

“Can This Be the Son of David?” – Matthew 1:1-17

Brandon Holiski

Southern Oaks Baptist Church

July 13, 2014

[What follows is the transcript of a sermon. It was originally intended to be heard, not read, so the tone is more conversational than academic. It has only been loosely edited, so forgive any grammatical, syntactical, or spelling errors. If you have questions please contact Southern Oaks Baptist Church through their official website, www.sobc.net.]

Welcome. Would you open your Bibles Matthew, chapter 1? While you are turning there, let me draw you attention to an insert in your bulletin...

[Explanation of Response Cards]

Let me also take this opportunity to say that our family is so appreciative of all of the groceries we received last Sunday night at the pounding. Over the years, I have had a few people in life threaten me with a “pounding,” but never anything like this...then again, maybe that’s what they meant I was missing out. In any case, we didn’t know what to expect, but we were pleasantly surprised. And we are incredible thankful for the full pantry.

Speaking of “pounding”...As we saw last Sunday, Matthew begins his book with a genealogy, or family tree, of Jesus. He’s teaching his readers various things about Jesus through the way he has organized this list of names, but there is one thing in particular that he is trying to *pound* into our minds about Jesus. I hinted at that main point last time, but today will be the first time we really explore it. It has to do with Jesus being a descendent of David and the implications that has for God’s people. There are a variety of ways Matthew draws attention to these truths in this genealogy, we are going to discuss them in our time today.

But before we do, let’s read His Word. Last time we read this whole section of verses and discussed many of the names on this list, today we will focus on really just one name—David—so let me simply read the first and last verses of this genealogy, since those are the verses we will be discussing. Start in verse 1...

The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. (Matthew 1:1)

And then verse 17 reads,

¹⁷ So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations. (Matthew 1:17)

This is God’s Word...

Let us pray...

For the sake of time, I really can’t rehash what we talked about last time. But you can find that sermon (in written and audio formats) on the church’s new website (www.sobc.net).ⁱ We talked about the nature of genealogies, the significance of many of the names on the list, and some of what Matthew was teaching through the list of names.

But the main thing Matthew is teaching in this section has to do with the identity of Jesus and that identity is summarized in verse 1, through four designations—Jesus, [the] Christ, the Son of David, and the Son of Abraham. We explored the significance of the first and last references last Sunday. Today, we will pick up the middle ones. Let's talk first about the title "Christ."

Now notice I said "the title 'Christ'" and not "the name 'Christ.'" It's true that over time we have grown accustomed to thinking of the term "Christ" as Jesus' last name. That practice is very old in fact. There are even places in the Bible where the word is used in roughly that manner. But originally it was a title and, arguably, that is how it is typically used in Matthew's writing.ⁱⁱ When Matthew says, here in verse 1, "Jesus Christ," he's saying, "Jesus is the Christ." So what does that mean?

The word Christ comes from a Greek word that is roughly equivalent to a Hebrew word that we translate "Messiah." The word "Messiah" simply means "Anointed One." The image of anointing refers to the old practice of putting oil on objects and individuals as a symbolic way of saying that they were set apart to belong to God and empowered by God to be used in some task or office. If a person was involved, that oil was typically applied to the head and may have, in some instances, been a picture of God's Spirit upon that person.

In the Old Testament we find many examples of religious anointing rituals, especially for prophets,ⁱⁱⁱ priests,^{iv} and kings.^v As time goes on, however, the image becomes increasingly connected to the kings. In fact, in the Old Testament "the Lord's anointed" becomes a common way of referring to Israel's king.^{vi}

Still, for Jesus to be called "Christ" (i.e., "Anointed One") could call to mind any of these offices, each of which Jesus fulfills for His people. He is the ultimate *Priest*, the Great High Priest as the writer of Hebrews calls Him,^{vii} who was anointed to mediate between God and humanity and offer to the Father a sacrifice that removes the guilt of our sins. He is the ultimate *Prophet*, anointed to tell the truth about the human condition and God's provisions. And He is the ultimate *King*, anointed to rule and defeat the enemies of God and His people. Matthew's Gospel gradually reveals that all three of these Old Testament offices pointed to and prepared us for Jesus and that He was anointed to fulfill all three of these main leadership offices of Israel.^{viii}

That said, the office of King is what is being stressed here. Matthew hints at this right out of the gate when he joins the terms "Christ" and "son of David" in the very first verse. Now "son of David" could just mean descendant of David, in fact that is how it is used in verse 20 in reference to Joseph. But every other place in Matthew the term is used it is a reference to a specific descendent of David who was promised in the Old Testament. A specific "anointed one." The long awaited king of God's people.

In fact, in many Jewish circles the term "Christ" and "Son of David" were essentially synonyms, referring to the same individual. Both were messianic titles.^{ix} Both in many circles had royal connotations.^x When most Jews heard the term "Christ," they would have thought of a king. When they heard the term coupled with the title "Son of David," they *all* would have thought of a king, the king they were promised who would deliver them.^{xi}

In the first century, when Jesus walked and Matthew wrote, there was much speculation and expectation concerning the coming Messiah, who he was going to be and what role he would play for Israel.^{xii} What they all seemed to have in common was that the Messiah, when he arrived, would deliver Israel from her enemies and, in the first century, at the top of that list of enemies was Rome, who currently suppressed the Jewish people and occupied their land. So make no mistake about it, when people back then started

entertaining the possibility that Jesus may be the Christ, most of them were expecting Him to throw off the Roman oppressors and rule over God's people.^{xiii}

In order for us to grasp the gravity of these expectations and exactly what the title "son of David" would have meant to Matthew's Jewish audience, we have to understand some things about David. In particular we have to understand a covenant, a promise, that God made with David, which at the time of the birth of Jesus was left seemingly unfulfilled. Let me explain.

David was Israel's best king. A man after God's own heart. A man with his fair share of flaws, but one who modeled a humble and repentant heart before the people of God. There came a day when David was settled into his own nice house and he thinks to himself, "Why am I in this nice house when God's sanctuary is little more than a pretty tent?" So he comes up with this idea (which is recorded in 2 Samuel 7). He thinks, "I'm going to build God a house," in other words, a temple. That seems reasonable enough. Even the prophet Nathan thought it was good idea and encouraged David to proceed.

Then Nathan has a dream. And in the dream, God tells Nathan, "I don't want David to build me a house. I've got another building project in mind. I'm going to build David a house," by which he means a dynasty (there is a word play in the Hebrew involving the word for "house").

Now, back up a second, why was David not allowed to build God a temple? On one level, it was because of all the wars David had waged and all the blood on his hands (this according to David in 1 Chronicles 22:7-9). But that was not the focus in 2 Samuel 7. There are two theological reasons given there.

The first we might call "the incarnational principle."^{xiv} Listen to 2 Samuel 7:4 and following...

"But that same night the word of the LORD came to Nathan, ⁵ 'Go and tell my servant David, 'Thus says the LORD: Would you build me a house to dwell in? ⁶ I have not lived in a house since the day I brought up the people of Israel from Egypt to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent for my dwelling. ⁷ In all places where I have moved with all the people of Israel, did I speak a word with any of the judges of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people Israel, saying, 'Why have you not built me a house of cedar?'" (2 Samuel 7:4-7).

So, in other words, here is the incarnational principle. God is saying, "I didn't ask you to build me a house so that I could rest because my people do not have houses in which they rest. I'm the kind of God who identifies with His people. I live with my people. When they were wandering in tents, I wandered in a tent. When they are poor, I will be poor with them. What they experienced, I experienced. If my people are not firmly established and secure in their place, then neither am I." So that's the incarnational principle. God identifies with his people. That's pretty amazing, if you think about it.

But then there is what we might call, the grace principle. Listen to the next verses, where God makes a series of promises to David.^{xv}

"Thus says the LORD of hosts, I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep, that you should be prince over my people Israel. ⁹ And I have been with you wherever you went and have cut off all your enemies from before you. And I will make for you a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth. ¹⁰ And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, so that they may dwell in their own place and be disturbed no more. And violent men shall afflict them no more, as formerly, ¹¹ from the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel. And I will give you rest from all your enemies. Moreover, the LORD declares to you that the LORD will make you a house. ¹² When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise

up your offspring after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom.
¹³ *He shall build a house for my name...*” (2 Samuel 7:8b-13a).

In other words, once my people have rest then I will allow your son, Solomon, to build a temple for me. But the promises just keep coming. Next God says,

“I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. ¹⁴ I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son. When he commits iniquity, I will discipline him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men, ¹⁵ but my steadfast love will not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. ¹⁶ And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me. Your throne shall be established forever.”” (2 Samuel 7:13b-16).

So here David is promised a dynasty that will last forever! This is huge. For one thing, David is keenly aware of his predecessor, Israel’s first king, Saul. Saul started as a good king, but falls into horrible sins that he never repented of and as a result his son, Jonathan, would never see the throne. If you read the narrative of 1 and 2 Samuel you are left thinking, “wow, Jonathan would have been a great king.” But he never gets the opportunity because of his father’s wickedness. So the dynasty of Saul ends with Saul (is one generation even a dynasty?). So David knows that even if he is faithful to the Lord, there is no guarantee that his offspring on the throne would love the Lord like he did and, therefore, there is no guarantee that his dynasty would endure.

But God is here saying to David, “I’m giving you a house, a dynasty, that will last forever.” And more than that, He’s saying “I’m going to build a house for you such that even if your son does something wrong—even if he is really wicked—I will not remove him from the throne the way I removed Saul, leaving him without a successor to establish the family dynasty. I will not do that. I will preserve your house, your household.”^{xvi} And, notice, he’s not just promised an enduring line of descendants, but a throne upon which his offspring would rule forever.

This is huge! And this is the grace principle. Here is what I mean. The common impulse in that day, is for a king to come around, build a temple for his god, and then all of the sudden some oracle would come from that god promising some sort of blessings and victories for the king because of the temple that he built for the god. So the blessing from the god is a reward to the king for building a temple.

Here, it’s as if the Lord is preempting that pattern and saying, “Nope. That’s not how this is going down. That’s how every other religion works. You do something nice for the god, he does something nice for you. That’s not how this is going to work. I’m the God of grace. I’m building you a house, not as a reward, but as an extension of my grace. You don’t get to do anything for me to get that. I’m doing something for you.” David gets it. He responds to this act of grace with a prayer of worship, which is recorded in the following chapter (2 Samuel 8).

Then God starts keeping his promises. Solomon, David’s son, comes around and builds the temple. King after king follows on the throne, all of whom are from among David’s descendants. Bad kings come and go, but God never snuffs out the line of David. God remains faithful to His promises and the people lived happily every after...well, not quite.

Eventually a day came when the Babylonians come, destroy Jerusalem, and carry God’s people off to exile. From that day forward there is no king on the throne of David. The line of David survives, but there is no king on the throne. Hundreds of years go by and there is no king. Some wondered, “has God forgotten his promise to David?” And as they reflect on this question it dawns on some of the people, “God must not have meant that the dynasty would be uninterrupted, but just that it would last

forever...there must be a descendant of David who will come and fulfill that promise. Establish this forever dynasty.” So they watched. And they waited. But none came. Then one day...enter Jesus. Enter the King.

Imagine the joy Matthew must have felt in writing the word, “the book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David...” (Matt. 1:1). Imagine the excitement he felt to be able to show his readers that Jesus was truly a descendent of David and the rightful heir to the throne. The King has come. While He may not be the King we expected, He is the one we needed. And in the pages that follow, Matthew paints through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus a picture of the King who brings forth the kingdom and now sits enthroned forever.

You see, Jesus comes to us as the fulfillment of God’s promise to David. And He doesn’t just fulfill that covenant by rising from the dead to reign as our eternal King. He fulfills the principles we saw in that covenant as well. He fulfills the incarnational principle in that the Son of God came to earth, took on our humanity, and identified with us in the flesh. He lived the life that we should have lived and died the death that we should have died. He became one of us, identifying with us in our weakness, that he might save us. He enacts that incarnational principle.

But He also fulfilled the grace principle. You don’t get to build a house for Him and earn his blessings. No, He blesses us when we have nothing to offer him. Through His death and resurrection, He offers to us a gift. Forgiveness of sin. A house forever with him. Freedom from the power of death. All of this undeserved by us, which means it’s offered by Him as grace. And if we would turn from our sins, acknowledge our need for Jesus to save us, and turn to Him for that salvation, He sets us free and gives us life. What grace. More than anything else, He enacts for us this grace principle.

Imagine the joy for Matthew to say to his Jewish audience, “Our King is finally here! His name is Jesus! And He is a glorious Savior!” He is calling us to rejoice! “God’s promises, though long delayed, had not been forgotten...the tree of David, hacked off so that only a stump remained, was [now] sprouting a new branch (Isa. 11:1).”^{xvii} The wait is over. The King is here! David’s greater Son has arrived to rescue sinners from eternal bondage!

And listen Matthew is screaming to his audience that Jesus is the king. He does this not only by calling him the “Son of David” in verse 1, but also by making sure David stood out in the genealogy as the central character (besides Jesus, of course). There are a lot of kings mentioned on the list, but only David is called “king.” He’s “David the king” in verse 6.^{xviii}

But then we get this curious remark about the number fourteen. Look at verse 17—“*So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations.*” When Matthew says, “all the generations,” he means “all the generations that he has mentioned above.” There are more generations that he has not mentioned (as we explored last week). But he has chosen to arrange the genealogy in three sets of fourteens. Why?

Many suggestions have been proposed, ranging from the arrangement was meant to aid in memorization to more involved interpretations. For example, some have pointed out that three sets of fourteen is another way of saying six sets of seven. That would mean, when Jesus arrives we are at the “seventh seven.” Of course the number seven is very often used as a symbol in the Bible and Jewish literature. It derives meaning from the days of creation. It was on the seventh day that God rested from his labors. If Matthew is thinking of this, then he may be saying that when Jesus has arrived, and the seventh seven has arrived with him. In other words, He brought with Him God’s rest.^{xix} Certainly that is a theme in

Matthew. It is Jesus after all who says, “Come to me all who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest” (Matthew 11:28). And, as the writer of Hebrews puts it, Jesus comes to lead his people into a Sabbath rest (Hebrews 4).

Others have made reference to the year of Jubilee in the Old Testament. The Jubilee year was a special year of forgiveness of sins and pardon throughout the land. It’s mentioned in Leviticus 25 and was scheduled for every fiftieth year, right after seven Sabbaths of years (i.e. seven sevens; see Leviticus 25:8-13). If that’s what Matthew is remembering, then perhaps that seventh seven that Jesus inaugurates creates anticipation for the ultimate year of Jubilee, coming, no doubt, when Jesus returns again. These interpretations are certainly possible and theologically sound, but I think there is a more obvious answer to the enigma of the fourteens, though it wouldn’t necessarily exclude these interpretations either.

The people back then recognized a practice called *gematria*, which assigned to every consonant of the alphabet a numerical value. Those letters/numbers could be added up to give every word a numerical value (cf. “666” in Revelation). If we were doing it in English, it would look something like this:

A = 1 B = 2 C = 3 D = 4 E = 5 F = 6 G = 7 H = 8 I = 9 J = 10

But then, once you get to “K” it would jump by increments of ten. So...

K = 20 L = 30 M = 40 N = 50 O = 60 P = 70 Q = 80 R = 90 S = 100...

From there it jumps by increments of one hundred.

T = 200 U = 300 etc....

So every word has a numerical value based on adding up the letters found in the word. I know what you are thinking, “this is kind of weird.” But bear with me here. I’m always skeptical of “biblical codes,” they all seem like a bunch of nonsense to me. But this practice is well documented in the ancient literature we have and there is clear evidence the Jews, in some cases, used gematria to communicate truth in subtle ways.

The Old Testament was written in Hebrew and the Hebrew alphabet has no vowels. So a word like “David” would simple be spelled DVD (having nothing to do with digital video discs). Of course, that’s English. In Hebrew the three consonants are דָּוִד (*dalet-vav-dalet*; read right to left). You probably don’t know the Hebrew alphabet, but here are the opening letters with the corresponding numbers...

...(6) ד (5) ו (4) ו (3) ו (2) ב (1) א

So if you add up the letters in David’s name (ד/4 + ו/6+ ד/4) you get 14 total. Ah, now we are getting somewhere. And notice that David’s name is the fourteenth name on the list. So it’s as if Matthew has arranged the genealogy in such a way, with three sets of 14s, to shout to us “David! David! David!” With superlative force, Matthew is emphasizing that Jesus is the King!

Now that’s all very interesting, but if Matthew is right, that Jesus is the King that the Old Testament foretold, then that is not a fact that we can merely brush off as interesting. That should change our very lives. But this is tricky for us, because we are Americans and Americans have an aversion towards royalty. We don’t do royalty in America. That’s in our DNA ever since 1776. I mean just read the writings of Alexander Hamilton, read the Federalist Papers, and you can all but see the disgust for royalty

dripping off the pages. It was Thomas Jefferson who once said, “If anybody thinks that kings and nobles are good conservators of the public happiness, let him go to Europe.” [spit] (I’m not sure if he spit then, but that’s how I imagined it...). We just don’t do royalty.

And yet we kind of like it from afar. Look at all the people who line up to get a glimpse of one of the English princes when they come to America. Thousands of teenage girls and moms acting like teenage girls will stand in the hot sun for that. Then there are the stories we tell our kids. Look at all our children’s tales that have kings and queens, princes and princesses, at the center.

And then there is Christmas. Think about the songs we sing throughout America during the Christmas season. Christians and non-Christians alike sing things like:

“Hark the herald angels sing, glory to the newborn king”
“Joy to the world the Lord has come, let earth receive her King.”
“Come and behold him, born the King of angels”
“This is Christ the King. Whom shepherds guard and angels sing.”

Everyone sings these songs and all of them glorify the idea of kingship and proclaim Jesus as King. This is remarkable.

Another pastor, named Greg Gilbert, reflected on these things and asked, “given who we are as a nation, with our allergy to royalty, and given who we are as human beings, with our allergy to Jesus’ royalty, how is it that we can so freely sing about Jesus being the king?” Then he answers his own question and I think he is spot on. He said,

“I think the reason we are able to sing songs like that is because we are able as human beings to sort of safely tuck those declarations of Jesus’ kingship into a little harmless box. The idea of Jesus’ kingship to a lot of us is merely a kind of religious symbol. It’s just something that is out there....Jesus, if he is a king at all, is a religious king at best. It’s an image we talk about at church. In other words, he’s a fictional king. One with no real authority. One with no real ability to affect our lives. One that really has nothing to do with us.”

But ladies and gentlemen, “this text challenges that entire assumption.”^{xxx}

Friends, if Jesus is the King then that changes everything for the Christian. Absolutely everything. And we are going to see, as we work through this book, that the Kingship of Jesus should radically change every area of our lives. Like what? (I’m glad you asked). Let me give you a few examples, as we close, to whet your appetite for what lies ahead for us.

1) If Jesus is not merely our Savior, but also our King, then it means we owe Him our unconditional obedience.

If it’s not unconditional, it’s not real obedience. Occasionally, I hear people say, “I’m not interested in Jesus. I tried Christianity and it didn’t work.” Have you ever heard that?

Timothy Keller writes,

“When you say, ‘I tried Christianity. It didn’t work,’ almost always that means, ‘There were some nonnegotiable things I want in my life. I want happiness. I want health. I want to be married. I want to be this. I want to be that. Christianity didn’t give it to me.’ What that means is, ‘I obey

God if ... I obey God conditionally,' which is not obedience at all. That's not obeying God. That's using God.... Unless you drop the *if*'s, you're not obeying at all. You're still on the throne of your life...

My friends, the hardest thing to give is *in*. The hardest thing to give Jesus is *in*. He did the impossible for you....If he's the King, that means you serve him even if it's not working for you. You serve him even if things don't seem to be paying off. You must obey him unconditionally."^{xxi}

You getting this? If He's the King, if He's your King, then the only appropriate response is obedience, regardless of the cost or outcome.

2) *If Jesus is the King it also means we ought to trust Him.*

The sovereignty of God at work in fulfilling this covenant displays the faithfulness of God. If He can orchestrate this, He should have no trouble with the details of your life.

Martin Luther understood that worry was a consequence of us trying to rule the world instead of letting God do it. When we are anxious about some future outcome, we're essentially saying, "God I think it needs to go down like this and I'm not convinced you're going to get this right." That's worry in a nutshell.

Luther had a friend named Philipp Melancthon, another great Protestant Reformer, but Philipp struggled a lot with worry. And Luther would come up along side him, put his hand on his shoulder, and say, "Philipp, it's time to chill out bro." Actually, he had a better, more theological, way of putting it. He would say something like, "Let Philipp cease to rule the world." In other words, "Stop trying to rule the world Philipp, and you'll stop worrying. You can't worry and let God be King. They just don't go together."^{xxii}

Here's another implication...

3) *If Jesus is King then it means forever joy for His people.*

Do you know why? Because He is the one who brings all of the promises of God to completion. All of the promises of God were handed down to Jesus and Jesus wants to hand all of the blessings of those promises down to those who come to Him in faith. If you come to this crucified King and say, "King Jesus I know that my sin disqualifies me from being a part of your kingdom, but I also know that you came to save sinners like me. You died on the cross as my substitute to save me because I can't save myself and you rose from the dead because I can't get right standing with God without you. Save me." When you come to King Jesus like that, He saves. And He will not send you away empty handed. No, no. All the blessings of the kingdom go from Jesus' hands to yours and you enter His kingdom. What good news, church! You can become a citizen of His kingdom today. That is the choice before you. Will you turn from your sins and turn to the King and receive life? Will you trust Him to save you?

If the answer is yes, will you take that response card from the bulletin and indicate that on that card. Give us a way to contact you and drop that card in the offering plates that will circulate in a few minutes. Someone from our pastoral staff will contact you this week and talk about that decision or whatever decision God may be leading you to make. But maybe you just can't wait that long. That's great. In a moment we are going to lift our voices as a church in worship to King Jesus. You are welcome to step out from your pew and come meet me at the front. I'd love to pray with you. Encourage you. And celebrate what God is doing in your life.

For those of you who have already been saved by Jesus. You've turned from your sins and put your faith in Him. Let's not forget that Jesus is not just our Savior. He's our King. Which means the only appropriate response from you today is to say to him "Jesus, you are the King, and because you are the King, there are no conditions on my obedience to you. I will follow you wherever you lead me, I'll give you whatever you ask of me. I will abandon all I have and all I am because you are King and you are worthy of nothing less."^{xxiii} That is the appropriate response to God's Word this morning...the only one. And that is at the heart of what it means to be a disciple of Jesus Christ.

Let's pray...

ⁱ I also mentioned that both Matthew and Luke include a genealogy of Jesus, but they differ at various points. The hope was to discuss some of those differences during this sermon, but time constraints would not allow it. Some argue that one is tracing the line of Joseph (Jesus' legal father) and the other Mary's line. Others have argued that both are tracing Joseph's line, one highlighting the legal line to demonstrate throne succession and the other his natural lineage. Other's find harmony between the lists through a variety of levirate marriages, which would occur when a man who had no legal heir died and his brother would marry the widow in his place to ensure his line continued. This can wreak havoc on genealogies. And there have been various other suggestions as well. Those conversations can be quite technical and convoluted, so I will spare you the details this morning. Suffice it to say, while some of the suggestions are more likely than others, all of them are at least possible. I'm not sure we have enough information at our disposal to say for sure what the best solution is, but when there are so many viable solutions available there is enough information to demonstrate that the differences net no real challenge to the inerrancy of Scripture. Some who argue that one genealogy relates Mary's line and another Joseph's, see J. L. Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1989), 170; R. C. Sproul, *Matthew* (St. Andrew's Expository Commentary; Wheaton: Crossway, 2013), 16, 18-19. Some examples of those who think that both genealogies connect to Joseph in some way, include: Grant Osborne, *Matthew* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 59; J. G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York: Harper and Row, 1930), 202-209. Another detailed study for those who read French is J. Masson, *Jésus fils de David dans les généalogies de saint Matthieu et de saint Luc* (Paris: Tequi, 1981). Masson opts for a mediating position between these two major suggestions, in which Mary and Joseph share a common great-grandfather. For a brief survey of the most common suggestions, see D. A. Carson, "Matthew" in *Matthew & Mark* (EBC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 89-90. For a more detailed study, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994), 918-923. Bock has arranged the options quite clearly. At the end, he concludes: "A clear choice is difficult to establish between the various views that see Joseph's line as present in both Gospels... What the options show is that it is premature to insist on error here, even though a definite solution does not emerge. Nevertheless, [Luke's] genealogy's point is obvious. Jesus has a claim to the throne through David and is related to all of humanity through Adam." *Ibid.*, 922-923.

ⁱⁱ So argues Osborne, 62.

ⁱⁱⁱ E.g., 1 Kings 19:16.

^{iv} E.g., Leviticus 4:3; 6:22.

^v E.g., 1 Samuel 16:13; 24:10; 2 Samuel 19:21; Lamentations 4:20. We also see the language of anointing used metaphorically in reference to Israel's patriarchs (Psalm 105:15) and even the pagan king Cyrus (Isaiah 45:1).

^{vi} E.g., 1 Sam. 12:3; Lam. 4:20.

^{vii} E.g., Hebrews 4:14.

viii Daniel M. Doriani, *Matthew, Volume 1: Chapters 1-13* (REC; Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2008), 8.

ix “When ‘Christ’ is joined with ‘the son of David, the son of Abraham,’ Jesus’s messianic status is even more strongly stressed. ‘Son of David’ is frequently a messianic title (Matt. 1:1, 6, 17, 20; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 45; cf. Rom. 1:3), drawing from such biblical material as 2 Sam. 7:11–16; Ps. 91; Jer. 23:5; 33:15.” David Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 57.

x “D. A. Carson writes, “Already in Hannah’s prayer, ‘Messiah’ parallels ‘king’: the Lord ‘will give strength to his king and exalt the horn of his anointed’ (1 Sa 2:10). With the rising number of OT prophecies concerning King David’s line (e.g., 2Sa 7:12-16, cf. Ps 2:2), ‘Messiah’ or ‘Christ’ became the designation of a figure representing the people of God and bringing in the promised eschatological reign.” He says, “Matthew’s linkage of ‘Christ’ with ‘Son of David’ leaves no doubt what he is claiming about Jesus.” Carson, “Matthew,” 87.

xi “For the Jewish people (and the disciples during Jesus’ life) that meant he would come as a conquering king. David was the great warrior-king who won great battles for his people. So when they thought of the royal Messiah, what they contemplated was the destruction of the Romans with the Jewish people as the new world rulers. Yet for Matthew this is not the main point; Jesus would first come as suffering Servant, dying for the sins of humankind (The Jews understood Isaiah 52-53 as referring to the nation rather than the Messiah), and would not return to defeat his enemies until his second coming (Rev. 19:11-21).” Osborne, 68.

xii Some were even expecting multiple “Messiahs” (Carson, “Matthew,” 87). Grant Osborne writes, “The Messiah or Anointed One was the subject of great speculation in the first century. Evans shows that many later ideas were not found prior to AD 70, such as that the Messiah would perform miracles, be preexistent, or suffer death. The Jews expected a victorious, conquering Messiah, with a wide variety of images, such as an anointed figure (1 En. 48:10, 52:4; 4 Ezra 7:28-29; CD 12:23-13:1, 14:19), a prince (CD 7:19-20; 1 QM 3:16; Sib. Or. 3:460), a branch of David (4Q161 frags. 7-10 iii 22; 4Q1174 frags. 1-3 I 11), the scepter (1QSb 5:27-28, 4Q 161 frags. 2-6 ii 17), Son of God (4Q246 1:9, 2:1), and Son of Man (1 En. 46:11-15, 52:4, 62:1-15; 4 Ezra 13:3). Of special interest are the priestly and royal figures of Qumran (1QS 9:11; CD 12:23-13:1, 14:19, 19:10-11, 20:1). However, the one thing they all had in common was that he would liberate Israel from their enemies.” Osborne, 62. Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992), 52, from R. A. Horsley, *The Liberation of Christmas* (New York: Crossroad, 1989). Also see, Craig A. Evans, “Messianism,” in *Dictionary of New Testament Backgrounds*, ed. C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter (Downers Grove: IVP, 2000), 698-707.

xiii An example of these expectation can be seen in the extra-biblical Jewish writing called Psalms of Solomon, which put it this way: “See, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David, to rule over your servant Israel In the time known to you, O God. Undergird him with the strength to destroy the unrighteous rulers, to purge Jerusalem from Gentiles who trample her to destruction.” (Psalms of Solomon 17:21-22).

xiv The “incarnational” and “grace” principles borrow the language used by Timothy Keller in an excellent sermon called “The Promise of David,” preached to Redeemer Presbyterian Church on December 14, 2003.

xv Bruce Waltke points out, “the Davidic covenant contains a total of ten blessings: three fulfilled in David’s lifetime; four in the lifetime of his son Solomon; and three in the remote future.” Bruce Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 661.

xvi D. A. Carson, *The God Who Is There: Finding Your Place in God’s Story* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2010), 78.

xvii Carson, “Matthew,” 87-88.

xviii “Not only is David the turning point in the genealogy, but the title recurs throughout the gospel (9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30-31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 45). God swore covenant love for David (Ps 89:28)...” Ibid., 87.

xix See R. T. France, *Matthew* (NICNT; Eerdmans, 2007), 31-32; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Matthew 1-7* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 1:162.

xx The quotes and some of the reflections above concerning our American DNA, I picked up from a sermon by Greg Gilbert called “The Dawn of the Kingdom—Matthew 1:1-2:12,” preached to Capital Hill Baptist Church in Washington D.C. on January 3, 2010.

xxi Keller, “The Promise of David.”

xxii Ibid.

xxiii The wording of that response was taken from David Platt, *Exalting Jesus in Matthew* (Christ-Centered Exposition Commentary; Nashville: Broadman and Holman Academic, 2013), 16.