



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jacob or Heli?

Jacob or Heli? - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/7/18 8:41

Who was Joseph's, husband of Mary, father? Jacob or Heli?

(Matthew 1:16 or Luke 3:23)

???

Re: Jacob or Heli? - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/7/18 10:08

One was his father and the other was his father-in-law.

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/7/18 13:20

How did you find that out, and also, which one is which?

Thanks
-Eli

Re: Jacob or Heli? - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/7/18 20:49

Heli: Mary's blood father.

Jacob: Joseph's blood father.

Luke 3:23 " (a)And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, (b)being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, (c)which was the son of Heli,"

Take the middle section out(b), between the comma's, to find out the subject of the last section(c).

"And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, which was the son of Heli,"

Section (b) is just showing the assumption of the layman. This geneology in Luke is then Mary's.

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/7/19 8:44

Ok, thank you very much.

-Eli

Re: - posted by wildbranch, on: 2005/7/20 7:10

This is pure speculation and assumption - no actual proof is supplied to this answer.

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2005/7/20 10:11

Quote:

-----This is pure speculation and assumption - no actual proof is supplied to this answer.

No not at all. With an understanding of First Century civilization this explanation is very plausible and very acceptable.

Luk 3:23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli,

Here is what Norman Geislar says about the subject:

Problem Jesus has a different grandfather here in Luke 3:23(Heli) than He does in Matthew 1:16(Jacob). Which one is the right one?

Solution This should be expected, *since they are two different lines of ancestors*(italics mine), one traced through His *legal* father, Joseph and the other through His *actual* mother, Mary. Matthew gives the *official* line, since he addresses Jesus' genealogy to Jewish concerns for the Jewish Messiah's credentials which required that Messiah come from the seed of Abraham and the line of David (cf. Matt. 1:1). Luke, with a broader *Greek* audience in view, addresses himself to their interest in Jesus as the *Perfect Man* (which was the quest of Greek thought). Thus, he traces Jesus back to the first man, Adam (Luke 3:38).

That Matthew gives Jesus' paternal genealogy and Luke His maternal genealogy is further supported by several facts. First of all, while both lines trace Christ to David, *each is through a different son* (italics mine) of David. Matthew traces Jesus through Joseph (his *legal* father) to David's son, *Solomon* the king, by whom Christ rightfully inherited the throne of David (cf. 2Sam. 7:12ff). Luke's purpose, on the other hand, is to show Christ as an actual human. So he traces Christ to David's son *Nathan*, through his *actual mother*, Mary, through whom He can rightfully claim to be fully human, the redeemer of humanity.

Further, Luke does not say that he is giving Jesus' genealogy through Joseph. Rather, he notes that Jesus was "**as was supposed**" (bold mine) (Luke 3:23) the son of Joseph, while He was actually the son of Mary. Also, that Luke would record Mary's genealogy fits with his interest as a doctor in mothers and birth and with his emphasis on women in his Gospel which has been called "the Gospel for Women."

I would add to Geislar's review that the first three chapters of Luke appear to be information gathered from Mary herself which lends further credence to Luke's genealogy of Jesus being from that of Mary's lineage. That Joseph is called the son of Heli is also perfectly acceptable because in the first century it was common for a son-in-law to be called a son.

Here is Adam Clarke's commentary on this passage:

Quote:
-----That St. Luke does not always speak of sons properly such, is evident from the first and last person which he names: Jesus Christ was only the supposed son of Joseph, because Joseph was the husband of his mother Mary: and Adam, who is said to be the son of God, was such only by creation. After this observation it is next necessary to consider, that, in the genealogy described by St. Luke, there are two sons improperly such: i.e. two sons-in-law, instead of two sons. As the Hebrews never permitted women to enter into their genealogical tables, whenever a family happened to end with a daughter, instead of naming her in the genealogy, they inserted her husband, as the son of him who was, in reality, but his father-in-law. This import, bishop Pearce has fully shown, νομιζεσθαι bears, in a variety of places - Jesus was considered according to law, or allowed custom, to be the son of Joseph, as he was of Heli. The two sons-in-law who are to be noticed in this genealogy are Joseph the son-in-law of Heli, whose own father was Jacob, Mat_1:16; and Salathiel, the son-in-law of Neri, whose own father was Jechonias: 1Ch_3:17, and Mat_1:12. This remark alone is sufficient to remove every difficulty. Thus it appears that Joseph, son of Jacob, according to St. Matthew, was son-in-law of Heli, according to St. Luke.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/7/21 13:38

Thanks so much, Jeremy. :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/21 15:59

I don't want to muddy the waters of Hulsey's explanation but I did some thinking about this a few years ago. Here are my notes. (tell me what you think Jeremy?)

When we 'follow the seed' through the genealogy in Matthew we immediately hit the question as to whose genealogy we are reading. Matthew says quite clearly that this is the genealogy of Joseph. It breaks the pattern of 38 'begettings' to say that Jesus was not begotten of Joseph by declaring not that Joseph 'begat' Jesus but was 'born' of Mary the espoused wife of Joseph. "And Azor begat Sadoc; and Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud; And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob; And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born

Jesus, who is called Christ.Â” (Matt. 1:14-16,) If you read it slowly you will see the sudden change in the pattern.

But if this Joseph's genealogy, why give it at all? Matthew's genealogy is the official royal descent of the heirs to the throne. Not all of the descendants of David in this list became kings, but all had throne rights. The throne line ended, technically with Jechonias (Jehoiachin), but Salathiel and his son Zerubbabel would have been the next kings if the monarch had continued.

A closer look at Jehoiachin may prove interesting. Jehoiachin was king in Judah for only 3 months and 10 days before being taken captive to Babylon. He lived as a prisoner in Babylon for the next 36 years and was released on the death of Nebuchadnezzar. Jehoiachin remained in Babylon until his death. During his absence his uncle Zedekiah as a puppet king for Babylon for 10 years. Zedekiah is not mentioned in Matthew's genealogy.

Matthew then says that Jehoiachin (Jechonias) 'begat' Salathiel and Salathiel is the person in whom the genealogies of both Luke and Matthew briefly synchronise. Matt. 1:12 And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel; and Salathiel begat Zerobabel;

Luke 3:27 Which was the son of Joanna, which was the son of Rhesa, which was the son of Zerobabel, which was the son of Salathiel, which was the son of Neri, The astute will notice that Matthew says that Salathiel was the son of Jechonias (Jehoiachin) whereas Luke says that Salathiel was the son of Neri. How come?

There is a key prophecy in Jeremiah that needs to be brought in as evidence. Jer. 22:24 As I live, saith the LORD, though Coniah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah were the signet upon my right hand, yet would I pluck thee thence; Jer. 22:30 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. (Coniah is a shortened form of Jehoiachin.) As a result of his sin God pronounced, through Jeremiah, childlessness upon Jehoiachin. Jehoiachin would never 'beget' anyone.

It is most likely that as a consequence Jehoiachin adopted a descendant of David to be his successor; Neri, the twentieth generation from David but of the line of Nathan, not Solomon. There may be an indication of this other 'royal family' in Zech. 12:12 And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart; By this 'adoption' Salathiel would become legal heir to the throne. (Adoption into the family line was an accepted phenomena in ancient eastern cultures and in the scriptures. cf Ruth 4:13-17 where Ruth's son by Boaz is recognised as Naomi's child) Salathiel thus became the legal son and heir of Jehoiachin. The word 'begat' in Greek comes from a root which actually means 'to become'.

Luke's genealogy says that Luke 3:23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, The word translated 'supposed' here in 'nomizo' which comes from the Greek word 'nomos' meaning law. Used in this sense it can bear the sense of 'legally'; technically 'to do by law'. It came to be used of 'judgements' or 'conclusions' (Matt. 5:17; 10:34; 20:10; Luke 2:44; 3:23; Acts 7:25; 8:20; 14:19; 16:13,27; 17:29; 21:29; 1Cor. 7:26,36; 1Tim. 6:5) In other words Jesus was 'legally regarded' as the son of Joseph. Mary referred to Joseph as Jesus' father in Luke 2:48 And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. Joseph was 'legally' though not physically the father of Jesus and as such it was Joseph who gave Jesus his name. (Matt 1:21,25)

So the Bible states quite plainly that Joseph is not the physical father of Jesus, but it also states that Jesus descended from the tribe of Judah. (Heb 7:14) This must mean that Mary descended from Judah, and there seems to be an indication of close connection between Mary and these genealogies.

There have been different suggestions aimed at squaring the two genealogies. Here is my favourite. Let's suppose that Luke's genealogy is the physical genealogy of Joseph and Matthew's is the legal, throne-line, genealogy. The two genealogies run in parallel until the time of David, although Matthew has some gaps. The line then divides. The legal descent continues through Solomon but the physical descent continues through Nathan; a different son of David. Solomon's physical line died out with Jehoiachin. Jehoiachin, as we have suggested, adopts a descendant of David (Salathiel) as his legal heir. From Salathiel the genealogies run in parallel again until we arrive at the descendant of Matthan or Matthat when they separate out again and go their separate ways.

If Matthan, no 38 in Matthew's genealogy, and Matthat, no 71 in Luke's genealogy, are the same person (and it seems most likely that they were) we discover that Jacob (Matt 1:15) and Heli (Luke 3:23) were brothers. But it seems to say that Joseph was the son of Heli in Luke 1:23 and that Joseph was the son of Jacob in Matt 1:16. Is there any scenario w

hich could fit this data? (I am following a different route to Hulse here) Yes there is, and although it may seem a little strained to our western ways, it is probably a scenario that was often worked out in bible culture.

Suppose or surmise that Joseph is the physical son of Heli and that Mary is the physical daughter of Jacob. (I know, I know, wait a while...) Let us surmise that Jacob had no son of his own and so adopted his nephew Joseph as his heir (or that Jacob died without male issue in which case his nephew would become his heir). This would make Joseph the legal son of Jacob and the physical son of Heli. Joseph now become betrothed to Jacob's daughter, his cousin, Mary. Luke's genealogy does not use the formula 'begat' but simply uses a definite article in the genitive case which simply means 'of'. (You can see this in a KJV which provides italics for added words.) This would certainly accommodate Joseph as his legal heir.

So, those are my thoughts. I find it particularly interesting that Luke's genealogy completely bypasses the whole monarchy after David. Was it because of Solomon's fully conscious sin that he forfeited the privilege of being an ancestor of the Christ?

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/7/22 9:10

Well, I followed you the whole way through that. Very interesting... in the end, you say that Joseph was the son of Heli but the legal son of Jacob? Wait a minute, I'm confused! lol :-P

-Eli

Re: Jacob or Heli?, on: 2007/4/25 16:58

philologos said

Quote:
-----This would make Joseph the legal son of Jacob and the physical son of Heli. Joseph now become betrothed to Jacob's daughter, his cousin, Mary.

Is Mary's status as Joseph's wife (one flesh with him) a component in the status her Son is given?

Re: Jacob or Heli?, on: 2007/4/26 15:50

I have another question about Mary.

Luke 1

5 There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the division of Abijah. His wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth.

36 "Now indeed, Elizabeth your relative has also conceived a son in her old age; and this is now the sixth month for her who was called barren.

What was Mary's relationship to Levi?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/26 16:42

Wow, Ron. That is a lot to process, but very interesting.

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/4/27 8:51

Quote:

dorcias wrote:

I have another question about Mary.

Luke 1

5 There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the division of Abijah. His wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth.

36 "Now indeed, Elizabeth your relative has also conceived a son in her old age; and this is now the sixth month for her who was called barren.

What was Mary's relationship to Levi?

Anna, her mother was either the sister or cousin of Elizabeth. Most probably the sister, since the angel doesn't go into genealogies, and Mary would then be the neice by marriage of Zacharias.

Isn't it odd to find Mary going to Elizabeth, or that Elizabeth's son would be Mary son's prophet?

However, in that extended tribal culture, Anna and Elizabeth could be favorite cousins, Mary a second cousin by marriage to Zacharias.

Luke 1:34. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?

35. And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

36. And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren.

37. For with God nothing shall be impossible.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/4/27 9:08

Quote:

dorcas wrote:

philologos said

Quote:

-----This would make Joseph the legal son of Jacob and the physical son of Heli. Joseph now become betrothed to Jacob's daughter, his cousin, Mary.

Is Mary's status as Joseph's wife (one flesh with him) a component in the status her Son is given?

Very much so, since Joseph, if the actual son of Jacob, was from the cursed line of David, and Mary from the uncursed line.

Jesus had to have both physical Davidic Lineage and Legal Davidic Lineage, to make sure the throne goes to a son of David through Mary, and through Joseph. Also, Jacob's line was the more direct lineage from David, and a lot easier to prove Jesus's Son of David lineage through.

In either event, Joseph and Mary were both of the Judahite lineage, necessary for the blessing of Jacob to descend to David.

1st Samuel 17:12. Now David was the son of that Ephrathite of Bethlehem Judah, whose name was Jesse; and he had eight sons: and the man went among men for an old man in the days of Saul.

13. And the three eldest sons of Jesse went and followed Saul to the battle: and the names of his three sons that went to the battle were Eliab the firstborn, and next unto him Abinadab, and the third Shammah.

14. And David was the youngest: and the three eldest followed Saul.

I've always thought God knew that Saul was the one to start the Kingdom, but not to carry it on, because he was a Benjamite.

Whoever wrote Samuel said the Lord repented of having made Saul king. Very nice sounding, but when it comes to planning the lineage for your only begotten Son, God would make sure that the line went through Judah.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/4/27 9:09

Quote:

-----JaySaved on 2007/4/26 21:42:27
Wow, Ron. That is a lot to process, but very interesting.

If you tried to 'process' it and struggled this pdf might help. Some years ago I did 14 'studies' on tracing the Seed in the Old Testament. This is the notes to No 9 and is entitled
(http://mp3.biblebase.com/workmanworkshops/The%20Seed_09.PDF) "a man of rest and a house of rest". You might find it easier to print them out so that you can compare the genealogies side by side.

You'll find the rest of the series (http://wiki.biblebase.com/index.php/Old_Testament_Introduction.) here.

I want to re-scan these documents and get the audio in place 'when I have time...' :-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/4/27 12:31

Quote:

-----If you tried to 'process' it and struggled this pdf might help. Some years ago I did 14 'studies' on tracing the Seed in the Old Testament. This is the notes to No 9 and is entitled "a man of rest and a house of rest"

I sure hope all of these various resources you have become available at some point. Like a free bible college education or something.

Re: Jacob or Heli?, on: 2007/4/27 15:20

UWR wrote

Quote:

-----Anna, her mother was either the sister or cousin of Elizabeth. Most probably the sister, since the angel doesn't go into genealogies, and Mary would then be the neice by marriage of Zacharias.

Is this connection in scripture?

Re: Jacob or Heli?, on: 2007/4/27 15:37

UWR asked

Quote:

-----Isn't it odd to find Mary going to Elizabeth, or that Elizabeth's son would be Mary son's prophet?

I don't think so, because Aaron had been the mouthpiece for Moses (both of Levi through both parents).

Not so long ago I noticed that the 'priest', Aaron, was the elder brother. (I know Miriam was older than both of them) but

what struck me was that the first son (first birth) received the priesthood and the second son, the role of leader; corresponding to the necessity of the flesh to be brought under the leadership of the Spirit. (Just a thought.)

John 11:47 - 52

Then the chief priests and the Pharisees gathered a council and said, "What shall we do? For this Man works many signs. If we let Him alone like this, everyone will believe in Him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation."

And one of them, Caiaphas, being high priest that year, said to them, "You know nothing at all, nor do you consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and not that the whole nation should perish."

Now this he did not say on his own *authority*; but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus would die for the nation, and not for that nation only, but also that He would gather together in one the children of God who were scattered abroad.

So, that John the Baptist was of the sons of Aaron, speaks for itself. And that Jesus' grandmother was also, is significant, if Mary's mother was a daughter of Aaron by birth.

Jesus was Priest and King both physically and spiritually, then.