

The Exaltation of Jesus

By Phillip G. Kayser · Acts 2:29-39 · 2005-8-7

Last week we looked at the humiliation of Jesus and how foolish it is to be ashamed of Him. To be ashamed of the cross of Christ is to miss God's delight in His Son. It is to miss the fullness of joy that verse 28 speaks about. And of course we saw that it is to miss out on life altogether. Today I want to show how Peter closes his sermon by showing the exaltation of Jesus. But before I get there, I want to comment on a phrase that keeps coming up in this book. And since I haven't commented on it so far, this is probably as good a time as any to do so. This is kind of a rabbit trail before we even get on the trail of the exaltation of Christ.

In Peter's interpretation (2:29-36)

A false interpretation ruled out (2:29)

Verse 29 starts with the phrase, "Men and brethren." Here's the question: Why do the apostles constantly address the men in their sermons? You see that in verse 14: "Men of Judea." You see that in verse 22: "Men of Israel." You see it again in verse 29: "Men and brethren." You saw it in chapter 1 when Peter addresses the church, even though there were clearly women present. Those phrases are repeated over and over again later on in this book. Or sometimes (I counted 51 times in Acts), despite the fact that there were women in the audience, the apostles say, "Men." And this was not just with the Jews. In Acts 17, Paul says, "Men of Athens..." In Acts 19 he says, "Men of Ephesus." Nor is this unique to the book of Acts. This occurs so pervasively in the Bible that one commentator claimed that the Scriptures only addressed the men. That's actually not true. When there are exhortations that pertain exclusively to wives, such as in 1 Peter 3 or in Ephesians 5, the apostles will on occasion say, "Wives," and address them directly. And I think that is appropriate in our preaching today as well. But that is extremely rare in the bible. Ordinarily God addresses the women and children through the men. Even Proverbs 31 (the chapter that beautifully describes the ideal woman) is not directly addressed to women. It is addressed to King Lemuel. He is told in verses 1-3 not to be attracted to loose women, but to seek a godly wife. And it says, "Who can *find* a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies.*" Why is the description of the virtuous wife addressed to the *man*? This has really mystified some people. In fact, in the TNIV (which is a gender neutral Bible) they translate the phrase "men and brethren" as "brothers and sisters." But that is to totally miss the point of why the Scriptures are addressed to the men.

I believe that there are several reasons, and none of them have anything to do with the false feminist charge that the Bible is not interested in women and children. That is absolutely not true. This book has elevated the status of women in every society to which it has gone. It is filled with instructions concerning the joyful role of women and children. God is *very* interested in them, and patriarchy was invented by God as the best means of promoting their welfare. Biblical Patriarchy fights against selfish

chauvinism just as much as it fights against selfish feminism. But the question *still* arises, "OK, I understand that; but why does the Bible tend to almost always address the men?"

The short answer is that they are the heads of the families and God ordinarily addresses the *whole* family through the patriarch. You can see that in Jeremiah 44 where God holds the men accountable for the sins of their wives and treats them not as individuals, but as families. If you bypass the patriarch all kinds of problems result. If you bypass the family as a governmental unit and only deal with the individuals of the family, all kinds of problems can result. Now here's the problem: we are so immersed in a culture of individualism in America that my short answer would probably make no sense to most Americans. So let me give you the long answer.

The first reason is hinted at in this chapter, and that is that God is interested in capturing and blessing families, not just individuals. And the most effective means of doing that is through the Father. Let's just look at the issue of evangelism in this chapter. Even if you were total pragmatists who ignored the Scriptures and only wanted to do what worked (and of course we are not pragmatists – but if you were), you would have to conclude that evangelizing men should be the top priority of the church *if you wanted to reach the women and children*. Let me repeat that in a different way. If you wanted to reach every man, woman and child on planet earth, the best way to do so would be to first of all evangelize the men. You will see this pattern all through the book of Acts, with one exception (Lydia) so that we don't get legalistic. Of course, that technically isn't an exception since she was the head of that household. So it actually fits the picture. But I have read quite a number of statistical studies on the evangelism that has gone on in this country and in other countries, and here is the consensus. If the child is the first one in a family that is led to the Lord, there is only a 3.5% probability that the rest of the family will come. You can look at Child Evangelism Fellowship or many other evangelistic campaigns, and you will find this to be true. Child Evangelism is not the best way to reach the family. It doesn't mean that we can't engage in it, but in terms of priorities, it is not very successful. Less than 4%.

If the mother is the first in the family to come to Christ, there is a 17% probability that the rest of the family will come. So in 17% of the cases, the whole family came to Christ when the mother did. That's a huge improvement. But it ought to scare any woman who wants to marry an unbeliever with the thought that she will lead him to Christ. It just doesn't work that way. In fact, there are even fewer cases of a believer who sinned by marrying an unbeliever, leading her spouse to Christ – probably because of the compromise that complicated the issue.

Now contrast that with evangelism that focuses on men. When the man of the household is the first to come to Christ, there is a 93% probability that the whole family will come. And these statistics have held true despite the fact that most of the efforts of evangelical churches in the last 100 years have been focused on reaching women and youth. By far the vast majority of money has been spent on reaching women and children. And yet they have failed. I find that remarkable. Now hear me: Peter did not engage in this method of evangelism because of pragmatism. Sure God's ways work,

and any time we deviate from God's methods it *will* mess things up, but Peter did not address the men because it worked. He addressed them because this has been God's covenantal model since the time of Adam.

Nor is this only true in evangelism. In Leon J. Podles book, *The Church Impotent: The Feminization of Christianity*, he documents that as the church has increasingly geared its teaching and programs to women and children, the men have left. You can see this in Japan (which is a predominantly female church); you can see this in America, in Canada and in Europe. He has documented that this has happened wherever the teaching and programs have been geared toward women. And he found that interestingly, the reverse has not been true. Both men and women have been attracted to the church and have become strong in that church when the teaching has been geared towards the men. It's a fascinating study. Another scholar said, "Orthodox Judaism has no crisis of the missing male because it more closely follows the ecclesiastical structures of the Biblically-approved synagogue system, a system where the synagogue is a servant of the covenant community, not vice-versa." One Reformed writer, after looking at the research and the Scriptural model said, "preaching should be self-consciously directed to the men of the covenant. Preaching is very powerful. In many contexts it reproduces its character in the congregation. If preaching is soft, round, pretty and introspective, you'll have a congregation of women, though they be of both sexes. If it is clear, well-defined, direct and objective, you'll find men drawn to it, *and women and children, too!* It's a case of 'Where the Boys Are,' my friends. Preach to women, have women; preach to men, have men, women and children." Now that may be a slight exaggeration, and we don't do things based on pragmatism anyway. But I thought you would be interested in seeing the results first. Now let me give you some of the Biblical reasons for this phenomenon.

The first reason is that the church of Jesus Christ is not made up of individuals, but of families. Biblical society is not made up of individuals, but of families. Over fifty times the Bible mentions either church or state covenants made with the fathers of families. Eighty times it numbers the members of the church by counting simply the male heads of households. In fact, you will notice the same thing in Acts. Look for example at Acts 4:4. It says, "However, many of those who heard the word believed; and the number of men came to be about five thousand." Is he denying that women believed? No. He has mentioned numerous men and women who believed, but they are counted by heads of households. The same is true in the Gospels. Matthew 14:21 says, "Now those who had eaten were about five thousand men, besides women and children." And so, to repeat this theological point, churches are composed of families, not individuals. Society is composed of families, not churches.

Now if churches really believed that theological point, it would revolutionize the way they functioned. It would rule out age segregated Sunday School. It would rule out a separate Children's Church. It would change the way they engage in ministry and the way they vote. How do most modern churches vote? They do so as a democracy where every individual has a vote. But the Biblical church is not a democracy; it is a theocratic republic. That's why in Biblical times, each family got only one vote. Why? Because it's not made up of individuals. And to fail to work through the head of the household would

be to undermine the integrity of that family. It is respecting (not diminishing) the integrity of the household unit as a whole for Peter to be preaching to men. He is saying in effect, "I respect the government of the family."

Secondly, according to Scripture, if the head of household is addressed, the whole family connected to him is addressed and they are responsible. Numbers 30:1 says, "Then Moses spoke to the heads of the tribes concerning the children of Israel, saying, "This *is* the thing which the LORD has commanded:" and he goes on to describe vows that are made by their wives and children. The whole chapter indicates that even though the instructions were given through the head of the household, God was indeed speaking to every member of the family and their responsibilities. Jeremiah 44 addresses every member of the families even though he only speaks to the men. Read any standard exposition of the ten commandments (which is addressed to men), and you will see how this works out. Now this may mean that a woman or a child who hears these words to the men will come to Christ and the husband does not. 1 Peter 3:1-7 addresses this possibility. But that passage goes on to show how God still does not deal with them as individuals who are divorced from their families. God values the family unit even when there are unbelievers in it. And so the second reason is that the women and the children really are being addressed when the men are addressed. They are addressed through their covenant head. They are not being left out.

But thirdly, passages like Jeremiah 44 and Numbers 30 show that the father; the husband is responsible for all of the actions that go on in that family. It says that if a child or a wife makes a vow and the father hears it, but does not oppose the vow until another day, he is liable for her breaking of the vow. If the vow was something that should not have been made, he needs to annul it the same day he hears about it. Failure to do so means that it has agreed to the vow. The actions of the wife and the child are his actions. He's the pastor of that family. He cannot lay the blame on his wife as Adam did. The buck stops with him. The Scriptural family is a patriarchal family from Genesis through Revelation. The man is accountable. He is the captain and he gets the blame when the ship goes down. Men don't like to hear that, but it is part of the equation.

Fourth, this is actually a protection of the family from the encroachments of other governments. There is a constant tendency of civil government and church government to become huge bloated power-hungry centers. Almost eighty times in Scripture it mentions the state government being limited in its powers by the head of household or the fathers of the families. One of the most moving examples of that was in 1 Kings 21 when king Ahab felt stymied by a head of household who stood up to the king. And he felt Ahab couldn't do anything about it. Naboth knew what his families rights were. In contrast, analyze the ideal of individualism anywhere in the world and you will find that it not only weakens the family, but that it also leads to tyranny. The pursuit of individualism destroys the power of the family and elevates the power of state and church – *automatically*. It's an inescapable fact. The first country to idealize individualism was France under the French Revolution, and it is a textbook case on the tyranny that individualism leads to. On the other hand, when other governments are forced to work through (not around, but through) family governments, such

encroachments are limited. When you find a church that wants to teach the children separately and will not allow the parents to be present (and that's the policy in many churches – parents are not allowed into the Sunday School room), then you have trouble. In a marvelous essay on the limits of the church, one Reformed pastor said, "Power is a commodity, subject to the law of scarcity: there's just so much to go around. Find an undue concentration of power in one institution and you'll likely discover it was gotten at the expense of another. How important it is, then, to strive to keep institutions operating within their God-appointed limits! The untoward amassing of power in the state, for example, is not innocent. It's power taken from another to whom it had been assigned by God." And so the governmental head of the family is being addressed by Peter and is being respected.

Now even with this explanation it may seem fuzzy in your minds. It's sort of like asking a fish if it is wet? And the fish who has never experienced dryness wonders what wet is. We are so immersed in a culture of individualism that is sometimes hard for us to think in covenantal terms. So when the Great Commission tells us to disciple nations, we don't think nations: we think *individuals* from every nation. When Acts 3:25 says, "And in your seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed," we don't think families, we think individuals from families. But I think it is important that we start reading Acts through Jewish eyes. The book will open up if you start reading it through Jewish eyes.

Well, that was a long side note from the main theme of this passage, but let's move on. Verse 29: "Men and brethren, let me speak freely to you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his tomb is with us to this day." The reason he mentions that David was dead and buried and was still in the tomb was that David could not possibly have been the fulfillment of Psalm 16, which Peter had just finished quoting. It had to be a reference to somebody else. And that someone else was Jesus.

By the way, this is proof that David was not one of those raised when Christ was raised. Matthew 27 says "*many* bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised." *Many*, but not *all*. Matthew Henry believes that it was only martyrs who were given this special privilege of being part of the firstfruits. It was a limited resurrection. So, argues Peter, David is still in the grave.

Verse 30: "Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn of his body, according to the flesh, He would raise up the Christ to sit on his throne, he foreseeing this, spoke concerning the resurrection of the Christ, that His soul was not left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption." David's body *did see corruption*. David could not possibly have been the primary referent in Psalm 16. The implication is that neither could Solomon, or Rehoboam, or any other dead king. These two verses are critical to understanding the enthronement of Jesus on the throne of David, so let's tear it apart phrase by phrase:

Verse 30 says, "Therefore, being a prophet" [I want you to notice that this is one of 35 times that the book of Acts defines what it means by "prophet." There is a modern charismatic idea out there that the New Testament uses the term prophet differently from the Old Testament. Well, this is one of several verses that prove them wrong. They

claim that New Testament prophets can make mistakes and are not infallible. But the problem with this theory is that Luke uses the term prophet *interchangeably* for both Old Testament writers of Scripture and New Testament prophets. According to his usage of terms, they are identical. His point was that Psalm 16 was written under inspiration and was predicting the future. "therefore, being a prophet", "and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his body, *according to the flesh*" [so it had to be a *literal* descendent of David. It couldn't be a figurative descendent. "according to the flesh" - Does anyone today know who is a fleshly descendent of David? No. Not a chance. All genealogies were long ago lost, and the Jews are so intermixed that there are no tribes or divisions. The fulfillment of this cannot be future as Jews claim, but had to be when the tribes were still distinct, or at least when David's family was still intact. And by the way, the passage that has these exact words is Psalm 132:11. Let me read that: "The LORD has sworn in truth to David; He will not turn from it: 'I will set upon your throne the fruit of your body.'" But notice the next phrase in Acts 2:30] "He would raise up the Christ to sit on his" [that is, on David's] "throne, he foreseeing *this*" [foreseeing what? Foreseeing that God would raise up the Christ to sit on David's *throne*. "he, foreseeing this,] "spoke concerning the resurrection of the Christ..." Get that phrase. The time that Jesus sits on David's throne is not future to us. It was when Christ was raised from the dead. It was the first century. He is presently sitting on David's throne.

Before we move on, I need to clarify what is meant by that. Was the *literal* throne that David sat on hundreds of years earlier still in existence, and somehow a wooden throne gets taken to heaven? And I would say, "No. It is a figure of speech." To sit on David's throne means to *rule* over David's kingdom.^[1] In my footnotes I have fourteen references to someone sitting on the throne of David, and all of them are figurative of the kingdom. Every one of them. Solomon was said to be sitting on the throne of David even though the literal throne that he had for ceremonial occasions was a hundred times more magnificent than the ceremonial chair that David had. And yet he is still sitting on David's throne. Likewise, both David's throne and Solomon's throne was said to be God's throne. 1 Chronicles 29:23 says, "Then Solomon sat on the throne of YAHWEH as king instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him." The literal throne that either David or Solomon sat on during ceremonial occasions didn't look anything like the description of God's throne in heaven. But since David and Solomon were God's representatives on earth, their throne *was* God's throne. And it's in that same sense that Acts indicates that when Jesus sits on His own throne, He is also sitting on David's throne. And so, in each of these passages, "throne" means kingdom. Jeremiah and Isaiah make several references to kings sitting on the throne of David centuries after David's throne was destroyed.

But even if you were to take this in a literalistic sense, as premillennialists sometimes do, there is still no getting around the conclusion. The prophecy of the Messiah sitting on David's throne was fulfilled in the resurrection. "He, foreseeing this, spoke concerning the resurrection of the Christ, that His soul was not left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption." I already commented on those words last time. His flesh was in the grave and did not rot, and His soul was in Hades and was not left there. And I gave a lengthy exposition of what is meant by Hades.

Verse 32: "This Jesus God has raised up, of which we are all witnesses." According to Matthew 28:11-15 it was common knowledge that Christ's tomb was empty. Everybody knew it. Even the guards were admitting it. There were over 500 witnesses who had seen His resurrected body. They could testify to the fact that Christ had been exalted. They saw Him ascend. They were witnesses.

Verse 33: "Therefore being exalted to the right hand of God," The right hand of God was the place of highest honor; the second in command. This means that Jesus has been given authority over all creation. And of course, that is exactly what He said in Matthew 28. "All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth." This means that He has inherited His kingdom.

This exaltation of the Son of Man to the right hand of God was prophetically recorded for us in Daniel 7:13,14. It says that He went up to the Ancient of Days on the clouds of heaven and the Son of Man

came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. Then to Him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass way, and His kingdom the one which shall not be destroyed.

So these are incredibly exciting words that Peter is declaring. The kingdom has started.

Peter goes on in verse 33: "Therefore being exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He poured out this which you now see and hear." John 7:39 says that we couldn't have the Spirit and His gifts unless the Son was glorified. So the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost was further proof that Messiah has been glorified and enthroned and has all authority.

Verse 34: "For David did not ascend into the heavens, but he says himself: 'The LORD said to my Lord, Sit at My right hand, till I make Your enemies Your footstool.'" But Psalm 68:18 and Psalm 110:1 both tie this sitting at the right hand of the LORD to Christ receiving His kingdom. What troubles so many people is that Christ did not set up an instantaneous victory of world peace, so they think that Christ can't be on His throne. But the word "till" implies a gradual progress of subduing resistance to His will. It doesn't happen all of a sudden. It's gradual. In fact, that is the point of many of the parables of the kingdom, that the kingdom would grow slowly. And the very next verse in Psalm 110 makes this clear. But let me read you the context of Psalm 110, which was being quoted here. It says,

The LORD said to my Lord, 'Sit at My right hand, till I make Your enemies Your footstool,' The LORD shall send the rod of Your strength out of Zion. Rule in the midst of Your enemies!

According to that passage there are still plenty of enemies when Christ begins His rule. He rules not in the absence of enemies, but in the midst of enemies. And how does He expand His rule? Psalm 110:3 says it is through the empowering of His people by the Spirit, and the next verse indicates that it is through Christ's priestly work. That must go on until all enemies are subdued beneath His feet as vassals. 1 Corinthians 15 expands

on this verse and says that putting all enemies beneath Christ's feet means that they serve Him. In other words, they are converted. Then and only then does Christ come back and end history according to 1 Corinthians 15.

Peter goes on in verse 36: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ." When Christ ascended to heaven, God the Father conferred the titles of "Lord" and "Christ" upon Him. Prior to this, Jesus did not call Himself by those titles (with the exception of when they adjured Him at His trial to say whether He was the Christ). This was His enthronement.

Interestingly, in the Greek, the words, "whom you crucified" are left to the end. The very one whom all the evidence shows was the Messiah; the very one who has been given all authority in heaven and on earth; the very one who is at the right hand of the Father, you have crucified. What terrifying words. No wonder the next verse says

"Now when they heard this, they were cut to the heart and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?'" Let me make an observation. Speeches by themselves cannot accomplish this work of humbling. But the Holy Spirit was powerfully at work on that day quickening the Scripture to the hearts of the Jews, bringing conviction and drawing them to Christ. And evidence of a change of heart can be seen in that they no longer called the apostles "Galileans," but called them "brethren." God is already knitting a kinship of spirit between them.

Notice too that it was only when these men were helpless, terrified and asking for help that Peter gives the solution. We are too quick to give the answer of how to get saved. We give it to people before they even feel lost. Peter didn't start with the good news as so many evangelists do today. He started with their wickedness in crucifying Christ in verse 23, hammers home point after point of how serious this rebellion against the Lord of history really was. In fact in verse 40 he continues to bring home that message. He only gave them hope when they were beginning to despair. Ray Comfort points out in his tape, "Hell's Best Kept Secret" that this was the normal strategy of evangelism in the Bible. The preaching of the law and conviction is the primary message of the Gospel. The solution is only given later. Otherwise you pick green fruit.

Nor does Peter go straight to faith. Look at verse 38: "Then Peter said to them, 'Repent,'" Though repentance by itself does not save, Scripture is clear that without repentance there can be no salvation because without repentance there is no genuine faith. Repentance and faith are flip sides of one coin. They are not synonyms as some people claim or the Bible would not say, "Repent *and* believe" or "repentance *and* faith." No, they happen at the same time, but they are two separate things. means to confess that we are as wicked as God says that we are and to turn from our sins to Christ. This is completely contrary to the self-esteem movement. It is not until we have no self-esteem left that we will recognize our need of a savior. Prior to that time our hearts are constantly seeking to provide their own solutions. So Peter destroys man's trust in himself by calling for repentance. Then, and only then does he call for trust. And this trust is visually pictured by baptism. "and let every one of you be baptized in the name

of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Water baptism was the sign, not the reality. You may remember from chapter 1 that John the Baptist had indicated that water baptism could accomplish nothing on its own. It was simply a statement of faith that looked forward to Spirit baptism. By being baptized they were expressing their trust in God's provision from above.

I agree with Simon Kisetmaker and Ned B. Stonehouse and other commentators that the clause "And you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" should be seen as a separate statement. Ned Stonehouse concludes a detailed study by saying, "One may conclude with confidence that Acts 2:38 is not to be understood as teaching that the gift of the Holy Spirit was conditional upon baptism." He is saying that the church is wrong in saying that water baptism saves us and produces Spirit baptism. Simon Kistemaker agrees and says, "A study in Acts on baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit reveals that these two are related but do not necessarily follow each other." Just as two examples, we can note that Cornelius received the baptism of the Spirit *before* he received water baptism, whereas disciples in Acts 19 received the Spirit shortly *after* being baptized in water. God is sovereign and can do it any time that He wants. But ultimately it is the Spirit who saves us.

But the cool thing about this verse is that it shows a historical transition. Once Pentecost has come, the ordinary time at which people receive the baptism of the Spirit is at the moment of conversion. Repent... and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The same Spirit that the 120 received, we receive when we are converted. That is the ordinary pattern. 1 Corinthians 12:13 says, "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free—and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." This baptism is the initiation into the Messianic kingdom and the empowering for that kingdom. And it's not just a few elites who can receive this baptism of the Spirit.

Verse 39 says, "For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all who are afar off, as many as the Lord our God will call." That gift of the Spirit is a permanent gift to the church until the Second Coming of Christ. And interestingly, it is promised not just to these adults, but their children, and not just to Jews, but to those who are afar off. But this baptism of the Spirit is only given to those whom God calls. Joel said that the Spirit would be poured out upon all flesh, not just Jews. Isaiah 44 talks about the Spirit being poured out upon our children. That chapter speaks of God's care for our babies in the womb (verse 2), then baptism in water (verse 3), then baptism of the Spirit (verse 3), then growing up (verse 4), then professing faith and signing the covenant (verse 5). But the relevant phrase is, "I will pour My Spirit on your descendants and MY blessing on your offspring." If the Baptism of the Spirit is for empowering, that means that even our believing youth have access to all the empowering they need to fulfill God's mandate.

I'll try to finish this chapter off next time, but for today let's glory in the fact that the long anticipated kingdom was started at Pentecost, that the long anticipated time for taking the earth for God's glory has begun, that all the empowering we need to accomplish that task has been provided in the Holy Spirit. Amen.

-
1. *2Samuel 3:10* to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul, and set up the **throne of David** over Israel and over Judah, from Dan to Beersheba."

1Kings 2:24 Now therefore, as the LORD lives, who has confirmed me and set me on the **throne of David** my father, and who has established a house for me, as He promised, Adonijah shall be put to death today!"

1Kings 2:45 But King Solomon *shall be* blessed, and the **throne of David** shall be established before the LORD forever."

Isaiah 9:7 Of the increase of *His* government and peace

There will be no end,

Upon the **throne of David** and over His kingdom,

To order it and establish it with judgment and justice

From that time forward, even forever.

The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.

Jeremiah 13:13 "Then you shall say to them, "Thus says the LORD: 'Behold, I will fill all the inhabitants of this land—even the kings who sit on **David's throne**, the priests, the prophets, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem—with drunkenness!

Jeremiah 17:25 then shall enter the gates of this city kings and princes sitting on the **throne of David**, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, accompanied by the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this city shall remain forever.

Jeremiah 22:2 and say, "Hear the word of the LORD, O king of Judah, you who sit on the **throne of David**, you and your servants and your people who enter these gates!

Jeremiah 22:4 For if you indeed do this thing, then shall enter the gates of this house, riding on horses and in chariots, accompanied by servants and people, kings who sit on the **throne of David**.

Jeremiah 22:30 Thus says the LORD:

"Write this man down as childless,

A man *who* shall not prosper in his days;

For none of his descendants shall prosper,

Sitting on the **throne of David**,

And ruling anymore in Judah.' "

Jeremiah 29:16 therefore thus says the LORD concerning the king who sits on the **throne of David**, concerning all the people who dwell in this city, and concerning your brethren who have not gone out with you into captivity—

Jeremiah 36:30 Therefore thus says the LORD concerning Jehoiakim king of Judah: "He shall have no one to sit on the **throne of David**, and his dead body shall be cast out to the heat of the day and the frost of the night.

1Kings 2:12 Then Solomon sat on the **throne of his father** David; and his kingdom was firmly established.

2Kings 10:3 choose the best qualified of your master's sons, set *him* on his **father's throne**, and fight for your master's house.

Luke 1:32 He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God will give Him the **throne of His father** David. 