

No.

5 (d)

"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD." COL. 3. 1.

THE
GENEALOGIES OF CHRIST.

An Address (revised) at

65 St. Mary Axe,
23rd May, 1913.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD.

Correspondence welcome:
Scriptural literature for Believers
Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – 74343 Sachsenheim – GERMANY

THE GENEALOGIES OF CHRIST.

An Address by Mr. P.W. Heward,
At 65 St. Mary Axe,
23rd May, 1913.

OUTLINE:

1. Scripture Genealogies, their importance and teaching.
2. Matthew 1,
 - a) What it Says.
 - b) What it Does Not Say.
 - c) Difficulties Removed, if any.
3. Luke 3, 23-38, (as with Matt. 1).
4. The Preciousness of Christ's Life, Death and Resurrection.

It is our privilege, beloved friends, to consider the genealogies of our Lord Jesus Christ, but, at the outset, it is well to refer generally to Scripture genealogies. For example we find in Genesis 5, that wondrous "cemetery" record of the line of grace, those through whom God brought the promised seed, but how they all died until the time came, when only one from among them lived, and all the other men of the world, who were not "with him" were destroyed in the solemnizing flood. Then we have the other genealogies in Genesis. The book of the generations of Esau, and so forth. When we come along to subsequent Scriptures we find various little genealogies interspersed:- for example, in connection with God's servant Moses, we have a brief genealogy in Exodus 6. Then again, we find a genealogy in connection with Ezra, in his own account of the way in which the Lord led him from Babylon to Jerusalem. But the book which is fullest of genealogies is the book of Chronicles, "The words of the days" as the Hebrews call it, telling of the various days since man was on the earth, and how quickly even thousands of years have gone by. We little realize how brief an interval is six thousand years in relation to eternity, but we may ask ourselves, before we come to the Later Scriptures, why do we have these Hebrew genealogies? Are they revelation? In some cases it is plain that they were rather to be viewed as divinely appointed extracts from state records. What then is the reason for their insertion? They were not all fresh "revelation", but there was a full INSPIRATION in their selection. There must be an importance in (anything in Scripture. *every*
The believer does not say, "If I see the importance I will believe

it", but rather, "Because this is in God's Book, therefore it is important":- our own wisdom must be put on one side, if at any time it collides with God's wisdom. It is a precious privilege to know that He has not included one unnecessary word, or left out one necessary word, from the Scriptures of Truth. It needed inspiration to write history:- what man could give an account of his own times without very serious defects? What man could know which genealogies to select and which to omit? What names to put in and what names to put out? Man fails in everything. The inspiration of Scripture extends to its inclusions and exclusions as well as to its wording, and these genealogies are plainly full of teaching, not only in the general way because they are in Scripture, but in many ways that our hearts can realize. First of all, we learn that God is not the author of confusion. It is well that this should be impressed upon us, for it is easy to be confused and disorderly. Genealogies are a guard against this. Again, God would show unto us His care for little things and for individual persons. At once we think of a Book with many more names. The Lamb's Book of Life, filled with names, and names only, and every one whose name occurs in that Book is infinitely dear unto the Lord of Glory, eternally dear unto the Lord of Glory, being blessed in Christ Jesus. Beloved friends, it is important to know that our heavenly Father is deeply interested in His people individually. We are not simply to view salvation as a work for a company of redeemed people, as if it were without His personal work, an individual work. We are saved as UNITS, though we are brought into a blessed unity. But not only so, the genealogies bring before us God's preservation of the people of Israel with a view to the Promised Seed. We have seen that the first genealogy leads up to Noah, because from Noah's family Christ came. Need I say that the genealogy of Abraham tends in the same way, and that where in the end of Ruth we have a genealogy, it is because there we have that which leads up to David, and through David to the Promised Seed. Genealogies point to Christ, and show how precious Christ is. Thus the bare historical details, as men would call them, become precious to those who see Christ through everything, and who rejoice in God's pointers that drew us toward the Son of His love. May I further suggest that the Scripture genealogies are also given to test the Lord's people? The majority can see the beautiful excellence of Habakkuk 3, or John 14, but it requires that one should have been born again to appreciate 1 Chronicles 1-8, and God has so worded and arranged Scripture as to test His people's respect for His will, and their delight in His plans and perfect purposes. Beloved friends, it is important that we should learn not to decide for ourselves, not to arrange for ourselves, but to be thankful for all the food which God has given us. There are no dry bones in Scripture, there are no words which are wasted, everything is food, as it is written, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for discipline that is in righteousness".

We pass on now to Matthew 1, - seeking as the Lord may enable to find out what it says, what it does not say, and desiring that if the Lord be pleased our difficulties may be removed. The first verse gives a heading and one key to the whole chapter:- I had almost said to the whole book. It is thus worded, - "A book of generation of Jesus Christ, Son of David, Son of Abraham". Here our beloved Lord is brought before us as the Son of David, and also as the Son of Abraham. Directly associated with both. He is not called the Son of Jesse, though in Isaiah 11 that term might seem suggested. He is not called the Son of Judah, the Son of Jacob, or even the Son of Isaac, - but the Son of Abraham. We can understand the Divine reason for not inserting any name after David, for our beloved Lord did not descend from the Son of David whose name is here given, His personal genealogy is not through Solomon but through Nathan. Thus the first verse is exact in what it says, and in what it does not say. The reason why all intervening generations between David and Abraham are awhile omitted is doubtless that we may connect the Lord Jesus with "the Seed" promised to Abraham, and, furthermore, that we may see in Him the One Who was associated with that father of them that have faith. We pass on, and we find the word "begat" occurring again and again and again. First, we have the fourteen generations from Abraham to David, then David starts the second section, and we find this ending with the carrying away into Babylon, the third section is from the carrying into Babylon unto Christ. Here are there three sections arranged for memorising, it would almost seem. Now it is fairly plain that the word "begat" means "begat". In other words it denotes blood relationship. I do not say that it always denotes immediate blood relationship of the father and son. It would be perfectly correct in Scriptural language to say that the grandfather begat the grandson. For instance, we read of the sons whom Hezekiah should beget who would be carried to Babylon, though they were some generations afterwards. That is Scripture phraseology. How utterly absurd is the present-day tendency to take hold of words in English, and then criticise the Bible. The Bible is a literature of its own, and though God has been pleased to use words of earth, there is no book exactly comparable with the Hebrew Scriptures, nor any book comparable, even in a linguistic way with the Greek Scriptures, but God has made the scope of both large enough to allow of comparison between verse and verse, and the best Bible dictionary we can obtain is a Concordance. A Hebrew or Greek Concordance actually affords definitions. A dictionary is only condensed usage, or man's opinion of usage condensed. It is therefore incumbent upon us to seek to realise the meaning from usage and to find out, for ourselves under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in what way God is pleased to employ words. "Begat" therefore may include several generations. This is an important key to the second section of the genealogy. In that second section we read, "Solomon begat Roboam, and begat Abia,

and Abia begat Asa, and Asa begat Josaphat, and Josaphat begat Joram, and Joram, and Joram begat Ozias". But if we turn back to the record of the kings of Judah we shall find that though the early part regarding Roboam is complete, that a gap recurs after Jehosaphat's son was Jehoram. Who was Jehoram's son? We find in 2 Chronicles 22 Ahaziah, and his son Joash; next we find Amaziah and his son Uzziah. So here it is plain that several generations are left out, between Joram and Uzziah. The descendants were Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah and then Uzziah. These three generations are left out with a Divine appointment. We know how God speaks about special judgment to the third and fourth generations, we know, furthermore, that Jehosaphat's son was intermarried into the house of Ahab so much so that he was united to Athaliah, the daughter of Omri. It is peculiarly solemn to see this association with evil, and God dealt with it, as God always does. In like manner we may observe how all his immediate descendants brought before us for several generations, died violent or peculiar deaths. (2 Chronicles, 21, 4, 19; 22, 8, 10; 24, 24) Jehosaphat's world-bordering brought its solemn consequences. Now there is no difficulty in this connection if we recognise the wider usage of the word "begat". Moreover, it is in accord with Scripture genealogies to leave out certain names. A striking case occurs in Ezra 7, and here we have a passage which is deeply important to bring before Jews, because I am perfectly sure that if such a difficulty occurred in the Later Scriptures they would say there was plain evidence of a careless leaving out of certain facts. It is much more difficult here to see the reason. At first, it looks like carelessness; But how some of us now praise God for things which LOOK LIKE mere omission in the Hebrew Scriptures, because they contain just the witness we need to bring before Israel. You must remember that if there was nothing that looked like carelessness in the genealogies of the Hebrew Scriptures we should lose some most powerful arguments in dealing with the Jews who accept the Hebrew Scriptures. Another view of the value of difficulties is then brought before us. Will you have your Bibles open at 1 Chronicles 6, and Ezra 7 together. We read in 1 Chronicles 6, how that Eleazer begat Phineas, Phineas begat Abishua, Abishua Bukki, Bukki Uzzi, Uzzi Zerachiah, Zerachiah Meraioth, Meraioth Amariah, Amariah Ahitub, Ahitub Zadok, Zadok Ahimaaz, Ahimaaz Azariah, Azariah Johanan, Johanan Azariah, Azariah Amariah, Amariah Ahitub, Ahitub Zadok, Zadok Shallum, Shallum Hilkiah, Hilkiah Azariah, Azariah Seraiah, Seraiah Jehozadak. Here we have then brought before us a list of names in which the same name occurs several times. You notice in verse 7, Amariah, then again in verse 11, Amariah; stranger still Amariah begat Ahitub in verse 7, Amariah begat Ahitub in verse 11. But this is nothing extraordinary even though the next verse goes on, verse 8, Ahitub begat Zadok, and verse 12 goes on Ahitub begat Zadok. This is nothing extraordinary. We realise that it is quite possible that in the generation of a man in England there should be the grandfather John, the father George,

and the son Arthur, twice over. Hence this is nothing strange, all those names are common. These names were common to the family of Israel, common to the priestly tribe, hence there was an actual and historical coincidence, but nothing of error, when the names occurred in the same order. But when we turn to Ezra, we find that Ezra was the son of Seraiah, Azariah, Hilkiash, Shallum, Zadok, Ahitub, Amariah, Azariah, Meraioth, and we look back and we see that certain genealogies, certain names, have been left out, a goodly number of names, and that the names are left out after the recurrence of the same forms. In 1 Chronicles 6, 11 we have Ahitub, Amariah, Azariah, but then we have no Meriaoth till we look back to Ahitub and Amariah in verse 7. We praise God that in Ezra the verse does not read Azariah, Amariah, Meraioth. If the order had been Azariah, Amariah, Meraioth, if the order in Chronicles had been the same, people would have said, it is fairly plain that when the name Amariah was put down there was a lapse of memory and so a going back to the other Amariah, but the Holy Spirit provided that by putting an Azariah in between, that there might not be the charge of carelessness. But there are sufficient gaps in the genealogy to shut the mouth of every Jew who objects to Matthew 1. So we reach again the important principle that one difficulty is often two blessings. It is not only a blessing in the study of itself, but a blessing in opening up some other passage, and helping in the dealing with it, apart from the humility result that should be produced in every student who would follow out the Scriptures. We often learn more from what we do not know than from what we know. Sometimes the first lesson in the Lord's school is a lesson as to our own ignorance.

Turning back to Matthew, we find here that the Holy Spirit suggests plainly in verse 17 that there is some omission for we read, "All the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations", but the word "all" does not occur again in the later part of the verse. May not the omission be to show us that there are omissions of names? I suggest this is true in the third fourteen, though we cannot check this. But in the genealogy in Luke, which goes over a like period, there are more names, and therefore we have brought before us that it is probable there were more persons here. Coming back then, dear friends, to Matthew 1, we notice that it refers to David, the king. No one else is called the king. Why is this? No one else is viewed as a king except the one from whom the Lord Jesus descended, but THE King of the Jews descended from David the King. There is no king before David in the genealogy, there is none characterised as a king after David. Let this be divinely impressed. There was only one king in Christ's actual and personal ancestry. David did not come of a royal line, and David's royal son was not the one from whom the Lord Jesus descended.

It is interesting to notice that this genealogy refers to several women. We are told of Tamar, of Rahab, of Ruth, of Bathsheba

who is characterised as the wife of Uriah. I suppose that Uriah is mentioned, because a Hittite. Thus almost all the names that are unexpectedly inserted bring before us not only sin, but some relationship to Gentiles, and Christ's saving work for Gentiles seems a prominent thought. Rahab suggests Jericho, and Ruth brings before us the Moabites. All the names suggest sin, but we here have that which leads up to the birth of Him who should save His people from their sins. Bathsheba, as I have said, not only reminds of sin, but also the condemned Hittite nation. Where sin abounded, grace did MUCH MORE abound. Here is the Lord's wondrous working for the salvation of men, and women, Jews and Gentiles, including those who seem most unlikely. Verily, grace abounds. It is deeply important to be able to notice that this is not the genealogy of Christ BY BIRTH. In verse 16 the language changes. Jacob begat Joseph, the HUSBAND of Mary, of whom, (that is, of Mary, not of Joseph) was born Jesus, Who is called Christ. This change of speech, not only emphasizes the virgin birth of our beloved Lord, but makes perfectly clear to us that Matthew never meant this should be the personal genealogy of our Lord. That it is a certain royal genealogy is undoubtedly true that it could not be a personal genealogy is equally clear, for we have brought before us that Jechonias begat Salathiel and Salathiel begat Zorobabel. Now Jechonias was WRITTEN childless. The Messiah could not descend from him, and therefore it was deeply important that it should be made clear that the Lord Jesus Christ did not come from that family. Thus everything here is confirmatory of the position, clearly brought out from Luke's Gospel that there we have the personal genealogy of the Lord, and as one cannot have two personal genealogies, if He has only one parent, it is plain this must be the official genealogy, and as this is plainly the personal genealogy of Joseph, the other cannot be the personal genealogy of Joseph, because he cannot have two fathers, therefore the other one must be the official genealogy of Joseph, and the personal genealogy of Mary. In other words, Matthew's Gospel gives us the personal genealogy of Joseph, the official of Christ, Luke's the official genealogy of Joseph, the personal of Christ. Joseph comes into prominence not only because by Divine arrangement he was the guardian of the Lord Jesus, and the one who cared for Mary, on the journey into Egypt and all the other arrangements, and to whom Mary was rightly married after this, indeed Deuteronomy 22, 23, 24 shows that the betrothed was viewed as a wife, and therefore Joseph's genealogy becomes necessary for One born of a betrothed virgin, but the stress on Joseph is because the Holy Spirit would show that when Christ came into this world there was a gracious condescension to the needs and conditions and feelings of men. Jews always emphasized genealogies in connection with the male. It was therefore fitting that God the Holy Spirit, Who never panders to man's sinful tastes, yet Who nevertheless met man's national eastern wishes, should give a genealogy that would show the relationship of Joseph to the king, because this was an important point to be proved to the Jews of that day. I do not say that Gentiles should regard this today as so necessary, but God gave the testimony then as well, and it is sufficient that the Lord so viewed it, and it is important to see His condescending

love to give for a witness to the Jewish nation, (which left women out of genealogies as far as possible) a genealogy which emphasizes Joseph, yet which incidentally, and more than incidentally, refers to women, as we have seen by the mention of Thamar, Rahab, Ruth and the wife of Uriah. Thus God used everything to emphasize grace to sinners the more strikingly.

Shall we now turn to Luke 3? The contrasts here are very marked. We have brought before us no mention of the word "begat". The words "The son of" are in italics throughout. The genealogy is much longer, containing, if we include the Lord Jesus, and the initial mention of God in verse 38, 77 names, - a number that is suggestive. We thus see the lengthening first of all, from the time of Christ to the Babylonian captivity. Secondly, from that Babylonian captivity to David. Of necessity the names are the same from Abraham to David. Then there come the added names from Abraham to Adam in which we see the importance of Genesis 5 with regard to the line of grace. We notice here that in verse 22 the voice came out from heaven "Thou art My Beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased." It has been suggested that we should read the whole genealogy very manifestly in connection with Christ, thus, - That the Lord Jesus was the Son of Joseph, that He was the Son of Heli, that He was the Son of Matthat, and so forth right back to the Son of God. I am not quite sure that this aspect is quite the one emphasized by the Holy Spirit. Undoubtedly it is right to associate the Lord Jesus Christ with God, not only in His Deity, as being God, but in His humanity, and therefore it is right to read verse 23 very closely with verse 38. Those who have propounded this theory have doubtless thought that it would identify the Lord Jesus Christ with all the different generations during which there were some found on earth who were to be redeemed by His precious blood. But I think it is preferable not to read verse 23 by itself, but to recollect the words "as was supposed", or "as was being legally reckoned" with the whole genealogy. Here we have then a hint at the very beginning that though it affords the personal genealogy, it is not necessarily stated. There is no mention of the word "begat", as we have already seen. Obviously in many cases the literal begetting WAS what was reckoned, but in some cases it was not so. At least three occurrences can be traced. Jesus was reckoned the son of Joseph, and they said, "Is not this the carpenter's Son"? but actually He was not. Joseph was evidently not the son of Heli, for Matthew very definitely tells us that Jacob begat Joseph, and the word "begat" cannot be put on one side, it must include Blood-relationship. Now a man cannot have two fathers, therefore it seems necessary to apply the words "as was reckoned". But if Heli was not the father of Joseph, Joseph was nevertheless rightly reckoned heir of Heli, because Mary, the daughter of Heli was espoused to Joseph. Jewish writings associate this name Heli with the father of Mary, and here is plainly Mary's personal genealogy. The other occurrence

is undoubtedly in verse 38. Adam was not literally the Son of God. He was not born of God in the same way as we are spiritually born of God, certainly He was not Son of God as That Glorious One Who is over all, our beloved Lord Jesus. But he was legally reckoned as belonging to God and distinct from all the animal creation, for God created man in His own image, in His own likeness as Matthew shows. Hence the genealogy says nothing inconsistent with other parts of Scripture. It never associates the Lord Jesus Christ physically and personally with Joseph. There is no contradiction, but everything is what we should anticipate, yet worded in a way that rebukes shallow thinking, and emphasizes the male line in genealogy quite as much as Matthew, though quite differently. Luke's Gospel deals with Christ's relationship to Gentiles, in another way to Matthew, and brings before us a great stress on women, even in the very first chapter, emphasizing Elizabeth and Mary, but yet they are not introduced in the genealogy as in Matthew. It is fitting that the Gospel of Luke which presents to us so often the MAN Christ Jesus, and lays such emphasis upon His prayers, that this Gospel should in genealogy, go back not to Abraham, but to Adam, and should contain the personal genealogy not of Joseph but of Mary. Everything is in accord with the Divine appointment, and we can only bow our heads and worship. But, beloved friends, it is not enough for us to know these facts, it is not enough to solve difficulties, and to meet arguments, we need to realise what the incarnation of Christ means to our hearts, that He Who was rich for our sakes became poor, that He Who was over all emptied Himself and took upon Him the form of a servant, and having become a Babe He grew up, described in the wondrous words of Luke 2, as growing up and waxing strong in spirit, being filled with wisdom and with the grace of God upon Him, that He went through those thirty years of waiting, like unto the period of the Levites, in order that He might rightly enter upon the ministry at the Father's appointed time, even that brief ministry culminating in His death for poor guilty sinners such as we are, and followed by the glorious resurrection, - the evidence that His sacrifice was accepted and the proof of our eternal security, if so be that by the work of the Holy Spirit we have been caused to flee for refuge to lay hold of the Hope set before us, not that we might become clever in genealogies, but that knowing Christ as our personal Saviour, we might value all the Scriptures and feed upon all the Scriptures and live with the largest confidence in all that God has set forth.

Q. Did you say that Jeconiah was written childless?

A. In Jeremiah 22, verse 28, God says, "Is this man Coniah, a despised broken idol? Is he a vessel wherein is no pleasure? wherefore are they cast out, HE AND HIS SEED and are cast into a

land which they know not. O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper IN HIS DAYS, for no man OF HIS SEED shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." The childlessness is not personal, but as to ruling power. The next chapter goes on to say, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch (Not unto Coniah and to David,) and a King shall reign and prosper", - "No man of his seed shall prosper" said the other passage - "And shall execute judgment and justice in the earth", (Concerning Coniah, it said O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord). Mark the expression respecting Christ, "IN HIS DAYS JUDAH SHALL BE SAVED". As to Coniah we are told a man that shall not prosper IN HIS DAYS. Scripture adds regarding Christ, "And Israel shall dwell safely, and this is His Name whereby He shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness". Here we have Jehovah, our Righteousness, - the Lord Jesus, and the pleasure of the Lord prospers in His hand (Isaiah 53, 10) Coniah is as it were beheaded, his real name is JEconiah, just a contrast with the One Whose Name is given us beautifully in full.

Q. I understand that Jeconiah did have children in the ordinary sense?

A. Yes, WRITTEN childless as to the kingdom, is the thought here. "He and his seed" and "no man of his seed shall prosper" imply that he had children.

Q. And the sceptre passed out of the hands of his immediate descendants?

A. And into the hands of the Nathan line of David.

Q. At that time, at Coniah's time?

A. No other king came to the throne except his uncle, his father's brother, Mattaniah, Mattaniah changes into Zedekiah. It is wonderful how God MANIFESTLY kept His Word. Of no other king of Judah's line could this have been said. Though God permitted another king after this, He arranged that it was not a son but it was an uncle.

Q. But that uncle was a son of Josiah, was not he?

A. Undoubtedly.

Q. As Coniah was a grandson.

A. Undoubtedly. Christ does not descend from Mattaniah or Zedekiah or Josiah at all. Christ goes right back to David, He does

not even come from Solomon. He is never called in Scripture, the Son of Solomon. He is said to belong to Jesse, to belong to David, but not to anyone subsequently. There is only one king in Christ's personal genealogy. That has struck me very forcibly. It never impressed me till somewhat recently, only one king.

Q. This was typical of course?

A. Very typical, intensely.

Q. What real power there was continued in Jeconiah's line for a time, did it not; Zerubbabel being governor after the captivity?

A. That was not sitting on the throne was it?

Q. No, he was not a king by any means.

A. No.

Q. There has been no real king since Zedekiah?

A. True.

Q. In the 23rd verse of Luke's genealogy, "And Jesus Himself began to be about 30 years of age, being as was supposed the son of Joseph." Could we make that parenthetic and then say, "Which was of Heli," leaving the suppositional parent and including the matter-of-fact parent?

A. That would not be true.

Q. He is definitely associated with Heli, but as was supposed of Joseph?

A. You are associating Christ with ALL the preceding persons.

Q. With all, yes, except the one who was supposed.

A. I do not like to say that is wrong, but I shall not feel on such sure ground in bringing that before a Jew, but rather would emphasize that the words "as was supposed" or "as was being reckoned" and to the genealogy generally that here we have not in every case direct blood relationship.

Q. I was only thinking that because Joseph was not the son of Heli only an heir through being espoused to Heli's daughter?

A. Yes, it is perfectly true. I have not the slightest objection to the truth of the statement, but the words "as was legally supposed" or possibly "as was reckoned" are plainly associated with

Joseph primarily, because they are put in to make perfectly clear that our beloved Lord had no human father.

Q. And then the 38th verse, "Which was of God"?

A. God breathed into man's nostrils a breath of life and man became a living soul.

Q. The creation would not imply that he was a son? -

A. The term "son", which is one of dignity is purposely omitted, through this passage, to make verse 22 stand out in entire contrast. We have here, "Thou art My beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased," "Being son as was reckoned of Joseph" There is no mention of sonship in the genealogy except in the word "as was reckoned", because Christ is marked out with a twofold sonship here. The sonship with respect to the Father, verse 22, not as was reckoned, but as was Divinely stated, then sonship as to Joseph, and so forth, as was reckoned. Not one other is called the son, and Adam is not called the Son of God for the term "son" is one of dignity.

Q. That "as was supposed" seems, if we take it the other way to have the effect of setting all the more than 70 names aside, as being factors in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but leaving the 22nd verse open, "Thou art My beloved Son" setting all those names aside as God's creatures, as God's creation, and associating Him immediately with God.

A. Although I do not want to lay too much stress on our English version, "as was supposed", because suppositions, are usually unsatisfactory, and though undoubtedly it was a common supposition, that He was the son of Joseph, which was man's erroneous opinion, His relationship to the others in the genealogy was a real fact, and a Divinely appointed fact, that He might literally and personally and actually be the Seed of the woman. I have no doubt that the going back to Adam here is particularly in connection with that promise in Genesis 3 which fittingly comes to mind in connection with the passage that brings before us Mary the woman. Some little difficulty may be presented by the mention of Salathiel and Zorobabel in verse 27 in this chapter. That is possibly the greatest difficulty of the two genealogies. You can at once see what a problem that seems to present at first with regard to Jeremiah 22, and how it seems to bring Christ back again into the line of Jeconiah, but I Chronicles 3, contains these names Salathiel and Zorobabel yet it also mentions a Pedaiiah in such a way as to bring before us one of two thoughts. First that there may have been many of the same name. We have already seen that illustrated in the genealogy of Ezra. Secondly, it causes us to notice that certain persons had more than one name. You know that Abiathar is called Ahimelech,

and Ahimelech is called Abiathar in the priestly line at the time of David, the father had the son's name, and the son had the father's name. If that was the case, is it surprising that those who were fairly closely related should very often have a kind of interchange of names. Certain names becoming almost official to the family, and something like our surnames. Even among us, a son often has the father's name, though it may be second. Luke 1. 61 helps showing the usual thought then prevalent.

Q. Under different circumstances, and in different associations a man might be recognised by different names too, might he not?

A. Yes. I am so thankful there is a difficulty in 1 Chronicles, 3, because it helps all our difficulty here, I mean the extra name of Pedaiah coming in.

Q. Christ did not come through Rahab?

A. Surely so, every one before David was in the ancestry of Christ. It must be so, must it not? It is only with Solomon that that the break comes, for the Lord is in Nathan's line, but everyone before David remains. It is noteworthy that the women are mentioned in Matthew 1, down to David. They are not mentioned afterward, because the part of the genealogy afterward is not the personal genealogy of the Lord Jesus. Gentiles are not mentioned in the second part, there is a beautiful reason for this.

Q. With regard to Ruth being brought into the line of our Lord, was it not said in the law of Moses that an Edomite or a Moabite was not to enter into the congregation of the Lord?

A. But we are thankful that a Moabite is not a Moabiteess., the masculine and the feminine were definitely distinguished.

Q. That would only apply to the male?

A. I think so.

Q. Ammon and Moab were the two prohibited nations?

A. Are there not three? Ammonite and Moabite excluded till their 10th generation, an Edomite excluded to the third generation.

Q. The tenth generation would mean indefinitely, would it not?

A. Would the third generation mean indefinitely?

Q. No, I have always looked upon ten as the indefinite number.

A. I should hesitate to go as far.

Q. That sounds rather weak - a Moabite does not include a Moabitess.

A. Surely not, the whole context in Deuteronomy 23 is dealing with males. The language is particularly referring to males from verse 1 to verse 8, and it goes on at once to mention the army going forth against the enemy, and we know how the Midianites and the Moabites were together in the time of Balak. Moses was commanded in Numbers 31 to avenge the children of the Midianites. Israel went forth and the Lord gave a special definite arrangement as the families of Midian and Moab who were linked together, at the very beginning, and refers back to it by the mention of the host in this immediate context in Deuteronomy 23. Thus the grace to Rahab is anticipated, in measure, in a chapter that men have so often opposed.

Further literature, concerning the Lord, gladly sent (international) to exercised believers for personal perusal, and **passing on** to God's glory, some also in German, Spanish, Russian, Polish, Czech, Romanian:

- "To Testify the Gospel of the Grace of God." -

COPIES FREE (as the Lord enables) on application to:
Scriptural literature for Believers
Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 - 74343 Sachsenheim - GERMANY