

Joseph.Lukowski



Joined on 08-14-2006
Posts 143

Re: Unit 3 - Interaction Question



Joseph,

thanks for helping me understand better, but still a bit confused . . . Maybe I'm imposing my limited understanding of 21st century genetic biology upon scripture but doesn't being a physical descendant of David through Mary make him still the seed of David, which was suppose to be cut off in Isaiah 7:14.

Andrew Wilkens

Andrew,

I have had to review Dr. Baylis's notes, and let me know if this helps. My purpose in answering your question is not to detract from the course with rabbit trails, but *to edify the Body of Christ in love in keeping with the objectives of this course established by Dr. Baylis.*

(1) In 2 Sam 7:12-16, David received the promise of a descendent to rule the throne forever. Yahweh would correct him, when he committed iniquity.

(2) Yahweh (not David) chose Solomon for anointing (divine appointment to the king throne) by divine declaration (1 Chronicles 28:5) just as Yahweh (not Saul; not Samuel) had chosen David for anointing by divine declaration (1 Sam 16:1, 13). The only other person chosen by Yahweh by divine declaration for anointing as King in the Old Testament (after David) was the character in Psalm 2, who had not yet arrived on the scene as far as the Old Testament was concerned. It was Solomon who had committed iniquity, and who was included in view in 2 Sam 7:14 of being corrected by Yahweh... and, as we know, Solomon did drop the ball. In the class notes, Dr. Baylis indicated that Yahweh (in Psalm 2) declared that he (Yahweh) was going to be the "father" of the yet future Anointed One (but yet still descended from David) as King. As we would see later in the Book of Isaiah, the "anointed" Solomonic line was cursed in Isaiah 7:14ff (Ahaz, Jeconiah). So there seemed to be a problem--i.e., the future descendent of

David (after Solomon's death) had an apparent obstacle, i.e., a curse that could appear to nullify the Promise. Satan's response at this development had had to have been something along the lines of "checkmate" (i.e., my frankenstein invention of sin can, and will, thwart God).

(3) None of the other "kings" in the Old Testament (some of whom had co-existed in the divided northern kingdom and southern kingdom at the same time & on separate thrones)--none of them--had ever been chosen by Yahweh for anointing. (In fact, some of these "kings" murdered people to gain their power.) In the our class notes, Dr. Baylis said that all of these kings "pretty much went downhill." So in the "anointed" character in Psalm 2, we see that the "Son" of Yahweh--and also "son" of David--appears to be the only hope for Israel. But there was still the curse in Isaiah 7:14ff.

(4) If Jesus was descended from David through Mary (let us suppose for a second), that is, through David's son, Nathan--who was Solomon's brother--then we have to ask: What happened to the "anointed" royal line through Solomon? Why does Matthew open his gospel establishing the "bona fides" of Jesus as King of Israel *using the line of Solomon*, and not his brother Nathan...? (Luke does, in fact, mention that Jesus was in the genetic line of David in Luke 3 through this Nathan; *but genetic descent does not automatically convey the Coventantal promises [see Romans 9].*)

Hold with me for a second.

Do you remember how Dr. Baylis communicated this concept in the videos and notes? That is, the dichotomy of the obedient image ("the upper line") and the physical image ("the lower line")...? Just because Jesus was a genetic descent of

David did not mean that he was automatically entitled to the Davidic throne. It was Psalm 2 that bequeathed that right by divine pronouncement of "anointing," because Jesus was the "seed" of Yahweh (top line) and also "seed" of David (bottom line). The Psalm 2 character is the only person in all of Scripture (after Solomon) to receive divine "anointing." (No one, and I mean no one, has this anointing apart from the character in Psalm 2.) There has to be a legal connect-the-dots tie, therefore, between Solomon and the Psalm 2 character for *eligibility* to the throne of David.

(5) In other words, the Anointed One (Christos) received the declaration by Yahweh of Anointing in Psalm 2 to be the promised Davidic King; and, as Dr. Baylis indicates, he is the Son of Yahweh (divine seed or obedient image of Yahweh); yet his *earthly* royalty, or right to the earthly throne, is through David (via the **Solomon-Joseph** line, according to Matthew). The curse through Ahaz & Jeconiah was a genetic curse ("seed" representing physical descent and, more importantly, as Dr. Baylis indicates, represents a physical, disobedient image of Ahaz and Jeconiah). ***But the curse did not nullify the Promise!*** Jesus was the *divine* seed to the throne (Psalm 2) as was he the *legal* seed to the throne through Joseph (Psalm 2 & 2 Sam 7 & Matt 1). While the genes obtained through Mary technically tied Jesus to the Tribe of Judah and to the genetic line of David, it was the *divine* seed that complemented the genetic part that resulted in the Unique Person (God/Man), who was uniquely qualified for the Title, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

To sum it up--Joseph was the legal head of his family, and so the divine seed (that impregnated Mary) "went around" the cursed genetic seed of Joseph. *But it was the pronouncement of Yahweh in Psalm*

2 that invoked Joseph's legal lineage (not related to genetics) to the promise of the throne of David via Solomon via Joseph, because Joseph was the legal father of Jesus by marriage to Mary. The result was "Christos" without the cursed seed from Ahaz and Jeconiah (because it was a "virgin" birth)!

Look at it this way: If it were different, Matthew would **not** have opened his gospel declaring Jesus as the Promised King of Israel with references to the "anointed"--yet cursed--Solomonic line, but instead would have somehow pointed to the Nathanic line from Mary (which, as you know, had never received any "anointed" blessing by Yahweh). In fact, Matthew would not have ever mentioned Joseph's parental lineage at all, if it were not very, very relevant to Jesus' royal right to the throne of David... *but it was very relevant... and it was very necessary!!*

Very Sincerely,
Joseph

Joseph Lukowski

"We do not live in accordance with our mode of thinking... but we think in accordance with our mode of loving" (V.V. Rozinov)



[Report](#)

Page 4 of 4 (53 items) [«](#) [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#)

[my.dts.edu](#) » [BE105OL - The Gospels \(Fall 2007 Online Education\)](#) » [Group 3 Assignments](#) » [Unit 3 - Interaction Question](#)

(please select)

-

You **cannot** add attachments
 You **cannot** post new topics
 You **can** reply to topics
 You **cannot** delete your posts
 You **cannot** edit your posts
 You **cannot** create polls
 You **cannot** vote in polls
 Forum statistics are **enabled**
 Forum is **unmoderated**

© 1998-2008 Dallas Theological Seminary | All Rights Reserved | [Terms of Agreement](#)

Copying of text or images located on this web site without express permission is prohibited. [Menus by Milonic](#)