

The Christ of Scripture

- ⁵ For to which of the angels did God ever say, "You are my Son, today I have begotten you"? Or again, "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son"?
- ⁶ And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, "Let all God's angels worship him."
- ⁷ Of the angels he says, "He makes his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire."
- ⁸ But of the Son he says, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom.
- ⁹ You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions."
- ¹⁰ And, "You, Lord, laid the foundation of the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of your hands;
- ¹¹ they will perish, but you remain; they will all wear out like a garment,
- ¹² like a robe you will roll them up, like a garment they will be changed. But you are the same, and your years will have no end."
- ¹³ And to which of the angels has he ever said, "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet"?
- ¹⁴ Are they not all ministering spirits sent out to serve for the sake of those who are to inherit salvation?"

Hebrews 1:5-14

The Word and Life

THERE IS A TERRIBLY IMPORTANT QUESTION that Jesus raises with the Pharisees. It is a question about authority. It is a question about the word. Seeing that today is Reformation Day, it is worth noting that it is a question that was raised many years later by the Reformers in more than one of their “*sola*” slogans. It is such an important question, that it ends up being about life itself. **How does one get the word of God to abide in them?**

In any question like this, there are multiple ways to answer. What I’m not talking about today is the angle of God’s sovereignty (*sola gratia*). Of course, the way you get the word to abide in you is that God has to open your mind and give you a new heart. And this is ironic, because you are not doing anything here. If the Holy Spirit doesn’t do this, the word will not abide.

However, **God uses means** to accomplish his will, and the chief means he uses to get the word to abide in a person is ... the word of God. *Sola Scriptura*, **the formal cause** of the

Reformation. By the “word of God,” I’m talking about the Scriptures. It is through the word that the word abides. That seems to make sense. Yet, what people mean by “the word of God,” even though they all point to the same book, is often very different. That is the question that Jesus puts to the Pharisees.

What is the word of God? Of course, it is the Bible. But since “the Bible” is actually many different smaller books put together into a collection, that begs the question. Ask a Jew and you will get one answer: The Bible is some collection of books that we would say are in the Old Testament, but it most certainly isn’t the New Testament. Ask some Christians, and while they may not say it, their practice implies the opposite. The Bible is really for all practical intents and purposes, the New Testament and maybe the Psalms and Proverbs. There are reasons why Christians publish NT only Bibles, why it is rare to find expositors preaching from Old Testament books, and why most ordinary Christians have little idea what to do with the majority of the Old Testament.

But let’s assume that we are agreed that the Bible is the sixty-six books that we have in our Protestant canon. What

then? What is the Bible then? Now we are able to move deeper into the question of “what is the Bible about?” Imagine your local fire department having as its training manual *Gone With The Wind*. I mean after all, there is a huge fire in that book! The illustration points out the absurdity of making a book that is obviously about one thing into something it is obviously not about at all. Yet, how many people do this with the Bible?

Is there a point to the Bible? If you were to read it cover to cover, would there be **an overarching purpose of it**? What would that be? Would you come away thinking about what a great nutrition book it is? A book on leadership principles or how to get rich in three easy steps? Would you come away thinking that this was a book on how you are to live your life? Certainly, the Bible has been used in all of these ways and many, many more.

Would **one character shine forth** as the main character? Is it even possible to talk about that given that it is a collection of books that span well over a thousand years between when the first and last books were written, and cover a period of time that includes many thousands of years

more than that, and does it while claiming to be actual history?

If we do not approach the Bible correctly, the very real and present danger is that we will not have God's word abiding in us, even if we read that word and memorize it every day of our lives. No group of people to this day has ever known the contents or "letter" of God's word better than the Pharisees.¹ Some of them had the entire Old Testament memorized. Yet Jesus told them, "You do not have his word abiding in you" (John 5:38). "Of course we do," they thought. "Give us any piece of Bible trivia, no matter how obscure, we will give you an answer. Ask us to rattle off any chapter of any book, and right here, right now, we will recite it for you. We don't have the word of God abiding in us. Poppycock!"

¹ **Going Deeper:** Leon Morris has a relevant quote in his comments on the John 5 passage. "In the early centuries of our era this reverence for the letter of Scripture was taken to extreme lengths. Sir Frederic Kenyon says that scribes "numbered the verses, words, and letters of every book. They calculated the middle word and the middle letter of each. They enumerated verses which contained all the letters of the alphabet, or a certain number of them" (*Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* [London, 1939], p. 38). In copying out the Scriptures the scribe was not to write more than one letter before looking at his exemplar again (*Meg.* 18b). This kind of thing cannot be attested for the New Testament period, but it undoubtedly had its roots there. It leads to a profound reverence for the letter of Scripture, coupled with a failure to grapple with its thought." Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995), 292, n. 118.

But Jesus revealed two things about their thinking about the Holy Scripture that bore witness to the fact that he knew what he was talking about. He talked about **their approach to it** and then to **their view of what they thought it was about** (or perhaps better, what they refused to see that it really was about). First he said, “**You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life**” (39). It was very common in those days to view the study of Torah as the way to gain life. Rabbi Hillel (Myth has him living 120 years like Moses, from 110 B.C. to 10 A.D.) said, “**The more study of the Law the more life,**” and “**If he has gained for himself words of the Law he has gained life in the world to come.**”²

What this means is that they viewed the Scriptures as the end rather than as a means to the end. To put it another way, they cared about **the letter** (no one could ever accuse them of not believing in the inspiration of the Scripture), **but not the lesson of it**. It is true that the Scriptures give life, but they do so indirectly, not directly. They do so only in as much as they point to something or someone else. Thus,

² Jm. Pirke Abot 2:7. Cited in Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, The New International Commentary on the Old and New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 331.

Jesus gives the Pharisees the first version of *solus Christus* in history: Christ Alone. “You do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe the one whom he has sent” (John 5:38). But upon what basis should they believe him? He tells them, “You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness about me” (39).

Reading the Scripture with Christ as the main actor means reading the OT this way, for those are the Scriptures he is referring to. This is also what he taught the disciples after his resurrection on the road to Emmaus. “And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself” (Luke 24:27). It is pretty obvious to see Christ in the New Testament. It doesn’t really take much to see that, though somehow many still do miss him for other, lesser things. But it is another thing to see him in “all the Scriptures.”

This makes some very uncomfortable. Thus, it is very common to hear things like, “We can see Jesus in those places where the NT sees him, yes, of course. But we must not go beyond what is written in the NT. That is dangerous.” This is actually the most common approach to

this question in conservative Evangelical and Reformed seminaries in America. The great fear is seeing Christ where he isn't or allegorizing or forcing him into texts and thus destroying the meaning of the Scripture. (*The reality never ceases to amaze me how if Christ isn't your grid, something else inevitably takes his place, so that in every Scripture, no matter what it is, it becomes a sermon of pure doctrine or of pure application or of pure law or of pure allegory of whatever suits your fancy, etc., etc.*).

The purpose in bringing all of this up today is because I know of few places in the Bible where such a question should be asked and can be answered, due to the overwhelming use of OT passages that are used in support of proving that Jesus Christ is the Unique Son of God. Our passage is the majority of Hebrews 1. Today, we will look at how the preacher uses the OT and what his purpose in going to the OT is. In this way, we can get a better handle on the question that Jesus posed to the Pharisees and the lesson he taught his disciples.

Hebrews 1 and the Old Testament

Hebrews 1-2 contains a dozen direct quotes (see below)

of the OT, and many more allusions.

Heb 1:5	=	Ps 2:7 & 2Sa 7:14; 1Ch 17:13
Heb 1:6	=	Ps 97:7 or Deut 32:43 LXX
Heb 1:7	=	Ps 104:4
Heb 1:8-9	=	Ps 45:6-7
Heb 1:10-12	=	Ps 102:25-27
Heb 1:13	=	Ps 110:1
Heb 1:14	=	Ps 34:8
Heb 2:6-8	=	Ps 8:5-7 (LXX)
Heb 2:12	=	Ps 22:22
Heb 2:13	=	Isa 8:17, 18

Most of these are found in the Psalms (**we will look at why this is next time**). Most of them deal with Angels. In one way or another, all of them are related to Christ. As we will see, the preacher of Hebrews learned how to read the Bible from Jesus. But as we will also see, it, along with the rest of the NT, expects that you and I would be doing the same.

You Are My Son: Hebrews 1:5, Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel

We will start with Psalm 2, because the first quotation in Hebrews 1:5 comes from here. Psalm 2 may be called a

Royal Psalm. We do not know its author, but we do know that he was upset at the kings and heathens of the nations because they rage and take counsel against the LORD and against his “Anointed” (1-2). The quotation comes from vs. 7, “I will tell of the decree: The LORD said to me, ‘You are my Son; today I have begotten you.’” The word “begotten” (Hb: *yalad*; Gk: *gennaō*) can refer to the literal birth of a child (a word for child in Hebrew is *yeled*, from the same stem). But it can also refer to non-human things like the law. In other words, the begetting does not have to be biological. So what kind of a Son is being begotten?

Well, no one would argue that God physically begets a son (see note 3 and the point about pagan myths). Nevertheless, who is this son? He is called in vs. 2 the “Anointed.” In Hebrew it is the word *mashiach* from which we get Messiah. In Greek it is Christ, which simply means Messiah. Of course, Jesus is called the Messiah (Jesus Christ). But so also is David and others. So what about the rest of the context?

First, the Anointed appears to be in heaven with God, for it is the kings of the earth that are raging against God and his Messiah (1-2). It says that “He who sits in the heavens

laughs; the Lord holds them in derision” (4). So the Lord is the one in heaven. But Lord here is Adonai, not Yahweh, as he was called in vs. 2, where Yahweh has an Anointed. Quite curiously, in the Targum, the Memra holds them in derision! Memra (Word) translates “Adonai.” Thus, He appears separate from Yahweh. There is someone in heaven laughing and another in heaven holding them in derision.

Second, together the Father and the Messiah say, “Let us burst their bonds and cast away their cords from us” (3). But David never dared speak as if he were an equal with God like this. **Third**, this Messiah will inherit the “ends of the earth” as his possession, and this is where **Hebrews 1:2** gets that idea (without quoting the Psalm directly). This was never true of David or any other Israelite King. It is why Hebrews says this Son inherits all things. **Fourth**, the parallel Psalm (**82:8**), the only other place where someone inherits the nations in the Psalms is called Elohim (God). In that Psalm he also appears to be called a “son” (see **vs. 6** and Jesus citation of it in **John 10:34** of himself).

Finally, it is worth noting that Hebrews does not compare the son to a human king, as so many commentators teach that the original meaning of the Psalm was about (and

in this way it seems to me implicitly deny the teaching of Hebrews).³ He compares the son to angels. This is strange. Where would he ever get that idea from in Psalm 2? It is because in **Deuteronomy** (4:19; 17:3; 29:26; 32:7-9), the only people inheriting nations are heavenly sons of God. In fact, David never inherits any nations.⁴ In other words, with the Deuteronomy worldview in your head rather than a contemporary secular worldview, it makes perfectly good sense to read this Psalm in reference to a heavenly Son being greater than all the other heavenly sons.

Therefore, and this is a major point, even apart from Christ's injunction on how to read the Bible, and apart from ancient Jews and modern Christians who see the original context only referring (only) to a human being, Hebrews has very good reasons from the Psalm itself to read this as referring to someone very, very special—the Son of God, Jesus Christ. It isn't just making it up. Apparently (and all

³ I want to be careful here, because I'm not saying that they deny the teaching of Hebrews. What I am saying is that when you read commentators talk about the "original context" and only talk about the human Davidic king and not the divine Messiah king, they are implicitly denying that Hebrews is applying the Psalm correctly, since it wasn't originally about God's son, but a created human king.

⁴ This does not mean that someone like David or Solomon or another king of Judah isn't in the near-mind of the author. God did set his human king on his holy hill in Jerusalem. But that king did not inherit the nations. That promise simply wasn't given to them.

the more so if our audience of Jewish Priests converting to Christianity and fleeing Jerusalem because of persecution), this quotation expects that you will be convinced by its citation of Psalm 2 and say, “Yeah, that’s right. That’s exactly what it says.”

A second quotation in this verse is from **2 Samuel 7:14**. This is the classic text where God, in covenant,⁵ promises David someone who will sit on his throne forever. The full verse has God speaking and he says, “I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son. When he commits iniquity, I will discipline him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men.” Obviously, you can see a problem here if the verse applies to Jesus, whom Hebrews itself says was “without sin” (**Heb 4:15**).

For this reason, everyone recognizes that the promise is given to Solomon. If ever there was a man who sinned boldly (to paraphrase Luther), it was Solomon. If ever a man learned the chastisement of the rod of God, it was King Solomon. But if this is talking about a sinful man, how could

⁵ The term “covenant” is not found in the text, and on those grounds, some would say there can’t be a covenant. Yet, Ps 89 sees a covenant here (see **Ps 89:3**; cf. **Jer 33:21**). You don’t need an explicit statement of “here is a covenant!” in order for there to be a covenant.

our preacher justify quoting it of Jesus? To answer that, we need to look again at the context.

In the night, the “Word” of the LORD came to the prophet Nathan (2Sa 7:4) and told him that the LORD (Yahweh) had a promise to give to David⁶ who had in mind to build God a house. “When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your seed after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever” (12-13). Clearly, Solomon built God a house. Clearly God established Solomon’s throne. Clearly Solomon had a kingdom.

But was it “his” kingdom? I mean, in a sense it was of course. But in another sense was it not rather David’s kingdom that was passed down to him? And was this kingdom “forever” as it promises? And is that house going to be in that eternal kingdom? You see how the language is ambiguous. In fact, Jesus came proclaiming a kingdom that was invisible, spiritual, and eternal. It was not like the

⁶ Are there two Yahwehs in vs. 11, or just one? “The LORD declares to you that the LORD will make you a house.”

kingdom of Solomon. It was truly His kingdom and it never belonged to anyone else. David and Solomon's kingdom was merely typological of Jesus'. Jesus also built a [house](#) that was eternal, as Hebrews will spend a lot of time explaining later on. But it is a different kind of house than the one Solomon built. For again, it is eternal.

But the real kicker here is the promise of the "[seed](#)." This is not unique to David. In fact, David stands in a long line of others who have been given this same promise. It was given to Eve ([Gen 3:15](#)), to Noah ([Gen 9:9](#)), to Abram ([Gen 12:7](#)), to Isaac ([Gen 26:3](#)), to Jacob ([Gen 28:13](#)), and others. David is just the next in line. So too is Solomon. Each person thought that perhaps their son would be The Seed. But they were all mistaken, which is why the promise continued.

So using the language again of the original passage and understanding the covenantal promise of someone greater in the future to which all others point, Hebrews uses the first part of the verse to tell us about Jesus, realizing that there is a near part of the prophecy that is about Solomon, not Jesus. Again, plenty of Jews saw the passage in a Messianic light, but did they truly know how unique this person would be? They should have, for the Father never calls anyone but this

person his Son using these kinds of images. And so again, the quote is given to prove from the OT itself that the Son who is speaking in these last days is unique.

You Are My Son: Hebrews 1:5, Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel

This continues in the next quotation. Hebrews says, “And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, ‘Let all God’s angels worship him’” (Heb 1:6). “Firstborn” is an idea that might be taken from any number of Psalms, but Ps 89 which tells us about the covenant with David is a good choice. “And I will make him the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth.” Notice, that firstborn refers to rank, not birth.

We aren’t entirely sure where the quote originates. It may come from Psalm 97:7. In the Hebrew, that Psalm says, “All worshipers of images are put to shame, who make their boast in worthless idols, worship him, all you gods!” “Gods” is the word *elohim*, and it is universally translated as “gods” by the English Bibles.⁷ However, the LXX translated

⁷ The Psalm Targum translates it as, “... all the peoples who worship idols bow down before him,” assuming that the gods have no real existence. Curiously though, the same Targum says in the previous verse that “the angels of heaven proclaim his righteousness,” when the Hebrew only said, “the heavens proclaim...”

Elohim as “[angels](#).” And so the quote might come from the LXX of this verse.

It may also be that it comes from a much earlier source: [Deuteronomy 32:43](#). This amazing verse has several different readings, depending on if it is the LXX, the Dead Sea Scrolls, or later Rabbinical anti-supernatural changes:

Masoretic (Hebrew) Text	4QDeut ^a	LXX
A1. O nations, rejoice His people	O <u>heavens</u> , rejoice with Him	O <u>heavens</u> , rejoice with Him
A2.	Bow to Him, <u>all divinities</u>	Bow to Him, all <u>sons of the divine</u>
A3.		O nations, rejoice with His people
A4.		And let all <u>angels of the divine</u> Strengthen themselves in Him.
B1. For He'll avenge the blood of	For He'll avenge the blood of	For He'll avenge the blood of
B2. His servants, And wreak vengeance On His foes,	<u>His sons</u> , And wreak vengeance on His foes,	<u>His sons</u> , Be vengeful And wreak vengeance And recompense justice on His foes,
C1.	Requite those who reject Him,	Requite those who reject Him,
C2. And will Cleanse His people's land.	And will Cleanse His people's land.	And the Lord will Cleanse His people's land.

In the Hebrew it tells the nations to rejoice. But in the others, the heavens are rejoicing. Bowing before God are the “sons of God.” The LXX says, “Let all angels of the divine strengthen themselves in Him.” Clearly the idea that heavenly beings bow down and praise God is biblical. But what about praising the Son of God? Hebrews is making this claim: Let all the angels worship *the Son*.

In Psalm 97, the God who is worshiped is called Yahweh. He has clouds and darkness that accompany him (2). Fire goes before him and consumes his enemies (3). The imagery goes back to Sinai and the Exodus. He has lightnings (4). He is the storm God. But mountains melt before him (5). These mountains melt before “Adonai,” “Lord” of all the earth. *Kurios*, the equivalent of Adonai is what Jesus was regularly called in the Gospels. It was a phrase associated with being the Son (Matt 12:8; 15:22; 20:30, 22:45, etc.). He is the Lord Jesus, son of man and son of God. It is this Adonai that the gods or angels are commanded to worship in vs. 7. Curiously, at the end of the Psalm Targum, it commands the people to rejoice in the Memra (the “Word”) of the LORD. His is the Name that we give thanks to.

In **Deuteronomy 32**, The Name of the LORD (3) is called the Rock of Faithfulness and Justice (4). This LORD Yahweh inherits the nation of Israel (9), because he apparently is one of the sons of God (8). This is the LORD the sons of God are commanded to worship in **vs. 43**. And so the context of both passages, in their original reading, again point strongly in the direction of a heavenly, unique Son.

Angels are Servants and Liturgists: Hebrews 1:7 and Psalm 104

The next verse quotes **Psalm 104:4**. It isn't talking directly about the son, but rather about the angels. "He makes his angels winds, his ministers a flaming fire," the verse says in the Hebrew. The same point is made in the last verse of Hebrews 1 (**vs. 14**). Angels are "ministering spirits sent out to serve for the sake of those who are to inherit salvation." The point is very simple. Angels are less than the Son. They were created that way. The word for a "minister" *leitourgos* (Gk) from which we get **liturgy**. They are servants of the heavenly temple.

Importantly, notice that the verse is not about Jesus per se! To say that all of the Scripture is about him is not to force him literally into every verse. Nevertheless, it is certainly possible to read this Psalm as being about Jesus, as it begins with the God of creation (and Hebrews says Jesus is the Creator). But even a verse like this which is not about Jesus (and most verses in the Bible are not directly talking about Jesus), can be indirectly compared to Jesus, as is happening here. Angels are not God. They are not the Son. They are servants. He made them. In this way, we learn to understand our Lord's teaching properly without fear that every single solitary word has to have some magical "Jesus" meaning in it.

The Throne of the Son: Hebrews 1:8-9 and Psalm 45:6-7

The next resumes the verses that are directly about Jesus. It comes from **Psalm 45:6-7**. "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever. The scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of uprightness, you have loved righteousness and hated wickedness. Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions." It is a Psalm of the sons of Korah, and their heart overflows with

a pleasing theme (1). It refers to someone as the **most handsome of the sons of men**. He is a son of Adam. He is a man that is full of grace, because God (Elohim) has blessed him forever (2). He is a **warrior** with a sword (3). He rides out victoriously for truth and meekness and righteousness, his **right hand** being the hand of power.

But from here, it gets very strange. “**Your arrows are sharp in the heart of the king’s enemies**” (5). Apparently, he is not the king! Yet, “**the peoples fall under you.**” Is he one of the king’s mighty men? No! He is called God in the next verse. “**Your throne O God (Elohim) is forever...**” (6). How can a Psalm in the OT refer to God as a man, a son of Adam? Because it is addressing someone who would become a son of Adam. Even more, **this God is said to also have a God** in the next verse. “**God, your God, has anointed you.**” “Anointed” is the verbal form of the noun Messiah. It is astonishing to read commentators say that here God is addressing someone like king David as God.⁸ That is pure nonsense. Not only this, but because the grammar is difficult, other suggestions have been made by scholars such

⁸ Weiser 1962: 363, cited in Guthrie, 937.

as the phrase, “Your throne O God is forever,” should really read, “Your throne is God’s forever...”

Scholars never cease to astonish me. We can learn very much from them, even from those who do not know Christ. However, Oswald Allis said it very clearly almost 100 years ago, “The dicta of the critics which we have been investigating [in this very Psalm] illustrate two things very clearly: the remarkable readiness of the critics to accept almost any explanation of Biblical data however uncertain or even improbable which rejects the Supernatural, and the singular inability which they often show to distinguish between Possibility, Probability, and Proof.”⁹ In other words, if Hebrews says it is one way, about the Son, then we must do everything in our power to make sure people know that isn’t what the text originally was talking about. In this way, they love the letter, but stop their ears at the lesson. Beloved, this is a self-imposed death sentence.

Hebrews is so remarkable here because it says that this Psalm teaches us that the Son is God. It couldn’t say it any clearer in how it says this. “Son” is not a word in the Psalm.

⁹ Oswald T. Allis, “Thy Throne, O God, Is for Ever and Ever,” *The Princeton Theological Review* XXI, no. 1–4 (1923): 266.

Yet, as someone born of Adam, as the seed of David (from Ps 2, 89, etc.), he clearly is a son. Born. Anointed. Yet, he is also God. God but not God. Yahweh but not Yahweh. Word. Name. Glory. Creator. Firstborn. Preeminent. The more I investigate this line of thinking in the OT, the more I am convinced that the entire OT is saturated with this thinking. We miss it because the veil has not been taken off of our eyes.

Creator Lord: Hebrews 1:10-12 and Psalm 102:25-27

The rapid fire burst of verses continues in **Heb 1:10-12**. Now he moves to **Psalm 102**. This is a Psalm of someone afflicted, who is pouring out his complaint to the LORD (1). He is **in anguish** over God seemingly hiding his face from him. As he cries out in sorrow, he confesses that Yahweh is enthroned forever (12). The LORD builds up Zion and appears in his glory (16). He hears the prayer of the destitute (17). Nations will fear his Name and his Glory (15).

He wants future generations to know even as he suffers that the LORD looked down from heaven and heard the groans of the **prisoners**, **set free** those doomed to die (20). This sounds like what Jesus reads of his own ministry from

Isaiah 61. Suddenly, having called God Yahweh the entire Psalm, suddenly in vs. 24, he calls him Elohim. This Elohim has “years that endure throughout all generations” (24). He is the Creator (25). The creation will wear out (26), but his years have no end (27). This is what is cited in Hebrews as referring to the Son. Again, why would it see this?

It is certainly curious that in the Psalm, God shifts from Yahweh to Elohim at just the point of Hebrews quote. Even more interesting is what the LXX does with this. It changes the words “he has broken my strength” in vs. 23 to “he answered him in the way of his strength.” Who is the Him? This is the Elohim of vs. 24 whom it calls *Kurios* (Lord). In other words, it is very possible to see, yet again, two divine figures in heaven in this Psalm. The one who has been appealed to throughout the Psalm is now speaking to the other who created the heavens (of course, as God, they both created the heavens). Is this Psalm actually a Psalm of the Suffering Servant being strengthened by the LORD in his greatest moment of human weakness by being called upon to remember that he is still the Lord who created all things, even though he has now become a man? That certainly

seems to be the way Hebrews takes it, and as we can see, yet again it is not without good reason for the text itself.

Creator Lord: Hebrews 1:10-12 and Psalm 102:25-27

Finally, he caps off Chapter 1 with a citation from **Psalm 110:1**. “And to which of the angels has he ever said, ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet?’” (**Heb 1:13**). Again, this is in the context of the Son. Somehow, this proves that there is a Son of God who is greater than angels. It does so first through a negative inference. God has in fact not said this to any of the angels. But in Psalm 110:1, he says it to the Lord (*Adonai* again).

This is the verse that Jesus uses to shut the Pharisees mouths after a curious discussion in (even more curiously) *Luke’s* Gospel about angels, marriage, and the resurrection (which seems to allude to the angelic sons of God in **Gen 6:1-4** as well; see **Luke 20:34**). Immediately after this Jesus says, “How can they say that the Christ is David’s son? For David himself says in the Book of Psalms, ‘The Lord said to my Lord, “sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool.” David thus calls him Lord, so how is he his son?’” (**Luke 20:41-44**).

Again, “son” is not in the Psalm, but Jesus’ logic is perfectly reasonable. David was going to have a son who would sit on his throne. Everyone knew this. Thus, all the Jews referred to their coming Messiah as the son of David. So Messiah is David’s son. But here, Jesus says, David calls him Lord. How can king David refer to his son not yet born as Lord? Great question. No wonder no one dared ask him any more trick questions!

Psalm 110:1 actually begins by saying, “*A Psalm of David. The LORD says to my Lord: ‘Sit at my right hand...’*” Yahweh speaks to Adonai, and king David overhears the conversation. Do you see that this Psalm also teaches you about Christ. There are two Lords here. One is Yahweh. One is above David, but below Yahweh. Father and Son. The Psalm is actually perfectly clear and Jesus wonders why none of them “got it.”

So yet again, Hebrews isn’t making this up. But we have not been taught sufficiently from our own Bibles how to read them. As I said earlier, many—Liberal or Conservative, it often does not matter—have found a plethora of ways to make these OT passages say anything other than what I’ve shown you that they say today. We have become

functioning Pharisees, at least as far as the OT is concerned. To God alone be the glory for his clearer Revelation in the NT, and his grace that alone saves us through faith in the message of Christ. He has allowed us to see this. But now, with the NT as our guide, are not without excuse when we avoid the clear teachings of the NT regarding the OT in these matters?

Part of that clearer revelation in the NT is the teaching that this is how we are to read the OT! And this is what people just don't seem to get. Many worry, often rightly, that people will abuse the OT and allegorize and find Jesus where he isn't. Fine. Then teach people how to interpret the Bible responsibly. That is one of the greatest things that came from the Reformation. No longer were people stuck having to believe whatever their priest (who himself often never read the Bible) said. They could go and responsibly read it and interpret it for themselves. And for it, do not forget, many men died at the hands of papists who would keep this knowledge from them.

No Ph.D. Required, Faith Alone

This isn't brain surgery. No Ph.D. is required for this work. You have to learn to read, yes. But one thing much greater is required. **You have to believe Jesus** and what he said about these things. Interestingly, in my experience it is actually those who are not trained in the Bible who have a much easier time accepting their Lord's teaching here than Seminary students, Ph.Ds, and Professors of Theology. Their great learning puffs them up, and they are unable to humble themselves before the Lord of Glory.

Not so with Dr. Luke (if he is the author, or the brilliantly educated Paul if he was, etc.). Returning to **John 5**, Jesus said, **"You do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe the one whom he has sent"** (5:38). Why should they believe him? There were plenty of reasons, but the one Jesus points to here is that **"the Scriptures ... bear witness about [Him]"** (39). Searching the Scriptures for whatever suits your fancy will not result in life, only foolish pride and dark holes that cause you to hide from the Truth. But even reading the Scriptures, studying them, and

memorizing them will be of little value to you eternally, if you do not believe what Jesus said here.

Hebrews has shown you the better way. It expects that you will go to the Psalms, read them for yourself, and see that what he is saying is not taken out of context. There is no other reason why he would quote them. It would be absolutely absurd to quote them and just tell you to believe what he says because he is an Apostle. That is what cult leaders do, not Apostles. It would be just as bad to tell you that he is giving them a new meaning. That ruins the point of quoting the OT in the first place. The point of a quote is that this is what the passage means.

Therefore, do not be like the Pharisees of old, and many around today. Jesus said, “**You refuse to come to me that you may have life.**” How can you refuse a Son like this who is greater than the Angels in heaven, because he created all things, has come as a man, has died for your sins while you were his enemy, has risen from the dead, and has become the Firstborn of Preeminence over heaven and earth?