

Dr. Bruce Waltke, Psalms, Lecture 21

© 2024 Bruce Waltke and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Bruce Waltke and his teaching on the book of Psalms. This is session number 21, Liturgical Approach, Coronation Psalms, Psalm 2 and 110.

We looked at accredited, we're looking at accredited methods or approaches to interpreting the Psalms and then zeroing in and zooming in on a given Psalm and handling that in more detail.

So, we looked at Psalm 4 for the historical approach. We looked at Psalm 100 for the hymn of praise. We looked at the Grateful Psalm of Praise.

And now in liturgical. So, I thought as in the Lament Psalms, I took a clearly Messianic Psalm, one that's used in the New Testament with specific reference to Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ. To illustrate the liturgical approach, I would take two coronation Psalms.

That is the Psalms in which the king is coronated as David's son is coronated as king over Israel. Both of these Psalms are cited in the New Testament, namely Psalm 2 and Psalm 110. On page 269 of your notes, we begin with a translation of the Psalm by way of introduction.

And then we'll look at an outline of the Psalm. And then we'll see that the setting of the Psalm is Zion, presumably at the temple. First of all, the translation, why do the nations conspire in the people's plot in vain? The kings of the earth take their stand and the rulers band together against I Am and against his anointed one.

Let us break their chains and throw off their shackles. The one enthroned in heaven's laughs, the sovereign scoffs at them. Then he spoke to them in his anger and in his wrath terrified them.

But I install my king on Zion, my holy hill. I will proclaim the decree. You are my son.

Today I give you birth. Ask me and I will give the nations your inheritance and the ends of the earth, your possession. Break them with the rod of iron, like a potter's vessel, and dash them to pieces.

Therefore, kings be wise, be warned rulers of the earth. Serve I Am with fear and celebrate his rule with trembling. Kiss his son lest he become angry and you be destroyed in your way.

For his wrath will soon flare up. How blessed and how rewarded are all who take refuge in him. The psalm of 12 verses falls into four stanzas with three verses in each stanza.

The stanzas are marked off by different speakers. In the first stanza, we hear the nations speaking. We hear them say in verse three, let us break us, that is the Lord and his anointed king.

Let us break their chains and throw off their fetters. Then we're transported from the earthly courts of the pagan kings, throwing off God's rule. We are then in verses four through six, lifted into the heavenly court.

We see the one enthroned in heavens and we hear him speak in verse six, but I stall my king on Zion, my holy hill. In the next three verses, verses seven through nine, presumably the king is speaking because he's proclaiming a stipulation of the Davidic covenant in which God says to him, you are my son. And so, the one speaking is the son of God and that is the Christ.

He recites what God told him. In the last stanza, the psalmist is speaking and he's addressing the kings of the earth directly. So, we have this outline of the hostile kings speak and we're taken into their own royal palace.

They resolve to throw off the rule of I Am and his king. In the second stanza, four through six, I Am himself speaks and he resolves to install his king on Mount Zion. The third stanza, the king speaks and he resolves to recite the decree, granting him dominion over the earth.

And finally, the psalmist speaks. He steps on the stage itself and he admonishes the hostile kings to submit to I Am and his king. I think it's quite clear that the setting of the psalm is a coronation liturgy because it says in verse six, I install my king on Zion, my holy hill.

And then he says, the king says, I will proclaim the decree, which says, you are my son. Today I give you birth. Today is presumably the day of his coronation in which he becomes, as it were, by adoption, the king, the son of God, as he's installed as king on Zion, God's holy hill.

Another setting is the setting within the book itself, using the German kind of language that's in the book, this is part of the introduction to the Psalter. Psalms one and two are an introduction. They have no superscript.

They have no subscript there and they're related. They have many catchwords that relate to them. So, for example, Psalm one begins, blessed is the man or how rewarded is the man or the person rather who adheres to God's law.

And you notice in verse 12, I've put it into italics, how rewarded, how blessed are all who take refuge in him. So, the Psalm one begins with the word blessed and Psalm two ends with that word blessed. Notice also the verb, *hagah*, which means to meditate.

And it's translated on one face, the pious person is meditating on God's word. By contrast, the kings in verse one of chapter two, are meditating, translated plot, they are meditating on overthrowing God's rule. Both employ the term to mock.

But in verse one is the ungodly who are mocking the righteous. In Psalm 2, it is God who is mocking the wicked. The metaphor of way and perish is used in both Psalms.

So, we have in Psalm 1 that the way of the wicked will perish. And we have in Psalm 2 in 12b, you will be, lest he become angry and you be destroyed in your way, same language. So, the editor probably used these two Psalms as a way of introducing the book to prepare those who meditate on his anthology of petitions and praises and of destruction to interpret the Psalm, both with respect to the king and to themselves as individuals within his kingdom.

So, there is a double level to the way we read the Psalms. They are applicable to the king and they are applicable to us as individuals in our relationship to the king. Finally, the setting within the canon itself that the Psalm has its fulfillment in Christ and his coronation when he ascended into heaven and he sat down at God's right hand.

That is referring beyond the historical king is clear in Psalm two, because this king rules through the ends of the earth. David at his best ruled from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates. But the Psalms extend that dominion to the ends of the earth.

And the New Testament identifies this Psalm with Jesus. In fact, as the kings rejected the historical king, when Peter and John healed the lame man at the temple, he goes away rejoicing and it's done at the gate, beautiful, where Christ should have been received. The leadership rejects Peter and John and the church again.

And so, they say, quote the Psalm, you spoke by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of your servant, our father, David. Why do the nations rage in the people's plot and vain? The kings of the earth rise up and the rulers band together against the Lord and against his anointed one. And then they comment and here's the irony that the religious rulers are lumped together with Pilate, with Rome, with the peoples of the earth.

Because originally why do the nations, the Goyim, they're not Israel, and the Leamim, the peoples are not Israel, but they're all lumped together because they're part of the conspiracy against Christ and his church. Indeed, Herod and Pontius Pilate, together with the Gentiles and the people of Israel in the city conspire against your holy servant, Jesus, whom you anointed. They did what your power and will have decided beforehand should happen.

And so, they recognize that this was all under divine sovereignty, this rejection of Christ and of his apostles and of his church. An early Protestant theologian, Amiot, said that we have to keep our left eye on the historical king and our right eye on the antitype of Jesus Christ. So, we must keep our left eye on the historical king and our right eye on the eternal Christ.

And so, when we interpret the Psalms, we're always looking at this history and this typology pointing forward to it. We will apply this again and again of how does it speak of Christ and his church? Because Jesus said the Psalms speak of him. Well, let's exposit the Psalm, and keep the translation in hand.

And let's begin with the first stanza, which is about the hostile kings throw off I Am's rule. In verse one, we're told immediately by the Psalms, their plot to throw off the rule will not succeed. In verse two, he informs us that the rebellion is universal.

It's worldwide. And the third is their motivation for throwing off his rule. First of all, their plot will not succeed.

And he expresses his amazement and indignation at their devising a plot that's doomed to failure because it's against God himself, the eternal one, and the king he has installed. So, when he says, why do the nations rage? He's not asking the real questions. He's not expecting to come back and say, well, here's the reason 1, 2, 3, 4. It's purely rhetorical.

He's expressing his amazement. Why in the world would they do such a thing as that? But this is the law of liberty. This is the way of life and it cannot succeed.

Nevertheless, the world insists on it. The nations and the peoples originally referred to the Gentiles. Probably the Psalm, what happened in the ancient Near East, when you got a new king, then the nations would test the new king and try to overthrow his rule.

So, David is anticipating the coronation of his successors. He anticipates that in each time the nations are going to test his rule and his power and refuse to submit to his dominion of salvation. So, they conspire and they plot, which means they're getting together.

They're setting up the first scene. Then I take us to be in a pagan court. They are determined to kill God and kill his king.

Just as I believe the people who have as their agenda, one world government and a secular state, a secular global government, a reestablishment of Babel, if you please, and they'll do it by the suppression of religions, suppression of conscience, suppression of speech. It's where I see, mechanically, our administration taking us to a one world government, which will take away all liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, liberty of religion, and we'll call freedom of speech, hate speech, anything that opposes their ideology. They want to get rid of God and they want to get rid of the church because the church represents freedom, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom to testify.

So, it's a reestablishment of Rome's tyranny. That's where I see the world going, be candid with you, toward the one world government. Historically, we know that this happened and we have the El Amar, El Amarna correspondence.

This is El Amarna a site in Egypt during the reign of Tughannamun, actually the 1300, about 1300 BC, in which we hear the petty kings. We have their correspondence in which the petty kings are revolting against the king of Egypt. So it offers a graphic description of the plottings and intrigues of the petty kings of Syria, Palestine against the Egyptian Susan and against one another.

But he says, it's in vain. It will not succeed. So, we have this tension.

God allows this evil to demonstrate who he is and his victory over evil. Then he speaks about their universal rebellion. He speaks about the kings and the rulers of the earth, verse two, the kings of the earth and their rulers, and they are representative of their people.

So, it's all the kings of the earth. They're said to be of the earth because that's in contrast to God who was in heaven. They take their stand in battle and they band together for they plot how to put their plan into action.

Their rebellion is against I Am, the God of covenants, the God of the Ten Commandments. I'm sure to a lesser extent is to rid America of the Ten Commandments and set up a secular state independent of God. I believe they're setting us up for the judgment that is to come.

I think most Christians discern what's going on in our country. And they're rebelling against I Am. And we said, that's God's name, that he is the eternal one who makes himself known in history.

He reveals himself by his victory over evil and through revelation. When it says against his anointed one, that's a figure of speech known as metonymy, a metonymy of adjunct. And the anointed one in the Psalms is the king.

There were three sacred persons in the Old Testament that were anointed. There was the king, there was the priest, and there was the prophet or the prophet, of course, anointed by the Spirit. But anointed in the Psalms refers to the king.

And there are several ideas involved in that anointing. The prophet would designate him. You know, with a clay jar or with a ram's horn.

Let's take the ram's horn. The ram's horn would have a large end that was attached to the head at the top. Then the point would be hollowed out so that it would fill the ram's horn with scented oil.

Then he would come to the king designate and he would allow that scented oil to cover the king from head to his feet. He did the same for the priest. Now that anointing, that covering with oil, that was the king's cachet, the word cachet, I'm using the sense of the seal of authority.

That was what set him apart. Just like the president has the president's seal if you have the president's seal, it speaks with authority. And so it is the king's cachet.

It is the king's validation. It is the king's legitimization that he is the king because a prophet has anointed him. If you don't have prophetic anointing, you're not a legitimate king.

So in the case when Adonijah set himself up as the king, even though he had Joab, the great general, like Moshe Dayan of his era, but the greatest general was Joab. He also had Abiathar who went with David with all the hardships of David in the wilderness. They all supported Adonijah, but he lacked one thing.

He didn't have the prophetic designation. Solomon had Nathan, the prophet's designation. So, he was validated as the king.

If you read the mind of prophets when it's during the dual monarchy, they will cite the Northern and the Southern kings, but they will not recite the kings who set themselves up on the throne, like a Pekiah or a Pekah or a Hoshea. They set themselves up with no authentic validation and the prophets will not recognize them. Hence, they don't cite them at all.

They are pretenders to the throne. So, the king has the anointing that sets him apart. In that anointing, he becomes God's property.

So, everything in the temple is anointed, all the pieces of furniture, the priest was anointed. By the anointing, it becomes God's property. Therefore, God's wrath is incurred when you touch his property, you defile his holiness, his sanctity.

That is, for example, why David couldn't kill Saul because he said, touch not God's anointed. By the anointing under Samuel, Saul had become God's property and David couldn't touch his property. And God had to dispose of his property in his own way.

That's what David recognized. He either will be killed in battle or God will rid himself in some other way because he knew God had also anointed him. So, we have this ambiguous situation where God anointed two kings.

It was a means of testing David, whether he would walk by faith and trust God to defeat Saul and not take matters into his own hands. But anyway, the anointing set the king apart. I think that's why Saul said he was the chief of sinners because he kept the law.

And yet he says, I'm chief of sinners. I think the reason is that he tried to kill God. He realized he touched God's anointed Christ.

I think that he was like, he took his fist into heaven and punched Christ right in the nose. And he says, I'm chief of sinners because I rejected Christ. I persecuted his body.

I persecuted his church. Well, these are, and then the third idea of the anointing is that he now is empowered to do the works of the king. It was a picture of the Spirit of God coming upon the king.

So far as we carry that over, I think you could see Christ has the cachet of John the Baptist, that all Israel knew that John the Baptist was of God. And Jesus says to his rejecters, why didn't you believe John? All the people knew a true prophet was in their midst. And he says, I tell, I say, John 5, this is one of the evidences for us being the Christ.

He says, not that I needed that, but I tell you that for your sake, you could see that John was the prophet. And he anointed me and said, he's not worthy to unlatch the latch of Sandal and so forth. And he was God's property.

He set himself apart to God. And the fact of the matter is until he handed over his life, no one could really touch him as we noted elsewhere. Well, that's the, and he's the anointed one.

He had the power of God. And similarly, we are anointed by the Holy Spirit. We're set apart, the presence of God in our lives that we live by God's grace, sanctified lives.

It's that Spirit of God that's in us that is our cachet, that we are the children of God. The motivation is to throw off God's rule. And whereas the pious and the saint, the ghosts that love God and fear God, to them, it is their delight.

And they meditate in God's law, day and night. For the unbeliever, it's galling bondage. It's restraining his liberty.

And so we have that the, we have the first stanza of this plot. It's universal and they don't want to come under the rule of Christ. They view it as a galling bondage of ropes and bonds, whether it's like a yoke on the neck, or I give you a picture here of people being carried into captivity.

In this particular case, the victor has punched holes in the tongues of their victims and put ropes through them to pull them by the tongue and totally control them. We turn to the second stanza and I Am installs his king on Zion, his holy hill. Here in verse 4, we learn that God laughs at the situation.

We'll have to comment on that. And when we talk about schadenfreude, God laughs. In verse 5, God is angry.

And in verse 6, he's resolved to set his king on his throne. Beginning then with verse 4, the one enthroned in heavens laughs at them. The sovereign scoffs at them.

I note that the poet frames the second stanza by beginning with, I am sitting enthroned in the heavens and ending with the anointed king on my holy hill. The upper frame speaks of his universal transcendence over all the earth and the lower frame of his imminent presence through his charismatic king, who extends his kingdom over all the earth. So, he who sits enthroned is again, an autonomy for the sovereign who is transcendent in contrast to the earthlings.

And he laughs. And I think there are two ideas to this. One idea, and I put the second, the first idea of laughter, it's the laughter of justice.

It's the laughter of righteousness, of the triumph of justice over tyranny, the laughter of righteousness over wickedness, the laughter that the tyrant is defeated and the oppressed are delivered. It's used in two other times when we're told that God laughs. This is in Psalm 37.12. There they are bellowing with their mouths with sharp words on their lips, but who do they think will know?

Psalm 37 is the wicked plot against the righteous and gnash their teeth at them. But I am who laughs at the wicked for he sees their day is coming. So he laughs at the destruction of the wicked who plot against the righteous.

So, it's the laughter of the victory over injustice and tyranny of righteousness over wickedness. And then looking at Psalm 59, there they are bellowing with their teeth, mouths with sharp swords on their lips for who they think will hear us. That is, they are agodly, ungodly, basically atheistic, but you laugh at them.

I am. You hold all nations in division. I think that involved in laughter, there's almost a comic aspect to it.

So, in my mind, it's sort of, I picture Gulliver and Gulliver's travels when he lands on the island of Lilliput. It's before daybreak, that his ship has fallen apart. He's in the sea, but he's close to the island of Lilliput.

He makes his way up onto the beach and on a grassy knoll, he falls into a deep sleep. He awakens at about 10 in the morning and he hears a knocking he looks down at himself and he sees a ladder coming up his side. His long hair is pegged into the ground.

His arms are outstretched with little strings around each finger and they're all pegged down. Then he sees this ladder and he hears this knocking and here comes the Lilliputians and they're led by their king. The Lilliputians are the size of his little finger and the king is one fingernail bigger.

And so, this king of the Lilliputians is telling Gulliver what to do. And Gulliver says, come on, you could just smash them like that and that would be the end of the story, but he doesn't do it. He plays along with the game.

So, in a sense, God is allowing this. There's almost a comic aspect to it in order that we might know that he triumphs over evil, righteousness, and justice will prevail and will not be defeated. But it does raise a question about what the German word is Schadenfreude.

It's very offensive that we should laugh at the destruction of other people. The Bible tells us not to gloat over the destruction of other people. So, I thought we ought to discuss a little bit about the Schadenfreude in German means joy at damage, joy at seeing other people hurt.

So, Christian and non-Christian sensibilities commonly regard Israel's pleasure derived from the misfortune of others, what the Germans call Schadenfreude, damaged joy, as expressed in Israel's Song of the Sea and in David's Psalms as an unworthy emotion. In 1852, Archbishop Trench of Dublin, in his study of words wrote, what a fearful thing it is that any language should have a word expressive of the pleasure, which men feel at the calamity of others. So, people today have trouble with Schadenfreude, that God would take pleasure at the damage of others.

Even Schopenhauer, a 19th-century German philosopher and atheist found it too dreadful to contemplate. Friedrich Nietzsche argued that malicious pleasure is illegitimate and makes one guilty because pleasure is derived from doing nothing. Schadenfreude is a dangerous emotion, I would say, when injustice is celebrated, but not when justice is served.

Schadenfreude is a dangerous emotion when injustice is celebrated, but not when justice is served. As in the case of Israel's Song and in Woman Wisdom's Sermon at the City Gate in Proverbs 1.20, where we're told she laughed at the destruction of the fools. John Portman, a professor of religious studies at the University of Virginia in his recent book, *When Bad Things Happen to Others*, argued that justice is a virtue.

So is the feeling of pleasure when we see lawbreakers brought low. In other words, if justice is a virtue, then joy at the triumph of justice is totally appropriate and a virtue. It's all to the good that we do because his pleasure reflects our reverence for the law.

Schadenfreude is a corollary of justice. So, it's because God is just that he rejoices when the wicked are destroyed. So, we've been arguing that Schadenfreude, when it's in connection with the triumph of justice, is a virtue.

But now we look at Christ, and how does he respond to wickedness? I do not find in Christ he's ever laughing at the destruction of the wicked. I think the reason is that in his first advent, it was not the time for justice. This is well known the way he handles his inaugural address that he's fulfilling Isaiah's prophecy from Isaiah 61, where Isaiah says, the spirit of the sovereign Lord is on me because the Lord has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor.

He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from the darkness for the prisoners to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor and the day of vengeance of our God. This is how Jesus launches his ministry in Nazareth by reciting this prophecy and saying it's fulfilled in him. This is found in Luke chapter four, beginning with verse 16.

He went to Nazareth where he had been brought up. On the Sabbath day, he went into the synagogue as was his custom. He stood up to read and the scroll of Isaiah was handed to him.

On rolling it, he found the place where it is written, the spirit of the Lord is on me because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the appointed free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor. So, our Lord sees himself as the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy.

But what's of interest is what he doesn't read because in Isaiah, it says, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor and the day of vengeance of our God. But what did Jesus do? He read the year of our Lord's favor. Then he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant, and sat down.

So, this was not the day of vengeance. This is the day of grace. And so I think that is the reason that you don't get this note in Jesus' preaching because this is the year of God's favor.

This is the time of God's favor. This is the time of grace and salvation, the time of vengeance and death, and the laughter of justice is still future. Is it kind of like you have in John where Jesus says, I didn't come to judge, but to save? I think that's very good enough.

Very, very similar to that. And also John, is that in John three? No, in John three. Yeah.

That's where that's found. He makes that statement. I think it's very much that, and this is the year, this is the time of salvation.

This is the time of grace. But there is a time of judgment. He does say later on, you know, I'm not going to judge you.

My words will, but that's the idea is that's a different time. That's different. You get it again in John six, I believe.

It's the same idea. I don't think it's appropriate for the church today to laugh when the wicked are defeated. Let me say it sounds strange, but Jesus, to me, would be contradicted to the Sermon on the Mount.

You've heard that it was said, love your neighbor and hate your enemy. But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. I give this illustration where this year, finally Canterbury took a stand against homosexuality and silenced the Episcopal church.

They can no longer really vote or participate in the Anglican communion. And I give the quote to that. So, one level, I do rejoice in the triumph, but I don't rejoice in the triumph over those evil bishops.

My heart wants to be, I want to pray for their salvation. I really believe it's true. I believe they don't know what they're doing.

Just like those who put Jesus on the cross. I think those who are favoring same-sex marriage, they really don't know what they're doing. They're destroying the home.

They think they're doing good and they're doing evil. And I want to pray for their salvation. I don't want to rejoice when they are defeated.

That's not my natural response. My natural response is to engage in schadenfreude, but I don't think it's appropriate for me as a Christian is what I'm saying. So, God laughs at them and God becomes angry at them.

And here's where Lewis is very helpful. In my judgment, God's anger against sin is a very neglected doctrine in the church. We speak only of God's love, but we do not speak of God's wrath.

God's wrath against sin is very real. Here I find Lewis very helpful. He says these expressions of anger are lacking in pagan literature because Israel had a firmer grasp on right and wrong.

They're the absence of anger, especially that sort of anger, which we call indignation can, in my opinion, be a most alarming symptom, the absence of anger against sin. I see an absence of anger in our society. It's due, I think, to relativity, the loss of absolutes.

No one's sure about what's right and what's wrong. We're becoming like Sodom and Gomorrah and the result is without God, without standards, you no longer have absolutes of right and wrong. Therefore, you're no longer morally indignant because you have no firm grasp on what's right and wrong.

I think it's an alarming symptom of our age. I think Lewis is right on. He says, if the Jews, and I don't refer to Old Testament saints as Jews, I think that's an anachronism.

The Jew today is one who rejects Jesus as we define it. But the Old Testament saints look forward to his day. So, I do not refer to them as Jews.

Anyway, if they curse more bitterly than the pagans, this was, I think, at least in part, because they took right and wrong more seriously. For if we look at their railings, we find they are usually angry, not simply because these things have been done to them, but because they are manifestly wrong or hateful to God as well as to the victim. The thought of the righteous Lord who surely must hate such doings as much as they do, who surely, therefore, must, but how terribly he delays, judges, or avenges is always there, if only in the background.

And so, God becomes angry. He becomes angry when they change his glorious person into a grass-eating, defecating bull of all things. And they worship it.

Incredible. And God is angry, rightly so. In the case of Christ, I do not find that it's ever said Jesus is angry in so many words, but it seems to me he expressed his anger when he raised Lazarus from the dead.

Bill, maybe you can help me here. But the Greek word *embrima ovo mai*, I think originally meant snorted. When he's going to raise Lazarus, it says, Jesus, I think it's equivalent to sternly rejecting what's about to happen in this situation.

I think he's angered by this situation that when he raises Lazarus from the dead, right under the noses of Jerusalem and the high priests and the leadership, he knows it's going to be his death. And Thomas said, let's go with him to death. And because he's going to raise a man from the dead, they're going to kill him for it.

And I think that's where Jesus is responding to that. I think the only actual time it says Jesus was mad and there was a textual problem is when the disciples couldn't exercise the demon out of the little boy. And there's a chance that if he was angry, he was angry at sin and how sin had destroyed his good creation.

That's the only time that *orginzo* has actually used of Jesus. So, I mean, we think of Jesus as an angry person, like the temple cleansing, but it doesn't say it. But he was deeply, deeply moved, which is the snorting.

That's how that's translated. But I think the deeply moved is the moval of anger. It's deeply moved.

It doesn't use those words in so many ways, but the word is used as I read the word. I think it's the expression of anger and displeasure. Anyway, I also think the cleansing of the temple when he makes whips out of the cords and he drives the money changers and the cattle out of the temple.

And he scatters the coins and he overthrows the table. That's pretty violent action, rejection. I would say it's violent in that it's zealous.

It's not violent in that it's anger. Zeal for my father's house is consuming. Yeah.

It's motivated by the zeal for his father's house. Anyway, it's an interesting discussion. I think a lot of people want to make Jesus mad as a validation for their own anger.

I'm not saying to you, of course, but it's just the safe way to say it is it's remarkable how rarely the Bible says Jesus was angry. And as you say, these expressions are against wickedness. Yeah.

Yeah. Not against the people. Yeah.

So far as the church is concerned, Paul says, be angry and sin not. So, I think that that be angry is the place, there is a place for moral indignation, but I don't think it's limited to that. I think it can be angry because your spouse doesn't squeeze toothpaste right.

Or something like that. You're just angry at a situation. You're frustrated by a situation.

And so, I think there's a place, but sin is not when you lose control. You lose, you become rash in the midst of its way. I wouldn't understand it.

Well, I would say looking at a situation where a girl is molested, if it doesn't respond in anger, there's something wrong with you because anger is that tool that God gave us to deal with danger. I like that. I think that's right.

And so I think there is a place for moral indignation at the least. Sin not, I make sure that nobody pays back wrong for wrong, but always strive to do what is good for each other, for everyone else. Rejoice always, pray continually, and give thanks in all things.

So, in other words, sin does not mean you wouldn't still be rejoicing in the Lord. That's going to qualify anger to a great extent. So, it's sinful not to be joyful, not to be thankful.

And it would be sinful to return evil with evil. Well, so now the third thing God does that we had God, it's comic laugh, it's the laugh of justice and triumph. It's his moral indignation, which is very valid and needed.

Thirdly, he installs the king on Zion. The I in the Hebrew text is highly emphatic. I install, well, by those words, he's installing the king, just like this is what we call a speech act theory that the minister says, I pronounce you man and wife and those words affect it.

And so, his word, I install my king in effect affects it as a marriage pronouncement, as I would understand it. And Zion, well, we don't really know what the word Zion means, but it refers to the hill between the Tyropean Valley on the west and the Kidron Valley on the east of the city of Jerusalem. In most instances, it refers to the temple mount where the Dome of the Rock now sits.

It connotes invincibility. The name and use before David's conquest was the stronghold of Zion. And so Zion connotes invincibility that it can't be defeated.

And it's called holy because it's where God dwells it's set apart. As I think it's Levinson says, Zion is in history, but it's also apart from history. It transcends history.

It's eternal and holy. The installation of Christ on Zion occurred, I think, at his ascension. I do not find in the New Testament that he's going to return and be installed on earth again as king.

I just can't find that in the New Testament. He says in John chapter 16 and verse 13, when he, the spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into Panta, all the truth. He will not speak on his own.

He will speak only what he hears and he will tell you what is yet to come. There is no reference in the New Testament that Christ is returning to earth to be installed king at Mount Zion or in Jerusalem. The whole theory, in my judgment, is made of whole cloth.

It just isn't there. And if the spirit is to guide us into all truth, for me to establish some notion that Jesus is going to return to earth and set up an earthly kingdom is any description as I understand it. Again, there is no reference in the New Testament to Israel being regathered as a political entity after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD.

There's just no reference to it. Now, I think the New Testament teaches Israel, all Israel will be saved. And I think that's at the end of history in Romans 11, but there's nothing in the New Testament about Jesus returning to earth, building a third temple.

There's smoke here that you can say, maybe it's alluding to that, but no clear revelation. Then secondly, John 4 says that the earthly is done away. We're now in the spirit.

The Samaritan woman put a finger right on the issue between the Jews and the Samaritans. The issue was where do you worship? Do you worship on Mount Jerusalem or do you worship on Mount Gerizim? The rabbi said, if the Samaritans would give up Gerizim and worship at Jerusalem, we could be brothers together. This was the dividing line between them.

The 10th commandment in the Samaritan Pentateuch is a picking up material from the building of an altar on Ebel and Deuteronomy 27 and so forth. The 10th commandment is essentially you shall worship on Mount Gerizim. And she picks up right on that issue.

Sir, the woman said, I could see you are a prophet. Our ancestors worshipped on this mountain, that Mount Gerizim in Samaria, present-day Nablus. But you Jews claim that the place where we must worship is in Jerusalem.

Woman, Jesus replied, believe me, a time is coming when you will worship the Father, neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem. You Samaritans worship what you do not know. We worship what we do know for salvation is from the Jews.

Yet a time is coming and now has now come when the true worshipers will worship the Father in the Spirit and in truth. For they are the kind of worshipers the Father seeks, God is Spirit and his worshipers must worship him in Spirit and in truth. So, we're in an age of the Spirit.

No longer the cultus is done away for all practical purposes. Furthermore, Jesus ascended into heaven and we're told it's at that time he sat down at the right hand of God. Exalted to the right hand of God, says Peter in the first sermon, he has received from the Father, the promised Holy Spirit has poured out what you now see in here.

But David did not ascend to heaven. Yet he said the Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool of your feet. Therefore, let all Israel be assured of this, that God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ.

And as I understand the New Testament, it's from heaven that Christ is now building his church. And we come to Mount Zion, which is the heavenly Jerusalem. And we do it in Spirit, says the writer of Hebrews, but you have come to Mount Zion, to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.

You've come to thousands upon thousands of angels in joyful assembly, to the church of the firstborn, whose names are written in heaven. You have come to God, the judge of all, to the spirits of the righteous men made perfect, to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks a better word than the blood of Abel. For the blood of Abel cried out for vengeance, but the blood of Jesus cried out for forgiveness.

But we have come to Mount Zion and that is the heavenly Jerusalem. So therefore, when I install my King, best I can tell, it finds its fulfillment when Christ descended into heaven and sat down at God's right hand. And from there he rules, has authority over all the nations, and builds his church.

In the third stanza, the King recites the decree, giving him the right to rule the earth. In verse seven, we have his relationship with God. In verse eight, his relationship to the earth.

And in verse nine, his relationship to the nations. First of all, his relationship to God, he's a son. Historically, when the one is speaking, I will declare the decree.

I Am said to myself, it must be the King and finds its fulfillment in Christ. And when he says, I will recite it, that's a cohortative, a resolve. I'm resolved to it because by reciting that decree and owning that he's God's King, he's accepting rejection and he's risking his life because he's willing to be the King and he doesn't run from it.

And he resolves to recite the decree. It took tremendous faith, knowing that the nations were going to, and Jesus would know they were going to put him to death. And yet he recited the decree.

I'm the son of God. It didn't shirk it. And today, I think with churches heading into persecution, I think it's very necessary that we recite the decree that as many as believe in him have the right to be called the sons of God.

He's the decree, it's the stipulation. Decree means it refers to a stipulation of a covenant. And the stipulation of the covenant is the Davidic covenant.

And God had said to David, when your days are over and you rest with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring, namely Solomon, in this case, to succeed you, your own flesh and blood. And I will establish his kingdom. He is the one who will build a house for my name.

And I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he will be my son. When he does wrong, I will punish him with the rod wielded by men, with floggings inflicted by human hands.

And that decree was not only for Solomon who became on his coronation, the son of God in that sense, but it's a coronation liturgy for all of Israel's kings. In the case of the king, we can think of him as the adopted son of God. Jesus is more than the adopted son, but the king was adopted as the son of, became the son of God.

I take it by adoption. He was not biologically begotten by God. He had a natural biological origin.

So therefore, he must be a son, not by a beginning, but by an adoption. Israel is called the son of God. It wasn't that they had divine blood in them.

It's that God adopted them or made them part of his family. He made Israel his family. He can be referred to as their father.

In another metaphor, he can be their husband. David, whose lineage is well-known, addressed God as Father. I think the illustration of it is the case of Boaz that Ruth begot physically.

She gave Boaz to Naomi, her mother-in-law. We're told that Boaz was made the son of Naomi and it would be by adoption. But Naomi became the mother and Boaz became the son of Naomi to take care of her in her old age.

So that's how I understand that David, the king is the son of God. Christ is the son of God in four ways. Three are the most important.

The first one, Luke says that he traces his lineage back to Adam and says, the son of God, which wouldn't necessarily distinguish him. But he's the son of God because he's the son of David. Every king of David's line is by adoption, the son of God.

But God rejected them, he disciplined them, and removed them. But Christ was the perfect obedient son of God and God owns him as a son. But he's a son of God by David.

I understand that to be what is meant in Psalm 2, today I have become your father. Today I begot you. I think that's his coronation day because the son of David, he is now coronated as the king and as such becomes the son of God.

He's the son of God by the Holy Spirit in Luke's theology. We all know the Christmas story that the angel said that the Holy Spirit would come upon her and he's begotten by the Spirit. So, he's the son of God as a son of David.

He's the son of God because he's begotten by God's Holy Spirit. He's the son of God by his eternal nature. He was always with God.

This is John's theology. This is the high Christology of John that this word was with God in the beginning and always was God. On his ascension, God restored to him the glory he had before he humbled himself.

He came into the world. And so, therefore, Christ is the son of God as the son of David. I frankly think that since Nathanael said, you are the Christ, the son of God.

And he said that before Peter confessed that you are the Christ, the son of God at Caesarea Philippi. This is right at the beginning of Jesus' ministry. I think Nathanael was under the fig tree, the symbol of Israel.

I think he was praying for the kingdom of God. And he recognizes that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God. But in Johannine theology, it's fleshed out to its fullest meaning.

I don't think Nathanael knew all that he was saying, but I think in light of John's theology, he was saying something more than he understood that he's the eternal son of God. You know, Bruce, on the adoption business, when Jesus was on the cross and he said, behold your son to Mary and to John, that's legal adoption language. So, it's the same kind of thing where it's very similar.

Yeah, very similar. The King's relationship to the earth is an inheritance from the creator of the earth, who has the right to give what he created to whomever he will. And so, the creator of the entire earth says, it's your inheritance to this King.

So, he says to the son, ask. And I say although a son by covenantal promise and an heir of the earth by patrimony, the King must ask and depend by faith on God to fulfill the promise. And so, God says, Jesus says, I have all authority, but we must ask, we must pray.

We must wrestle in prayer in order to fulfill the great commission. So he's in prayer and he's praying to God who owns the earth by creating it. And then he says, and I will give it.

I think that's the right translation. It could be translated that I might give it. The nations, of course, are those who have been in rebellion against them.

And the inheritance is an estate or property inherited from one's father without payment of a purchase price. And the ends of the earth is beyond the limits of the Abrahamic covenant. This is the close of Psalm 72 as Solomon is anticipating his future King and his universal rule in time and space.

May he, the merciful and just King that's coming rule from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth. May the desert tribes bow before him and his enemies lick the dust. May the kings of Tarshish and of distant shores bring tribute to him.

May the kings of Sheba and Seba present him in presence. May all kings bow down to him and all the nations serve him. Psalm 72, finds its fulfillment in Christ.

And he saw Satan fall from heaven who lost his ascendancy prior to that. God allowed him in the former evil age to rule. But now Jesus has conquered him in this age.

He has bound him in other languages. And in Galilee, as Matthew closes the Christ's ministry, he said, all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me. Therefore, go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit and teaching them to obey everything I've commanded you.

And surely, I'm with you always to the end of the age. As far as the church is concerned, we are co-heirs together with Christ. And so that's what Paul says, for those who are led by the Spirit of God are the children of God.

The Spirit you received does not make you slaves so that you live in fear again. Rather, the Spirit you received brought about your adoption to sonship. And by him, we cry, Abba, Father.

The Spirit himself testifies with our spirit that we are God's children. Now, if we are children, then we are heirs, heirs of God, and co-heirs with Christ. If indeed we share in his sufferings in order that we may also share in his glory.

And so every day in our liturgy, Elaine and I pray, we say, Lord Jesus Christ, you stretched out your arms of love on the hardwood of the cross to bring everyone within reach of your saving embrace. So, clothe us in your Spirit that we reaching forth our hands in love may bring those who do not know you to the knowledge and love of you for the honor of your name. Finally, the King's relationship to the earth is that he's going to rule and he's going to break them at his second coming, as it turns out, with a rod of iron.

There's a textual problem here about the word break. The Hebrew word is vocalized, Terroim. And I give you the consonants of T-R in Hebrew, got an iron, and then you get an M, Terroim.

And the issue is, does it come from the root raah, which means to break? Or does it come from the root raah, which means to shepherd? And so that's a textual problem that you have here. It's the consonants are the same. The issue is how do you vocalize it? And I think break is the original meaning because for one thing, as you have an oxymoron, you're going to break them with the rod.

You're going to shepherd them with an iron rod and it's possible. It doesn't seem to go very well shepherding. The rod was there to protect the sheep.

You don't shepherd sheep with a rod. So it doesn't work for me. And the parallel is that you will smash them.

The better parallel to me is break. And the word raah, to break is an Aramaic word, which is much more difficult. But you have another Aramaic when it says kiss the sun, the Hebrew word for sun is bar like Barabbas.

And it's an Aramaic word. So, all the ed indicates to me is that it originally meant to break with a rod of iron and it's going to smash them. But this is at a second advent when it's going to come.

And the church I put in there, the church, this was on page 281. I had in mind the movie War Room where the wife saved a home and a marriage through prayer but she would not allow the devil to have the victory in her house. I think it's a good illustration of how we conquer through prayer.

The psalmist warns the rulers to submit. First of all, they're submitted to their relationship with the psalmist, then the relationship with I Am, and finally the relationship with the king. The relationship to the psalmist is to be wise.

Here's the logic. I'm telling you; it cannot succeed. God has set up his king.

This king is the heir of the earth and he's going to shatter you. Therefore, in light of those three stanzas, get smart and submit to his rule. There's a logic of it.

His relationship to I Am is to serve I Am. This is the word for worship. I discuss the word I Am.

It means fundamentally to be in subjection to or in subordinate position to I Am as master. And I go on to say that because we're mortals, we serve some master. We either serve sin and death and Satan, or we serve God and Christ.

So, when we step out from under God's rule, we come under our own passions and we come under satanic rule because that's who we are as mortals. We're just mortals. That's what I'm trying to develop here.

It refers to a whole way of life. This is why Joshua says, as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord, total submission to the God of Israel's covenants. And that's what the relationship should be.

And so far as the Son is concerned, they are to worship the Son. To kiss the Son means to worship him. On page 282, I give a picture of Jehu kissing the ground of the Assyrian king.

And you can see the picture there. And if you don't, he says, it will be to perish, but blessed are all who take refuge in him. That God's final word is salvation and that's his desire.

Okay. So that's the coronation, one of the great coronation liturgy.

This is Dr. Bruce Waltke and his teaching on the book of Psalms. This is session number 21, Liturgical Approach, Coronation Psalms, Psalms 2 and 110.