an applicational parenthesis in the argument of the book, challenging the readers about their dullness of hearing that precludes explanation of deeper truths about Melchizedek (5:11–12).

²⁸ The reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτὸν* (“Himself,” v. 5a) makes the two potential actors—the Father and Christ—to be the two major options juxtaposed in this passage.

²⁹ This is contra Beale (318–19) and Lövestam (34), who hold that Psalm 2:7 and Psalm 110:4 are quoted of the same event (i.e., Christ was appointed as High Priest at his resurrection). However, “passed through the heavens” (4:14) and “exalted above the heavens” (7:26) together with the description of Christ's priestly service in the heavenly temple in chapter 8 (cf. 1:3) indicate that although the glorification of resurrection qualified Christ for priesthood, he was not installed in the priestly office until his ascension. For many additional Scriptural confirmations of this point, see Andrew Minnick, 291n57. Speaking of 5:4–6, Caird (75, cf. 73–81) oversteps and makes priesthood a necessary corollary of sonship, as does James Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), 64. *Γενηθῆναι*, however, is a purpose infinitive (i.e., sonship is a prerequisite to priesthood), not a result infinitive (i.e., priesthood is a corollary of sonship). Although they overstate the teaching of the passage, Caird and Moffatt's position does support the position being advocated here.

³⁰ What moved Christ from a state of suffering and death (vv. 7–8) to become the “source of *eternal* salvation” (v. 9b, emphasis added) as Melchizedekian Priest (v. 10) is the divine passive aorist participle, “having been made perfect” (v. 9a), for it gives the means of the main verb “He became” (v. 9b). On pages 194–208, Moffatt persuasively corroborates the position being advocated here that the *perfect* terminology when applied to Christ in Hebrews is “a life that endures,” which is “the distinguishing feature that qualifies him for that priestly office” and thus was obtained at the resurrection *before* becoming priest (194–97).

Hebrews 1–2

Tracing the sonship of Christ through Hebrews uncovers the role of Hebrews 1–2 in the argument of the book: these chapters argue that in his humanity Christ became superior to the angels because by resurrection the Father begot him as a Son, and he therefore not only has eternal life and dominion for himself but also can give it to his followers.³¹

Obtaining Sonship (Hebrews 1:1–6)

Hebrews 1:2 gives the summary thesis of Hebrews 1–2: in his humanity, Christ is better than the angels (1) because he is a Son and (2) because the Son inherits rule over creation.³² In 1:3b–4, the author locates chronologically his obtaining the name *Son* between his making purification for our sins (the cross) and his exaltation to the Father’s right hand (the ascension).³³ Evidently the author of Hebrews concurs with Paul and John that the name *Son* was imparted at least in some sense by resurrection. Verse 5 then quotes Psalm 2:7 and 2 Samuel 7:14 to demonstrate that the name obtained by resurrection was “Son.” The author of Hebrews recognizes in these passages the same thing as Paul and John—OT anticipation of one from David’s line who as the pinnacle of Israel would succeed in Israel’s role of restoring Adamic sonship and rule in a new creation.

Since Hebrews 1 contains all these elements of the Adamic-sonship-by-resurrection Christology discovered elsewhere in Scripture, it is unsurprising that verse 6 goes on to use the title *πρωτότοκος* to encapsulate that Christology, just as did Paul and John.³⁴ “When He again brings the firstborn into the world” refers to the resurrection as the event of his becoming *πρωτότοκος*.³⁵

³¹ Because the term *priest* does not occur until 2:17, the argument for Christ’s superiority over angels in Hebrews 1–2 seems like an unrelated prelude to the argument in 3:1–10:18 for the superiority of Christ’s priesthood over that of Levi. Explanation of the relevance of the first two chapters to a Hebrew audience often goes little beyond minor observations, such as angels being involved in the giving of the Mosaic law (2:2).

³² Although it is typical to see verses 1–3a as speaking of the pre-incarnate Christ, for an extensive argument that these verses are speaking of Christ’s incarnate state, see Andrew Minnick, 295n60. Beale observes, “This is classic Adamic language in verses 1–4” (317–18), and Caird concurs (74).

³³ The aorist tense locates the participle *γενόμενος* (“having become,” v. 4) antecedent to “He sat down.” This temporal sequence is corroborated by the sequence in the subsequent argument of Hebrews noted above: sonship came by resurrection (5:5), but installation as Priest came at the ascension to sit at the Father’s right hand (8:1; cf. 4:14; 7:26; 9:24).

³⁴ Lövestam writes, “It is impossible to resist the conclusion that the proclamation of Jesus as God’s Son with quotations from Ps. 2:7 and 2 Sam. 7:14, and the conception *πρωτότοκος*, stand in an immediate exegetical connection with one another” (14). He also points out that *πρωτότοκος* is not followed by a determining phrase such as “from the dead” or “of all creation” as it is elsewhere (Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Rv 1:5) (14). Instead, *πρωτότοκος* is to be understood here in light of the quotations of sonship in verse 5. Further, the sonship of verse 5 is what sets him above the angels (v. 4), and the *πρωτότοκος* status of verse 6a is the ground of the command of their worship (v. 6b). See Gareth Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 104.

³⁵ Some argue that this phrase refers to the eschatological Parousia because verse 6 quotes Psalm 97:7, the context of which allegedly speaks of Yahweh’s eschatological judgment of the world. This objection, however, is actually a false dichotomy. The OT’s expectation of a Messiah who would reclaim Adam was an eschatological expectation, but it has broken into the present age in the inaugural event of the resurrection of Christ. For additional arguments that this phrase refers to the resurrection, see Andrew Minnick, 298–301.

Implications of Sonship (Hebrews 1:7–14)

Starting in v. 7, the author quotes a catena of OT passages that unfold two implications of the sonship imparted in vv. 3–6: dominion and immortality. They tell of a Messiah who will rule unendingly. It was this unending Adamic rule that the Davidic dynasty attempted and yet failed to produce in the OT era. But in Christ it has come, inaugurated at his resurrection and culminating at his Parousia.

That some of the titles and qualities in these OT quotations are those of deity in no way contravenes recognition of Adamic sonship in verses 3–6. First Corinthians 15:21, Colossians 1:15, and Romans 1:3–4 were found to set Christ’s Adamic sonship squarely in the realm of his human nature (including his material part) and ancestry as received in the incarnation and as anticipated in the OT. But that OT filial messianic expectation included both humanity and deity, all in one Son, (see the discussion of Lk 1 and Is 9 below). In short, the interrelationship of the pre-incarnate sonship and Adamic sonship of Christ evident in Hebrews 1 is another aspect of the mystery of the hypostatic union.³⁶

The argument of Hebrews 1–2, however, focuses primarily on Christ in his humanity, specifically on his reclamation of Adamic sonship and dominion. In other words, these chapters do not emphasize that Christ is superior to the angels in that he rules over them as deity, for that role never ceased during the incarnation. Rather, Hebrews 2 will argue that Christ is superior to them in that in his humanity he gets to do something (Adamic rule over the new creation) that they never will do (2:5) because he has a human relationship to the Father (“Son”) that they never will have (1:4–6). His superiority to the angels did not come by reclamation of something that he had before the incarnation but was willing to forego for a time in the incarnation. Rather, superiority to the angels consists in his coming to possess in the incarnation something that he never possessed before, something human that Adam lost. Accordingly, a heavy emphasis in Hebrews 2 is the necessity of the incarnation (e.g., v. 14).³⁷

Sonship Through Incarnation (Hebrews 2)

After one of the author’s typical parenthetical admonitions (2:1–4), 2:5 carries on the theme of dominion over the world about which the author has been speaking in Hebrews 1. The need for incarnation is drawn from Psalm 8:4–6 (Heb 2:6–8a), which speaks of dominion over the creation being given to Adam, not to angels (cf. v. 5). However, throughout Hebrews 2 as in Genesis 3, death

³⁶ The two senses of Christ’s sonship held in tension in the mystery of the hypostatic union coalesce in *κληρονομέω* (“inherited,” v. 4), which implies previous sonship as the basis for receiving the name “Son”: the pre-incarnate Son of God inherits the name “Son” in the Adamic sense. D. A. Carson observes both senses of Christ’s sonship in Hebrews 1. *Jesus the Son of God: A Christological Title Often Overlooked, Sometimes Misunderstood, and Currently Disputed* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2012), 61–62.

³⁷ Amy Peeler notes that the exaltation of Hebrews 1 was gained by Christ’s being willing to take on humanity in Hebrews 2. *You Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Library of New Testament Studies (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 103. In reality the entire argument of Hebrews 1–7 focuses on Christ’s role as incarnate priest (cf. 1 Tm 2:5 and the superfluous-unless-significant designation of Christ in his mediatorial priestly role: “the *man* Christ Jesus,” emphasis added).

is the main enemy and threat to this dominion.³⁸ Instead of ruling (v. 9), man is ruled by death (v. 15). Creation's rebellion triumphs over man, ending his rule and reclaiming the body given to enable his rule over creation. The thesis of the chapter is that Christ gained his Adamic dominion that makes him better than the angels by means of incarnation into humanity for the purpose of death (vv. 9, 10, 14) and the subsequent victorious resurrection that qualified him for dominion.

His death is explicitly spoken of in verses 9, 10, 14, and several designations of his resurrection are evident. *Τελειόω* ("to perfect," v. 10) was found in 5:9 and 7:28 to refer to his being given by resurrection the "indestructible life" (7:16) that is the prerequisite for successful priesthood.³⁹ Because both the perfection (2:9) and the crowning (v. 10) are juxtaposed with the "suffering of death" (v. 9), the two are referring to the same thing. The "glory" and "honor" with which he was crowned are taken directly from the Psalm 8 quotation in the preceding verses and refer to both Adam's filial status and ontological glory—the image of God, the pinnacle of which is possession of life in the body—and his consequent functional glory—dominion over the creation.⁴⁰ Christ's being "crowned with glory" is the same event as his being "glorif[ie]d" in 5:5—resurrection imparting unending filial life as the prerequisite for successful priesthood.⁴¹ As found in 1:3–6, the result was Adamic sonship for

³⁸ "Embedded in this passage are three reasons man fails as viceregent: death, Satan, and sin (vv. 9, 14–15, 17)." Jared Ramler, "Social Justice and the Mediarial Role of Christians as Viceregents in the Kingdom of God" (PhD diss., Bob Jones University, 2014), 96. The devil has from the beginning sought to subvert God's plan for filial viceregents over his creation by tempting them to sin, which leads to death. Death is the actual failing in viceregency, Satan is the cause, and sin is his means.

³⁹ Again, Moffitt observes from 2:9–11 that the timing of "to perfect" is that of the resurrection (i.e., between the cross and the ascension): "That the Son's being perfected through suffering is necessary for the salvation of the many suggests that the perfection of the Son stands between his own endurance of suffering and his becoming the high priest whose service sanctifies his siblings" (196). William Lane notes that *τελειόω* and its cognates are used in the LXX "to signify the act of consecrating [setting apart] a priest to his office (Ex 29:9, 29, 33, 35; Lev 4:5; 8:33; 16:32; 21:10; Nm 3:3)." *Hebrews 1–8*, vol. 47 of WBC, ed. David Hubbard and Glenn Barker (Dallas: Word, 1991), 57. Accordingly, the resurrection not only gave Christ the filial everlasting life that was a necessary prerequisite for priesthood (Hebrews 7), but it also set him apart for that office (cf. "appointed," 5:1; "designated," 5:10; "appoints," 7:28). These two motifs coalesce in chapter 7 in the discussion of Melchizedek and Psalm 110. Note that *ἀρχηγός* ("author") is also paired with a cognate noun of *τελειόω* (*τελειωτής*, "perfecter") in 12:2 in what two considerations show to be a reference to the resurrection. First, the phrase is distinguished from Christ's suffering on the cross, since at the time of that suffering his work was not yet complete (i.e., salvation was not yet "perfected") since he "endured" it. And second, it is also distinguished from his sitting down at the right hand of God as High Priest (8:1), this latter action being temporally subsequent to his being perfected (see 7:28 where *τελειόω* is in the perfect tense and thus antecedent to his appointment to priesthood, discovered above to have taken place at his ascension to sit at the Father's right hand).

⁴⁰ Brandon Crowe points out that the title *son of man* from Psalm 8:4 (quoted in Heb 2:6) is connected to the "Son of Man" in Daniel 7 and points back to Adam: "The son of man in Daniel 7, from a canonical perspective, builds upon the royal imagery for humanity originally given to Adam; the son of man in Daniel is the fulfiller of the Adamic task of ruling in God's image." *The Last Adam: A Theology of the Obedient Life of Jesus in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017), 39.

⁴¹ Walter Brooks confirms that the moment of crowning was the moment when Christ became "Son" (1:5), which was the resurrection, which was the time of Christ's perfecting. "Perpetuity of Christ's Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89/2 (June 1970): 207–8.

Christ: he is from the same Father as the children, and so he is their brother (2:11–13).⁴² And the result was restoration of the material part of the filial nature of Adamic sonship: Christ had to take on that material part in the incarnation (v. 14a) in order to free men from the power of death (vv. 14b–15).⁴³

Christ’s reclamation of Adam was prototypical. The otherwise superfluous appositive *Jesus* (v. 9) is an overt switch-reference, indicating that v. 8 is speaking about man’s flawed dominion after the fall (v. 8; cf. v. 15). “Not yet” (v. 8), however, points to the day of Christ’s purpose to “lead [αγω, which is prototypical] many sons to glory” (v. 10), the glory that he possesses by resurrection (v. 9). Again, this “glory” subsumes both Adam’s lost eternal filial ontology (the image of God) and his forfeited rule (vv. 5–9), which will be restored by resurrection (vv. 14–15). We will share in Christ’s filial status (v. 11). We will be “made perfect” (7:19; 9:9; 10:1, 14; 11:40; 12:23) after the likeness of the ἀρχηγός (“author”) and τελειωτής (“perfecter”) of our faith (12:2).⁴⁴ God’s original intent of a race of forever-reigning glorious sons will one day be a reality (2:10), with Christ as its literal πρωτότοκος-by-resurrection (1:6)!

1 Peter 1:3–5

Peter calls for blessing the Father of Jesus for providing a new birth that we currently possess (v. 3). This new birth is, however, only the first stage of our new-creation eschatological salvation that fills verses 3–9. The prepositional phrase *to a living hope*, the purpose infinitive *to obtain*, and the designation *inheritance* all indicate that, as in Romans 8, our current filial status by new birth is a present inbreaking of this eschatological salvation that guarantees its future dimension (vv. 3–4).⁴⁵

That this future stage comes “through the resurrection of Jesus Christ” together with the participial modifier *living* in “living hope” indicate that Peter is talking about our resurrection.⁴⁶ And as discovered above in numerous passages, the prototypical nature of Christ’s resurrection is evident in the plural ἐκ νεκρῶν (“from the dead ones”; cf. νεκρῶν in Acts 13:30; Rom 1:4; 8:11; 1 Cor 15:12,

⁴² The broader concept of Adamic children who exercise Adamic dominion is derived from Psalm 8:2 (see discussion of Psalm 8 in the first part of this article). Note the familial concepts all through Hebrews 2: God as Father (2:10, 11), inheritance (2:8), sons (2:10), brothers (2:11, 12, 17), and children (2:13, 14).

⁴³ Kim emphasizes that the solidarity of Christ with the other sons in the chapter is in terms of his incarnation (139–40). And even Donald Macleod, responding to the positions of A. T. Robinson and James Dunn that Hebrews contains “adoptionist” language, argues that this filial language should be interpreted “in the light of the doctrine of the incarnation.” *The Person of Christ*, *Contours of Christian Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 83.

⁴⁴ Peeler notes, ἀρχηγός carries the prototypical idea of leading the way for others who will follow (82). See also Gary O’Neal, *Bringing Many Sons to Glory: The Αρχηγος Motif in the Letter to the Hebrews* (PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013).

⁴⁵ The aorist participle ἀναγεννήσας points back to new birth at the time of conversion. Beale recognizes in this mention of the new birth the idea of new creation discovered to be a facet of the new birth theology elsewhere in the NT, both at the time of regeneration and resurrection (324).

⁴⁶ This observation is confirmed by the context of corporeal trials, specifically bodily persecution that often resulted in death, the same topic as Romans 8. The terminology of v. 4—“imperishable” and “undefiled”—suggests that eternal life by resurrection is in view as the heart of that salvation. This terminology mirrors similar concepts found above in Colossians 3:1–4 (“be revealed,” “life is hidden with Christ,” etc.) and regeneration and resurrection as the two stages of life in the Spirit in Romans 8, the former guaranteeing the latter. Note also “glory” at the appearing of Christ in 1 Peter 1:7.

20; Col 1:18; Rv 1:5).⁴⁷ It is evident that Peter was thinking within the same framework of a two-stage eschatological filial salvation as was Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews.

Luke 1

When Mary asked about the biological impossibility of a virgin conceiving a child, the angel responded that the Spirit would effect the miracle, and *διό* (“for that reason,” v. 35b), the child would be called the Son of God. On the surface *διό* communicates that the deity of the conception’s agent would ensure that the produced child would be divine. Although this surface meaning is true, the angel did not bring up the Spirit’s role to explain why the child would be divine, for that was not Mary’s question. Rather, the Spirit is the explanation for her coming conception being virginal. Against the Isaianic background to which the angel alludes, there are two levels of significance to the Spirit’s making her conception virginal, and thus two levels of the significance of *διό* beyond the surface explanation that divine agency produced a divine child.⁴⁸

The OT Background of the Angel’s Message

In the first place, that Mary would conceive as a virgin points back to Isaiah’s prophecy (7:14) when the invasion of Rezin and Pekah threatened the end of David’s dynasty (vv. 1–2, 6). The contemporary “near fulfilment” was to be a sign that the invasion would fail, and David’s line would still rule. In Luke 1 the Spirit would make Mary’s conception virginal as a “far fulfilment” sign to the world that God’s promise to David was sure for all time.⁴⁹ Accordingly, the angel’s message to Mary is that her son would be the son of David (“His father David”) and would sit perpetually on the Davidic throne (“He will reign . . . forever, and His kingdom will have no end”).

Second, the Spirit’s making Mary’s conception virginal would ensure that the child to be born and reign forever on David’s throne (vv. 32b–33) would be the “Son of the Most High” (v. 32a). It is very tempting to see the deity of the “Son of God” as the qualification for his everlasting rule on David’s throne, and thus *διό* is communicating that because the agent of the virginal conception was divine (the Spirit), the produced child would also be divine (the “Son of God”). It is true that the Spirit’s role ensured that the produced child would have a divine nature, and it is true that a property of that divine nature is eternity.

But against the backdrop of Isaiah 7:14 there is a deeper role of the virginal conception as communicated in the word *διό*: the Spirit’s activity would ensure that the Son born of Mary would be

⁴⁷ There is a sense in which both the past new birth and the future living hope are dependent upon Christ’s resurrection. Beale argues that both “through the resurrection” and “to a living hope” modify “born again” (324, footnote 24). For a discussion of our past resurrection with Christ (cf. Rom 6:3–4; Eph 2:6; Col 3:1), see Richard Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul’s Soteriology*, 2nd ed. (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1987), 127–34.

⁴⁸ It is of little surprise that Luke’s Christology would incorporate the elements of Adamic sonship so integral to Paul’s Christology, given the amount of time Luke spent traveling with Paul and listening to him reason with the Jews from the OT.

⁴⁹ Note the plural *you* all through Isaiah 7:13–14 and the plural verb *listen* in v. 13. The sign was given to the entire “house of David” (v. 13), which included Mary.

the Son of Isaiah 9:6–7, who would fulfil the OT messianic expectation of a Son from David’s line who would reclaim Adamic sonship.⁵⁰ Elsewhere the NT stresses that the Adamic Son of David’s line must be a man (Rom 1:3–4; 1 Cor 15:21; Col 1:15; Heb 2:5–15). And accordingly, Isaiah 9:6–7 expects a “Son” who will be a man from the Davidic dynasty (“the government will rest on His shoulders . . . on the throne of David”) having an eternal reign (“no end to the increase of His government . . . from then on and forevermore”). Isaiah, however, also amazingly designates the coming Son as “Mighty God”!⁵¹ The Spirit’s role in Mary’s conception (i.e., rendering it a virginal conception) and the human ancestry of Mary through David came together in synergy to produce the Son of God, who had been predicted to be a God-Man. *Διό* therefore communicates an amazing role of the virginal conception—it would be not only God’s *sign* that the Davidic dynasty would rule forever but also the *mechanism* that actually produces the God-Man who could fulfill that role of David’s expected forever-reigning Son of God and reclaim Adam’s lost eternal filial rule.

The one who was Son of God from all eternity and thus divine had to become human and thus also become Adamic Son of God in order to reclaim what Adam lost, for his divine nature could never include a material body, part of the filial nature of human sons of God. Thus, although the divinity of the Son was the result of the virginal conception, the good news in the angel’s words in Luke 1 was not that the perpetuity of the Son’s rule would derive from his being *deity*. Rather, the Adamic/Davidic rule of which the angel spoke is a *human* rule, based upon his perpetuity of life in his *human* body pertaining to his *human* nature, and the angel’s good news was that all this would be made possible by his taking on *humanity* in the mystery of the incarnation by virginal conception effected by the Spirit. To be sure, divinity was necessary for the Son to carry out his redemptive mission successfully. But in terms of qualification and enablement to reclaim Adam, the genius of incarnation by virginal conception was not so much that the produced child would be divine, for Adam was not divine and also there had already been a divine Son from eternity past without any incarnation (Rom 8:3; Gal 4:4; 1 Jn 4:10, 14). Rather, the genius of the incarnation was that divinity would take on humanity, thus enabling the Son to reclaim the human things that Adam had lost, specifically here

⁵⁰ Several considerations demonstrate that the Son in Isaiah 7:14 is the Son of 9:6. “The second line [‘a son will be given to us’] emphasizes that this is a work of God’s gracious giving, not just a coincidence. No date of birth in the future is hinted at, and the only comparable son promised by God in earlier oracles was Immanuel in 7:14–15. An identification marker that links these two sons is that they both will be righteous Davidic rulers.” Gary Smith, *Isaiah 1–39*, vol. 15A of NAC, ed. E. Ray Clendenen and Kenneth A. Mathews (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2007), 240. The divine passives *will be born* and *will be given* in 9:6 also point to the agency of God in the conception of the “Son.” Further, “son” is the same term in 7:14 and 9:16, and “child” in 9:6 is the noun form of the verb “bear” in 7:14. And finally, the angel’s words in Luke 1:30–35 draw together the prophecies of a virgin-born son as a sign to the house of David of its perpetuity (7:13–14), who will be the Son of God and rule on David’s throne forever (9:6–7). See also comments on 9:6–7 by Mark Minnick. “His Governing Will Bring Great Joy” (Sermon, Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Greenville, SC, December 30, 2018).

⁵¹ In 7:14 the name of the child will be “Immanuel.” The only other two occurrences of this phrase translated “Immanuel” are in Isaiah 8:8 and 8:10, where the invasion of Judah by the king of Assyria would fail (vv. 9–10a) because “God is with us,” a literal translation of “Immanuel” (v. 10b). This sequence establishes the meaning of the name in 7:14 as “God with us,” which is a prophecy of the incarnation—the joining together of deity (“God”) and humanity (“with us”).

perpetual rule on David's throne. Διό (Lk 1:35) is communicating that the sonship in the last line of v. 35 was possessed as a result of his taking on humanity in the incarnation.⁵²

The Surrounding Context

That this Adamic sonship resulted from the Spirit's work of incarnation suggests that Christ possessed it from his incarnation (i.e., before his resurrection), a suggestion confirmed in the remainder of Luke 1–4. Accordingly, Luke's genealogy (3:23–38) traces Christ's lineage from Adam, whom Luke calls “the son of God” (Lk 3:38), and it passes through Mary's line (in contrast to Matthew's genealogy through Joseph's line), including David's generation (v. 31). Essentially, this genealogy is an expanded expression of Gabriel's statement of Christ's Adamic sonship by descent from David's line through Mary (1:33, 35). Luke's apparently haphazard placement of the genealogy in his third chapter is upon closer examination very intentional—the genealogy supports multiple surrounding pericopes that set forth Jesus as the Son of God and the last Adam.⁵³ These include ascription of sonship to Christ at his baptism (Lk 3:22) and Christ's triumph in three temptations that recapitulate Adam's temptation in Eden and that center on the question of Christ's Adamic sonship (4:1–13).⁵⁴ They also include the juxtaposition of his supposed sonship of Joseph (4:22) with his role as the messianic Anointed One (4:18); the demon's ascription of sonship (4:41a; cf. “the Holy One of God” in v. 34), which is tantamount to messiahship (“the Christ,” v. 41b); and Jesus' words at age twelve in the temple, “My Father” (Lk 2:49). In conclusion, Luke's genealogy is certifying Christ's Adamic sonship, and the associated surrounding pericopes demonstrate that this Adamic sonship was possessed at the time they occurred (i.e., prior to Jesus' resurrection).

The key to the harmonization of pre-resurrection Adamic sonship in Luke 1–4 with the Adamic-sonship-by-resurrection Christology discovered previously in this study is the recognition that Adamic sonship was owing to Christ's human descent from David (albeit as utilized by the Spirit in the mystery of the virginal conception) and thus pertained to his human nature. Davidic lineage included only the limited sense of Adamic sonship of God enjoyed by Israel's kings: i.e., it did not include restoration of the material part of the image of God, which was therefore possessed by Christ

⁵² Geerhardus Vos concludes from the Davidic language of verses 32–33 that Jesus did by incarnation receive sonship that pertained to his human nature. *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus: The Modern Debate About the Messianic Consciousness*, ed. Johannes G. Vos, 2nd ed. (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1953), 183. However, Vos distinguishes between “messianic sonship” which derives from the line of David and “nativistic sonship” which is “the origin of the Messiah's human nature as ascribed to the direct, supernatural paternity of God . . . in Luke 1” (141–42). This distinction cannot be maintained in Luke 1, however, for here the work of the Spirit makes him the Son of God (v. 35) who will on that basis inherit David's throne (v. 32).

⁵³ Leon Morris comments, “Luke adds the son of God, for we must see Jesus ultimately in his relationship to the Father. In this the genealogy harmonizes with the preceding and the following narratives, both of which are concerned with Jesus as the Son of God.” *Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 3 of TNTC, ed. Leon Morris (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988), 120.

⁵⁴ The Devil and Jesus both knew full well that Jesus was the second Person of the Trinity and the eternal Son of God. The first and last temptations concern the preservation of life, and the middle temptation concerns Jesus' messianic rule, both human realities for Christ and both corollaries of Adamic sonship. See David Garner, *Sons in the Son: The Riches and Reach of Adoption in Christ* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2016), 199–200; and Lövestam, 100–01.

in its un-restored form from incarnation.⁵⁵ And accordingly, if Christ had not risen, *pertaining to his humanity* he would have been yet another OT Davidic king failing to *fully* reclaim Adamic sonship and rule (i.e., he would never have realized the eternal Davidic rule of Lk 1:32b–33), for he would not have become the “life-giving Spirit” (1 Cor 15:45), the “Son of God with power” (Rom 1:4), the “Son, made perfect forever” (Heb 7:28), or “ἀρχή of the [new] creation of God” (Rv 3:14). In short, he would not have become the πρωτότοκος.

Conclusion

Our improved methodology has enabled us to incorporate the image of God into this study and thus recover recognition of the ontological nature of sonship. We have been thereby able to trace the theological intersection of resurrection with Scripture’s single sonship motif through all the relevant authors, not just Paul, and thus synthesize a full-orbed theology of the intersection that explains the birth terminology.

It has been found that the “small-a author systematic theologies” of the various NT authors all synthesize with and expand upon what was discovered in Paul. First, they all draw a single sonship motif from the OT. Second, they formulate their filial anthropology within the same two-stage, new-creation experience of sonship—regeneration pertaining to the inner man presently, and resurrection pertaining to the body in the future. And third, they advance the same sonship-by-resurrection Christology. In their eyes, Christ’s being “begotten” by resurrection (Acts 13:33; Heb 1:5; and 5:5, quoting Psalm 2:7) was no mere adoption or entrance into “functional sonship” (as contrasted with his pre-incarnate “ontological sonship”). It was a literal begetting into ontological Adamic sonship, imparting the filial nature of human sons of God, specifically its material part. They speak of Adamic sonship, therefore, as pertaining to Christ’s human nature. Further, they see his begetting by resurrection as prototypical of our begetting, for by union with him in resurrection we come to share in his reclaimed Adamic filial ontology. Thus, every Christological NT occurrence of the πρωτότοκος title (Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Heb 1:6; and Rv 1:5) encapsulates this prototypical-first-to-be-begotten Christology in its literal meaning.

On the one hand, Arius of old and James Dunn of late have denied that Christ was the divine Son of God from before his incarnation and was ontologically fully God.⁵⁶ Unfortunately, however,

⁵⁵ It is important to realize that certain aspects of Christ’s messianic role as the last Adam were perfect before resurrection, such as the moral perfection of the Adamic image of God pertaining to his immaterial part. Christ did possess the fallen image of God pertaining to his material part (i.e., a mortal body), however, until resurrection fully imparted to him the wholeness of the Adamic image of God. We know that his material part was mortal because he died on Calvary. Accordingly, although he was the Messiah before his resurrection, Peter could say that “God has made Him both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:36) by resurrection and ascension (vv. 24–35).

⁵⁶ This orthodox position of the church through the centuries has been argued convincingly elsewhere and is assumed in this study: Macleod, 90–91; Byrne, 199–200; Gordon Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007); and Robert Reymond, *Jesus, Divine Messiah: The New Testament Witness* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1990), 242–43. See Chapter 2 of James Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) for Dunn’s conception of the development of the Son of God Christology in the early church. For an evaluation of Dunn pertaining to Christ’s sonship, see Garner, chapter 7; and Macleod, 89–90.

many orthodox believers have made the mistake of Dunn, only in the other direction, effectively throwing the truth of sonship-by-resurrection overboard.⁵⁷ Though Garner warns against the danger of throwing out one sense of Christ's sonship in defense of the other, he has nevertheless erased the tension of two *ontological* senses of Christ's sonship by positing that Adamic sonship is merely functional.⁵⁸ Garner's position effectively relegates Adamic sonship to being a facet of Christ's work, not of his person. The tension between ontological Adamic sonship and ontological pre-incarnate sonship can be preserved, however, by recognizing that the person of Christ comprises two complete natures in the hypostatic union. It was discovered (from Rom 1:3–4; 1 Cor 15:21; Col 1:15; Heb 2:5–15) that Christ's role as the last Adam, reclaiming Adam's lost reign and filial nature, including its material part, all pertain to the human nature of Christ.⁵⁹ Although Adamic sonship and the filial nature of the human image of God was taken on in the incarnation, its material part was mortal as evidenced on Calvary and so was perfected by resurrection: it was restored into the "spiritual body," thereby reclaiming the material part of the unfallen image as imparted to Adam by creation.

The study of Luke 1–4 against the Isaiah 7–9 background confirmed this understanding of the two filial natures of Christ, for Isaiah 9 expected a Son who was both God and man. Instead of saying that there are two senses of Christ's sonship, each pertaining to one of Christ's natures, we could just as well say that because of the incarnation there is now one Son with two natures, and *each* nature is filial. That the divine nature is filial is part of the mystery of the intra-Trinity relationships. That the human nature is filial is explained within the framework of the Adam-Fall-Israel-Last Adam redemptive plan of God.

Among the benefits that spring from this study is a demarcation between the elements of Christ's sonship and ontology that believers come to experience (those pertaining to his human nature) and those filial elements that we will never experience (those pertaining to his divine nature). The passages investigated in this study speak of the Adamic image of God as the original line of demarcation between what elements of God's nature he did and did not impart to his first human son, Adam. Further, these passages speak of Christ's taking on flesh in order to reclaim a restored Adamic image of God as the prototype of our restoration into that image by union with him. The original Adamic image comprised the communicable attributes of God's nature, specially re-packaged as human filial nature. In the incarnation Christ's taking on of humanity was his being made in the human image of God.⁶⁰ Then by resurrection the material part of that holistic image was restored to Christ.

⁵⁷ For example, Trevor Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*, NSBT, ed. D. A. Carson (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 106–07; *The Message of Sonship*, 114–18.

⁵⁸ He eloquently calls for preservation of the tension of two senses of Christ's sonship (190–93, 202–05).

⁵⁹ Several theological considerations corroborate this point. First, Christ's divine nature was immutable and complete (Nm 23:19; 1 Sm 15:29; Ps 102:26–27; Mal 3:6; 2 Tm 2:13; Heb 6:17–18; Jas 1:17). Second, divine ontology/nature is incorporeal (Jn 4:24). Therefore, his filial material acquisition in the incarnation and filial material transformation by resurrection must pertain to his human nature. "Image' or 'image of God' when used of Christ always presents him as human." Robert Peterson, *Adopted By God: From Wayward Sinners to Cherished Children* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2001), 477.

⁶⁰ The image of God is the essence of humanity. "The creation account makes it clear that the image and likeness of God is what makes man unique, distinct from all other created entities. It is what makes man *human* and constitutes him

Our restoration into the image of God by means of conformity to the Image of God, therefore, is not our coming to possess God's divine nature directly, else we would be divinized.⁶¹ Rather, it is our coming to possess the communicable attributes of God's nature that he chose to impart to Adam as his image.⁶²

We are restored into the image of God by conformity to Christ, who is the Image of God. Although we do not come to share in Christ's divine sonship and become conformed to his divine ontology/nature directly, we do come to share in his Adamic/human sonship and become conformed to the ontology/nature imparted to Adamic/human sons.⁶³ For Christ the ontology of that Adamic sonship is his divine nature selectively communicated to his human nature through the mystery of his acquisition of the human image of God by incarnation. His human nature was derivative from his divine nature, but it was derivative *through his possession of the image of God*, just as any other man's possession of the image of God is that man's sharing of the communicable attributes of God's nature.⁶⁴ This role of the image of God as a demarcation between the two natures of Christ supports the Chalcedon statement of "two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably*; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved."⁶⁵ While the inner workings of the theanthropic God-Man are a mystery, we can point to some individual elements and say they pertain to one nature or the other.⁶⁶ For example, omniscience is an attribute of Christ's divine nature, not his human nature. And it has been found that the NT

as a *person*." Layton Talbert, "Lecture 4: Towards a Biblical Theology of Soteriology—The Genesis of Soteriology: Man & Sin" (unpublished class notes from Soteriology, BJU Seminary, Greenville, SC, Spring 2015, emphasis original).

⁶¹ "If Jesus possesses no other than the trinitarian sonship, and sinners are made His 'brethren' in any true and real sense, then, being made partakers of this unique sonship of Christ, they are introduced into the circle of the Trinity, and so made to change the metaphysical constitution of the Godhead by their advent into it as members of the Second Person." Robert Webb, *The Reformed Doctrine of Adoption* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), 94 (cf. 103–04).

⁶² David Garner recognizes that the image of God is the demarcation between becoming *like* God and *becoming* God. "Adoption in Christ" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2002), 175.

⁶³ This understanding is parallel to John Calvin's understanding that our righteousness in Christ pertains to his human, not his divine, nature. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge, Accordance electronic ed. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845), 3.11.12.

⁶⁴ Meredith Kline observes that in human experience, possession of the image of God is possession of elements of the divine nature: "In the vocabulary of Peter, 'partakers of the divine nature' expresses renewal in the image of God (2 Pt 1:4)." "Creation in the Image of the Glory-Spirit," *Westminster Theological Journal* 39/2 (1977): 266.

⁶⁵ Philip Schaff, "SYMBOLUM CHALCEDONENSE," in *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper Longmans, 1919), 3:62 (original emphasis). Recognizing this role of the image of God protects against the mistake of Luther, who defended consubstantiation by holding that Christ's divine nature communicated some of its attributes to the human nature. Specifically, omnipresence was communicated to the body of Christ. And thus Luther truncated the true humanity of Christ.

⁶⁶ "Christ's person is theanthropic, but not his nature; for that would make the finite infinite, and the infinite finite. Christ would be neither God nor man; but the Scriptures constantly declare Him to be both God and man. In all Christian creeds therefore, it is declared that the two natures in Christ retain each its own properties and attributes." Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (New York: C. Scribner, 1887), 2:389. Hodge goes on to differentiate between two kinds of passages. There are "passages in which the person is the subject, but the predicate is true only of the divine nature, or of the Logos. As when our Lord said, 'Before Abraham was I am'" (392). And there are "passages in which the person is the subject, but the predicate is true only of the human nature. As when Christ said, 'I thirst.'" (393).

authors speak of Christ's body as a part of the Adamic image of God and thus as a part of his human nature, for it is something taken on in the incarnation. His body does in some ways reflect the divine nature, but derivatively through the filter of the image of God, just as the human body of any other man does (though imperfectly before resurrection). In the resurrection the effects of the fall on that body were removed, thus restoring the original Adamic ideal in order to be the prototype for our restoration.

This study therefore concludes that the relationship of the two ontological senses of Christ's sonship is yet another facet of the mystery of the hypostatic union. His pre-incarnate sonship pertains to his divine nature/ontology, and his Adamic sonship pertains to his human nature/ontology, including its material part. This conclusion is actually no explanation of their relationship at all but rather a willingness to embrace the mystery of the hypostatic union and to preserve one more facet of that tension that the church has been preserving since Chalcedon.

Because it is Adamic sonship that Christ entered into fully by resurrection, and because this article set out to examine resurrection's intersection with sonship, the study has *de facto* focused on passages that are most clearly speaking of Adamic sonship. Because the incarnate Jesus was the theanthropic God-Man, however, many references to his sonship in the Gospels particularly (but also in other NT books and even in the OT messianic prophecies) are not any more easily parsed into divine nature and human nature than are other aspects of the person of Christ (knowledge, power, emotions, etc.).⁶⁷ References to the sonship of Christ are a spectrum—in some passages sonship is clearly Adamic, in some it is clearly pre-incarnate, and in some it is an inseparable perichoresis of the two.⁶⁸ Passages in the latter two categories are outside the scope of this study. So may the reader not go out and attempt to parse every mention of Christ's sonship as clearly and dogmatically as this study has parsed passages that speak of Christ's receiving sonship by resurrection. Instead, may we be ever prepared to bow in humble reverence before the mystery that God, in the fullness of time, sent his divine Son through Mary to be begotten as his human Son by resurrection, that we through him might have sonship.

Thine be the glory, risen, conqu'ring Son;
Endless is the vict'ry Thou o'er death hast won.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ This study has recognized that mystery in certain passages that were examined: Isaiah 9 and Hebrews 1.

⁶⁸ D. A. Carson recognizes that the communication of the "Son of God" title in some passages is broader than the sense in which it was understood in the Christological councils of the third and fourth centuries. As Garner does with the first Council of Nicea (*Sons in the Son*, 182), Carson urges fidelity to the orthodoxy set forth in the statements of Chalcedon, while recognizing that this orthodoxy and a messianic sense of Christ's sonship are a "both-and" matter, not an "either-or" matter. He therefore urges understanding of the "Son of God" title in each passage according to context (73–74).

⁶⁹ Edmond Budry, "Thine Be the Glory," trans. Richard Hoyle.