**23—38.**] GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD.  
Peculiar to Luke.

**23.**] **Jesus was about thirty years old when He began  
(His ministry):** not, as A. V. ‘began to be  
about,’ &c., which is ungrammatical. This  
is the intérpretation of Origen, Euthymius,  
and the best commentators. See Acts. i. 1.

This **about thirty** admits of considerable latitude, but only in one direction ; viz. *over* thirty years. He could not  
well be *under,* seeing that this was the  
appointed age for the commencement of  
public service of God by the Levites; see  
reference to Numbers.

If no other proof were in existence of the *total* ***independence of the present Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke,*** their *genealogies* would  
furnish what I conceive to be an undeniable one. Is it possible that either of these Evangelists could have set down his  
genealogy *with that of the other before  
him?* Would no remark have been made  
on their many, and (*on such a supposition*)  
unaccountable variations? It is quite beside the purpose of the present Commentary to attempt to reconcile the two. It  
has never yet been accomplished; and  
every endeavour to do it has violated either  
ingenuousness or common sense. I shall,  
as in similar cases, only indicate the landmarks which may serve to guide us to all that is possible for us to discover concerning them. (1) The two genealogies are *both the line of Joseph, and not of Mary.*Whether Mary were an heiress or not,  
Luke’s words here preclude the idea of the  
genealogy being *hers;* for the descent of  
the Lord is transferred putatively to Joseph  
by the **as was supposed,** before the genealogy begins; and it would be unnatural to that the reckoning, which began  
the real mother, would, after such  
Transference, pase back through *her* to *her*  
father again, as it must do, if the genealogy  
be *hers*.

The attempts of many to  
make it appear that the genealogy is that  
of Mary, reading ***‘the son (as supposed of Joseph,but in reality) of Heli,  
&c.’ are, as Meyer has shewn, quite unsuccessful;*** see Dr. Mill’s vindication of the Genealogies, p. 180 ff., for the history  
of this opinion. **(2) St. Luke appears** to  
have taken this genealogy entire from some  
authority before him, in which the expression **Son of God,** as applied to Christ, **was** made good by tracing it up, **as** here,  
through a regular ascent of Progenitors till  
we come to Adam, who was, but here again  
inexactly, the son of God. This seems much  
more probable than that St. Luke should,  
for his Gentile readers, have gone up to the  
origin of the human race instead of to  
Abraham. I cannot imagine any such purpose *definitely present* in the mind of the Evangelist. This view is confirmed by  
the entirely insulated situation of the  
genealogies here, between ver. 23 and ch. iv. l.  
(3) The Points of divergence between the  
genealogies are,—in Matthew the father of  
Joseph is Jacob—in Luke, Heli; this gives  
rise to different lists (except two common  
names, Zorobabel and Salathiel) up to  
David, where the accounts coincide again,  
and remain identical up to Abraham, where  
Matthew ceases. (4) Here, as elsewhere, I  
believe that the accounts might be reconciled, or at all events good reason might be assigned for their differing, if we were  
in possession of data on which to proceed ;  
but here, as elsewhere, *we are not.* For  
who shall reproduce the endless combinations of elements of confusion, which might creep into a genealogy of this kind? St.  
Matthew’s, we know, is squared so as to  
form three groups of fourteens, *by the  
omission of several generations ;* how can  
we tell that some similar step, unknown to  
us, may not have been taken with the one  
before us? It was common among the  
Jews for the same man to bear different names; how do we know how often this may occur among the immediate progenitors of Joseph? The marriage of a brother with a brother’s wife to raise up seed  
(which then might be accounted to either  
husband) was common; how do we  
know how often this may have contributed to produce variations in the terms