

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Preface | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter I. The reconciliation of the two genealogies of Jesus | |
| 0. Introduction | 5 |
| 1. Reconciling the two genealogies of Jesus | 8 |
| 1.1. Julius Africanus (Levirate marriage) | 9 |
| 1.1.1. The influence of Africanus | 18 |
| 1.1.2. Objections to Africanus | 18 |
| 1.1.3. Modifications to Africanus' view | 22 |
| 1.2. Augustine (Matthew gives Mary's genealogy) | 25 |
| 1.2.1. The Davidic descent of Mary | 26 |
| 1.3. John Damascene (Mary as a direct descendant of Nathan) | 28 |
| 1.4. Annius of Viterbo (Luke gives Mary's genealogy-Double names) | 29 |
| 1.4.1. Support for Annius | 30 |
| 1.4.2. The influence of Annius | 30 |
| 1.4.3. Objections to Annius | 37 |
| 1.5. John Speed (Luke gives Mary's Nathanic genealogy) | 37 |
| 1.5.1. The influence of Speed | 40 |
| 1.5.2. Support for Speed | 40 |
| 1.5.3. Against the Marian genealogy | 42 |
| 1.5.4. Objections to Speed | 44 |
| 1.6. Cornelius à Lapide (Heiress-both genealogies are Mary's) | 47 |
| 1.6.1. Support for Lapide's solution | 49 |
| 1.6.2. Objections to Lapide's solution | 50 |
| 1.6.3. Modification to Lapide | 51 |
| 1.7. Hugo Grotius (Luke gives Joseph's natural descent) | 51 |
| 1.8. Abbé Nicholas Caussin (Two different Josephs) | 53 |
| 1.9. Johannis Barrett (Luke gives Mary's Solomonian genealogy) | 54 |
| 1.9.1. Double names | 55 |
| 1.10. Christian Observer (Luke gives Mary's father and mother) | 56 |
| 1.11. Daniel Benham (Three merged tables in Luke) | 57 |
| 1.12. Arthur C. Hervey (Matthew gives Mary's genealogy) | 58 |
| 1.12.1. Support for Hervey | 71 |
| 1.12.2. Modifications to Hervey's solution | 71 |
| 1.12.3. Objections to Hervey | 73 |
| 1.13. Marshall D. Johnson (Nathan the prophet) | 74 |
| 1.14. Arthur Custance (Luke gives Rhesa's genealogy) | 75 |
| 1.15. Other Ideas | 76 |
| 2. Toward an alternative solution | 77 |
| 2.1. The relationship between Jehoiachin and Shealtiel | 78 |
| 2.2. The relationship between Joseph and Heli | 79 |
| 2.3. Jesus the Righteous One | 82 |
| 2.4. The two grafts in Luke's genealogy | 83 |
| 2.5. The theological significance of Luke's genealogy | 84 |

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| 2.6. | The inscrutability of God's ways | 86 |
| 2.7. | Summary of criticisms of the two main solutions | 88 |
| 2.7.1. | The Levirate solution | 88 |
| 2.7.2. | The Marian solution | 90 |
| 2.8. | The criteria test | 91 |

Chapter II. The Omission of Three Kings in Matthew's Genealogy

| | | |
|--------|---|-----|
| 0. | Introduction. | 94 |
| 1. | The omission of the three kings was deliberate | 95 |
| 1.1. | The omission reduced the number to fourteen kings | 95 |
| 1.2. | These three were the most wicked kings | 97 |
| 1.3. | These three were the most barren kings | 98 |
| 1.4. | These three were reckoned dead in God's sight | 98 |
| 1.5. | These three were universally known | 99 |
| 1.6. | They were omitted due to some popular misunderstanding | 99 |
| 1.7. | Ahab's curse extended to the fourth generation | 99 |
| 1.8. | Ahaziah and the house of Ahab | 102 |
| 1.9. | Tainted or illegitimate kings | 104 |
| 1.10. | Ahaziah was not the legitimate successor to Joram | 107 |
| 2. | The omission of the three kings was accidental | 108 |
| 2.1. | Matthew's incompetence | 108 |
| 2.2. | The omission was due to the mistake of a transcriber | 111 |
| 3. | Was Ahaziah included in the missing three kings? | 113 |
| 3.1. | Oziah was taken to be Uzziah | 114 |
| 3.2. | Oziah was taken to be Ahaziah | 115 |
| 4. | Toward a new solution | 116 |
| 4.1. | LXX translations-Old Greek, Old Greek Revised, and Lucian | 116 |
| 4.2. | The translation of the Three Kings' names in the Septuagint | 120 |
| 4.2.1. | The translation of Ahaziah's name in the Septuagint | 120 |
| 4.2.2. | The translation of Azariah/Uzziah in the Septuagint | 122 |
| 4.2.3. | The translation of Amaziah's name in the Septuagint | 123 |
| 4.3. | Common denominators among the three kings | 127 |
| 4.4. | The Covenant with Phineas | 130 |
| 4.5. | The extent of Ahab's curse | 130 |
| 4.6. | Matthew's Fourteen Generations | 131 |
| 4.7. | Jehu's Covenant was a divinely approved Dynasty | 131 |

Chapter III. The Omission of Jehoiakim in Matthew's genealogy

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 1. | Preliminary considerations | 134 |
| 1.1. | The problems stated | 134 |
| 1.2. | Matthew's gaps and legal begetting | 135 |
| 1.3. | The Opinions of the Church Fathers | 135 |
| 2. | The omission of Jehoiakim was deliberate | 136 |
| 2.1. | Jehoiakim was omitted for personal sin | 136 |
| 2.1.1. | The curse on Jehoiakim | 138 |

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 2.2. | Jehoiakim was an illegitimate ruler | 140 |
| 2.3. | Theocratic rule ended with Jehoiakim | 141 |
| 3. | The omission of Jehoiakim was accidental | 141 |
| 3.1. | The omission was due to homoioteleuton | 141 |
| 3.2. | A simple corruption of Jehoiakim into Jechoniah | 143 |
| 3.3. | Iekonia" (Jeconias) and Ieconia" (Jechonias) were confused | 143 |
| 3.4. | ΔIwakeivm and ΔIwaceivm were confused | 143 |
| 3.5. | The confusion occurred at the Hebrew stage | 144 |
| 3.6. | Matthew's two registers | 144 |
| 4. | Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin are included by Matthew | 144 |
| 4.1. | Both kings had double names | 144 |
| 4.2. | Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin were both called "Jechoniah" | 145 |
| 4.2.1. | "Jechoniah" was another name for Johanan | 148 |
| 4.3. | Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin were both called "Joakim" | 148 |
| 5. | An alternative solution | 150 |
| 5.1. | The textual evidence for the inclusion of Jehoiakim's name | 151 |
| 5.1.1. | Support for the UBS3 variant reading | 152 |
| 5.1.2. | Support for Beza's reconstruction | 154 |
| 5.1.3. | Support for Hervey's reconstruction | 156 |
| 5.1.4. | Other suggestions | 156 |
| 5.1.5. | Conclusion | 157 |
| 5.2. | The transliteration of Jehoiakim's name in the Septuagint | 157 |
| 5.3. | The transliteration of Jehoiachin's name in the Septuagint | 158 |
| 5.4. | Instances where a younger son has been promoted | 161 |
| 5.5. | Who was Shallum? | 161 |
| 5.6. | Jehoiachin's Coregency | 162 |
| 6. | Conclusion | 166 |

Chapter IV. Luke's qualifying clause-"As was supposed"

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 0. | Introduction | 169 |
| 1. | The Greek text of Luke 3.23 | 169 |
| 1.1. | "as was supposed"-an interpolation | 171 |
| 1.2. | Compatibility with the virgin conception | 172 |
| 2.0. | The meaning of wJ" ejnomivzeto | 173 |
| 2.1. | Popular opinion or hearsay | 173 |
| 2.2. | As was reckoned by legal records | 176 |
| 2.3. | As was legally reputed to be (but really Mary's genealogy) | 177 |
| 2.4. | As was legally reputed to be (Joseph's genealogy) | 178 |
| 2.5. | "As was supposed" applies to each name in the pedigree | 179 |
| 2.6. | Mystical-we are not what we appear to be | 180 |
| 2.7. | Luke quoted a genealogy which he knew to be incorrect | 180 |
| 3. | The content of the parenthesis | 181 |
| 3.1. | Being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph (MT) | 181 |
| 3.2. | Being (as was supposed of Joseph) the son of Heli (MT) | 181 |
| 3.3. | Being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph (UBS3) | 186 |
| 3.4. | Being the son (as was supposed of Joseph) of Heli (UBS3) | 186 |
| 3.5. | Being the son (as was supposed of Joseph . . . Adam) of God (UBS3) | 187 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 3.6. | Beginning to be about . . . , being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph | 187 |
| 3.7. | Jesus as the son of each name in the list | 187 |
| 4.0. | Clearing up a misconception-the Greek article | 189 |
| | Conclusion | 192 |
| | Bibliography | 197 |