

THE GENEALOGY OF JESUS IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE:
A WINDOW INTO THE ACTIVITIES OF THE RELATIVES OF JESUS IN
THE EARLY CHURCH

Thomas Haviland-Pabst

One Family Ministries, Asheville, NC, USA

In his book *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, Richard Bauckham argues at length that two New Testament documents—the letter of Jude and the genealogy of Luke—provide a glimpse into the character of an expression of early Jewish Palestinian Christianity led by the relatives of Jesus.¹ Despite the significance of his contribution to the question of the role Jesus' relatives played in early Christianity, there is a surprising lack of scholarly attention given to his argument.² Thus, it is the purpose of this paper to look at one aspect of his argument, namely, the window that the genealogy of Luke (Lk. 3.23-28) gives into the activities and beliefs of the rel-

1. Richard Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990).

2. D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo (*An Introduction to the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005], p. 692), David E. Garland (*Luke* [ZECNT, 3; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011], p.172) and George J. Brooke (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005], p. 85) mention different aspects of Bauckham's argument in passing but do not offer a thorough engagement with it. A notable exception to this is Christophe Guignard ('Jesus' Family and their Genealogy According to the Testimony of Julius Africanus', in Claire Clivaz *et al.* (eds.), *Infancy Gospels: Stories and Identities* [WUNT, 281; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], pp. 67-93), who deals extensively with a major part of Bauckham's argument, which we will see below.

atives of Jesus in the early church,³ which will be followed by some possible further implications this may have for New Testament studies.

1. Julius Africanus's Testimony Regarding the Family of Jesus

In order to evaluate Bauckham's discussion of the Lukan genealogy in particular, we need to first look at Julius Africanus's testimony regarding the family of Jesus and their genealogy and, in turn, other evidence which may corroborate this testimony.

Eusebius of Caesarea preserves two passages of Julius Africanus's *Letters to Aristides*, which was written sometime in the first half of the third century.⁴ In these passages, Africanus reports two traditions concerning the genealogy of Jesus which he claims were passed down by the relatives of Jesus. It is likely that he had access to these traditions because he was born in Jerusalem and lived 'a part of his later life at Emmaus'.⁵ In the first tradition,⁶ Africanus presents an explanation which attempts to reconcile the divergent genealogies of Jesus in Luke and Matthew.⁷ Regarding the second tradition, he writes, 'This [the genealogy solution] is neither devoid of proof, nor is it conjecture, for the human relatives of the Saviour have hand-

3. François Bovon's statement (*Studies in Early Christianity* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005], p. 168) is pertinent in this regard. He writes, 'On one level, the gospels are the recollection of the pre-Easter life of Jesus. On a second level, they are the windows through which the post-Easter life of the apostles and churches can be seen.'

4. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 355; Guignard, 'Jesus' Family', p. 68.

5. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 355-56.

6. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.1-10 [Lake, LCL]).

7. The so-called 'levirate' solution where Jacob is the physical father of Joseph and Heli the legal father (Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 356); J. Gresham Machen (*The Virgin Birth of Christ* [repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971], p. 204) seems to offer the best solution, seeing Matthew as giving legal descent from David (i.e. heir to the Davidic throne) and Luke as giving a line of physical descent.

ed on this tradition.⁸ This tradition can be summarized in three parts: (1) Herod's origins as a temple slave and rise as Jewish ruler; (2) Herod's subsequent destruction of Hebrew family records in order to protect his position; and (3) the preservation of private records by a few families.⁹

Of the three parts of this second tradition, the third is of particular relevance to us. It reads,

But a few careful people have private records of their own, either by remembering the names or in some other way securing them from copies, and pride themselves on preserving the memory of their noble birth. Among these are those already mentioned, known as the *desposynoi* ... because of their kinship with the family of the Savior. From the Jewish villages of Nazareth and Kokhaba they travelled around the rest of the land and interpreted the genealogy they had ... from the Book of the Days ... as far as they could trace it.¹⁰

This third part, what Guignard calls 'the Desposynoi tradition',¹¹ is of particular interest to Africanus for it lends credibility to his genealogical solution. There are two possible reasons for this. First, the care which Jesus' family used to preserve their genealogy indirectly supports his position. Second, he seemed to have understood the interpretation (ἐξηγησάμενοι) of the genealogy by the *desposynoi* as pertaining to the discrepancies between Luke and Matthew's genealogy of Jesus.¹²

A common origin behind the two traditions has early attestation,¹³ which bears on the question of the dating of the *desposynoi* tradition since

8. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.11 [Lake, LCL]).

9. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.11-14 [Lake, LCL]).

10. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.14). The English translation comes from Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 358-59.

11. Guignard, 'Jesus' Family', p. 69. We will follow this designation.

12. Guignard, 'Jesus' Family', p. 71. Bauckham (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 361) adds that Africanus's use of the word ἐξηγησιν when he writes 'a clearer account' (*Letters to Aristides* [in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.15 (Lake, LCL)]) lends further support to Africanus's reading of a *desposynoi* tradition, which will become more relevant below.

13. Guignard, 'Jesus' Family', p. 69.

the concerns of the first tradition make possible ‘a rather late attempt to reconcile the genealogies’,¹⁴ which, if a late date is accepted, would affect how useful the *desposynoi* tradition is for understanding the Luke genealogy. But a closer reading of the text militates against these two traditions sharing the same source.

While the phrase *παρέδοσαν καὶ ταῦτα*, with the relatives of Jesus as the subject, at first glance seems best translated as ‘have handed down this tradition *also* [καὶ]’, which, in turn, would connect the first and second traditions, Africanus’s lackluster concluding statement, ‘We have nothing more satisfactory or true to allege upon it ... The Gospel, however, in any case states the truth’ seems to point away from a connection between the two traditions,¹⁵ especially when one notes how the above statement conflicts with the confidence he has in the *desposynoi* tradition itself.¹⁶ Thus, *καὶ* must have a different sense than ‘*also*’, namely, a weakened value, warranting the translation ‘this very [καὶ] tradition’.¹⁷ This then yields translating *γοῦν* as ‘at any rate’¹⁸ rather than ‘*for*'.¹⁹

There is evidence beyond the above noted that the *desposynoi* tradition was not an invention of Africanus to substantiate his solution to the genealogy problem²⁰ but rather a previously existing source upon which Africanus drew. First, Africanus omits the word *desposynoi* when introducing the second tradition but later, when using it, he adds an explanation of

14. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 357.

15. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, pp. 69-70 (italics original). The translation is Guignard’s. Italics original.

16. Guignard (‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 70) notes the contrast between Africanus’s statement *πάντως ... ἀληθεύοντες* (‘certainly ... it is true’) concerning the *desposynoi* and the reservation of his own conclusion, i.e. ‘without proof’ (*ἀμάρτυρος*) (Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.11, 15 [Lake, LCL]).

17. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 71.

18. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, pp. 70-71 (emphasis mine).

19. ‘*for the ... relatives ... have*’ (Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* [in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.11 (Lake, LCL)]; emphasis mine).

20. Guignard (‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 72) suggests that such an idea should be rejected at the outset since ‘the Desposynoi tradition ... meets so imperfectly [Africanus’s] needs.’

the term, which suggests that it did not originate with him.²¹ Second, he does not appear to understand the meaning of ‘the Book of Days’ ($\betaί\betaλος\tauῶν\,\,\,\eta\muερῶν$) in the tradition.²²

In addition to this, there is another set of evidence within the *desposynoi* tradition which points to an earlier, Jewish historical context for this tradition. One telling strand of evidence in this regard is the survey of Herod’s origin, rise and subsequent destruction of public family records to protect his position. The ‘half-Jewish origins’ of Herod would reflect Jewish concerns concerning his legitimacy as a leader of the Jews. Alongside this, the account of his destruction of public Hebrew family records by fire²³ rather than at the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 suggests a pre-AD 70 date for the tradition.²⁴

Furthermore, the preservation of private records demonstrating ‘good [noble] birth’ by a few families, including the *desposynoi* (which Bauckham translates as ‘those who belong to the Master’),²⁵ when coupled with suspicion of ‘the Herodian dynasty’ adds further weight to a first century, indeed, pre-AD 70 ‘Palestinian setting’, as does the mention of the *desposynoi* departing from ‘Jewish villages’ for missionary purposes.²⁶

Africanus writes, ‘From the Jewish villages of Nazareth and Kokhaba [the *desposynoi*] travelled around the rest of the land and interpreted the genealogy they had.’²⁷ Nazareth is clearly situated in Galilee, but the identity

21. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 361; Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 72.

22. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 80. Bauckham (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 361) sees the Book of Days as referring to the book of Chronicles whereas Guignard takes an agnostic position on the matter (‘Jesus’ Family’, pp. 79-83).

23. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.13 [Lake, LCL]).

24. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 359-60. Cf. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, pp. 87-88, who, while agreeing with Bauckham’s basic assessment, ‘strongly disagrees’ with Bauckham regarding the historical credibility of Herod’s destruction of public, Hebrew family records (p. 77 n. 33).

25. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 358.

26. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, pp. 87-88; Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 61, 362.

27. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.14). The English translation comes from Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 61.

of Kokhaba has been debated by scholars. Many have thought that this refers to a place in the Transjordan, but it seems better to see Kokhaba as referring to what is now ‘the modern village of Kaukab’, which is ‘sixteen kilometers’ from Nazareth.²⁸ So, what we have then is a picture of the *desposynoi* leaving from their ‘home bases’ of Nazareth and Kokhaba for the purpose of missionary work into the rest of the land (τῇ λοιπῇ γῇ), i.e. Palestine, with the interpretation of the genealogy they possessed playing a part.²⁹

The Palestinian-centered mission strongly points to a pre-AD 70 situation, as was mentioned above. Also, given the fact that this tradition preserved by Africanus has a pre-AD 70 Palestinian provenance is especially important as we consider two features of this tradition, namely, the missionary activity of the relative of Jesus, the *desposynoi*, and their connection to a genealogy, which served a function in their missionary efforts.

Beyond this, there are two further lines of evidence, from the New Testament, which add to the relevance of this *desposynoi* tradition for the Lukan genealogy. The first is found in Paul’s mention of ‘the brothers of the Lord’ (οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου) in 1 Cor. 9.5.³⁰ In the context of this verse, Paul is discussing the rights which he should be able to enjoy in his missionary travels, such as taking a wife along with him and having their needs provided for (9.4 and 9.6, respectively) but that he has not ‘made use of this right’ (9.12).³¹

Although his mention of ‘the brothers of the Lord’ seems incidental at first glance, some observations can be made. First, he includes οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου with ‘the other apostles … and Cephas’ (οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι … καὶ Κηφᾶς). Bauckham argues that the inclusion of οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου here means that they are a particular instance of οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι, of which Cephas is also.³² But whether one accepts this argument or not, it is clear that they were a noteworthy group within early Christianity who exer-

28. Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 79. Cf. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 61-66 for further argumentation.

29. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 61; Guignard, ‘Jesus’ Family’, p. 79.

30. All Scripture translations are taken from the ESV unless otherwise indicated.

31. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 57-58.

32. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 59.

cised leadership in the churches. Also, given the context of 1 Cor. 9.5, ‘the brothers of the Lord’ seemed to be travelling missionaries.³³

The second line of evidence (which, as we will see, is perhaps the most important New Testament link of the *desposynoi* tradition to the Lukan genealogy) is found in the letter of Jude. Jude opens writing, ‘Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James’ (v. 1). Jude describes himself as a ‘servant of Jesus’. It is an ‘honorific title of authority’ which James (Jas 1.1), Jude’s brother, as well as Paul and Peter use (Rom. 1.1; 2 Pet. 1.1), yet Jude is less prominent than other leaders hence his need to identify himself a ‘brother of James’.³⁴ The fact that Jude mentions this fraternal relationship without further comment suggests that this is the same James who is called ‘the Lord’s brother’ (Gal. 1.19) and who was a prominent leader in the Jerusalem church (Acts 15.13-21). Thus, Jude, as a brother of James, is also a brother of Jesus.³⁵

Bauckham notes four Christological titles in Jude—(1) ‘Christ’ (Χριστός); (2) ‘Lord’ (κύριος); (3) ‘our Lord’ (κυρίου ἡμῶν); and (4) ‘Master’ (δεσπότης)—all of which reflect a Jewish Christian provenance.³⁶ Of these, however, the most striking is ‘Master’ (δεσπότης) in v. 4. This title for Christ is unique in the New Testament with the only extant use in Christian literature, prior to the second century, found in this verse.³⁷ The fact that

33. Bauckham (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 59) also sees περιάγειν in v. 5 as referring to ‘travelling … with a wife’ (p. 58) (italics original).

34. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 128-29.

35. Carson and Moo, *Introduction*, pp. 690-91; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), p. 902.

36. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 282.

37. Bauckham (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 283) notes another occurrence of δεσπότης in 2 Pet. 2.1. Scholars have long noted the similarities between the letter of Jude and 2 Pet. 2-3, with some claiming Petrine dependence upon Jude (cf. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 147) and others who claim Jude’s dependence upon Peter (cf. Carson and Moo, *Introduction*, p. 657, who lean toward this while remaining agnostic). Regardless of the stance one takes, the fact that some kind of dependence exists should not militate against diminishing the importance of δεσπότης here. It seems possible that even if one accepts Jude’s dependence upon 2 Peter, the Christological title δεσπότης could still have the specific provenance which we will discuss below, given the Jewish emphasis of much of Peter’s ministry as well as his connection to Galilee (Mt. 4.18; 8:5, 14; 26.69-73; Mk 14.67-70; Jn 1.44).

desposynoi is used of Jesus' relatives, as we saw above, can only make sense if $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ was a common designation for Christ in 'Palestinian Christian circles'.³⁸

It is entirely likely that Jude, as a brother of Jesus, would belong to the broader group of Jesus' relatives: the *desposynoi*—a connection which is further strengthened by his use of the uncommon Christological title $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$. Furthermore, given the lack of the Christological title $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ elsewhere the New Testament, it is likely that it reflects a particular group within early Christianity, namely, the *desposynoi*, of which Jude was possibly a leader as 'a servant of Jesus Christ'.³⁹

Thus, when taking 1 Cor. 9.5 and the letter of Jude together, we see a picture which strongly parallels the *desposynoi* tradition. Paul mentions 'the brothers of Jesus', who were, at the very least, recognizable leaders and travelling missionaries in the early church. One of these brothers—Jude—not only appears to have prominence in some Christian circles but uses a title for Christ which reflects the designation of a group of travelling Jewish Christian missionaries, i.e. the relatives of Jesus, who—for reasons mentioned above—appeared to operate sometime before the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, which is especially indicated by their Palestinian focus. This group, the *desposynoi*, used a family genealogy as a part of their missionary endeavors to proclaim Christ, their Master ($\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$), to their surrounding Jewish neighbors, and it is to the question of this genealogy that we now turn.

2. *The Genealogy of Luke*

Bauckham sees two dimensions within the text of the Lukan genealogy (Lk. 2.23-38) which provides connection to the *desposynoi* tradition, namely, an 'Enochic' and a 'Davidic' dimension.⁴⁰ The purpose of this section is to look at these two dimensions, but before that, we will look at a textual-critical problem decisive for understanding the Enochic dimension.

38. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 283.

39. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 305.

40. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 315-53.

Textual-Critical Problem

It is generally recognized that the Lukan genealogy contains eleven sets of seven names or seventy-seven names,⁴¹ although following variant readings would lead to seventy-two or seventy-six names.⁴² There is one main textual-critical problem that would cause us to pause before accepting the seventy-seven names found in the UBS4.

The main variant arising out of textual tradition is found in Lk. 3.33 with the occurrence of the three names Amminadab, Admin and Arni (τοῦ Ἀμιναδὰβ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ). Metzger writes of this verse, ‘Faced with a bewildering variety of readings ... [we] adopted what seemed to be the *least unsatisfactory* form of text.’⁴³ Beyond the variety of readings, Heater notes the discrepancy between the Lukan genealogy and 1 Chron. 2.9, Ruth 4.18-19 and Mt. 1.3-4; in particular, whereas Lk. 3.33 has two names between

41. Garland, *Luke*, p. 171; Arthur A. Just, *Luke 1:1-9:50* (ConcC; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1996), p. 165; François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), p. 135; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), p. 160. Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB, 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981], p. 491) and John Nolland (*Luke 1:1-9:20* [WBC, 35A; Dallas: Word, 2002], p. 169) note that the count would be seventy-eight names if one includes God, but Fitzmyer states that this still implies ‘seventy-seven generations’ (p. 169). The UBS4 includes all seventy-seven names (or seventy-eight with God).

42. Just, *Luke*, p. 165. Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.22.3) is the main attestation of seventy-two names. Africanus omits Matthat and Levi in Lk. 3.24 (*Letters to Aristides* [in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.5 (Lake, LCL)]). Cf. Marshall D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (SNTSMS, 8; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 232. Another minor textual-critical problem is found in Lk. 3.32 with the name Σαλά but is commonly recognized as the harder reading of the name Σαλμών (cf. Mt. 1.4-5; 1 Chron. 2.11). Cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994), p. 361.

43. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1994), p. 113 (emphasis mine).

Amminadab (Ἀμιναδάβ) and Hezron (τοῦ Ἐσρώμ), namely, Admin and Arni, the other genealogies lack them.⁴⁴

Although the complexity of this debate cannot be entered into here, a few salient points can be raised regarding the reading retained by the UBS4. Heater argues that the name 'Ram' (Ἀράμ) contained in Mt. 1.3-4 (cf. 1 Chron. 2.9; Ruth 4.18-19) should be the preferred reading between Amminadab and Hezron rather than the two names found in Luke. He offers two reasons for this. First, he notes that Mt. 1.3-4, 1 Chron. 2.9 (MT) and Ruth (MT) do not have any textual variants at this point. Second, he sees a dittography occurring in the LXX of 1 Chron. 2.9, which contains the names Ἀράμ καὶ Ἀρράν, with the latter deriving from the alternate spelling of Ram found in Ruth 4.19 (LXX), thus adding confusion to the extant genealogy.⁴⁵

Contrary to this, Bock argues that all the textual errors that must have occurred in order for Admin and Arni to be included in some readings of Lk. 3.33, as indicated by Heater, make his thesis unlikely. Instead, arguing for the harder reading retained by UBS4, he sees their original inclusion as the better reading.⁴⁶ Thus, the UBS4 reading will be retained for the purposes of this paper with Arni (Ἀρνί) corresponding to the alternate spelling of Ram in Ruth 4.19 (LXX), Ἀρράν.⁴⁷ Since there is no other serious contention against the reading of seventy-seven names as original, this will be assumed as we move forward.⁴⁸

44. Homer Heater Jr., 'A Textual Note on Luke 3:33', *JSNT* 28 (1986), pp. 25-29 (25).

45. Heater, 'Textual Note', pp. 25-26.

46. See Bock, *Luke*, pp. 361-62, who, however, argues for the inclusion of Ἀράμ alongside Admin and Arni following some variants (p. 362).

47. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 165.

48. Except for the inclusion of these two names, Matthew and Luke are in agreement from Abraham to David (Mt. 1.2-6; Lk. 3.31-34); yet this hardly characterizes the relationship between the two genealogies. Thirty-six names in Luke's genealogy are otherwise unknown (Fitzmyer, *Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, p. 491)—for example, the names in Lk. 3.24-31 until we reach the name Nathan (Bock, *Luke*, p. 351), with the possible exception of Matthat (Lk. 3.24; cf. Mt 1.15; so Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* [SP, 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991], p. 70), as well as Zerubbabel and Shealtiel (3.27). The inclusion of the latter two, as we will see, proves to be a major and important discrepancy between the genealogies in Matthew and Luke.

The Enochic Dimension

Many scholars have seen lying behind the seventy-seven names an elaborate apocalyptic structure in which world history is divided into twelve periods with Christ concluding the eleventh and ushering in the twelfth and hence last period.⁴⁹ Bauckham, however, sees this analysis of the Lukan genealogy to be on ‘a false track’ for such apocalyptic ‘speculations’ are usually measured in years not generations and an eschatological or messianic importance is lacking in ‘the transition for the eleventh to the twelfth period’.⁵⁰

Although those who see a twelve-period structure likely do so because eleven is an unsatisfactory and incomplete number, eleven times seven, or seventy-seven, has the opposite meaning for if seven denotes fullness, then seventy-seven implies ‘ultimacy’.⁵¹ This suggestion finds strength in the fact that Jesus is in the seventy-seventh position (Lk. 3.23) and, alongside this, we see Enoch in the seventh position (Lk. 3.37) and the only other namesake of Jesus among his ancestors (Lk. 3.29) is in the forty-ninth (7×7) or jubilee position.⁵²

49. Nolland, *Luke*, p. 169; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 160; Garland, *Luke*, p. 171; Just, *Luke*, p. 168; Bovon, *Luke*, p. 135.

50. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 318.

51. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 318. He offers two biblical examples of this: Gen. 4.24 (‘If Cain is avenged sevenfold, then Lamech seventy-sevenfold’); and Mt. 18.22 (‘I do not say to you seven times, but seventy-seven times’).

52. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 319, who writes of the place of Enoch and Jesus, ‘If Enoch as the seventh is special, Jesus as the seventy-seventh is the ultimate.’ This assumes a descending order of the genealogy starting with Adam and ending with Jesus, which we will argue for below. The astute reader may recognize that the number forty-nine does not appear to correspond to the biblical jubilee (or fiftieth) year (Lev. 25.10). John S. Bergsma (‘Once Again, the Jubilee, Every 49 or 50 Years?’, *VT* 55 [2005], pp. 121-25) offers a feasible solution to this problem by noting, like the counting of the Feast of First Fruits and the First Weeks where the ‘first and last day are festivals’ (p. 122), that the seventh Sabbath year (forty-ninth) is followed by the Jubilee year (fiftieth), i.e. non-concurrent, and so, the fiftieth, Jubilee year is at the same time the first year of the next Jubilee cycle; therefore, it is functionally forty-nine years long. This is in contrast to those who would assume a gap between the forty-ninth year and the beginning of the next jubilee cycle (i.e. forty-ninth, fiftieth then first).

Beyond these observations based on numerical symbolism, there is evidence of an Enochic substratum beneath the genealogy, which further substantiates the role of Jesus as the end of world history. In *1 En.* 10.12, the archangel Michael is commanded to bind the fallen angels ‘for *seventy generations* ... till the day of their judgement [*sic*] and of their consummation’,⁵³ and since in this literature the binding happened after the first generation (i.e. Enoch’s translation), then the entirety of world history, from Adam to the Last Judgment, consists of seventy-seven generations.⁵⁴

Another place in the Enochic literature—the Apocalypse of Weeks—lays out world history in a generational scheme in which each of its ten weeks is a generation: for example, ‘I [Enoch] was born seventh in the first week’ (*1 En.* 93.3). While, in contrast to *1 En.* 10.12, eleven periods are reduced to ten, the connection of generations with weeks (periods) of world history, as well as Enoch’s place in the first generation/week, seems therefore to make a connection between this and the Lukan genealogy; that is to say, the latter consists of seventy-seven generations (cf. *1 En.* 10.12) of eleven weeks (cf. the Apocalypse of Weeks).⁵⁵

Furthermore, the Apocalypse of Weeks shows concern to place key events and figures at the seventh position, the ‘sabbath’ of each week, as it does with Enoch (*1 En.* 93.3); for example, Abraham seems to be the end of the third week (93.5); the law at Sinai in the fourth week (93.6); and, in the fifth, the temple (93.7). The fact that only one week is given for the period from the divided monarchy to the destruction of the temple and subsequent exile (93.8), when combined with the attention paid to the law and temple before, shows the author’s intention to emphasize the end of the seventh week where ‘the elect righteous [shall] receive sevenfold instruction’ (93.10). Moreover, the occurrence of revelation to the elect at ‘the seventh generation of the seventh week’, the jubilee position, marks it off as a turn-

53. Emphasis mine. All citations of *1 Enoch* are taken from R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (London: SPCK, 1921).

54. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 320.

55. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 320-21, who further notes that the Apocalypse of Weeks is found in *1 En.* 93.3-10 and 91.11-17 with the earlier verses coming chronologically after the latter (p. 320 n. 11).

ing point in world history with the last three weeks comprising stages of eschatological fulfillment with the last week (91.15) ending in judgment.⁵⁶

Clearly the details of this are not followed strictly by the Lukan genealogy, but there are notable points of contact. The Lukan genealogy places key figures at the end of weeks, e.g. Enoch (Lk. 3.37), Abraham (3.34) and David (3.31). Also, Jesus (Ιησοῦς) is found at the forty-ninth or jubilee position. Like the jubilee position in *1 En.* 93.10, when combined, these seem to point to the end of the genealogy, the end of world history: Jesus, the seventy-seventh generation.⁵⁷ Despite this points of contact between the Lukan genealogy and the Enoch literature, however, the lack of evidence of Enochic influence elsewhere in Luke suggests that this structure came from the source other than Luke.⁵⁸ Before turning to the question this raises, however, we will turn to another dimension of the Lukan genealogy, the Davidic dimension.

The Davidic Dimension

Upon comparing the Matthean and Lukan genealogies, one of the most striking, and indeed, important areas of discrepancy between them lies in the connection they make to the line of David.⁵⁹ In Mt. 1.6-11, Davidic descent is traced through his son Solomon, who was heir to his throne, with Zerubbabel being a notable postexilic figure in this line (1.12-13); whereas,

56. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 322-24. Relevant in this regard are the indications in some Jewish traditions that 'sabbatical cycles are used to announce Messianic redemption,' drawing from Dan. 9.24-27 (Samuele Bacchiocchi, 'Sabbath Typologies of Messianic Redemption', *JSJ* 17 [1986], pp. 153-76 [173]). Cf. Bacchiocchi, 'Sabbath Typologies', pp. 172-76; Ben Zion Wacholder, 'Chronomessianism: The Timing of Messianic Movements and the Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles', *HUCA* 46 (1975), pp. 201-18 (202-4, 210-11).

57. Bauckham, (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 324) also notes the position of Joseph (Ιωσήφ) at the end of the sixth week (Lk. 3.20) and the tenth week (3.24) as further evidence of this pull. On a different note, Bauckham notes that the Lukan genealogy differs from the Apocalypse of Weeks, which deemphasizes the Davidic line, by placing David in a position that draws attention to Jesus' descent from him (p. 325), which will become more relevant below.

58. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 326.

59. Johnson, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 71; R.P. Nettlehorst, 'The Genealogy of Jesus', *JETS* 31 (1988), pp. 169-72 (169); Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 158.

in Lk. 3.27-31, Davidic descent is traced through David's less prominent son Nathan and, furthermore, Zerubbabel and his father Shealtiel are mentioned (3.27), just as they are in Mt. 1.12.

This discrepancy between these two accounts of Davidic descent as well as the inclusion of Shealtiel and Zerubbabel in both gives the reader pause. It is noteworthy that Matthew is following 1 Chron. 3.16-19 (LXX) in making Shealtiel, the father of Zerubbabel, the son of Jeconiah (Mt. 1.12), but in Luke, the names between Nathan and Shealtiel are unknown (Lk. 3.27-31).⁶⁰ The uniqueness of tracing the Davidic descent of Jesus from Nathan through Zerubbabel, especially in light of the genealogies in Mt. 1 and 1 Chron. 3, suggests a distinct purpose for the Lukan genealogy.

Before turning to this matter specifically, we must assess the viability of reasons given for descent from Nathan. The first, proposed by Johnson, is that Luke emphasized the prophetic ministry of Jesus and, consequently, the church; therefore, in his awareness of the tendency of some Jewish circles to identify David's son Nathan with the prophet of the same name, he rejected Davidic descent through Solomon giving preference to Nathan in order to emphasize Jesus' prophetic ministry.⁶¹ Bauckham argues against this, writing, '[this] Jewish ... tradition [cannot refer to] the prophetic status of the Messiah [because] prophecy is not inherited, and noone [sic] in Judaism ever supposed it was.'⁶² The second suggests that Solomonic descent was avoided because of the curse against Jeconiah that his descendants would not sit on David's throne (Jer. 22.30).⁶³ While this may contain some truth, it does not answer why Davidic descent through Solomon was completely excluded or why Zerubbabel was still retained in Luke's genealogy.⁶⁴

There are a number of questions which need to be explored in order to understand the account of Jesus' Davidic descent in the Lukan genealogy. Noting the inconsistency of Zerubbabel's place in Nathan's line when compared with genealogies which place him in Solomon's line (Mt. 1 and 1 Chron. 3), we are forced to ask whether the Lukan genealogy at this point is in fact historical, and, if so, why it is significant that he is a descendent from Nathan through Zerubbabel rather than from Solomon.

60. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 326-27.
61. Johnson, *Purpose*, pp. 248-52.
62. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 327.
63. Fitzmyer, *Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, p. 501.
64. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 327.

Admittedly, not all of the evidence for the historicity of Lk. 3.27-31 is of equal weight, but the cumulative weight of all of them leans in favor of historicity. First, Rhesa (τοῦ Ρῆσα [v. 27]) admits of an Aramaic origin.⁶⁵ Second, the fact that Zerubbabel, an important figure, does not have a sabbatical position suggests inclusion prior to the shape given to it by Luke's source.⁶⁶ Third, the Lukan genealogy preserves continuity with 1 Chron. 3 at points omitted by Mt. 1.⁶⁷ These are strengthened by a few other considerations: (1) the high 'genealogical consciousness' evidenced in Ezra–Nehemiah (Ezra 2; Neh. 7) makes the ability of one to trace their Davidic descent probable; (2) the mention of 'the house of Nathan' as distinct from

65. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 328. Many argue that Rhesa (Ρῆσα) is a transliteration of the Aramaic word ܐܫܲܳܰ, and thus, a title rather than a name. Cf. Nolland, *Luke*, p. 170; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 163; Noval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), p. 154; Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 328-31. Contra this assertion are various arguments. Fitzmyer, while recognizing the lack of attestation of this name otherwise, writes, 'The formation of the list, as it now stands in the Lukan text, is against' reading Rhesa as a title (*Gospel According to Luke I–IX*, p. 500). Bock (*Luke*, p. 354) offers further argument in this regard: (1) it assumes an early corruption of the text, which is lacking in the MS evidence; and (2) the lack of other comments in the genealogy militates against reading Rhesa as a comment calling Zerubbabel prince. But one does not need to argue for Rhesa as a title to recognize its Aramaic origin; rather, like many other names (e.g. Jesus = salvation), Rhesa could be a proper name while also having a particular connotation.

66. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 329-30. Cf. Lk. 3.27 with above discussion. Now, while a pre-Lukan redaction of the genealogy is admitted in order to create a sabbath structure based on Enochic literature, this does not argue against the basic historicity of the genealogy, but rather, recognizes that genealogies are created, or redacted, for different purposes, which we will discuss further below. Cf. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 157, who writes that, while there is possible symbolic material in the genealogy, 'the attempt to dismiss them out of hand as unhistorical is in no way justified.'

67. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 333. He argues that 'Ιωανάν (Lk. 3.27) corresponds with a descendent of Zerubbabel in 1 Chron. 3.19, 21: Hananiah (Ἀνανία; the change in spelling has other biblical parallels, e.g. Jeconiah [Jehoiachin] and possibly 'Ιωδά [Lk. 3.26] = Ιωανᾶν [1 Chron. 3.24]). Cf. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 163, who sees 'Ιωδά as Ἀβιούδ in Mt. 1.13.

‘the house of David’ in Zech. 12.12; and (3) the possibility that the genealogy of 1 Chron. 3 gives the descent from the official heads of the family, which we will discuss further below.⁶⁸

While many of the above lines of evidence render more probable the historicity of Lk. 3.27-31, clearly most of them do not answer why Luke disagrees with 1 Chron. 3 and Mt. 1. The answer appears to lie in the apparent purpose of the genealogy in 1 Chron. 3 to give the line of descent from which the official heads of the Davidic family derive, and, consequently, those who have first claim to the Davidic throne. Hattush, son of Shemaiah (1 Chron. 3.22), is a clear example of this as he is described as the head of David’s house in Ezra 8.1-2. If we accept that the genealogy of 1 Chron. 3 is concerned with official family heads and dynastic right, then it appears that Lk. 3.27-31 must refer to a less prominent (with the notable exception of Zerubbabel) and thus more natural Davidic line.⁶⁹

Yet, if the natural descent of Zerubbabel, and his father Shealtiel, is from David’s son Nathan, then why did the Chronicler insert them into the Solomonic line in place of natural descendants of Solomon? Earlier we noted that some have tried to resolve the issue of descent from Nathan by suggesting that this was in order to avoid the curse placed upon Jeconiah (Jer. 22.30), and while this does not address why the Solomonic line was avoided in its entirety, which we have now seen is because the Lukian genealogy records Zerubbabel’s natural descent from Nathan and the Chronicler’s genealogy records official family heads, it does appear to give an answer as to why Shealtiel and Zerubbabel are included in 1 Chron. 3 as an official head of the Davidic family.⁷⁰ That is to say, because of the curse

68. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 333, 340-43. Regarding (2), Bauckham suggests that, since ‘the house of Shimeites’ appears to be a prominent house within ‘the house of Levi’ (Zech. 12.13; cf. 1 Chron. 6.39-43), ‘the house of Nathan’ may also be a prominent house within ‘the house of David’ (p. 343).

69. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 333, 340. Also, the lesser prominence of this line in Lk. 3.21 and the following verses further adds to its historicity as it argues against the view which asserts its status as a mere invention.

70. At this point, we must mention that 1 Chron. 3.19 (MT) has Pedaiah as Zerubbabel’s father whereas 1 Chron. 3.19 (LXX) has Shealtiel (Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 326). But the fact that Pedaiah and Shealtiel appear to be brothers does not alleviate the problem noted. Machen’s view that Shealtiel is

placed upon Jeconiah, none of his offspring could be legitimate heirs to the Davidic throne and thus an heir must come from another Davidic family.

There is much in the way of Old Testament data to substantiate this. In Isa. 11.1 we read, ‘There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit.’ Micah, a contemporary of Isaiah, writes, ‘But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are too little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose coming forth is from of old, from ancient days’ (Mic. 5.1 [5:2 MT]). With Isa. 11.1, we have a picture of a tree, in this case the royal Davidic house, chopped down leaving only a stump from which the ‘shoot’, the ‘branch’, will arise. With Mic. 5.1, we see a ruler arising from the diminished place of Bethlehem. Taken together, a picture is formed which indicates that there will be a ‘fresh start’ to the Davidic kingdom that will originate from its origins (cf. the ‘stump of Jesse’, David’s father, as well as the mention of Bethlehem, which is David’s clan).⁷¹

If the stage had already been set for the anticipation of a new ruler arising from the beginnings of David’s line, this was cemented when Jeremiah, a later prophet, proclaims both a curse against Jeconiah in Jer. 22.24-30, which concludes with ‘for none of his offspring shall succeed in sitting on the throne of David and ruling again in Judah’ (Jer. 22.30b), and the promise of new ‘righteous [Davidic] branch’ in Jer. 23.5. In sum, Solomon’s descendant Jeconiah will not produce heirs to the throne, and the Lord has promised a new Davidic ruler from David’s humble beginnings.

This then brings us to arrival of a new leader: Zerubbabel. In Zech. 6.12, a man named ‘the Branch’ shall possess ‘royal honor’. Although the identity of the man is not made clear here, it seems likely that ‘the Branch’ alludes to both Jer. 23.5 (cf. Isa. 11.1) and Jer. 33.15, 17-18 (cf. Zech. 6.13). More strikingly, Zech. 6.13 seems to allude to Jer. 22.30 thus pointing to the reversal of the curse upon Jeconiah, the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. It is Haggai’s prophecy which helps us to identify ‘the Branch’ in Zech. 6.12-13 with Zerubbabel. There are three reasons for this: (1) Hag. 2.23, speak-

the adopted father of Zerubbabel seems likely (*Virgin Birth*, p. 206). For Zerubbabel as Shealtiel’s son, cf. Ezra 3.8; 5.2; Hag. 1.1, 12, 14; 2.2, 23.

71. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 334-35. Cf. also J.A. Motyer, *The Prophet Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Press, 1993), p. 121; Kenneth L. Barker, *Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah* (NAC, 20; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), pp. 98-99.

ing of Zerubbabel as God's 'signet ring', alludes to Jer. 22.24; (2) Jer. 22.24 is the same text to which Zech. 6.12-13 alludes; and (3) Haggai and Zechariah were contemporaries who shared the same postexilic setting. Furthermore, various other Old Testament passages indicate Zerubbabel's prominence (Neh. 7.7; Ezra 2.2; 5.2-5; 6.14; and esp. 4.3).⁷²

Now, it must be stated at this point that Zerubbabel is only an immediate, *partial* fulfillment of the prophecies regarding the coming Branch; that is, he does not exhaustively fulfill them; rather he is a confirmation of the fuller fulfillment to come. That he is a partial fulfillment of these prophecies is seen in the fact that he gave the people hope of a future restoration of the Davidic line by his postexilic activity of temple rebuilding,⁷³ of which the Chronicler attests by his inclusion in the line of Solomon. Yet that he was not the exhaustive fulfillment of these prophecies is seen in his inclusion in the Lukan genealogy. Despite his prominence in earlier biblical history, he is noted without comment in this genealogy, with another ruler being given the rightful place as the true Davidic heir: Jesus Christ.

3. *The Lukan Genealogy and the Relative of Jesus*

Many recognize a Jewish provenance for the Lukan genealogy,⁷⁴ of which the Enochic and Davidic elements found within the Lukan genealogy further attest. But are these enough to establish a connection between this genealogy and the *desposynoi* tradition?

The strongest strand of evidence for such a connection is found in the letter of Jude. Already we have noted that Jude's relationship to Jesus as his brother as well as his use of the unique Christological title 'Master' (δεσπότης [Jude 4]) in combination with Paul's mention of the missionary activities of the 'brothers of the Lord' (1 Cor. 9.5) gives us a strong parallel

72. Cf. Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8* (LHBOTS, 506; New York: T&T Clark, 2009), pp. 137-41, 146, 150-53; Eugene H. Merrill, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary* (Chicago: Moody, 1994), p. 197; and Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 332, 337-39 for further argumentation.

73. Stead, *Intertextuality*, pp. 140-41.

74. Bovon, *Luke*, p. 137; Fitzmyer, *Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, p. 491; Johnson, *Purpose*, p. 239.

in the New Testament to the *desposynoi* tradition preserved by Eusebius. Now, turning again to the letter of Jude, we see evidence of a strong connection between it and the Lukian genealogy.

We noted above an Enochian dimension to the Lukian genealogy. The seventy-seven generations of names in the Lukian genealogy seem to draw on *1 En.* 10.12, which mentions the judgment of 'fallen angels' after seventy generations (after Enoch). It is precisely this text which Jude seems to allude to in Jude 6 when he writes, 'And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day.' Specifically, Jude's phrase 'until the judgment of the great day' echoes 'till the day of their judgment' in *1 En.* 10.12. Furthermore, in Jude 14, we read, 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam'. This reminds us of another feature of the Lukian genealogy where Enoch is the sabbatical position of the first week, which seems to allude to the sabbatical concerns of the Apocalypse of Weeks (cf. 'I [Enoch] was born seventh in the first week' [*1 En.* 93.3]). So, remarkably, these two allusions to Enochic literature by Jude are the same two texts from which the author of the Lukian genealogy appears to draw.⁷⁵

There are two main reasons to suggest strong support for the genealogy mentioned in the *desposynoi* tradition as the Lukian genealogy (minus a few additions, which we will note below).⁷⁶ First, the connection of Jude with the *desposynoi* as a 'brother of Jesus' who follows the 'Master' (δεσπότης), namely, Christ. Second, Jude's allusion to the very Enochic texts which appear to undergird the Lukian genealogy. Additionally, Bauckham's claim that 'in early Christianity [First Enoch] was not widely used at first', if correct, further strengthens the Enochic connection existing between Jude and the Lukian genealogy.⁷⁷

75. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 363-64. Cf. Just, *Luke*, p. 164.

76. Contra Ernest L. Abel, 'Genealogies of Jesus O XPICTOC', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 203-10, who denies this connection based on a lack of historicity with regard to both the *desposynoi* tradition and the Lukian genealogy (p. 205).

77. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 232. Contra Sverre Aalen ('St. Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of 1 Enoch', *NTS* 13 [1966], pp. 1-13), M. Black ('The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins', in James H. Charlesworth *et al.* [eds.], *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* [First Princeton Symposium on

Moreover, the fact that the *desposynoi*, along with others, preserved private records which attested to their relationship to David⁷⁸ makes sense in light of the Davidic dimension, discussed above, found in the Lukan genealogy. In Lk. 3.27-31, we see an account of David's line through this son Nathan, with Zerubbabel's presence pointing to the promise of a coming Davidic king. It could be that some families, although not of Solomonic descent, would preserve family records in light of the prophecies noted above. That is to say, some may have waited in anticipation of the Messiah arising from another quarter than the direct royal line from David through Solomon.⁷⁹ Perhaps some of them were of the house of Nathan, which seems to be a subgroup within the larger Davidic family who recognized that if the curse upon Jehoiachin was to be avoided, the Branch, the new Davidic king, must arise from a family outside of decent from him. Zerubbabel, as a partial fulfillment of messianic prophecies and as descend-

Judaism and Christian Origins; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992], pp. 145-68) and Gerbern S. Oegema ("The Coming of the Righteous One" in 1 Enoch, Qumran, and the New Testament', in James H. Charlesworth [ed.], *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume Three: The Scrolls and Christian Origins* [Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006], pp. 381-96), who argue for a larger degree of Enochic influence in the early church. Bauckham argues that, only in the letter of Jude and possibly 2 Pet. 2.4, independent of Jude, do we see an awareness of Enochic literature (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 232). Regarding 2 Pet. 2.4, it may be that it 'reflects a growing influence of the [Enochic] work at the end of the first century' (Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 232) or, as we noted in another connection, that 2 Peter and Jude shared a common milieu at points.

78. Julius Africanus, *Letters to Aristides* (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.14 [Lake, LCL]).

79. Although Jesus' family was of Davidic descent (Lk. 2.4), they were far from affluent, which is indicated by their offering of 'turtledoves ... or two pigeons' when presenting Jesus at the temple (Lk. 2.22-24). The fact that Nazareth, the hometown of Jesus, did not appear to be viewed favorably (cf. Jn 1.46) also accents the humble status of his family. Abel ('Genealogies of Jesus', p. 204) discounts Jesus' Davidic descent, claiming, 'It is unlikely that the people of Galilee would have been ignorant of the fact.' Yet Abel's assessment does not appear to adequately deal with the humble status of Jesus' family presented in the Gospel traditions as well as the argument that Jesus' Davidic descent was traced through the less prominent line of Nathan.

ed from Nathan not Solomon, would strengthen this belief.⁸⁰ Thus it is natural to suppose that Jesus' family, being of the house of Nathan and therefore Zerubbabel, would also keep such records. When, in turn, the messianic expectation was met in the person of Jesus, this genealogy would take on a new and greater significance.

So, what we have then is a picture into the role of the genealogy in the missionary activities of *desposynoi*. With the Davidic dimension, Jesus is seen to be the fulfillment of the expectation of the new Davidic king arising from an unexpected quarter; with the Enochic dimension, Jesus is seen as the one who is greater than Enoch inasmuch as seventy-seven is greater than seven.⁸¹ These relatives of Jesus, the *desposynoi*, initially went out from their home towns of Nazareth and Kokhaba into Palestine in order to proclaim Christ. The use of their family genealogy as a tool to show Jesus' significance as the true Davidic ruler, the one greater than Enoch and the apocalyptic bringer of the eschatological age,⁸² would be a formidable tool indeed, especially in view of a Palestinian audience who would also be concerned with the Davidic pedigree of the Messiah and would possibly be acquainted with such apocalyptic writings as *First Enoch*.⁸³

4. Conclusion

Hurtado writes, 'Well within the first couple of decades of the Christian movement (i.e., ca. 30–50 C.E.) Jesus was treated as a recipient of religious

80. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 360.

81. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, pp. 319, 370-71.

82. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 325.

83. At this point, it is important to recognize that genealogies were used for different purposes such as politics or the legitimization of a held office (Robert R. Wilson, 'The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research', *JBL* 94 [1975]. pp. 169-89 [172]) and, while this could mean that some genealogies lack historicity, this does not necessarily have to be the case. Rather, as we would argue is the case of the Lukan genealogy, it could be that the core of the genealogy is retained, with some forgotten names added or some others omitted for a particular purpose and yet with those names retained still having attachment to historical realities. Thus, the original Davidic genealogy possessed by the family of Jesus could have modified it to fit the apocalyptic scheme, under the influence of Enochic literature, in order to use for the purpose noted above without impinging on its historic validity.

devotion and was associated with God in striking ways,⁸⁴ and it is this same devotion to the Lord that we see undergirding the Lukan genealogy. This, in turn, lends some substance to placing it in a pre-AD 70 context at the very latest. We recall, however, that the *desposynoi* tradition in written form already points to this date.

So, it seems that the Lukan genealogy can be placed even earlier, especially if we accept the pre-AD 70 dating for the written *desposynoi* tradition. That is to say, if the written form is this early, then it seems likely that the events which it reports are even earlier. When we combine this with F.F. Bruce's assertion that 'the brethren of the Lord [in 1 Cor 9:15] also undertook itinerate ministry ... in the 50s,'⁸⁵ an earlier date seems more likely.

Turning to the book of Acts, we see Jesus' brothers and his mother praying with other believers (Acts 1.14). Later, in Acts 15, Luke gives an account of the council at Jerusalem, and that which followed. It is likely then that Luke had a real acquaintance with the brothers of the Lord, at the very least, and, possibly, the more extended family of Jesus.⁸⁶ Given the great

84. Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), p. 2. Hurtado (*How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], p. 33) dates Paul's letters 'ca. 50 CE'. Cf. Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), p. 19, who writes, 'The highest possible Christology—the inclusion of Jesus in the divine identity—was central to the faith of the early church even before any of the New Testament writings were written, since it occurs in all of them.'

85. F.F. Bruce, *Men and Movements in the Primitive Church: Studies in Early Non-Pauline Christianity* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1979), p. 98; cf. Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2nd edn, 1998), p. 3, who dates these missionary journeys to AD 50–60.

86. In the New Testament, we already see some indication of the involvement of Jesus' extended family in the early church. In Jn 19.25, 'Mary, the wife of Clopas', is mentioned. Bauckham states that Clopas is named because he was 'known in the early church' (*Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 17) and moreover he identifies Clopas in Jn. 19.25 with Cleopas in Lk. 24.18 (p. 17). The wife of Clopas, Mary, is called the 'sister' of Jesus' mother, which Bauckham, under the assumption that Clopas is the brother of Joseph, understands to be 'the wife of Jesus' mother's brother-in-law', which the description of 'his mother's sister' could

care and historical integrity Luke demonstrates in his two volume Luke–Acts,⁸⁷ it is very possible that he acquired the genealogy of the *desposynoi* from the relatives of Jesus directly. This inclusion of the genealogy would by itself seem to bolster a pre-AD 70 date for the Gospel of Luke, at the very least.

Luke's inclusion of the genealogy does not mean that he did so without any modification of it, nor does it mean that he had the same purposes in mind as the *desposynoi*. Rather, he appropriated it for his own purposes, which is indicated by his reversal of its order from descending, reflecting Enochic themes, to ascending, which followed the style of Greco-Roman genealogies.⁸⁸ This is fitting as his audience is more a part of this milieu than the thoroughly Palestinian one of the *desposynoi* (cf. Lk. 1.3). Furthermore, he added the phrases ‘as was supposed’ (ὡς ἐνομίζετο) and ‘the son of God’ (τοῦ θεοῦ) (Lk. 3.23 and 38, respectively).

The former phrase seems to highlight the virgin birth of Jesus mentioned earlier (Lk. 1.34–38). The latter refers to Jesus' relationship to all humankind, with his virgin birth paralleling the creative act of Adam apart from human generation and, therefore, his role as the savior of all humankind.⁸⁹ Like his reversal of the original genealogical order, he adds these, in part, to show to his audience that Christ is more than the coming Davidic king, he is something greater, he is the savior for all people.⁹⁰ This does not mean that Luke did not recognize the significance of the appearance of such figures as Enoch, Zerubbabel and David in the genealogy, but rather, that he recognized that Jesus is greater than all of them.

Here, despite the very different audiences that had the attention of the *desposynoi* and Luke, there is conceptual overlap. Both represent a high view of Christ. Both present Christ as greater than even the great men that appear in his genealogy. It is even possible that Luke actually understood some of the original intentions lying behind the genealogy (although this is not clear from the text itself) and, in appropriating it, he understood that the

cover (p. 16). In any case, clearly Mary and Cleopas belonged to Jesus' extended family.

87. Cf. Lk. 1.1–3.

88. Just, *Luke*, p. 167.

89. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 369.

90. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus*, p. 370.

conceptual overlap between them was enough for him to repurpose it for a different audience.

So, to conclude, the thesis of Richard Bauckham not only gives us a glimpse into activities of a group of Palestinian Christians in the early church as well as their Christological understanding, but it also strengthens the historicity of the Gospel of Luke, the case for an early date, and adds another perspective on how Christians in the early church, although with different audiences in mind, shared a common theological milieu which exalted Christ as the one deserving of worship and trust.