

THE DAVIDIC LINEAGE OF MESSIAH YESHUA

by Avram Yehoshua

[The Seed of Abraham](#)

Prophecies about the Messiah in the Tanach (Old Testament) speak of Him coming from the lineage of King David (Jer. 23:5; Ezk. 34:23, etc.) and a number of New Testament Scriptures reflect that, saying that Yeshua is from the Seed of David (as well as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Judah).¹ How, though, is there a *physical* connection from David (and also Abraham, etc.) to Yeshua, as some Scriptures literally speak of (2nd Sam. 7:12; Is. 11:1-9; Ps. 132:11), when Yeshua had no earthly father as His progenitor? The answer to this evaded me for quite some time,² but on 18 June 2008, while reading in the Book of Acts, the Lord opened my eyes to this enigma in a most wonderful way.

It's improbable that physical lineage from David came through Mary because Scripture is silent on her genealogy, although some try unsuccessfully to prove that Mary was from the House of David through Luke's genealogy (Lk. 3:23f.) to give Yeshua some form of Davidic lineage. Even if one could prove that Mary's lineage came from David it wouldn't help because ancestry was traced through the father, not the mother, and this is reinforced for a king (Mt. 1:6-11f.). David Stern confirms this when he says:

‘even if Luke's genealogy is of Miryam (Mary) and goes back to David, it doesn't help Yeshua because descent, for purposes of inheriting kingship, cannot be counted through the mother.’³

Some try to force Luke's genealogy of Joseph onto Mary by suggesting that the missing Greek article (*the*) in front of Joseph's name means that Joseph is not the ‘son of,’ but rather the ‘son-in-law’ of Heli

¹ Mt. 1:1-17; Lk. 1:27, 32, 69; 2:4; 3:23-31; Acts 13:22-23:

Rom. 1:3: ‘the Good News concerning His Son, who was *descended from David according to the flesh.*’

2nd Tim. 2:8: ‘Remember! Yeshua the Messiah, raised from the dead, *the Seed of David*—that is my Good News.’

Heb. 7:13-14: ‘Now, the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another Tribe, *from which no one has ever served at the Altar.* For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that Tribe Moses said nothing about priests.’ Heb. 8:4 by inference, ‘Now, if He were on Earth He would not be a priest at all since there are priests who offer gifts according to the Law.’

Rev. 5:5: “Then one of the Elders said to me, ‘Do not weep! See! *The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David,* has conquered so that He can open the Scroll and its seven seals.’”

Rev. 22:16: ‘It is I, Yeshua, who sent my angel to you with this testimony for the Assemblies. *I am the Root and the Seed of David,* the bright morning star.’

² Actually, the answer to that question has stymied Church theologians for almost two millennia. They have never been able to properly answer this question. Many Jews, who are anti-Yeshua/Jesus, use the Scripture about Messiah being from the loins of King David as ‘proof’ that Yeshua isn't the Messiah, since Christians theologians don't have an understanding of it.

³ David Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary* (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1992), p. 173.

(Eli in Hebrew), thus making Eli Mary's father, but this explanation defies the Greek language.⁴

Another way of presenting Joseph as Eli's son-in-law is to interpret, 'as was supposed' (Lk. 3:23), which means that Luke was saying that people really thought that Yeshua was Joseph's natural son, to mean, 'as was supposed of Joseph, but really of Eli.' This would make Eli the father of Mary and make it her genealogy.⁵ Alexander Bruce says that this is 'ingenious, but not satisfactory,' noting that if that had been Luke's intention, he would have clearly stated it.⁶

Another attempt would make the phrase to mean, 'Joseph, the son of Heli by marriage,' but this is just the concept above with a different twist. Leon Morris writes that Luke 'does not mention Mary' in the genealogy and 'genealogies were not traced through the female line.'⁷ Craig Evans states that it's Joseph that Luke is writing about in Lk. 3:23, not Mary, and that Luke brings out the Davidic descent of Joseph in other places as well (Lk. 1:27; 2:4).⁸

The only lineage information on Mary that we have is that she was somehow related to Elizabeth, who was of the 'daughters of Aaron' (Lk. 1:5, 36). This doesn't make Mary of the House of Aaron or Levi, as she could have been related by marriage and not by 'blood.' For example, Mary's mother's brothers (if she had any) could have married one of Elizabeth's sisters (or aunts or female cousins), which would make Mary related to Elizabeth, but with no direct, physical lineage to Aaron. It's possible that Mary was from the Tribe of Levi (and/or even the Tribe of Judah),⁹ but there's no Scripture to support this, and Yeshua is never once referred to as having any ancestry or physical link to Levi or Aaron.¹⁰ Just the opposite is the case, as Hebrews 7:13-14 and 8:4 state.

Many theologians correctly believe that Matthew and Luke's genealogies speak of Joseph, not Mary,¹¹

⁴ In an article written by Arnold Fruchtenbaum, and circulated by 'Jews for Jesus,' Mr. Fruchtenbaum makes the following claim: 'In the Greek text of Luke's genealogy, every single name mentioned has the Greek definite article 'the,' with one exception: the name of Joseph (Luke 3:23). Someone reading the original would understand, by the missing definite article from Joseph's name, that this was not really Joseph's genealogy, but his wife Miriam's.' (Mary).

David L. Blank, Professor of Classic Languages at The University of California–Los Angeles, made the following observation about Mr. Fruchtenbaum's comment:

'According to the Greek original, Eli is indeed the father of Joseph. There is a definite article before each name, except that of Joseph, and that definite article is in each case the masculine genitive singular article—*you*. Not only does this *not* clearly indicate that Joseph is skipped in the genealogy, it *cannot*, by any stretch of the imagination, be taken as so indicated. The author's comments (Mr. Fruchtenbaum) on the Greek grammar of the passage are absurd and manifest an appalling ignorance of the facts of Greek syntax' (from http://www.sullivan-county.com/identity/gen_jesus.htm).

⁵ Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D., Author; W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, M. A., LL. D., *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. one: *The Synoptic Gospels* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 485.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Leon Morris, The Rev. Canon, M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Luke* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), p. 110.

⁸ Craig A. Evans, *New International Biblical Commentary: Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1990), p. 60.

⁹ This would make a physical connection to David through Mary, and with no earthly father, a way that Yeshua could have physically descended from David, but because this is never mentioned as such, it seems unlikely. The New Testament writers, who wrote of Yeshua descending from David, listed Joseph's lineage, not Mary's.

¹⁰ There are some who insist that Mary had to have at least one parent with lineage to Aaron because, in their eyes, that would make Yeshua's high priesthood possible under Mosaic Law. This thought, though, fails to recognize that Yeshua was a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, not Aaron (Ps. 110:4; Heb. 2:17; 3:1; 5:6, 10; 7:1f.;

even though Matthew and Luke present different fathers for Joseph (as well as different lineages back to King David). That's why some want to place *Mary* into Luke's genealogy. Julius Africanus, though, seems to offer a possible explanation for the problem of the two different fathers for Joseph.¹²

In his encounter with the angel, Joseph is called a 'son of David' (Mt. 1:20), but there's no mention of any lineage for Mary. In Mary's encounter with Gabriel he calls her, 'Highly favored' (Lk. 1:26, 28) but there's no mention of any Davidic lineage (e.g. he could have said, 'Highly favored daughter of David'). Also, if Yeshua's Davidic lineage came through Mary, why is it that only Joseph's lineage to King David is mentioned? We may never know Mary's ancestry 'this side of the New Jerusalem,' but we can know how Scripture sees Messiah Yeshua coming from the 'fruit of King David's body.'

FROM THE FRUIT OF KING DAVID'S BODY

Reading Acts 2:29-30 that day in June I was struck again by the concept of Yeshua coming from the physical lineage of David. Acts Two is *Shavu'ot* (Pentecost), with the Holy Spirit initially falling on the Jewish Apostles and quite possibly all the 120 (Acts 1:15). Peter proclaims a number of wonderful things to the multitude of Jews who gathered around him, the chief of which was how Yeshua was the long awaited Messiah. At one point Peter expressly speaks of Yeshua coming from the 'fruit of' (loins of) David's body 'according to the flesh:'

'Men and brethren! Let me speak freely to you of Father David, that he is both dead and

cf. Zech. 6:12-13). There was no need for Yeshua to have any lineage from Aaron. See [Yeshua—From the Tribe of Levi?](#)

¹¹ I. Howard Marshall, author; I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, editors, *The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 62, 157 (see also Evans, *Luke*, p. 25). The lineage of Yeshua goes back to King David through Joseph in both *Matthew and Luke's genealogies*. *Mary is never mentioned as coming from King David*, but being married to Joseph, who was from the Seed of David: 'and Jacob, the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born, who is called the Messiah' (Mt. 1:16). Mt. 1:20: "But just when he had resolved to do this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, 'Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary as your wife, for the child conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.'"

Luke 1:27: 'to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the House of David. The virgin's name was Mary.'

The NASB, though, for Luke 1:27 has, 'to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the descendants (plural) of David, whose name was Mary.' This could be interpreted to mean that both Joseph and Mary were of the Seed of David, but both the NRSV and the KJV have it speaking of only Joseph and it seems that the NASB is only stating that Joseph was one of many of the descendants of David, as we see in Matthew chapter one:

The NRSV: 'to a virgin engaged to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David. The virgin's name was Mary' (Lk. 1:27).

The KJV: 'to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary' (Lk. 1:27).

The NIV has descendent, singular, which points directly to Joseph and Joseph only: 'to a virgin pledged to be married to a man named Joseph, a descendent of David. The virgin's name was Mary' (Lk. 1:27).

Luke 2:4: 'Joseph also went from the town of Nazareth in Galilee to Judea, to the city of David called Bethlehem, because he was descended from the House and Family of David.'

Luke, too, traces Yeshua's lineage through Joseph: 'Jesus was about thirty years old when He began His work.

buried, and his tomb is with us to this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn, with an oath to him, that *of the fruit of his body* according to the flesh, He would raise up the Messiah to sit on his Throne...’ (Acts 2:29-30).

How could Peter be saying that? How could Yeshua be from the physical lineage of King David when Yeshua had no earthly father (Luke 1:34-35), and Mary’s lineage is never mentioned? Some, as we’ve already seen, try and force her into the House of David through Luke’s genealogy (Luke 3:23f.). *The New Unger’s Bible Dictionary* states that Mary was from the Tribe of Judah, from the lineage of David,¹³ but there’s no mention of how they came to that conclusion.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (ISBE) also believes that Luke was speaking about Mary’s lineage when it states that the phrase in Luke 1:27, “‘of the House of David,’ goes with virgin, not Joseph,” but adds that “this is controversial.”¹⁴ *ISBE* admits that Mary’s lineage to King David ‘cannot be proved conclusively from the genealogy of Lk. 3:23-28.’ *ISBE* goes on to interpret rather poorly the two verses found in Luke 1:32, 34 when they say that they point,

“in the direction of Mary’s Davidic ancestry when it says, ‘The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David,’ for Mary was engaged, *but not yet married* to Joseph. It is *evident* that Mary realized that *Joseph was excluded* when she said, ‘How shall this be since I have no husband?’”¹⁵

“Evident” to them, perhaps, but the problem with *ISBE*’s teaching is that the Greek doesn’t have Mary saying, ‘since I have no husband,’ but rather, ‘since I have not known a man’ (ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω, lit. ‘since man not known’), or ‘since I have not (sexually) known my (intended) husband.’¹⁶ Also, Mary knew that she was betrothed and would have considered herself married to Joseph, even though the marriage hadn’t been consummated yet. Howard Marshall states that betrothal in ancient Israel was,

“regarded as equally binding as marriage, the girl having the same legal position as a

He was the son (as was thought) of Joseph, son of Heli’ (Luke 3:23).

¹² Morris, *Luke*, p. 110. Julius Africanus (160-240 A.D.) in his letter to Aristides, says that he heard from a descendent of James that Heli (Eli) of Luke 3:23 died childless. Jacob (Mt. 1:16) Eli’s half brother, had the same mother, but obviously, a different father, and married the widow of Eli, and Joseph was born (see also <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08565a.htm>). If this is true, and Africanus seems to be a credible source, it reconciles the different fathers and lineage of Joseph in Matthew and Luke.

What this means is that Eli was the original husband of Joseph’s mother, but Eli died childless and according to Mosaic Law (Dt. 25:5-7; see also Ruth 4:5, 10; and law that predates Moses; Gen. 38:6-10, 14, 24-30) a brother of the dead husband was to raise up a son for his dead brother through his dead brother’s widow so his dead brother’s ‘name’ and inheritance wouldn’t be forgotten or lost in Israel.

Joseph is literally and legally the son of Jacob (Matthew’s Gospel), but theologically the son of Eli (Luke’s Gospel). The two different lineages of Jacob to David (Matthew) and Eli to David (Luke) come from Jacob and Eli being half-brothers with different fathers of Davidic lineage. This is seriously questioned by Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 158, who says it’s improbable, but also states that the enigma ‘is insoluble with the evidence presently at our disposal’ (p. 159).

¹³ Merrill F. Unger, *The New Unger’s Bible Dictionary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1988), p. 822.

¹⁴ Geoffrey W. Bromiley, general editor; Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, associate editors, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. three (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), p. 269.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 69. Marshall writes of J. B. Bauer suggesting “that ἄνδρα (man/husband) should be translated as ‘my husband.’”

wife, but it was not normal for intercourse to take place during this period.”¹⁷

The Wycliffe Bible Commentary confirms Marshall and states:

“Jewish law held espousal or engagement as binding as marriage,” and “After the betrothal the groom could claim his bride at any time.”¹⁸

The Illustrated Bible Dictionary says that when one was betrothed they were recognized as husband and wife:

“In the Near East betrothal (Talmudic *erusin* and *qiddusin*) is almost as binding as marriage itself. In the Bible the betrothed woman was sometimes called ‘wife’ and was under the same obligation of faithfulness (Gen. 29:21; Dt. 22:23-24; Mt. 1:18, 20), and the betrothed man was called ‘husband’ (Joel 1:8; Mt. 1:19).¹⁹

David Stern relates that the Jewish Sages thought that adultery in the betrothal state was a greater sin than adultery after betrothal. He says that the,

“word for betrothal is ‘*Kiddushin*,’ which signifies ‘sanctification, separation,’ i.e. the setting aside and separating of a particular woman for a particular man. According to the Mishna, adultery during the betrothal period is a more serious sin than adultery after marriage.”²⁰

Ancient betrothal was legally as the marriage state, except for consummation and living together, so even though Mary was ‘only engaged’ to Joseph, he was certainly not ‘excluded’ from Mary’s, nor Gabriel’s thoughts because Mary was theologically and spiritually ‘one’ with her husband, Joseph. That’s *why* Gabriel waited until *after* the betrothal (and *before* the consummation) to come to Mary. This will prove to be the key to understanding how Yeshua could come from the loins of King David.

Commenting on the phrase ‘House of David’ (ἐξ οἴκου Δαυὶδ i.e. a descendant of David) in Luke 1:27, “to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the House of David,” Marshall writes:

“had that phrase been meant to refer to Mary, it would have had to be differently constructed (in Greek). It is meant to show how Jesus was the ‘son of David’ through Joseph as his legal ‘father’ (3:23; Mt. 1:16)...Nevertheless, Origen and others have held that the phrase was meant to refer to Mary, whose Davidic descent is asserted in Protev. Jac. 10:1; Ign. Eph. 18:2; Justin, Dial. 43, 45, 100, 120.”²¹

Alexander Bruce suggests that the phrase could refer to Mary, but says that because Luke uses the Greek word for virgin twice in the same verse, ‘House of David,’ should refer to Joseph, not Mary:

‘Mary, Joseph or both? Impossible to be sure, though the repetition of παρθένου (*parthaynu*–virgin) in the next clause (instead of αὐτῆς ‘her’) favours the reference to Joseph.’²²

Granting *ISBE*’s interpretation of Luke 1:32, 34, without accepting it as true (that Gabriel spoke of David’s throne as referring to Mary ancestry, and that Mary knew that Joseph was excluded from

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 64. SBI, 45-47; II, 393, Jeremias, Jerusalem 364-367.

¹⁸ Charles F. Pfeiffer, Old Testament; Everett F. Harrison, New Testament, *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977), pp. 1030-1031.

¹⁹ J. D. Douglas, M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., Organizing editor, *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, part 2 (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998), p. 955.

²⁰ Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary*, p. 3.

²¹ Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, pp. 64-65

²² Bruce, *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 463.

Gabriel's words because 'Mary wasn't married yet'), if Mary was a descendant of David, if Yeshua's Davidic human lineage came through Mary, where, at the very least, is a second witness in Scripture to Mary descending from David?²³ Even with *ISBE's* far fetched 'interpretation' there is not one clear and plain Scripture of Mary coming from the lineage of David. Yet, there are three clear and specific Scripture witnesses to Joseph being a descendant of King David (Mt. 1:20; Lk. 1:27; 2:4). Why is Miryam's lineage never mentioned *if she is the one through whom Yeshua's Davidic lineage is supposed to have come from?* And why is Joseph specifically mentioned as coming from David when he wasn't the father of Yeshua? In other words, it wouldn't matter if Joseph was from David or not, except for the fact that biblical lineage is seen from the father; not the mother.

The Illustrated Bible Dictionary (IBD) relates that Luke's genealogy speaks of Joseph's ancestry, and says that even though Scripture is silent on Mary's ancestry she could have come from David, but of course, this is pure conjecture on their part. *IBD* also relates how Origin, and other ancient writers, could 'fill in the blanks' about Mary coming from David, without any credible references to support them, saying:

'Luke tells us that Joseph was of Davidic descent and although no mention is made of Mary's lineage it is possible that she came from the same line...This...sketch of Mary and her relationship to our Lord leaves many gaps in the record, which pious *legend* has not been slow to fill, but we are not able to press the Gospel record beyond their historical limit.'²⁴

Some say that Joseph legally *adopted* Yeshua as His earthly father, and so, it could be said that Joseph's lineage passed to Yeshua. As true as this may be, adoption is never mentioned or even hinted at in Scripture. Yeshua saw Joseph as His earthly father and submitted Himself to him (Lk. 2:41-51), and it's fairly reasonable to think that Joseph raised Yeshua as he would his own sons (i.e. Joseph loved Yeshua), and legally, Joseph's lineage would pass to Yeshua, with or without adoption papers, as no one would dispute it because most thought Yeshua was from Joseph's loins (Lk. 3:23), but where is the physical aspect of Messiah *coming from the Seed of David*, as Peter, and Scripture, speak of? No, adoption, whether legally 'with papers,' or not, isn't how Scripture presents Yeshua as coming from the fruit of David's body according to the flesh.

AN INSIGHT FROM ABOVE

As I pondered Peter's words that day in June, it came to me. So simple and so sublime, as it always is with the Holy Spirit revealing the Word. It wasn't by my intelligence or reasoning capabilities. It was by the Holy Spirit. Conceptually, just as Yeshua rebuked the Sadducees for not believing in an afterlife, basing their belief on *their* understanding of the Law of Moses (they didn't believe in the Prophets or the Psalms), so it is with Yeshua's Davidic (and Abrahamic, etc.) physical lineage.

Yeshua went right to the Torah (the Law of Moses; Genesis through Deuteronomy) and showed the Sadducees how wrong they were in their interpretation of God's Word, using the only Scripture they thought was divine (the first five books of the Bible; i.e. Mosaic Law; Genesis through Deuteronomy). He told them of Moses at the Burning Bush and how God had said, speaking in the present tense, 'I **am** the God of your father; the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob' (Ex. 3:6), not I was the God of Abraham, etc.. To God, Yeshua explained, even the dead are alive unto Him (Mt. 22:31; Mk. 12:26; Lk. 20:37). How could the Sadducees have failed to see that?!

²³ Dt. 19:15; Mt. 18:16; 2nd Cor. 13:1.

²⁴ Douglas, *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, part 2, p. 959.

How indeed! Without Yeshua telling us, we would have failed to see it, too! Praise God for Yeshua who reveals His Word to us by His Spirit! Yeshua's physical lineage to David and Abraham is also conceptually seen in Torah, at Genesis 2:24:

‘Therefore, a man shall leave his father and his mother and cling to his wife, *and they shall become (or be) one flesh.*’

At *betrothal*, Joseph and Mary became *one flesh* in God's eyes. Adam and Eve were ‘one’ before Eve came forth, and when men and women marry they symbolically and spiritually revert back to that oneness (1st Cor. 6:15-16). Also, Scripture does not record the genealogies of women. That's because the woman is ‘one’ with her husband (or father). This is why only men were counted in the numbering of Israel in the Wilderness, and in the feeding of the 5,000 by Yeshua, etc.²⁵

Mary, from whatever lineage she may have been from, was now of the lineage of King David through her husband Joseph. That's why it was essential for Joseph and Mary to have been betrothed²⁶ *before* Gabriel came to Mary. Mary had become ‘one flesh’ with Joseph at betrothal, even though the marriage hadn't been consummated yet. Now the Child could be conceived and born under Joseph's physical lineage to King David, even though Joseph hadn't had sexual intercourse with Miryam. It's no accident that Mary's lineage is never mentioned in Scripture.

Isn't this what happens with us ‘in Messiah’? Having died to self (like Mary losing her past ancestry and becoming one with Joseph), and given eternal life through our union with Messiah (Rom. 6–7), we are now the betrothed Bride of Messiah Yeshua (Rev. 19:7; 21:2, 9). We are *one* with Messiah²⁷ so we can

²⁵ Women and children were considered part of the family, *one* with the husband or father. The man was the head of the family.

Only the firstborn sons in Egypt were killed at the First Passover, while the firstborn sons of Israel were spared (Ex. 12:12). Because of that, Yahveh spoke of them, the firstborn sons of Israel, being His (Ex. 13:1-2, 12-13, 14, 15; 22:29). An obvious thing in the Old Testament was circumcision, for men only, ‘to come into the Covenant.’ Why not something for women? There isn't anything because they are one with their father or their husband.

Only the firstborn *male* is considered the *firstborn* to open the womb (Ex. 12:48). In Ex. 30:11-16 it's only the men over 20 years old that are allowed to give a half-shekel for their redemption from Egypt, and subsequent numbering. In Ex. 34:19-20 only the male sons are to be redeemed when they are born (for it was only the firstborn sons of Egypt that died and the firstborn sons of Israel that were spared). Ex. 34:23 only mentions that the males are to come to the place where Yahveh has His Name, three times a year, to celebrate the major Feasts, and in Ex. 38:25-26 only the men gave of the silver half-shekel to be redeemed and numbered (as per Ex. 30:11-16).

Only the *male* Levites could be helpers to Aaron and his sons. Only the *male* priests could eat of the grain sacrifice (Lev. 6:18) and the trespass sacrifice (Lev. 7:6) and offer up sacrifices. Also, it was literally only the Sons of Aaron that could minister and offer sacrifice in the Tabernacle of Moses, and later Temple.

Only the men of Israel over 20 years old were numbered in the two censuses of the Wilderness, and that, according to their *Father's* House. The women weren't numbered (Num. 1:1-4, 20, 22; 2:32 26:1-4). The male Levites were also numbered according to their Father's House (Num. 3:14-15f; 26:22), and only the male firstborn of Israel were numbered (Num. 2:23; 3:40-43). God commanded Moses to number the Levitical men from 30-50 years old for the various work of the Tabernacle (Num. 4:1-18). Israel camped around the Tabernacle according to their Father's House, not their Mother's House (Num. 2:1-2). Only the man can bring a charge of infidelity against his wife (Num. 5:11f, esp. vv. 19-20, 29). Only the Sons of Aaron could be priests (Num. 8:16, 17, 18; 24-26). There were no priestesses (only in paganism do we find priestesses modeled after the Queen of Heaven).

The regulations for the Passover that one could observe in the second month only applied to men being unclean or on a long journey, not to women (Num. 9:10). In Num. 18:19 it specifically states, ‘sons and daughters’ when indicating such as to receive portions, and in 18:21 the *b'nay* Israel (Sons of Israel) only means *sons* as it speaks of the Levites who worked or ministered in the Tent as receiving the tithe. Only men are given land as an inheri-

bear *fruit* unto God (Rom. 7:4). Yet, the consummation of our Marriage won't happen until Judgment Day. Our lineage, now, doesn't go back to our fallen mother and father, and through them, to Adam and Eve, but to the eternal lineage of Messiah Yeshua, *God* the Son (Luke 3:38; John 1:1-2). We have 'come out of the side' of Yeshua (the sword piercing His side as His sacrificial death; Jn. 19:34-35), similar to how Eve came out of Adam's side (Gen. 2:21-24). We have a divine genealogy now, being 'one flesh' with Messiah Yeshua, and just as it's written in Gen. 2:24 and Eph. 5:31-32, Yeshua left His 'Father and Mother'²⁸ and He is joined to us, and we are 'one flesh' with Him.

Don't you just want to dance and sing praises to Yeshua?!

Yeshua—from the *Seed* of King David—our BrideGroom!

Just as the Scriptures speak of!

“Yahveh has sworn in truth to David and He will not turn from it. ‘I will set upon your Throne the fruit of your body.’” (Psalms 132:11)

“He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High God and Yahveh God will give Him the Throne of His Father David.” (Luke 1:32)

“Wives, be subject to your husbands as you are to the Lord. For the husband is *the head of the wife*, just as Messiah is the Head of the Assembly, the body of which He is the Savior. Just as the Assembly is subject to Messiah, so also, wives ought to be, in everything, to their husbands.”

“Husbands, love your wives, just as Messiah loved the Assembly and gave Himself up for her, in order to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of Water by the Word, so

tance (Num. 26:52-56), unless there were no men to give it too (Num. 27:1-11). If a woman made a vow, her father or her husband could annul it in the day that he heard it (Num. 30:3-16), such was the authority that the man had and how 'one' the women were to their father or husband.

All the men, it's written, assembled before King Solomon for the dedication of the Temple (1st Kings 8:1-2; 39-40, 57-58). There were only kings in Israel, not queens, who ruled (the only exception being one woman who usurped the authority of a king (2nd Kings 11:1-3). 1st Chron. 15:15 shows that 'Sons of Israel' pertains most of the time to men only, and 1st Chron. 21:5 records the unlawful census that King David took, of the men.

In the NT, the concept of women being *one* with their husbands naturally continues. Only men are counted, but not women (Lk. 9:14; Jn. 6:10, the feeding of the 5,000). Interestingly enough, in the accounts of Yeshua and the Passover there aren't any women observing it with Him, just the 12 Jewish men. Yet, it specifically says that women ministered to Him and came with Him to Jerusalem at the time of the Passover (Mk. 15:40-41). Also, there were 12 *men* Apostles, but no women.

Some might say that this line of thinking is archaic and denigrates women, but God's ways are not Man's ways and as Yeshua said to Peter, 'You're not thinking as God thinks, but as Man thinks' (Mt. 16:23). Satan has come into the Body of Messiah and turned things upside down, one of them being that most men and women do not know what biblical authority is in relation to husbands and wives. There cannot be two authorities in a marriage. Biblically, the woman must give way to her husband (1st Peter 3:1) and recognize him as her head (1st Cor. 11:3).

²⁶ Even though Joseph was 'only' betrothed to Mary and hadn't yet consummated the marriage when Gabriel appeared to Mary, they were still officially married. Mt. 1:19 calls Joseph the *husband* of Mary and says that he wanted 'to put her away' (i.e. divorce her; see also Mt. 1:24-25; Luke 1:26-27; 2:5).

²⁷ Rom. 6:11; 7:4; 8:1; 12:5; 1st Cor. 1:2, 30; 4:17; 6:16; 2nd Cor. 1:21; 5:17; Gal. 1:22; 3:28; Eph. 1:1, 11; 2:6, 10; Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:2; 1st Pet. 5:10, 14, etc.

²⁸ See [Three Persons—One God?](#) to understand the gender of the Holy Spirit.

as to present the Assembly to Himself in splendor, without a spot or wrinkle or anything of the kind—yes, so that she may be holy and without blemish. In the same way, husbands should love their wives *as they do their own bodies*. He who loves his wife loves himself. For no one ever hates his own body, but he nourishes and tenderly cares for it, just as Messiah does for the Assembly, *because we are members of His Body*.”

³¹“For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two become one flesh.” ³²This is a great mystery, and I am applying it to the Messiah and the Assembly” (Eph. 5:22-32).

Yeshua said,

“and the two shall become one flesh,’ so then they are no longer two, but one flesh.” (Mark 10:8)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bromiley, Geoffrey W., general editor, Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, associate editors. **The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979).

Bruce, Alexander Balmain, D.D; Marcus Dods, D.D., authors. W. Robertson Nicoll, editor, M.A., LL.D. **The Expositor’s Greek Testament** (vol. one) **The Synoptic Gospels** (A. Bruce) and **The Gospel of St. John** (M. Dods; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002).

Douglas, J. D., M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., Organizing editor. **The Illustrated Bible Dictionary** (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998).

Evans, Craig A. **New International Biblical Commentary: Luke** (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1990).

Marshall I. Howard, author. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, editors. **The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Luke** (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978).

Morris, Leon. M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., **Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Luke** (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000).

Pfeiffer, Charles F., Old Testament. Everett F. Harrison, New Testament. **The Wycliffe Bible Commentary** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1977).

Stern, David. **Jewish New Testament Commentary** (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1992).

Unger, Merrill F. **The New Unger’s Bible Dictionary** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1988).²⁹

²⁹ Revised on Tuesday, March 31, 2020.