

The Despised of Nazareth

📖 Matthew 13:53-58

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 January 27, 2016

🌐 fgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

We continue in Matthew 13 tonight. We have just finished Jesus' third discourse. Remember that Matthew records more of Jesus' discourses than any other gospel. Now that we have finished the third discourse we move to Matthew 13:53 tonight. This verse has Matthew's distinguishable marker *και εγενετο οτε ετελεσεν ο Ιησους* that signals the end of one section and the beginning of a new one. This expression is translated "When Jesus had finished these..." It is used five times in order to divide the book into six narratives followed by discourse in Matthew's argument. Each narrative sets the context for the following discourse. The first division is 1:1-7:29 where we find the Preparation for the King; the second division is 8:1-11:1 where we find the Presentation of the King; the third division is 11:2-13:53 where we find the Opposition to the King and tonight we will begin the fourth division in 13:54-19:2 where we find the Reaction of the King. This reaction can be described in one word; *withdrawal*. Jesus is withdrawing from the religious leaders of the nation in order to prepare for His crucifixion and to train His disciples for the ongoing ministry in the coming interadvent age.

Let's review what we have seen. In general, what is the one word that summarizes the character of this gospel? Jewish. Matthew is extremely Jewish. It begins with a Jewish genealogy tracing Jesus back to David and Abraham, assuming you know the significance of that. It includes Jewish customs without giving any clarification, assuming you know the customs. It has a lot of OT quotations relative to the other gospels, assuming you are familiar with the OT. It primarily uses the expression kingdom of heaven instead of kingdom of God assuming you have some sensitivity to the overuse of the name of God. It uses a number of unique Jewish words and expressions, assuming your closeness to Jewish culture. It groups things by number, a common method for memorizing in Jewish education. From earliest times observations like these have convinced students of Matthew's gospel that it was written to Jewish believers. But remember that it was written over in the church, over in about AD50.

Why did Matthew write a gospel to Jewish believers in the church? What was the purpose of his writing? People don't just sit down one day and write a book. It's my opinion that the NT authors sat down to write their books in order to meet some need. That's why you write a book; because there's a need. What need could Matthew be addressing? What need could Jewish believers have in say, AD50, about the year Matthew wrote? These Jewish

believers were spread throughout the Mediterranean world. They lived in Rome, they lived in Thessalonica, they lived in Philippi, and they lived in Smyrna. They lived all over the Mediterranean world. Who did they live among? Typically among fellow Jews. Every city had the Jewish ghetto. They were a separate people with separate customs, separate traditions, separate beliefs so they lived separate lives. The problem was some were believers some were unbelievers. What are the Jewish believers going to be sharing with their fellow Jewish unbelievers? The Messiahship of Jesus. And what is going to be the chief objection to this identification? "If Jesus is the Messiah then where is the Messiah's kingdom?" The Jewish worldview taught that when Messiah came He would establish His kingdom. Jesus came and did not establish His kingdom and so Jesus must not be the Messiah. So what Matthew seems to be doing is writing a book to help Jewish believers answer this objection.

What is His answer? What is the argument Matthew makes? There are two arguments. The first argument is Matt 1-11 that Jesus is the King. He has all the credentials of the King. He has the genealogy of the King, He has the birth of the King, He fulfills OT prophecy of the King, He has the divine approval of the King, He is impervious to temptation, He has the words of the King, He has the works of the King and so forth and so on. The second argument is Matt 13-28 that the Kingdom program is being postponed due to that generation's rejection. So Matt 12 sits in between these two arguments and gives the reason for the second half of the book. In this second half of the book Jesus will prepare for His crucifixion and train His disciples for ministry during the interadvent age preceding Israel's repentance and the arrival of the kingdom to come. So Matthew really is making two arguments; one that Jesus is the King and two that His kingdom is postponed.

What do we mean by postponed? We mean that as far as the kingdom's arrival in history, it was contingent on Israel's repentance and therefore since Israel did not repent the kingdom did not come and will not come until Israel does repent. Thus the kingdom drew near but the kingdom did not come here and will not until some future time. There are a lot of people who do not like the idea of postponement and hence approach Matthew in a very different way, saying that the kingdom has many forms or facets and that in light of the rejection there is not a postponement of the kingdom but a change in the form of the kingdom, what they refer to as the kingdom in mystery form. Many classic dispensationalists, men I admire greatly, like C. I. Scofield, John Walvoord, Dwight Pentecost, Charles Ryrie and Arnold Fruchtenbaum all taught this. I have several difficulties referring to the time between the two advents as a mystery form of the kingdom. For one, Jesus didn't say in Matt 13:11 that He was talking about a "mystery form of the kingdom," only "mysteries of the kingdom." A mystery is a truth hidden in God now being revealed. The truth hidden in God is that the kingdom is being postponed. For two, the kingdom is never re-defined as something other than the kingdom promised to Abraham and David and which had social, political, earthly and spiritual elements. For three, if the present age is a form of the kingdom then this confuses kingdom structures with church structures. The church is not a kingdom, it does not have a king, it does not have physical territory, it does not have national boundaries, and it is not in conflict with other earthly kingdoms. It is spiritual, it has a savior, it possesses spiritual territory, it is transnational and it is in conflict with spiritual forces of darkness. The two could not be more unlike and it is dangerous to say that the Church is

a form of the kingdom because kingdom structures end up being transported into the nature, function and purpose of the Church that are not appropriate to what is laid out for us in the Upper Room Discourse and the NT epistles. So we are holding that the kingdom's arrival into history has been postponed due to Israel's rejection and after the church has run its course Israel will repent and the kingdom will come. That is the plan of God.

The next narrative followed by discourse section is Matt 13:54-19:2. I've titled this section "The Reaction of the King" because this is the King's reaction to that generation's opposition to Him. His reaction may be summed up in one word—withdrawal—and this withdrawal eventually results in abandonment. In other words, His reaction to that generation's opposition was to withdraw and eventually abandon them. The full pattern that emerges is opposition—withdrawal—training—miracle—and back to opposition. Toussaint says, "The withdrawal of Jesus as presented by Matthew in this section follows a definite pattern. After a manifestation of antagonism on the part of the leaders toward Jesus, He withdraws. Following this withdrawal there is a performance of a mighty work. This series of events occurs twice. The third time opposition arises the King not only withdraws but finally "abandons" (*καταλείπω*; "leaves," NASB) the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matthew 16:4)."¹

This pattern is found in Matt 13:53-58, the leading pericope in this section. Notice in verse 54 that He withdraws from the place of the opposition to His hometown where we might expect Him to find acceptance. He then begins training in the synagogue where He apparently does some mighty miracles but in verse 57 He is met with opposition. Because this pattern is established in this pericope Toussaint says, "This brief paragraph is the key to the section."²

In 13:53 we read, **When Jesus had finished these parables, He departed from there.** This is His withdrawal. It signals the end of what many have called the Long Day because so much happened on this day. Schlegel says of this day, "The religious leaders made the absurd claim that Jesus was empowered by Satan and then demanded a sign. That day Jesus began to teach in parables (Matt 13)."³ Therefore all of what we have studied in Matt 12 and 13 occurred on the same day making it the Long Day. Verse 53 says that at the end of this Long Day **He departed from there.** This is the beginning of His withdrawal. Since the opposition and parable were given near Capernaum on the Lake of Galilee then we can say that He withdrew from Capernaum. Capernaum is located on the north shores of the Lake of Galilee. Today it's just a ruin but Matt 4:13 reports that this is where Jesus had made His base of ministry after He first visited Nazareth and was rejected (cf Luke 4:16-29). Most of the disciples He called were from the area of Capernaum because it was a fishing village and they were fishermen. Peter lived in Capernaum and it was presumably from his house that Jesus operated His ministry. Mark 4:35 adds that on the evening of the Long Day He said to them, "Let us go over to the other side." While they were sailing the fierce storm arose and He calmed the wind and the waves. When they came to the other side in the country of the Gerasenes He cast out a legion of demons into the swine that drowned in the lake. He then crossed over the lake again and healed the daughter of the synagogue official named Jairus and the woman who had the hemorrhage

for twelve years. Matthew bypasses these events because he has already reported them in chapters 8-9 as part of his argument that Jesus has the power to bring in the kingdom conditions.

In 13:54 He travels to **His hometown**. The name of **His hometown** is not mentioned but we know it is Nazareth. He was traveling there from the Lake of Galilee. There was a common route of travel from the Lake of Galilee through the hill country to Nazareth that was about 11 or 12 miles. This route is still known today. Nazareth was probably a small town. It was where Mary lived. Some think that her father was a rabbi and trained men at the synagogue in the nearby city of Sepphoris that was being built during the early years of Jesus' life.⁴ It was to Nazareth that God sent the angel Gabriel to announce to Mary that she would conceive and bear a son and name Him Jesus and revealed that He would be great and would be called the Son of the Most High and that the Lord God would give Him the throne of His father David and He would reign over the house of Jacob forever and His kingdom would have no end (Luke 1:26-33). When she asked how this could be since she was a virgin the angel answered that the Holy Spirit would come upon her and the Most High would overshadow her so that the holy Child would be called the Son of God (Luke 1:34-35). These things happened at Nazareth and we know then that the Holy Spirit conceived the child in her at Nazareth. It may be presumed that the great majority of her pregnancy was also spent in Nazareth but the census required them to go to Bethlehem in order to fulfill the prophecy that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem. After His birth they were visited by a caravan of astronomers from the east who worshipped Him. After they departed an angel warned Joseph in a dream to escape to Egypt because Herod the Great had plotted to destroy Him. Joseph therefore took his family and left for Egypt retracing the steps of the previous Joseph whose family followed him to Egypt. After the death of Herod an angel appeared to Joseph again and told them to return to the land of Israel. This they did continuing to retrace the steps of the nation Israel who also went out of Egypt (see Matt 2 for details). Rather than returning to settle in Judea and being warned by God in another dream they left for the region of Galilee and settled in Nazareth. Matthew says this was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophets: "He shall be called a Nazarene." The problem is that you can search the whole OT and you will not find a prophecy that says the Messiah will be called a Nazarene. What prophecy then is Matthew referring too? To understand the prophecy one has to understand Nazareth as a 1st century Jew would understand Nazareth. Nazareth was on the edge of the Valley of Armageddon which was of strategic importance. The Roman army had established a military installation in Nazareth. Thus many Roman soldiers lived among the Jews of Nazareth. For this reason it was a despised place. This is why Nathaniel asked, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" His point was it was a despised place and nothing good can come out of a despised place. If the Messiah came out of Nazareth then the Messiah must be despised. Thus the prophecy, "He shall be called a Nazarene" is really a prophecy that "He shall be despised." Did the OT prophets predict that the Messiah shall be despised? Numerous times. Isa 53:3, "He was despised and forsaken of men...despised and we did not esteem Him." Ps 22:6, "I am...despised by the people." Thus the reason that Jesus grew up in Nazareth was because the prophets predicted that He would be despised and that was the reputation of this town.

In 13:54 Jesus comes to Nazareth the second time. Since He was almost murdered the first time it was almost too horrible to mention the name of the town again and so it is merely referred to as **His hometown**. This is where He withdrew too. If there was one place that you might think He would be accepted, it would be in **His hometown**. Typically a person receives a warm welcome when he returns to his hometown. But if the person has an exalted status they are often despised when they return. The reputation of the town itself foreshadows they would despise Him. The second element in the pattern now comes into focus. In verse 54, he **began teaching them in their synagogue**. What was the **synagogue**? The **synagogue** developed due to the absence of the Temple during the Babylonian exile as a meeting place for prayer, reading of Scripture and exposition of the portion of Scripture read. By the time of Christ synagogues were commonplace in the various towns and cities throughout the land and in the Diaspora. Jesus and His disciples commonly taught in these synagogues. The end result of His teaching is that **they were astonished**. The Greek word **astonished** is the same word used after the Sermon on the Mount where it says, "When Jesus had finished these words, the crowds were astonished at His teaching. The word means "to be filled with amazement to the point of being overwhelmed."

They were overwhelmed by two things. First in verse 54, His words. They ask, "**Where did this man get this wisdom?**" The problem was that they had known Jesus from when He was just a little boy; He had grown up among them, worked among them and lived among them. He had not gone to the rabbinic schools where Jewish people thought wisdom was acquired. Pentecost says, "In response to His teaching, the audience had to face the question of His person. Jesus had grown up in a carpenter's home and was not trained in an accepted rabbinical school, and therefore the multitude could not understand where He got His knowledge of the Scriptures."⁵ So the first thing that overwhelmed them was His wisdom. Second in verse 54, His works. They ask, "**Where did this man get ...these miraculous powers?** Evidently Jesus did miracles in connection with His teaching in the synagogue. Since His teaching was orthodox the miracles would serve to authenticate that He was the Messiah. The people of Nazareth were therefore seeing Messianic miracles, astonishing works that undeniably pointed to Him as the Messiah. J. Vernon McGee points out. "Let me call your attention again to the fact that in Christ's day they never questioned whether or not He could perform miracles."⁶ That was well-known. Their question was "**Where did this man get ...these miraculous powers?** This is a question arising from lack of belief in the Scriptures regarding the Messiah's origins. The scriptures taught that the Messiah would have both earthly and heavenly origin. The earthly origin is "a child will be born"; the heavenly origin is "a Son will be given." Again the earthly origin is "from Bethlehem One will go forth for Me"; the heavenly origin is "His goings forth are from long ago, From the days of eternity." The fact that their questions only consider His earthly origin is telling regarding their understanding and belief in Scripture. This is their number one problem.

In 13:55 they ask, **Is not this the carpenter's son?** There are three important things to note in this question. Toussaint, among others, thinks the use of the demonstrative pronoun **this** is meant as a term of contempt. He says, "They refer to Him with the pronoun "this" (*ουτος*, 13:55) which is often a term of contempt (Matthew 12:24)."⁷ In other words, those who knew Him best had never thought of Him as anything special. This points up

the error of the apocryphal gospels that Jesus did many boyhood miracles. Carson notes, "(Incidentally, their questions render impossible the fanciful miracles ascribed to Jesus' childhood by the apocryphal gospels.)"⁸If He had done boyhood miracles He would have been viewed as special by those who knew Him. However, their contempt seems to argue against Him ever having done anything notable. Second, the fact that He is referred to as **the carpenter's son** with the definite article may indicate that Joseph was the only carpenter in town and therefore Nazareth was small. However, in Greek the definite article is not always used to specify but often to emphasize. They may be emphasizing the lack of special status that could be attributed to Jesus' origins. Jesus was just **the son** of a **carpenter**. With this attitude it is easy to see that they did not even consider a heavenly origin as the OT taught. Third, the fact that Joseph is not mentioned by name and Mary and His brothers are could signify that Joseph was no longer living. MacArthur says, "The fact that Joseph does not actually appear in any of these accounts suggests that he was no longer living."⁹ This fact is further confirmed by the fact that later when Jesus is on the cross he gives John the responsibility of taking care of his mother. But the big point of this question is that "They did not recognize who He really was. To them He was just a carpenter's son. And that is all He is to some folk in our day. They think He was a great teacher, a great man, a wonderful person, but to them He was only a carpenter's son."¹⁰ If they had understood and believed the OT Scriptures they would have known that the Messiah would have both an earthly and a heavenly origin and that His heavenly origin would account for His wisdom and power but they considered only His earthly origin.

Their second question arising out of unbelief is, **Is not His mother called Mary, and His brothers, James and Joseph and Simon and Judas?** In other words, these are just ordinary people. There is nothing special about them. This is just another family. How could one son in the family have this wisdom and power and not the others? The fact that they knew them all by name is another indication that Nazareth was a small town.

In 13:56 the third question asked out of unbelief is, **And His sisters, are they not all with us? His sisters** still lived in Nazareth. They knew them well. There was no wisdom or miraculous powers in them. This leads to their final question. But before we deal with it we should deal with the Roman Catholic doctrine that denies that Jesus had blood-brothers and sisters and affirms either that these were Jesus' cousins, arguing that they were the children of another Mary, Mary of Clopas, Jesus' aunt¹¹ or step-siblings, arguing that they were the children of Joseph from another marriage.¹² Did Jesus really have blood brothers and sisters or are they cousins or step-siblings? What is the real issue? As a platform for making this argument Roman Catholics commonly point out that 'brother' does not always refer to a blood relative. Fraternities refer to their members as brothers, Christians refer to fellow Christians as brothers and so forth and so on. That is true in certain contexts. The problem in this context is that His father is said to be the carpenter and His mother to be Mary and so naturally His brothers and sisters refer to blood brothers and sisters even if only as half-brothers and sisters consistent with the virgin conception. Second, Roman Catholics often argue that because the Holy Spirit conceived Jesus in the womb of Mary that this constituted a marital union between the Holy Spirit and Mary such that if she had relations with Joseph after the birth of Jesus it would have been viewed as an adulterous affair. The problem with this is that in

no terms does the Bible teach that the conception by the Holy Spirit constituted a marital union of the Holy Spirit and Mary. The Bible clearly does teach that Joseph kept her a virgin until after she gave birth to Jesus, implying that they did have relations. Third, Roman Catholics argue that Mary was obligated to maintain a vow of perpetual virginity after the birth of Jesus. The problem with this is that the Bible never says anything like this. The Bible says that Joseph kept her a virgin until after she gave birth to Jesus, implying that afterward they did have relations. Fourth, Roman Catholics argue that the prophecy regarding the virginity of Mary would not have been fulfilled if she had other children. This argument rests on two assumptions. First, that the prophecy concerns perpetual virginity over and against virginity for the birth of the Messiah. Second, that Mary took a vow of perpetual virginity in order to maintain the fulfillment of the prophecy. The problem is that the prophecy in Isaiah said to be fulfilled in Matthew was said to be fulfilled at the birth of Jesus. Any change in her virginity afterward could not change the fact that it was already fulfilled. It seems that the reason Roman Catholic Doctrine really rejects that Jesus had any blood brothers and sisters is simply because, as one Roman Catholic author says, "The Catholic Church has always proclaimed that Mary was ever-virgin."¹³ Since the Bible is the final authority and not the Roman Catholic Church and the Bible never says Mary was a perpetual virgin then the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary should be rejected. The Bible is quite clear in stating in Matt 1:24-25 that Joseph took Mary as his wife, but kept her a virgin until she gave birth to a Son," implying relations after the birth, and here in Matt 13:55 and 56 He had brothers and sisters through Joseph and Mary that all grew up together with Him in Nazareth. This view does nothing to detract from the virgin conception and birth.¹⁴

In 13:56 their final question arising out of unbelief manifests utter misunderstanding of the Scriptures. Logically, if Jesus did not get these things from any earthly origin then they would have to be explained by a heavenly origin. But this is not even considered. **Where then did this man get all these things?** If they knew the OT Scriptures why did they not consider the possibility of a heavenly origin? The fact that they did not reveals that the real issue is not where did this man get all these things but why did they not know and believe the Scriptures? They were not prepared to meet the Messiah. This seems to be the crux of the whole issue. If they had believed the Scriptures they would have been believing in Him. Repeatedly elsewhere Jesus makes this connection. John 5:46, "If you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me." John 5:47, "But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?" Luke 24:25, on the road to Emmaus they could not recognize Him because they did not believe the Scriptures. He says, "O foolish men and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken." The bottom line here is that they did not believe the Scriptures and therefore they could not see who Jesus was. Toussaint says, "Matthew's main point in including this brief narrative is to show the unbelief of Israel and its blindness to the person of Christ."¹⁵ This is exactly correct as the final verse in the pericope will prove. But why did they not believe? Jesus didn't fit their Messianic profile. They had an incomplete profile. He was fitting the profile perfectly. They didn't know the Scriptures.

In 13:57 note that **they took offense at Him**. The verb **took offense** is *σκανδαλιζω* and in the imperfect tense and passive voice means they stumbled into sin in such a way that they were identified with that cursed

generation that was going to destruction. In 11:6 Jesus had said to the disciples of John whom John had sent, "blessed is he who does not take offense at Me." There were only two sides to that generation of Israel; the blessed, those who believed the Scriptures and therefore believed in Him whom the Scriptures pointed and the cursed, those who disbelieved the Scriptures and therefore did not believe in Him whom the Scriptures pointed. This was a very sharp division. Those in His hometown stumbled....

In 13:57 Jesus then quotes what had become proverbial in Israel. **A prophet is not without honor except in his hometown and in his own household.** Regarding one's hometown Constable says, "Usually a person enjoys a better reception at home than anywhere else, except if he has attained an exalted position, in which case the opposite is often true."¹⁶ This points up the truth of the old proverb, "Familiarity breeds contempt." As Glasscock says, "The Nazarites' familiarity with Jesus' family and personal life hindered their acceptance of Him as the Messiah."¹⁷ So they rejected him. Regarding **his own household**. None of his brothers believed in Him until after His resurrection. Remember that the next time someone in your family won't believe and you have been trying to evangelize and talk with them for years. Jesus' own brothers didn't believe in Him till after the resurrection. They were rejecting Him.

The consequences are stated in 13:58. **And He did not do many miracles there because of their unbelief.** Pentecost put it strongly when he said, "The unbelief of finite people "shackled the omnipotence" of an infinite God." This, of course, does not mean that Jesus was unable to do miracles there but that He was unwilling to do them **because of their unbelief**. Ultimately Jesus did miraculous works only at the discretion of the Father. As such He did them only when the Father instructed. In this case God did not permit Jesus to **do many miracles** because they were in unbelief. This in part was gracious on the part of God since more miracles would have been more revelation and consequent greater judgment. As it was Nazareth lived up to its reputation of being a despised place because they despised perhaps the only good thing that did come out of Nazareth, Jesus, the Messiah.

In summary, the new section beginning in 13:53 and ending in 19:1 is titled The Reaction of the King. His reaction to their opposition is to withdraw, train, and do some mighty work that results in further opposition. This section will trace this repeated pattern until the third time when Jesus does not withdraw but abandons them. In 13:53 on the Long Day when Jesus finished the parables at Capernaum on the Lake of Galilee He departed from there. Mark mentions that while they sailed He calmed the fierce storm, when they landed He cast out the demoniac and when they sailed back He healed the synagogue ruler's daughter and the woman with the hemorrhage for twelve years. In 13:54 He then went to Nazareth, His hometown and began teaching them in their synagogue. So powerful was His teaching that they were overwhelmed. This was not possible since Jesus had not attended any of the traditional rabbinic schools where wisdom was learned. Because they were not believing the Scriptures they said, "Where did this man get this wisdom and these miraculous powers" that authenticated His wisdom. In 13:55 they view His origins as entirely earthly, "Is not this the carpenter's son?"

Joseph was not a learned Pharisee. He was responsible to teach in the home but he could not have imparted this wisdom. "Is not His mother called Mary, and His brothers, James and Joseph and Simon and Judas? And His sisters, are they not all with us?" None of them had this wisdom and so they could not have gotten it from Joseph. Yet these questions reveal the deeper problem of unbelief in the Scriptures which portray the Messiah as coming into history through a normal family. They did not recognize in 13:56 any other possible origin of this man than earthly origins. Yet the Messiah is painted in the OT as having heavenly origins. So in 13:57 "they took offense at Him." They stumbled over the stumbling stone, the rock of offense. The old proverb was merely repeating itself, "A prophet is not without honor except in his hometown and in his own household." Not even his brothers and sisters believed in Him until after His resurrection. Familiarity breeds contempt and this reveals the fallen nature and need of all man for Messiah. In 13:58 "He did not do many miracles there because of their unbelief." The reason is because He was unwilling to do them, not because He was unable to do them.

In conclusion, what can we learn? From the negative side of the Nazarites the most basic thing we can learn from this pericope is the importance of believing the Scriptures and passing them on truly from generation to generation and not allowing false doctrine to creep in or our familiarity with hearing the Scriptures taught truly breed contempt for the Scriptures, as if there is something more that we need than the words of life. There is no greater treasure than the Scriptures because in them we find the Christ; the one crucified for our transgressions and risen for our justification so that through Him we might be crucified to the world and the world to us and we are seeking first the kingdom. Are the Scriptures your greatest treasure? Are you seeking the kingdom first?

¹ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p. 187.

² *Ibid.*, p 188.

³ William Schlegel, *Satellite Bible Atlas*, near 9-5.

⁴ See Richard Batey, *Jesus & The Forgotten City*.

⁵ Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 226-7.

⁶ J. Vernon McGee, *Talk Thru the Bible*, p 81.

⁷ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p. 188.

⁸ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 13:55.

⁹ John MacArthur, *MacArthur Study Bible*, note on Matt 13:55.

¹⁰ J. Vernon McGee, *Talk Thru the Bible*, p 81.

¹¹ St Jerome.

¹² Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis.

¹³ <http://www.catholicdoors.com/misc/apologetics/brothersofjesus.htm>

¹⁴ Helvidius.

¹⁵ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p. 188.

¹⁶ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 13:57.

¹⁷ Ed Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 300.