

The Baptism and Genealogy of Jesus

📖 Luke 3:21-38

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 August 22, 2018

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Last time we concluded Luke's treatment of John the Baptizer in 3:1-20. What we noted in 3:1-6 is that John came to fulfill the role of forerunner of Messiah. The forerunner was to prepare the Jewish people for the Messiah's arrival. The preparation involved a baptism of repentance, where the one being baptized was repenting of the ways of the Pharisees and Sadducees and returning to the true intent of the Mosaic Covenant. The repentance required a visible change of behavior. This would make them ready for the Lord so that they could believe in Him. In verse 7, crowds of people came out to the Jordan River from all over Israel to be baptized by John. John's message, "You brood of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" sent an electric shock throughout the streets of Israel. According to the parallel in Matthew, the Pharisees and Sadducees were among the crowds and they were chiefly the brood of vipers John warned. His warning was that the wrath of the day of the Lord was near. So, in verse 8, they needed to bear fruits in keeping with repentance and they should not say to themselves, "We have the merits of Abraham" and thereby conclude that they were exempt from wrath, for God is able to raise up a spiritual children that are not descended from Abraham, a reference to any and all Gentiles who have faith. In verse 9 the need for repentance was urgent, "Indeed the axe is already laid at the root of the trees; so every tree" or individual Jew, "that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire." The non-bearing fruit trees refer to the non-remnant destined for destruction. In light of the danger, in verse 10 the crowds were asking John, "What shall we do?" His answer in verse 11 to the general populace was, share with others, something contrary to human nature. In verses 12 and 13 the tax collectors who came to be baptized were asking "What shall we do?" His answer to them was to be fair in their exacting of taxes. In verse 14 some soldiers asked, "What shall we also do?" They were probably hired to protect the tax collectors, so the answer is along the same lines. They should not use force or blackmail to exact money, but rather be content with their wages. By doing these things they would manifest true repentance and be prepared to meet the Messiah. In verse 15, the ministry of John caused quite a stir and people began to expect the Messiah and discuss whether John himself was the Messiah. But in verse 16 John answered that he was not the Messiah for two reasons; first, his was a baptism of water while Messiah's was of the Holy Spirit and fire; and second, Messiah was mightier than he. In verse 17, when Messiah comes, He will come as Judge and divide the remnant from the non-remnant and take the remnant into the kingdom but the non-remnant will go to eternal fire. In verse 18

Luke summarizes John's ministry as one of preaching the good news to the people that Messiah was near and that He would provide forgiveness of sins. In verses 19-20 John's ministry is quickly summed up. John reprimanded Herod Antipas, resulting in his being cast into prison, only later to be executed by beheading. Thus, the stage was set for Messiah to come, the one John would point out as the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world.

Now at this point someone questioned why Luke concluded verse 20 with John's imprisonment while verses 21-22 refer to his previous baptizing of Jesus. To this it is to be noted that John is not mentioned as baptizing Jesus in verses 21-22 because the focus is not on John's baptizing work but on Jesus' baptism and the heavenly announcement. What Luke is doing by wrapping up John in verse 20 is summarily bringing the focus on John to a close so he can dedicate his remaining work to Jesus. Remember that the Gospel of Luke is not written in a chronological order but a logical order. Too often people conclude from a cursory reading of Luke 1:3 that the words "having investigated everything carefully from the beginning, to write it out for you in consecutive order" indicate sequential order. But the Greek word translated "consecutive order" does not necessarily mean sequential. It simply means "orderly." It could be logical order or topical order or sequential order. But we know the book is not written in sequential order, so we understand that Luke meant logical order. In any case, in 3:20 he's done focusing on John so he can put his full attention on Jesus. For perspective, relatively few verses are dedicated to John in Luke 1-3, the remaining chapters are dedicated to Jesus, Luke 4-24. Thus, Jesus is greater than John.

In 3:21-22 we see the baptism of Jesus. Bock said, "For Luke, John drops entirely out of this pericope. His name is not explicitly mentioned, so that attention is placed exclusively on Jesus' prayer and the divine voice."¹ The emphasis is not even on His baptism, but the voice that comes out of heaven to approve of Him. Verse 21 says, **Now when all the people were baptized, Jesus was also baptized.** This has caused much confusion. If John's baptism was a baptism of repentance with a view to forgiveness of sins, and Jesus had no sin to repent of, why was Jesus baptized by John? Luke doesn't even raise this question, much less answer it. The parallel in Matthew 3:13-14 indicates that Jesus was identifying with John's ministry, not because He needed to repent of anything, but to approve of John's message, and thereby link His ministry to John's. But Luke's purposes are different. His purpose is not explain the baptism but to reveal the significance of the voice out of heaven's response to the baptism. So, after His baptism, verse 21b says, **and while He was praying, heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended upon Him in bodily form like a dove, and a voice came out of heaven, "You are My beloved Son, in You I am well-pleased."** The expression at the end of verse 21, **and while He was praying,** is unique to Luke. Only Luke tells us that Jesus **was praying** when **heaven was opened** and the **Spirit descended** and the **voice came**. As for **heaven** being opened this is usually seen in vision by an individual. Or it is a figure of speech for God breaking into history to make some revelation. Here it was seen by John for sure, probably in vision, as it was not seen by anyone else. The purpose was to reveal to the prophet John the identity of the

Messiah so that he could reveal the Messiah to the Jewish people. He would have no need to do that if everybody saw.

In verse 22, after John saw heaven opened he saw **the Holy Spirit descend upon Jesus in bodily form like a dove**. The description of the Spirit coming upon Jesus **like a dove** has led many to erroneously depict the Spirit as a dove. But John did not see the **Spirit** as a dove. He saw the **Spirit descend in a bodily form**. The form John saw was that of a human body. The phrase **like a dove** is a comparison of how the human body descended and lit upon Him. The word **like** is an adverb of manner, $\omega\varsigma$. Bock said, "What was visible was not a dove, but rather what was seen is compared to a dove, since $\omega\varsigma$ is an adverb of manner. The manner of the Spirit's descent was like the way a dove floats gracefully through the air."² Thus, the Spirit is not to be depicted as a dove. In fact, God is never to be depicted as any created thing. He can only be compared to them. Jesus, for example, is not a lion or a lamb, though He is compared to both. A comparison is far different from an identification. A comparison of Jesus with some created thing shows one point of similarity. For example, when Jesus is called the Lamb of God it is because lambs were known as a sacrificial animal and Jesus was God's sacrifice for our sins. Or, when Jesus is called the lion of the tribe of Judah it is because the lion is the most regal creature and Jesus is the regal descendant of the tribe of Judah. These similes are designed to convey some truth, not identify substance. God cannot be captured by any created substance. Even Jesus in His humanity, while fully God, set aside His glory in the incarnation. The human form could never fully encapture God. Thus, the Spirit is not to be depicted as a dove, but rather the manner of His descent upon Jesus was like a dove, floating gracefully through the air and resting upon Him. According to Peter in Acts 10:36-38, it was here at the baptism that "God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and with power" for His ministry. Thus, the baptism of Jesus and the voice from heaven mark the beginning of Jesus' ministry.

At this point **a voice came out of heaven** saying, "**You are My beloved Son, in You I am well-pleased.**" There are allusions to Ps 2:7, Isa 42:1 and possibly Isa 41:8 in the voice's endorsement, and the voice is that of the Father. The allusion to Ps 2:7 is with respect to the phrase **My Son**. "he said to Me 'You are My Son, Today I have begotten You. Ask of Me, and I will surely give the nations as Your inheritance, And the very ends of the earth as Your possession.'" The context is Messiah's rule. Therefore, the phrase **My Son** is the Father's endorsement that Jesus is the Messiah, fit to rule. The allusion to Isa 41:8 is only possible, but if so is with respect to Him being **beloved** of the Father. "But you, Israel, My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, Descendant of Abraham My friend," could be Messianic. The allusion to Isa 42:1 is with respect to the phrase **I am well-pleased**. "Behold, My Servant, whom I uphold; My chosen one in whom My soul delights. I have put My Spirit upon Him; He will bring forth justice to the nations" is certainly Messianic and expresses the Father's pleasure in the Son. Ultimately, what the Father's endorsement from heaven does is identify Jesus as the regal King-Messiah-Servant. Heaven has spoken. God has revealed His Messiah. Now John can reveal the Messiah's identity to the Jewish people so they can believe in Him and receive forgiveness of sins in preparation for kingdom entrance. But before he does, two other items are needed in preparation for His ministry. First, His credentials must show that He is connected

with humanity. Thus, in 3:23-38 His genealogy is traced back to Adam. Second, His credentials must show that He is righteous, unlike Adam. So, in 4:13-18 His temptations by Satan are reported and his victory recorded.

We will look at this first item tonight, His genealogy that is traced back to Adam in 3:23-38. In verse 23, **When He began His ministry, Jesus Himself was about thirty years of age.** As mentioned in 3:1, John began his ministry in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, which was AD29. In evaluating the views on when Jesus began His ministry, Hoehner wrote, "Luke (3:23) mentions that at the commencement of His ministry, Jesus was "about thirty years of age." ...Jesus was born around December, 5. B.C./January, 4 B.C....it seems more plausible...for John to have baptized Jesus sometime in A.D. 29 and to have the commencement of Christ's ministry sometime before the Passover of A.D. 30 which means that Christ would have been around thirty-two or thirty-three. This view is more acceptable for the following three reasons. First, it does not require a quick succession of events in such a short span of time in John's ministry. Second, it allows for Christ's ministry to be at least three years in duration. Third, the fact that Luke used the term "about" (ὡσεὶ) indicates that Jesus was not exactly thirty years of age when He began His ministry."³ Thus, Jesus was not thirty years of age, but He was approximately thirty years of age. Probably the significance of age thirty is that was when a man was considered mature and able to enter into an office such as priest. As for Jesus' exact age **when He began His ministry**, He was probably thirty-three.

Then we are told, **being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph.** The words **as was supposed** are the imperfect active and reflect the general opinion of the day; people thought that Jesus was **the son of Joseph**, though He was not actually his son. The **supposed** statement hints at the virgin birth. Bock said, "Jesus' sonship to Joseph comes with a remark showing that this sonship is strictly a legal one, since Joseph was "supposed" ...to be Jesus' father—a remark suggestive of the virgin birth." This leads to the next issue of whether Luke's genealogy is that of Mary or Joseph. In the past I have taught that this was Mary's genealogy under her husband Joseph's name, tracing Jesus' human lineage, while the one in Matthew was Joseph's genealogy, tracing Jesus' legal lineage. However, the statement in verse 23, **as was supposed, the son of Joseph**, makes me pause since it seems *prima facie* to be the genealogy of Joseph. If Mary, are we to take it that Jesus was supposedly the son of Mary? That is dubious. Debate persists on the issue. Arnold Fruchtenbaum holds that it is Mary's genealogy; Darrell Bock holds that it is Joseph's. Andy Woods holds that it is Mary's genealogy; Tom Constable holds that it is Joseph's. If you read all the scholars, the weight of opinion is on the side of Mary. Personally, I don't know if it can be entirely resolved, but fortunately, I don't think it has to be entirely resolved in order to get Luke's point and I don't think that is the point anyway. As John Martin said in the Bible Knowledge Commentary, "Regardless of one's view it is important to note an important aspect of the theology Luke expressed in his genealogy. He related Jesus not only to Abraham but all the way back to Adam and to God. This is an indication of the universal offer of salvation, which is common to his Gospel—that Jesus came to save all people—Gentiles as well as the nation of Israel (cf. Luke 2:32)." This is the main point, and it seems an injustice to the text to spend an inordinate amount of time reviewing and evaluating all the views, especially when all of them have irresolvable difficulties. So then, I will

simply summarize the three views and then teach the genealogy, making points throughout and then drawing some conclusions.

The three views may be summarized as follows, "The differences...as well as some problems of detail, have been explained in part by one or more of the following assumptions: (1) Joseph's lineage is given in Matthew, Mary's in Luke; (2) the legal line is traced in Matthew, the actual line of descent in Luke; and (3) there was a levirate marriage at one or more points in the line."⁴ It's the levirate marriage that could result in Joseph legitimately having two fathers, thereby making both genealogies his.

In verse 23 we are told that **Jesus...was supposedly, the son of Joseph**. However, the Greek text says it a little different. It literally says, "being son, as was supposed, of Joseph." It splits "son" away from "of Joseph," a further impression that Jesus is not really the son of Joseph, another strong hint of the virgin birth. Another peculiarity is that there is no definite article before Joseph, whereas there is a definite article before every other name in the genealogy. This led Fruchtenbaum to conclude that the genealogy was not Joseph's but Mary's. He said, "If, by Jewish law, you could not mention the name of a woman but you wished to trace a woman's line, how would you go about doing so? The answer is that you would use the name of her husband. That raises a second question. If you were to use the husband's name, suppose somebody picked up a genealogy to read, how would he know whether the genealogy is that of the husband or that of the wife since in either case it would be the husband's name that would be used? The answer to that riddle lies in a problem with the English language that does not exist with the Greek language, In English, it is not good grammar to put the word *the* before a proper name. We do not use a definite article "*the*" before a proper name - *the Matthew, the Luke, the Mary, the John*, etc. However, it is quite permissible in Greek grammar. In the Greek text of Luke's genealogy, every single name mentioned has the Greek definite article *the*, with one exception, and that is the name of Joseph. Joseph's name does not have the definite article *the* in front of it, while all the other names do. What that would mean to someone reading the original is this: When he saw the definite article missing from Joseph's name, while it was present in all the other names, it would then mean that this was not really Joseph's genealogy but rather Mary's genealogy...We have two examples of this in the Old Testament: Ezra 2:61 and Nehemiah 7:63."⁵ While that sounds convincing, Luke was not a Jew, nor was he writing to a Jewish audience. Why then would he have a problem mentioning a woman's name in a genealogy? And further, if it was against Jewish law to mention the name of a woman, why does Matthew in his genealogy written to Jews mention four women? And still further, if Luke has more interest in women than any of the other gospel writers, and he does, then why would he not include Mary's name in her own genealogy? Such a conclusion appears totally at odds with his book. Ultimately, it seems *prima facie* to be Joseph's genealogy. That's simply what it says.

Then we are told that **Joseph** (or Mary), was **the son of Eli**. Taken straightforwardly Joseph's father was **Eli**. However, those who take this as Mary's genealogy claim that there is an ancient Talmudic reference to a Miriam that was the daughter of Heli. Yet, it is highly questionable that the Miriam in the Talmud is Mary because she is

never called the mother of Jesus and there were many women named Miriam. But there are also problems with this being Joseph's father, because in Matt 1 it says, "Jacob was the father of Joseph," not **Eli**. How is this conundrum explained? By a Levirate marriage. According to Levitical law, if a brother died without offspring, one of his brothers was to marry his wife and raise up children in his name. In this case, Jacob and Heli were half brothers. When Heli died without any offspring, his brother Jacob married his wife and bore Joseph. In this way Joseph can be said to have two fathers, both Jacob and Heli. This is a possible solution, but speculative.

In verse 24 this **Eli** is said to be **the son of Matthat**. In the Matthew genealogy the name "Matthan" is used about the same place in the genealogy. Perhaps they are the same. Perhaps they are not. A similar name is found in 3:25, "Mattathias" and in 3:31, "Mattatha." The name and its derivatives must have been popular. This **Matthat** was the **son of Levi**, the name of one of the twelve tribes and a common name. And **Levi** was **the son of Melchi**. This name appears again in 3:28, so it too was a popular name. **Melchi** is **the son of Jannai**, a name used only here (and one of my daughter's middle names). He was **the son of Joseph**. This name was already seen in 3:23 and will be seen again in 3:30 where it is used of the Joseph in the book of Genesis whose story made his name popular among Jews.

In verse 25, this Joseph was **the son of Mattathias**, again, a common Jewish name. He was **the son of Amos**, a name with ties to the OT prophet. **Amos** was **the son of Nahum**, another name with ties to an OT prophet. And he was **the son of Hesli**, a name found only here. **Hesli** was **the son of Naggai**, a name that appears related to Nogah in 1 Chron 3:7.

In verse 26, **Naggai** was **the son of Maath**, a name that seems related to "Mahath" in 1 Chron 6:35. **Maath** was **the son of Mattathias**, again, a very common name. And he was **the son of Semein**, a name found only here. He was **the son of Joseph**, a name found only here. And he was **the son of Joda**, a name that possibly comes from Joida or Jehoida from the OT. In the Greek it's pronounced Yoda for those of you who are interested in Star Wars.

In verse 27, this **Joda** was **the son of Joanan**, a name with a root that is common in Jewish names. He was the **son of Rhesa**, though this name is highly debated. Some insist that this is an Aramaic title for "Prince" and should go with **Zerubbabel**, describing him as Prince Zerubbabel. However, there is no manuscript evidence to support this reading. He appears to be a "son of" just like all the other names. This is his only mention. If so, he is **the son of Zerubbabel**. This is the well-known **Zerubbabel** who returned after the Babylonian captivity. His name is also in Matthew's genealogy where it reads in 1:12, "After the deportation to Babylon: Jeconiah became the father of Shealtiel, and Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel." So, at this point the genealogies agree indicating either that they are both genealogies of Joseph or there was a Levirate marriage in Mary's line or there was some kind of convergence at that time. The data are inconclusive. This **Zerubbabel** is said to be **the son of Shealtiel**, just as in Matthew 1:12, another point of contact between the two genealogies. And **Shealtiel** is said to be **the son of Neri**, which differs from the Matthew genealogy, because **Shealtiel** is said there to be the son of

Jeconiah. So at this point there is a divergence in Luke's genealogy. He doesn't mention Jeconiah at all. And Jeconiah is the king who was cursed in Her 22 such that none of his heirs could sit on the throne of David. Some think Luke deliberately didn't mention Jeconiah because of the legal disqualification, so that at this point the legal line got diverted to the line of **Neri** who came from David's son Nathan. Again, there is nothing conclusive. This is one of those biblical difficulties that is the result of many difficulties, which is why you can't be conclusive. There are just too many complications and not enough data. If we'd lived in Luke's day, before the Temple was destroyed and all the records that were held there, we probably could have easily solved it, but we don't.

In verse 28, **Neri** is **the son of Melchi**, the same name used earlier in verse 24, a popular name. And **Melchi** was **the son of Addi**, a name found in the LXX version of 1 Chron 6:21. And **Addi** was **the son of Cosam**, a name found only here. And **Cosam** was **the son of Elmadam**, a combination of Spanish and English, El-Madam, a name found in the Table of Nations in Gen 10:26 (Elmodad). And he was **the son of Er**. How would you like to be named **Er**? Just think every time some public speaker said, "er." You'd go crazy, but it was a common name in the OT.

In verse 29, **Er** was **the son of Joshua**. This is the name Jesus in the Greek text, spelled just like Jesus' name throughout the NT. But the translators changed it for some reason. Who this Joshua was during the OT is not known, but surely it was a popular name due to the well-known Joshua during the wilderness wanderings and the Conquest. And he was **the son of Eliezer**, another popular name in the OT (e.g. Gen 15:2; Ex 18:4). He was **the son of Jorim**, possibly another spelling of Joreim found in Ezra 10:18. He was **the son of Matthat**, again, a very common name from the same name in 3:24 and 3:31. And he was **the son of Levi**, a name used in 3:24, but many generations before, a tribal name.

In verse 30, **Levi** was **the son of Simeon**, another tribal name and the name of the man we met in Luke 2:25 who was very old and swept the baby Jesus out of Mary's arms to bless Him. He was **the son of Judah**, another tribal name and the tribe from whom Messiah would come. **Judah** was **the son of Joseph**, a very popular name because of the Joseph in the book of Genesis and also the name of Jesus' legal father. This **Joseph** was **the son of Jonam** who was **the son of Eliakim**, a name that is also found in Matthew's genealogy, showing a possible point of contact.

In verse 31, **Melea** is found only one time, **Menna** is found only one time. **Mattatha** is found here and it's derivative again in 3:24 and 3:26, a very common name. And finally we meet some more people we are familiar with. **Nathan** was **the son of David**, his third son in particular. In Matthew's genealogy Solomon is listed. Some think that because Solomon's line went down to Jeconiah, who was cursed, that Luke is indicating that the line would go down through Nathan instead. This is problematic to me since I think that 2 Sam 7:12-16 indicates that the line must come through Solomon. But is it possible that that line was cursed beyond repair with Jeconiah? Perhaps. Could God still fulfill his promises to David through his son Nathan? Perhaps. In any event, this **Nathan**

was **the son of David**. **David** is the royal line. Everyone knows David and Jesus is no doubt descended from David, a key man in history.

In verses 32ff, all the names are more well-known and paralleled in Matthew's genealogy. This makes sense whether the line is Joseph's or Mary's, since they were both descendants of David, but the overall trend seems to indicate to me that the one in Luke is Mary's and it is tracing physical descent, while the one in Matthew is Joseph's and is tracing legal descent, but I can't be dogmatic. **David** was **the son of Jesse**. He was from the tribe of Judah and lived in Bethlehem. He was **the son of Obed**, back in the judge's period now. In the Book of Ruth Naomi nursed **Obed**. **Obed** was **the son of Boaz**, who took Ruth the Moabitess and married her, he was her kinsman-redeemer. He was **the son of Salmon** who swam downstream from **Nahshon**, a common name in the OT. He was **the son of Amminidab, the son of Admin, the son of Ram, the son of Hezron, the son of Perez**. **Perez** was the result of the incestuous relationship of Judah and Tamar. **Judah** is the father of the tribe of Judah from whom the Messiah would come. Of course, he was **the son of Jacob**, who was in the covenant line, and **Jacob** was **the son of Isaac**, in the covenant line, and **Isaac** was **the son of Abraham**, the head of the covenant line to whom the promises were made and a very significant figure on par with David. The genealogy then plunges before the time of Abraham and this portion has no parallel in Matthew because the purpose of Matthew's genealogy is to establish that Jesus is the King, descendant of Abraham and David. But Luke is doing something else and this is clear now that he is going before Abraham. **Abraham** was **the son of Terah, the son of Nahor**. These were Abraham's father and grandfather who lived in Ur of the Chaldees. **Nahor** was **the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg**, these men all lived after the Flood and were descended from Shem. It was in **Peleg's** day that the note in Gen 11 says that in his day the earth was divided. Some division, probably the tower of Babel, took place and it was a division of languages that took place in **Peleg's** day. He was **the son of Heber** who was **the son of Shelah** who was **the son of Cainan**. This name is not mentioned in the Masoretic Text, but it is in the LXX. Whether it should be included or not is unclear. He was **the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem**, one of Noah's three sons, such that now Luke has taken us back to the flood. **Shem** was **the son of Noah**, who was **the son of Lamech**, so we are before the flood now, and just notice how normally and literally Luke took the people before the flood, he didn't spiritualize Genesis. These were all real people who lived real lives in a real world described in Genesis who gave rise to the later people who gave rise to the Messiah.

Verse 37, **Lamech** was **the son of Methuselah**, the oldest person on record at 969 years. He was **the son of Enoch** who walked with God and was not, because God took him, He raptured him. And he was **the son of Jared**, who was **the son of Mahalaleel**, this is all the godly line that came from Seth as recorded in Gen 5. And **Mahaleel** was **the son of Cainan** who was **the son of Enosh, the son of Seth**. **Seth** was the son of Adam and Eve who replaced Abel who was killed by Cain. And it was in **Seth's** day that men began to call on the name of the Lord through sacrifice. And this **Seth** was **the son of Adam**, so that Luke has traced all the way back to the beginning, to the first man created directly by God in the image of God. In this way Luke has done something unique. He has connected Jesus to the entire human race. Pentecost said, "While Matthew was concerned with

Messiah in relation to Israel, Luke was concerned with Messiah in relation to the entire human race. According to the Old Testament, Messiah would not only rule over Israel but over all nations. He was to be the world's Messiah as well as Israel's. In keeping with his theme, then, Luke traced the genealogy of Jesus to Adam, the head of the human race."⁶

But then Luke adds that **Adam** was **the son of God**, a totally unique feature of Luke. Nowhere else is **Adam** stated to be **the son of God**. But he is the original son of God who fell into temptation and brought the curse upon the whole human race. This verse actually explains the Gen 6 "sons of God" as the godly line and not fallen angels. Adam was the first **son of God**. Of course, he fell, but he was the first fallen person to believe and be saved. Those who followed him in faith became sons of God too. But Adam as originally created was the prototype of the ultimate Son of God, who was just endorsed as the Son of God by the Father in 3:22 at His baptism when heaven opened and the Spirit descended in bodily form as a dove and the voice said, "This is My beloved Son with whom I am well-pleased."

In this way Luke has presented an elegant argument in the genealogy of Messiah. He bookends it, so to speak. He is the Son of God but He is also the Son of Man. As the Son of God He came to Israel, as the Son of Man He came to the whole world. Salvation in the Messiah is not just for Israel but for the whole world. This is Luke's theme. So then, I place less stress on trying to determine whether this is Joseph's genealogy or Mary's, and more stress on what Luke is trying to accomplish with his genealogy, how it contributes to his argument. Truly the genealogy belongs to either Joseph or Mary, and I lean toward Joseph, but the real point is that Jesus is the Son of Adam and the Son of God and that He came to bring salvation for all humanity. To this I think all can agree.

Wiersbe agreed, "By putting the genealogy here, Luke reminded his readers that the Son of God was also the Son of man, born into this world, identified with the needs and problems of mankind."⁷ Liefeld agreed, "The significance of the genealogy in Luke probably lies in the emphasis on Jesus as a member of the human race, a son of Adam; in the contrast of Jesus, the obedient Second Adam (a theme implicit but not explicit in Luke), with the disobedient first Adam; and in Jesus as the true Son of God (cf. "Adam," v. 38)."⁸ McGee agreed, "Luke reveals Jesus Christ as the Son of Man and the Savior of the *world*. His line does not stop with Abraham, but goes all the way back to Adam who was the first "son" of God—the created son of God. But he fell from that lofty position when he sinned. Jesus Christ, the last Adam and the Son of God, is come to bring mankind back into that relationship with God which Adam formerly had and lost. This relationship is accomplished through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."⁹ I hope we can all agree on this very important truth.

¹ Darrell Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 335.

² Darrell Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 338.

³ Harold Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*, 38.

⁴ Gaebelein, Frank E., D. A. Carson, Walter W. Wessel, and Walter L. Liefeld. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Vol. 8. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.

⁵ Arnold Fruchtenbaum, *Messianic Christology*, 138.

⁶ J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, 34.

⁷ Wiersbe, Warren W. *The Bible Exposition Commentary*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996.

⁸ Liefeld, Walter L. "Luke." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*, edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Vol. 8. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.

⁹ McGee, J. Vernon. *Thru the Bible Commentary: The Gospels (Luke)*. Electronic ed. Vol. 37. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1991.