

# The Genealogy of Jesus Christ

(A plausible reason for Luke's Genealogy account of Jesus)

Please Note: I do realize that this article may be controversial to some. However, I do see it as a logical and plausible way on how Jesus could be truly related to not only Mary, but Joseph as well. And because it doesn't violate any scriptures, is backed up by medical studies and practiced in marriages today; I felt it would be safe to share with you the reader. So, whether you except it or not, I would like to hear your thoughts by emailing me at: [repent4forgiveness@outlook.com](mailto:repent4forgiveness@outlook.com).

Now, let's get to the article itself.



## Matthew & Luke's Account

Doesn't the genealogy recorded in both Matthew and Luke's gospel make it clear that Jesus was in fact related to not only to Mary, but to Joseph as well? Why else would we have two separate account? And yes, there are those who have come up with one answer or another. However, they all appear to be made up because they just don't line up with scripture as a whole. For doesn't Matthew's gospel starts out saying, "*The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.*" (Matthew 1:1 ESV) And in Luke's gospel we read: "*Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his public ministry. Jesus was known as the son of Joseph. Joseph was the son of Heli*" and so on. (Luke 3:23 NLT)

Now, it's important that we first expose some misconceptions found in our modern translation. For most bibles have Matthew's genealogy through Joseph's descendants and Luke's through Mary's. However, by closely studying God's word, we can see that the opposite is true. For according to the Aramaic English New Testament, the genealogy in Matthew's account is that of Mary's and the one in Luke's account is that of Joseph. That's because the Aramaic language has a specific word for "husband" which we see being rightly used in Matthew 1:19. But in verse 16 of this same chapter, the Aramaic translation doesn't use this same word for "husband," but instead one that can be translated as "guardian" or even Father. So then, this would make the "Joseph" in Matthew's account her actual "father" instead of her "husband."

However, this is not true in the Greek because it has no specific word for "husband." For this same word can be used as ether "father" or "husband" or even as a "man" in general. So, it all lies in the hands of the translators to figure out what word to use. Therefore, we can easily see how corruption could creep into some modern Greek text of today. So yes, both the father of Mary and her husband shared the same name "Joseph." This is not uncommon because there are three other Josephs being mentioned in

Luke's genealogy account in both the Greek and Aramaic bible. And just to let you know, both the Revised English version and the Cephher translation use the word "father" in verse 16 as well. So, that all being said, I believe the Aramaic, Cephher and the REV translations are correct when it comes down to these two genealogies.

## The Miraculous Conception

According to the scriptures, we know that Jesus was truly miraculously conceived. For we can see this to be true when Mary asked the angel Gabriel before her conception: *"But how can this happen? I am a virgin."* (Luke 1:34 NLT) Also, we know that Joseph didn't undo her virginity throughout her pregnancy: *"but kept her a virgin until she gave birth to a Son; and he called His name Jesus."* (Matthew 1:25 NASB).

Now, we should all acknowledge that even though Jesus was miraculously conceived, he was still related to Mary. For studies have shown that both the mother and child's DNA naturally pass over to one another through the umbilical cord. And studies have also shown that these passed on DNA's are also retain by both recipients. But what about Luke's genealogy account which mentions Jesus in it? Why would he go through all the trouble to record it in his gospel? For as already mentioned, it's clear that Joseph kept Mary a virgin throughout her whole pregnancy. So, is there any other way that Joseph's DNA could be passed on to both Mary and Jesus? Well, in fact there is, so please read on to see how this could be true.

## Becoming One Flesh

Studies have shown that the components of a man's semen (including his DNA) are present in the woman's bloodstream within a few hours after her receiving it. This would be true however she receives it into her body. So, the passage in Mathew 19:5 which reads: *"For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh,"* would be a fact and not just some metaphor. Also, let's remember that Luke was a physician. Therefore, he should have understood that this was true back in his day as well. For even scripture itself says: *"What has been is what will be, and what has been done is what will be done, and there is nothing new under the sun. Is there a thing of which it is said, 'See, this is new'? It has been already in the ages before us."* (Ecclesiastes 1:9-10 ESV)

Now, because Joseph and Mary were husband and wife, there would have been no restrictions placed upon them regarding sexual intimacy with each another. However, we know that Mary remained a virgin throughout her pregnancy with Jesus. I believe this was the right thing for Joseph to do on his part. This way he could honestly say that he had nothing to do with the conception of Jesus. Also, this would help Mary to have a safer pregnancy as well. For there are doctors who claim that vaginal sex during pregnancy could cause a woman to have early contractions, and thus deliver a premature baby. And as mentioned above, this knowledge could have been known in Joseph's time as well.

So, does this mean that Mary while being pregnant had to refrain from all forms of sex? Is there any sexual act that she could perform with Joseph that wouldn't contradict the scriptures and still be safe? Well, yes there is and that would be the act of oral sex. So, by Mary receiving Joseph's semen through this act, she would still remain a virgin throughout her pregnancy and thus her miraculously conception of Christ would still hold true. (Matthew 1:18, Luke 1:35) Also, the genealogy in both Matthew and Luke's account would truly be more understandable and unquestionable. And as mentioned earlier, both the

mother and child within her womb would literally become *“one flesh”* with the man she had sex with. And again, this would include oral sex as well.

Below is a video and a few articles concerning the benefits of sex:

- [Mood Enhancer](#)
- [Women receive and retain a man's DNA through sex – Video](#)
- [Women receive and retain a man's DNA through sex - Article](#)
- [Sex for a safer pregnancy - Article 1](#)
- [Sex for a safer pregnancy - Article 2](#)
- [Ejaculation Frequency for a healthy prostate](#)
- [Sex for Older Couples](#)

## Made Like Us

Now, let's remember that Joseph was a man with needs and desires. Also, wouldn't Mary want to bring pleasure to Joseph and show her desire to be *“one flesh”* with him? For a man to refrain from having sex with his wife for nine months would not only be wrong according to scripture, but a hard thing to do as well. And doesn't scripture say: *“Do not deprive each other of sexual relations, unless you both agree to refrain from sexual intimacy for a limited time so you can give yourselves more completely to prayer. Afterward, you should come together again so that Satan won't be able to tempt you because of your lack of self-control.”* (1 Corinthians 7:5) And yes, Joseph being a man wouldn't be immune to Satan's temptations. Therefore, it would be good for Joseph and Mary to engage in such an act that's not condemned by God nor violates scripture.

And let me ask you this. How many of you today have either given or received oral sex? So then, wouldn't it be hypocritical if you engage in such an act yourselves and yet condemn Mary and Joseph for doing the same? So then, just as it would be for us today, it surely would have been a blessing for not only Joseph, but Mary and the Christ child within her womb as well.

## In Closing

Now, even though there may be evidence for this both biblically, scientifically, and in day-to-day life, you may still be questioning whether or not this could be true. Therefore I encourage you to at least test what's being said instead of just throwing it all out. For you should always: *“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”* (2 Timothy 2:15) And please, leave me a comment at the email below. Especially, if you're one that happens to see this article as being plausible and maybe even logical as well. My email is: [repent4forgiveness@outlook.com](mailto:repent4forgiveness@outlook.com). Thank you for taking the time to read this article and may God bless you.