

Pastor-teacher Don Hargrove  
Faith Bible Church  
Thursday, April 7, 2011  
<http://fbcweb.org/doctrines.html>

JEWISH APOLOGETICS (47)  
ANSWERING JEWISH OBJECTION #38  
(DDR #666)

**Objection #38: God doesn't have a son.**

Brown's short response to this objection:

It all depends on what you mean by the word *son*. In the Hebrew Bible, Israel was called God's son, the king was called God's son, and the angels were called God's son. Is it any wonder that the Messiah, the ideal representative of Israel, the king of all earthly kings, and the one more highly exalted than the angels, should be called God's Son? More than anyone else who has walked this earth, Jesus the Messiah is uniquely entitled to be called the Son of God.<sup>1</sup>

In his longer section Brown provides the details and implications of "son" throughout the Old Testament in reference to kings, angels, and Israel. He takes exception to the idea of Jesus Christ being "eternally begotten of the Father" as stated in early creeds. This does not mean that Brown does not hold to the eternality of the Son. I agree with him that "eternally begotten" does not make much sense. I noted this when we studied in detail the deity of Christ and the hypostatic union back in 2009.

Brown provides great insight regarding the nature of prophecy in general and in particular with reference to the son and the Messiah (e.g. Isa. 9:6; Psa. 2:2). He explains how certain proclamations had a historical referent but were only fulfilled in Jesus Christ. This

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael L. Brown, *Answering Jewish Objections to Jesus: General and Historical Objections—Volume 2*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 2000), 38-48. In his book, Brown lists the objection and then gives a short response that is followed by a more developed response. This DDR series, for the most part, tracks the objection and his *short* response, after which you will find my comments. I highly recommend his book if you are interested in his longer responses (there is far too much material to include in the DDRs).

section is well worth serious study for an understanding of how proclamations could refer to both David and Jesus, yet without double fulfillment.

Given the many references to “son” in the Old Testament (and the Targums) and their connections to a coming Messiah, there is no basis for Judaism’s rejection of divine sonship.

On the Glory Road,

*Pastor Don*