Matthew	Mark	Luke	John	related passages
1:1-17		3:23-38		

NOTABLE ITEMS FROM THE GENEALOGIES

■ *several generations possible between names :* there is no question that there are names purposely omitted in the genealogies. For example, in Matthew's (Mt 1:8) genealogy there are three kings missing between Joram and Uzziah (Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah). These omissions are not unique to these genealogies. Note by comparing Ezra's priestly genealogical tables with those of 1 Chronicles we discover six generations of priests omitted by Ezra (Ezra 7:1-5; 1 Chron 6:3-15). "It should be clear that genealogies are not necessarily complete, the main point being legitimate descent rather than inclusion of all the links in the genealogy." [Walvoord, quoted by Gromacki, *Virgin Birth*]

1 Chron 6:3	Aaron	Aaron	Ezra 7:5
1 Chron 6:3,4	Eleazor	Eleazar	Ezra 7:5
1 Chron 6:4	Phinehas	Phinehas	Ezra 7:5
1 Chron 6:4,5	Abishua	Abishua	Ezra 7:5
1 Chron 6:5	Bukki	Bukki	Ezra 7:4
1 Chron 6:5,6	Uzzi	Uzzi	Ezra 7:4
1 Chron 6:6	Zerahiah	Zerahiah	Ezra 7:4
1 Chron 6:6,7	Meraioth	Meraioth	Ezra 7:3
1 Chron 6:7	Amariah		
1 Chron 6:7,8	Ahitub		
1 Chron 6:8	Zadok		
1 Chron 6:8,9	Ahimaaz		
1 Chron 6:9	Azariah		
1 Chron 6:9,10	Johanan		
1 Chron 6:10,11	Azariah	Azariah	Ezra 7:3
1 Chron 6:11	Amariah	Amariah	Ezra 7:3
1 Chron 6:11,12	Ahitub	Ahitub	Ezra 7:2
1 Chron 6:12	Zadok	Zadok	Ezra 7:2
1 Chron 6:12,13	Shallum	Shallum	Ezra 7:2
1 Chron 6:13	Hilkiah	Hilkiah	Ezra 7:1
1 Chron 6:13,14	Azariah	Azariah	Ezra 7:1
1 Chron 6:14	Seraiah	Seraiah	Ezra 7:1
1 Chron 6:14,15	Jehozadak		
		Ezra	Ezra 7:1

beget = Greek gennaō "to be born", chiefly used of men begetting children (Mt 1:2-16); rarely used of women begetting children (Lk 1:13 "shall bear", 57 "brought forth"); used in Mt 1:20 for conception; used in Jn 16:21 of the mother "is delivered of" and of the child "is born." Also used metaphorically to describe the new birth (e.g. Jn 3:3,5,7), as evil men as mere animals (2 Pet 2:12), and even gendering strife (2 Tim 2:23). Note how Matthew uses the phrase "A begat B" throughout his genealogy until coming to Jesus (vs 16), then changes the wording to protect the virgin birth.

It stands to reason we must therefore be more liberal with the term *son* than our narrow interpretation found in our culture. For example: in 2 Chron 22:9 Ahaziah is called the son of Jehoshaphat, when in reality he was the grandson; note even Jesus is called the son of David, the son of Abraham (Mt 1:1). This is the reason the genealogies alone cannot be used to argue strict

chronological time tables.

■ *Jewish marriage laws :* when Joseph took Mary to be his legal wife, Joseph was Jesus' legal father by Jewish law and custom. Note this was accepted by the Jews in the town of Nazarene (Lk 4:22).

Another pertinent Jewish law / custom is found in Dt 25:5-10. If a man would die without children and had a brother, the living brother's responsibility was to go in and bear children in his brother's name. This ensured the dead brother's seed would be passed on. The firstborn male child (vs 6) would be the *legal* child of the dead brother although the actual lineage would have been through his living brother. An illustration of this may be found in the book of Ruth (cp Dt 25:7-10 and Ruth 4:7,8).

■ *the reasons for the genealogies :* It is clear from the genealogies that Jesus "is no isolated figure, no mere innovator, but one who can be adequately measured only in terms of what has gone before." [Tasker, *Matthew*, quoting Stonehouse] Several important scriptural items are proved by the genealogies:

● *to establish Jesus as the seed of a woman* (Gen 3:15; Rom 16:20; 1 Jn 3:8; Heb 2:14) See below, *The Two Adams.*

● *to establish Jesus as the seed of Abraham* (Gen 12:3; Gal 3:16; Heb 2:16) Within the nation of Israel was the promises of their fathers (Rom 9:4,5). This was so important to the Jew that many Jews felt they were in a right standing before God solely due to their Jewish heritage (Mt 3:8,9; Jn 8:37-40; also see last week's lesson, Jn 1:13).

● *to establish Jesus as the seed of David* (Lk 1:31,32; 2 Sam 7:12-16) Note in Isa 11:1-5 (esp v1) the word "stem, stump, a shoot" is the Hebrew word netzer (according to Culver, *Life of Jesus*) from which we get "Nazarene." This was to be out of the stock of David's father Jesse (Zech 3:8; 6:12,13; Isa 4:2).

■ *the two Adams :* Matthew calls his genealogy *the book of the generation* (Mt 1:1), a term used in only one other place to give Adam's genealogy (Gen 5:1). Paul traces the source of our sin to one parent, Adam (Rom 5:12,15,19), then continues by showing the solution to the sin problem, the Second Adam (1 Cor 15:45-50). Because of Adam and Eve's sin all die (so Gen 5 "and they died...") but life came through *the man* Christ Jesus (1 Cor 15:21,22).

■ *the placement of the genealogies :* Matthew places his in the very beginning of his gospel. Writing to a theocratic Jew familiar with the OT prophecies, it was very important to prove Jesus was the Messiah, the promised Son of David and Abraham (Mt 1:1). Luke places his after the birth narratives, Jesus' youth, and the story of Jesus' baptism. As Jesus is beginning His public ministry, it is there that Luke records His background. Several reasons may be given for this. Luke's intention could have been much the same as Paul's in showing the Gentiles (the Greeks) that all of the human race originated with the Lord (cp Acts 19:26). Note Luke traces his genealogy to Adam, showing the universality of redemption. Jesus was just not the Jewish Messiah but He was the Savior of the world, both Jew and Gentile.

Godet states that Luke puts the emphasis on the Person of Jesus (Lk 3:23), the verse literally reading "and Himself was, He, Jesus ...". By doing so, "Luke indicates this as the moment when Jesus enters personally on the scene to commence His proper work. With the baptism, the obscurity in which He has lived until now passes away; He now appears detached from the circle of persons who have hitherto surrounded Him and acted as His patrons - namely, His parents and the forerunner. He henceforth becomes the *He*, the principal personage of the narrative. This is the moment which very properly appears to the author most suitable for giving His genealogy.... In crossing the threshold of this new era, the sacred historian casts a general glance over the period which thus reaches its close, and sums it up in this document, which might be called the mortuary register of the earlier humanity." [Godet, *Luke*]

■ *women in the genealogies :* Matthew mentions four women in his genealogy (five if Mary is included, v16): Tamar v3, Rahab v5, Ruth v5, Bathsheba v6. Tamar was an adulteress (Gen 38), Rahab was a Gentile harlot (Josh 2), Ruth was an Moabite, an outsider (Ruth), and Bathsheba was an adulteress (2 Sam). All of these women became part of the geneological record by an unusual act of providence. From such a background came the sinless Son of God. Chrysostom in his homilies on Matthew gives the question (quoted by Jukes, *Four Views*): "It is worth inquiry, wherefore can it be that, when tracing the genealogy through the men, he hath mentioned women also; and why, since he determined to do so, he hath yet not mentioned them all, but, passing over the more eminent, such as Sarah, and Rebekah, and as many as are like them, has brought forward them that are famed for some bad thing, as, for instance, a harlot, an adulteress, a mother by incest, and a stranger."

The following is a type which I found interesting and worth mentioning:

Gen 49:10 states Judah is the line of the kingdom, the scepter is his, but his seed is born of a Canaanite mother and is wicked. Tamar is brought in and given to Judah's sons, but they dislike her and refuse her and she therefore remains barren. The Lord kills them for their iniquity, and Tamar later is found pregnant through the sin of Judah. Not knowing the seed was his, Judah thinks the line of descent will be to an illegitimate child and demands Tamar to be stoned. Tamar provides proof that the seed is of Abraham. Anderson's type: the first wife is a picture of the Jews. Note Judah strived to build this line to bring in the kingdom, but to the Lord the seed was evil. Another wife was brought in (picturing the new covenant, the church age), and the evil first sons (a picture of the Jews) would have nothing to do with it. The Lord allowed the Jews to turn from the new and brought judgement upon the old. It is the new that is bringing forth the fruit of the kingdom of God.

■ *Matthew's groupings of three "fourteens" :* as a Jewish Christian familiar with the Rabbinical way of doing things, Matthew

has divided the groups into three "fourteens" (Mt 1:17). This could perhaps have been used as a memory aid, but was probably more given to center around the rise and fall of the kingdom. The three divisions are from Abraham to the establishment of the kingdom under David (vss 2-6); from David to the end of the monarchy and the deportation to Babylon (vss 6-11); and from the Babylonian exile to the birth of Jesus (vss 12-16). In this division, David is counted twice resulting in a total of forty-one names.

■ *Theories on the differences between the two genealogies*

● *Matthew = Joseph's physical lineage; Luke = Joseph's legal lineage :* According to this theory, Jacob (Mt 1:15) and Heli (Lk 3:23) were brothers. Heli married and died, leaving no children. According to the law of the Levirate marriage found in the OT, the nearest single relative was supposed to marry the widow (see previous note). The first born son of the second marriage would carry on the legal inheritance of the dead brother. Therefore Jacob could be Joseph's physical father while Joseph would have been the legal heir of Jacob's dead brother Heli. This is further strengthened if Matthan (Mt 1:15)and Matthat (Lk 3:24) is the same person. The problem here is why the grandfathers of Jacob and Heli would be different, and why do the two lines go back to two different sons of David?

● *Matthew = Joseph's legal lineage; Luke = Joseph's physical lineage :* Used by J. Gresham Machen in his book on the Virgin Birth. Machen used the term "begat" in the sense of the legal designation of the heir apparent. The problem here is that is a movement away from the natural use of the word "begat".

● *Matthew = Joseph's physical lineage; Luke = Mary's physical lineage :* Joseph is therefore correctly called the son of David by the angel (Mt 1:20), for although a poor carpenter, Joseph was still a member of the royal family. Note the prominence of Joseph in Matthew's narrative: angel explained the pregnancy of Mary to him (1:18-25); warned him to flee to Egypt (2:13-15); informed him of Herod being dead (2:19-21); and the Lord told him to go to Nazareth (2:22). Luke on the other hand centers the narration around Mary: the angel tells her the detains of the virgin birth (1:26-38); she went to Elisabeth's house and praised by Elisabeth (1:39-45); she praised the Lord (1:46-56); she delivered the Child (2:1-7); she pondered the sayings of the shepherds (2:8-20); she offered the sacrifice for her purification (2:21-24); Simeon addresses her (2:25-35); and she addresses the 12-year old Jesus in the temple (2:41-52). According to this theory therefore, Heli was Mary's father and the father-in-law to Joseph.

This interpretation centers around the phrase "and Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was *the son* of Heli..." (Lk 3:23). Note the second time the words "the son" is used they were supplied by the translators. The phrase literally reads "the son as was supposed of Joseph of the Eli of the Matthat of the Levi...". The article *tou* (possessive, meaning "of the") occurs prior to every name in Luke's list *except Joseph's*. Note also the placement of the parenthesis marks. In the Greek there are no parenthesis marks, although none would doubt that they are definitely necessary in our English translation. The question is though, what belongs within the quotation marks? It is here that the translator's opinion is reflected. If the translator(s) felt the genealogy belonged to Joseph, it would be marked as the KJV, "being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was *the son* of Heli...". But if the translator(s) felt the genealogy was that of Mary's, the verse could easily be read "being the son (as was supposed of Joseph) of Heli...".

This also coincides with information found in the Talmud: "It is remarkable that, in the Talmud, Mary the mother of Jesus is called *the daughter of Heli* {"Chagig." 77:4} . From whence have Jewish scholars derived this information? If from the text of Luke, this proves that they understood it as we do; if they received it from tradition, it confirms the truth of the genealogical document Luke made use of." [Godet, *Luke*]

Why the absence of Mary's name? "Since women did not appear in direct genealogical listings, Joseph stood in Mary's place, but Luke was careful to note that there was no physical connection between Joseph and either Jesus or Heli." [Gromacki, *Virgin Birth*]

Note that many bible students since the earliest days of the church have believed Mary to be descendent of David as well as Joseph. This belief is not just due to the genealogical records but by other scriptures as well: Peter says "that the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh (not merely by Jewish laws about inheritance) would raise up Christ to sit on the throne (Acts 2:30). The prophecy of the Son of David states that "thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels" (2 Sam 7:12). Paul says that of this man's seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel Jesus (Acts 13:23). See also 2 Tim 2:8; Heb 7:14; Rev 22:16; Lk 1:32,69; Isa 11:1.

MATTHEW	LUKE
traces back to Abraham - the promised Messiah, the heir of a kingdom, the chosen seed (Ps 80:20-29)	traces back to Adam - the Son of Man, the second Adam (Rom 5)
from Abraham to Christ (descending)	from Christ to Adam (ascending)
Joseph's line	Mary's line
connected with His birth ("He's the Messiah")	connected with His baptism (identifying the One being presented to the world for ministry)

ADDENDUM

■ ***these should not be a point for argument :*** Note 1 Tim 1:4; Titus 3:9. It is clear from this study that we do not have all the answers, as we have frequently found already in several points of the gospel narratives. But the main points of the genealogical tables are clear, and although we do not have all the answers, there is abundant evidence to believe they are trustworthy and no real reason to doubt their authenticity.

■ ***Jesus' public ministry began when He was about thirty years old.*** As a side note of Luke 3:23, it is here that we learn the approximate age of Jesus when He began His public ministry. It was this age which among the Jews, the Levites entered upon their duties (Num 4:3,23). It is said that it was also the age at which a young Greek could take part in public affairs. [Godet, *Luke*]