

Reading Psalms 2 and 110 with the Grain of Scripture: A Proposal for Reading the Psalter Canonically

DAVID SCHROCK

David Schrock is Pastor of Preaching and Theology at Occoquan Bible Church, Woodbridge, Virginia, and Professor of Systematic Theology at Indianapolis Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Indiana. He earned his PhD in Systematic Theology from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. Dr. Schrock has written for *Credo Magazine*, *9Marks Journal*, *Desiring God*, *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*, *Southeastern Theological Review*, *Criswell Theological Review*, and is the author of two books, *Royal Priesthood and the Glory of God* (Crossway, 2022) and *Brothers, We are Not Plagiarists* (Founders, 2022).

In this essay, I will show the internal logic behind Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 and why many New Testament (NT) authors read them together. It is my contention that their connection is not based upon some later collection of verses, nor is it based upon a prosopological voice speaking in the text. Rather, there exists in the Psalter itself a literary and covenantal connection between Psalm 2 and Psalm 110. The NT, especially Hebrews, recognizes this fact and reinforces the point that a canonical reading of the Psalms is not forced upon the text, but arises from reading along the grain of Scripture.

Conversely, attempts to support doctrinal positions by reading select verses (e.g., Pss 2:7; 40:6-8; 45:6-7; 110:1, 4) in isolation from their native contexts does damage to the unity and clarity of Scripture. Even more, such reading,

as advocated by Matthew Bates, Craig Carter, and others, is unnecessary when we see how the Psalms can be read in context.

As I outlined in my first essay, prosopological exegesis (PE) is a growing exegetical technique that has roots in antiquity. Yet, this interpretive method also demonstrates a number of modern, postmodern, and Roman Catholic characteristics. More troubling, PE does not find its origins in the biblical text, as much as it superimposes later exegetical techniques upon the Bible. It then justifies these reading strategies by means of permitting “post-texts” to interpret the Bible, which is a clever way of saying that Tradition can inform the inspired Word.

In contradistinction, this essay will seek to show how doctrine develops in Scripture—first in the Psalter and then in the entire canon. To say it differently, in seeking to hear God speak in his inspired canon, I will let the arrangement of the Psalms lead us to see how Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 relate to another. Then, I will consider how the NT, especially Hebrews, teaches us how to read the Psalms as unified whole, with Psalm 2 and 110 serving as “type” and “antitype” respectively. Finally, I will draw connections between biblical text and doctrinal formulation.

I will not rehearse all the reasons how and why the Psalms should be read canonically. Instead, this study of Psalms 2 and 110 will assume all the points made by Brad Baugham’s essay on the canonical psalms.¹ Additionally, this essay will follow the perspective of David Mitchell, Stephen Dempster, and others who see the Psalms as unfolding an eschatological story of redemption from David to David’s greater son.²

Due to the size of this study, I will not attempt to make all the exegetical points necessary to prove my case. Rather, I hope to make the modest case that reading Psalms canonically is more faithful to the text of Scripture than PE, which jumps from individual verses to the voice of God the Father or God the Son.³ Materially, I will show how Psalm 2 relates to Psalm 110, and why readers of Psalm 2:7 should not immediately fly from David’s words (“You are my Son, today I have begotten you.”) to the eternal decree or the doctrine of eternal generation.⁴ Instead, Psalm 2:7, set in the context of the Psalms, should set us on a course to find the man who will sit at God’s right hand (Ps 110:1). And from that Christological trajectory, followed all the way to the finished work of Christ, we can begin to develop Christological and trinitarian doctrines based upon the whole canon of Scripture.⁵

To focus on the Psalms alone, we should read Psalm 2 in the context of the Psalter before making theological decisions that relate to the entire canon—not to mention eternity. Inspired by the Spirit to point us to David's greater Son, Psalm 2 is properly understood when it is related to Psalm 1, and then Psalm 3, and then every other psalm thereafter. Persuaded that the arrangement of the Psalter is both intentional and inspired, what follows is a canonical reading of Psalm 2 that finds fulfillment in Psalm 110 and thereafter in David's greater son—the Lord Jesus Christ.

HOW TO APPROACH THE PSALMS: THREE LEVELS OF CONTEXT

In his excellent work on Psalms, *Psalms in Their Context*, John Crutchfield makes the case that we must read every Psalm with respect to three horizons. He writes,

If the current theories of the composition of the Psalter are to be taken seriously and applied to Psalms study as an exegetical method, then the interpreter must seek to answer questions which surround a given psalm in a canonical context as opposed to an historical or a linguistic context. It is our contention that this kind of approach to the Book of Psalms must ask contextual questions at three levels: (1) the immediate context (i.e., surrounding psalms); (2) the context of the entire book; (3) the context of the entire Canon.⁶

Notably, Crutchfield's three horizons are similar to the three contexts of Richard Lints and others who argue that Scripture must be read in its textual, epochal, and canonical horizons.⁷ Because of its unified nature, the parts of the Bible must be read in light of the whole and vice versa. At the same time, such a unified reading also requires awareness of chronology and the eschatological unfolding of covenant history. This is true of the whole Bible and it is true of the Psalms. On this point, Crutchfield is helpful. He states,

The interpreter begins with a careful analysis of the Psalm, employing all historical, literary and linguistic tools at his or her disposal. What are the themes of the psalm? How does the psalmist treat these themes? The next step is to compare this psalm to the surrounding psalms as they appear in canonical order. This is

the first concentric circle mentioned above. How do the themes and concepts of the surrounding psalms compare to the psalm in question? Is there any development? contrast? disagreement?

The interpreter must also ask how the immediate context fits into the overall plan of the Psalter. Have the themes and subjects been treated earlier or later in the book? Is there an overall development? How does the present context further the theological purpose of the Psalter?

The most remote contextual circle is that of the entire canon of the Hebrew Bible. How do the themes and concepts compare with other canonical treatments? Is there a conscious allusion to “antecedent scripture,” i.e., to passages that appear earlier, literally speaking, in the Hebrew Bible? Other canonical contexts? How do these intertexts relate? Is there development? supersession? disagreement? How does the present context contribute to the canonical development of a given theme?⁸

Crutchfield’s threefold approach connects individual texts to the whole biblical canon—i.e., the Hebrew Bible plus the later NT. As noted in my other essay in this issue of *SBJT*, Matthew Bates and those who follow him also call for a canonical horizon. But they are equally content to read verses of personal ambiguity in non-contextual ways.⁹ In other words, when the voice of God the Father or God the Son is spotted in a particular Psalm, that verse can be directly connected to the personal conversation of the Godhead. A couple examples will have to suffice.

First, when Matthew Bates reads Psalm 2, he focuses on verse 7 (“I will tell of the decree: The LORD said to me, ‘You are my Son; today I have begotten you.’”) and the way Jesus purportedly understood this Psalm, especially when he heard it spoken at his baptism (Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22).¹⁰ From this mediation on Jesus’s self-understanding, Bates speculates on Jesus’s internal logic¹¹ and cites the Early Church (e.g., the author of Hebrews, Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, etc.) to say that “Psalm 2:7 is to be understood ... as reflecting conversation between the preexistent Christ and the Father.”¹² More expansively, Bates provides a theodramatic reading of Psalm 2:5–9 LXX, where he identifies the various persons in the text.

DAVID himself: Then he [God] will speak to them in his wrath and in his anger he will trouble them.

David in the prosopon of THE Son (providing the occasion for the direct speech in theodramatic setting “B”): But I was established as king by him upon Zion, his holy mountain, by heralding forth the decree of the Lord [God].⁵⁵

David in the prosopon of THE SON (continuing): The Lord [God] said to me... [begin REPORTED SPEECH]

REPORTED SPEECH (with *THE SON* reporting a previous dialogue between *GOD THE FATHER* and *HIMSELF* that occurred in theodramatic setting “A”): You are my Son, today I have begotten you. Ask of me and I will give you the nations as your inheritance and the ends of the earth as your possession. You will rule them with an iron scepter; as a clay pot you will shatter them.¹³

In this dramatic reading, with characters identified by Bates, we see exactly what PE is doing and why it is an interpretive method that undermines contextual reading of the Psalm. Not only does it introduce a labyrinth of voices, but it makes impossible a contextual reading of the Psalter, where neighboring psalms relate to one another and all 150 Psalms unfold a single-yet-escalating messianic message of hope.

Furthermore, by identifying conversations in the text that spring forth from behind the text—indeed, from eternity—we are watching a modern method of interpretation, even if it finds validation in ancient practices. In what follows, therefore, I will attempt to show why a literary reading that attends to multiple horizons in the text is a better approach. And, as William Dernel has noted, it is one that can even recognize various voices in the text, when they appear.¹⁴ Importantly, however, those voices are discovered by a careful reading of the text itself, not by depending on an extra-biblical methodology or a subsequent reception history.

A second example comes from Psalm 110, where Bates again points to the way Jesus uses Psalm 110 in Mark 12:35–37.¹⁵ Here is what Bates says Jesus is doing when he reads Psalm 110:1, or Psalm 109:1 LXX.

The best explanation is that Jesus, as he is portrayed in Mark 12:35-7, is interpreting Psalm 109: 1 LXX [Ps. 110:1 EV] prosopologically, pointing out a conundrum in the text and then encouraging the audience to identify the speaker and the addressee correctly. More precisely, Jesus seems to believe that the Holy Spirit had inspired David to slip as an actor into what we might term “a theodramatic vision” and from within that visionary world to make a speech in the character (*prosopon*) of someone else. As such, the Spirit is really speaking the words through David (“David himself said while speaking *by means of the Holy Spirit*”—Mark 12:36), so the Spirit is supplying the script. For Jesus, the role in the theodrama that David adopts here is God, and God’s theodramatic addressee is a person David himself calls “my Lord.”¹⁶

In this example, Bates argues that David, according to Jesus, is a vehicle through which the Holy Spirit speaks. That is to say, David’s voice is replaced by the Spirit who “supplies the Script.” This interpretation of Jesus and of Jesus’s interpretation of David is debatable, but it shows the way PE works.¹⁷ Instead of reading Psalm 110 in the context of the Psalter, Bates argues that Jesus himself is taking individual verses and running them back to eternity—“divine dialogues from the dawn of time.” If so, Jesus himself is reading such verses out of context. But I do not think that is the case. Instead, this is another example of the type of interpretation I am attempting to address in this essay.

Indeed, rejecting all interpretations that interpret verses by extricating them from their surrounding contexts, I will read Psalm 2 along the three lines of context suggested by Crutchfield. As I will show, we can better appreciate the message of Psalm 2, and how it leads to Psalm 110 and then to Jesus Christ when we pay attention to the Psalms ever-widening circle of context. In other words, while keeping our finger on the text of Scripture, we can both be assured of what the Spirit inspired, in the way he inspired it, *and* we can see how the Psalter fits into the entire canon to present a fulsome view of Christ when he comes in the fullness of time.

PUTTING PSALM 2 IN ITS PLACE

Following this threefold approach, we can assess Psalm 2 by looking at the flow of thought (1) in the Psalm itself, (2) in the two psalms next to it (Psalm 1 and Psalm 3), and (3) in the narrative flow of the Psalter. In the same way,

when we get to Psalm 110, we will also consider the surrounding context. From this “thick” reading of the Psalter, we will see why reading the Psalms together results in a more faithful reading of Scripture, which in turn assists our understanding of the relationship between Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 in the NT. Moreover, this reading of the Psalter will begin to explain why it is impossible to read Psalm 2:7 or Psalm 110:1 in isolation, without doing damage to the message of the Psalms, which in turn impacts our theological formulations. So, let’s begin with Psalm 2.

First, in the flow of Psalm 2, verse 7—the verse which is supposed to directly support eternal generation—we find one of three verses (vv. 7–9) that address the king who will sit on God’s holy hill (v. 6). In the whole psalm, the twelve verses can be divided into four sets of three verses. Accordingly, verses 7–9 should be read together and in connect with what comes before and after it.

If this verse taken in isolation, as Bates reads it, the poetry of Psalm 2 is eviscerated and the propositions are left unstrung. As a result, making Psalm 2:7 an independent verse related to the Son’s eternal generation, fails to consider the message of the Psalm and its place in the Psalter.

The point of Psalm 2, taken as a whole, is not eternal generation, even if it may foreshadow or anticipate that doctrine when all things are considered. In the Psalter, the point of Psalm 2 is the enthronement of God’s son, a covenantal title associated with David and his son, according to God’s promise in 2 Samuel 7:14. That Hebrews 1:5-6 unites Psalm 2:7 and 2 Samuel 7:14 indicates that we have biblical warrant for reading Psalm 2 in conjunction with the Davidic covenant promised in 2 Samuel 7. But even before Hebrews gives us an inspired interpretation, the antecedent theology of “sonship” goes back to David (2 Sam 7:14), and before him Israel (Exod 4:22–23), and before them Adam (cf. Luke 3:38). Long story short, there is every reason for understanding Psalm 2:7 (“You are my son, today I have begotten you”) in the context of God’s covenant with David and his decree of an eternal throne.

Second, Psalm 2 cannot be read independent of Psalm 1 and Psalms 3 and the subsequent psalms. As Jamie Grant has noted, there are in the Psalter three pairs of psalms that conjoin law and royal themes.¹⁸ These pairs are Psalms 1-2, Psalm 18-19, and Psalms 118-119. Importantly, Psalms 1-2 function as a double introduction to the whole Psalter. This is one reason why David’s second psalm (see Acts 4:25; 13:33) is lacking a Davidic superscript; Psalms 1-2 are the superscript for the Psalms. Accordingly, we must read Psalm 1-2

as a packaged unit and one that prepares us to connect law and kingdom (cf. Deut. 17:14–20).

Even more, we find an *inclusio* between Psalm 1:1 and Psalm 2:12. At the beginning and end of these two psalms, we find two ways of blessing—perfect obedience or personal trust.

Blessed is the man who walks not in the counsel of the wicked, nor stands in the way of sinners, nor sits in the seat of scoffers. (Ps 1:1)

Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and you perish in the way, for his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him. (Ps 2:12)

By reading these two psalms together, we gain an appreciation for the way the law works. Only the Psalm 1 man can ascend to the hill of the Lord and remain there (cf. Pss 15 and 24). It is not accidental, therefore, that Psalm 2 is looking for a Psalm 1 man—a king who delights in the law of God—to sit on the throne.

At the same time, for those who trust in the perfect king, the Son who shares the characteristic of God (Ps 2:7), there is salvation and blessing. Unfortunately, this king will not show up in David's lifetime, or in any human born son of David. Hence, the need for a divine Son remains. Yet, this *need* for a "divine" Son does not come from behind the text in Psalm 2:7, as PE suggests. Rather, this need comes from reading the whole Psalter, only to find that all the sons of David have failed beginning with Absalom, who is named in Psalm 3.

Again, it is not accidental that as soon as Psalm 2 introduces the idea of a son of God (2:7) seated on God's holy hill (2:6) that the first son of David named is Absalom, the one who betrayed David and sought his life (3:ss "A PSALM OF DAVID, WHEN HE FLED FROM ABSALOM HIS SON"). As I read it, the placement of Absalom's Psalm (i.e., a Psalm written by David from a later period in David's monarchy) is to stress the distance between the ideal (Psalm 1-2) and the real (David's wicked son). Despite the promise to David of an eternal throne, this promise would not come quickly. Instead, Psalm 3 indicates the short journey from promise to fulfillment is not short after all. In fact, it will take the rest of the Psalter to get to a place where the true Son is seen—and even then Psalm 110 is a vision of things to come.

Third, Psalm 2 must also be read with the rest of the Psalter in view. This is evident by the fact that Psalm 2 is part of the introduction for the Psalms and because of the tight relationship between the promise of a son (2:7) and the delinquency of a son in Psalm 3:ss. Due to the unity of the Psalms, all of the Psalms contribute to the message of the Psalter. Just as every note plays a role in the musical score and every instrument plays a role in the symphony, so every Psalm plays a part in the redemptive-historical message of the Psalms. To fully appreciate how the Psalms work then, we need to see the eschatological development of the Psalms from the historic David (Psalms 1-71) to David’s glorious son Solomon (Psalm 72) to the more glorious Son to come in Psalm 110 and surrounding psalms.

In context of the whole Psalter, Psalm 2 introduces the idea, well-founded in the Prophets that a son of David would sit in glory. Psalm 3 immediately casts doubt upon that promise, as Absalom’s name is mentioned in the superscript. Thereafter, the drama of the Psalter follows ups and downs of the historical David in Books 1-2 (Psalms 3-71) to the enthronement of Solomon (Psalm 72). Then following the downfall of David’s house in Book 3 (Psalms 73-89), the promise of God’s intervention, salvation, and rule in Book 4 (Psalms 90-106), we finally come to the Son who would fulfill Psalm 2—the righteous and sacral king in Psalm 110. This is the one like Melchizedek who will rule over the nations, because of his righteousness.

While space does not permit a full explanation of the drama that unfolds from Psalm 2 to Psalm 110, these two psalms are going to play a pivotal role in the NT. And that is because of how Psalm 110 fulfills the promise of Psalm 2 in the Psalter itself. But how do we see that? At the risk of oversimplifying, let me offer this outline of the Psalter (Fig. 1), followed by a few highpoints.¹⁹

FIG. 1: THE RISE, FALL, AND RETURN OF DAVID’S GREATER SON

Book	Psalms	Description
1	1-2	A Royal Priestly Son Introduced (Pss 1-2)
	3-41	The Plight of David, son of Jesse (Pss 3-14)
		The Promise of David’s Kingdom (Pss 15-24)
		The Perils of David’s Rise to Power (Pss 25-41)

2	42–72	The Exaltation of David in Zion (Pss 42–50) Sin, Suffering, and Supplication in David’s Kingdom (Pss 51–71) The Greater Exaltation of David’s Son (Pss 72)
3	73–89	The Downfall of David’s Throne (Pss 73–89) The End of David’s Kingdom (Pss 89)
4	90–106	A New Exodus, Beginning with Moses (Pss 90–106) The LORD Reigns (Pss 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1)
5	107–145	The Promise of and Plea for Salvation (Pss 107–110) The Arrival of a Royal Priest (Pss 110) The Establishment of a New Royal Priesthood (Pss 111–34) The Praise and Warfare of this New Kingdom (Pss 135–45)
	146–50	The Greater King’s Coronation of Praise (Pss 146–50)

If Books 1–2 follow the basic storyline of David’s earthly life—from suffering to glory—then Book 1 traces the difficult period of Saul’s persecution of David, followed by God’s salvation of David from Saul (see Ps 18:ss), which in turn leads to royal Psalms associated with David (see Pss 20–24). In Psalm 25, we enter a new section of these Psalms and ones that move towards the temple (Pss 29–30) and then Davidic Covenant.

As I read it, the marital song of Psalm 45 is positioned roughly to correspond with the Davidic covenant (2 Samuel 7). Notice, it comes after the temple songs (Pss 29–30 = David bringing the ark to Jerusalem, cf. 2 Samuel 6) but before David’s adultery with Bathsheba (Ps 51; cf. 2 Sam 11). More closely, it is surrounded by the psalms of the sons of Korah (Pss 42–49), a selection of Levitical songs that place David in the center of the worshiping community. This fact matches his leadership in bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron 22–26). And in Psalm 45 itself, there is a glorious covenantal union between the unnamed king and his bride from the nations.

Following this high point in David’s life is the sin with Bathsheba (Ps 51), which in turn leads to season of difficulty in David’s life. Psalms 52–71 follow this period time, as David’s throne again is in question.²⁰ Without getting into all the details, David’s earthly throne is eventually passed to Solomon,

as Psalm 72 serves as a prayer for David's greater son. Psalm 72 is another high point in the Psalter, and one that matches the highest elevation of Israel's history—namely, the glorious rule of Solomon (cp. 1 Kings 4–10). Like Psalm 2, Psalm 72 also typifies the royal rule of David's son, and will even be applied to Jesus in his birth narratives, as the kings of the nations come to Christ bearing gifts (72:10–11; Matt 2:1–12, esp. vv. 10–12).

Continuing in the Psalter, we can also observe that Psalm 71 identifies the end of David's earthly life (see vv. 17–18 esp.) and Psalm 72:20 concludes the end of David's prayers, so Psalm 72 indicates the glorious inheritance that Solomon possesses—but only for a moment. This Psalm, like Psalm 2 and Psalm 45, indicates something of the unfolding drama of salvation that centers on God's promise to David and his greater son. In Israel's history, these promises of glory flash and then fade into black. Yet, they build anticipation for what is coming, and that eschatological anticipation is what the Psalter continues to foster and pursue.

Entering Book 3, Psalm 73 takes a downward turn. And throughout Psalms 73–89, the fate of David's house is falling, as a result of sinful kings. There flickers of hope, as in Psalm 86, but ultimately, Psalm 89 recounts the promises of the Davidic covenant and its ultimate devastation because of covenant unfaithfulness. This too matches Israel's history and David's disobedient sons. It also sets the stage for a new exodus in Book 4 and the need for God to be king.

In fact, that is the message of Psalms 90–106—"Yahweh reigns" (see Pss 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1). When Israel had no king, God was their deliverer. When they lost their kingdom, because David's sons proved to be unrighteous men, Psalms 90–106 demonstrate how God still reigns.

That said, God's plan was always to put a righteous Son on the throne. This was the promise in Psalm 2 and in Book 5, God fulfills this promise. Or at least, he will promise the Son who is to come. Accordingly, Book 5 is the most explicitly eschatological section in the Psalter, with Psalm 110 identifying the Son for which all the Psalms have been looking. Putting it graphically, this is how Psalm 110 fits into Book 5.²¹

FIG. 2. THE REDEMPTIVE EFFECT OF THE PSALM 110 SON-PRIEST-KING

Psalm	Big Idea	The Royal Priesthood of David's Son
107	<i>A New Exodus Psalm</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son is God's means of redemption from exile
108–110	<i>"Right Hand" Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son is an answer to prayer (Ps 108–09) The Son is the royal priest who defeats his enemies (Ps 110)
111–17	<i>Hallel Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son brings people to praise God The Son inaugurates an everlasting covenant (Ps 111:5, 9) The Son brings the sanctuary to Judah (Ps 114)
118–19	<i>Kingdom and Covenant Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son will be rejected by men, but finally his sacrifice will create a new temple (Ps 118:22–26) The Son brings a new covenant, with a heart that love the Law (Ps 119)
120–34	<i>Ascent Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son leads his people to God's house (Ps 127) The Son establishes a new priesthood (Pss 132–34)
135–37	<i>Praise, Thanksgiving, and Pain Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son brings praise and pain—God's people praise him (Pss 135–36), but his enemies revolt against him (Ps 137)
138–45	<i>David's Warfare Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Son begins a holy war against his enemies with the Word of God (cf. Ps 110) The Son establishes the everlasting kingdom of God
146–50	<i>New Creation and a Symphony of Praise Psalms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The finished work of the Son ignites cosmic praise The Psalter concludes with glory and praise, just like the tabernacle (Exod 40) and temple (1 Kings 8)

Importantly, the psalms leading up to Psalm 110 set the stage for the words spoken by God in Psalm 110. In Psalms 108:6 and 109:31, the psalmist petitions God for salvation from God's "right hand," and in Psalm 110 God answers and places his Son, who is David's Lord, at his right hand (v. 1).

If we read the declarations of God in Psalm 110:1 and 110:4 as prosopological dialogue, we miss the way that Psalm 110 is an answer to prayer. Moreover, we miss how the divine promise of salvation given in Book 4 will be transferred to the Lord identified in Psalm 110:1. Indeed, just as God condemns the wicked shepherds of Israel in Ezekiel 34 and then promises to be Israel's shepherd, only to give that role to a new David (see vv. 23–24), so in the Psalms, after God promises to deliver Israel from wicked kings, he turns and gives Israel a new royal priest. Indeed, in Psalm 110, we have the fulfillment of everything promised in Psalm 2 and everything hoped for since the let-down of Psalm 3.

Reading the Psalms as a unified canon, we discover how Psalm 110 is the literary fulfillment of Psalm 2. Accordingly, when we move from the Psalms to the NT, we find Matthew, Mark, and Luke framing the earthly life of Jesus by putting Psalm 2 at the beginning of Jesus's ministry and Psalm 110 at the end. Similarly, Hebrews conjoins Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 no less than three times. Therefore, it is my contention that such consistent use of Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 demonstrates an awareness of the arrangement of the Psalter *and* the eschatological message of the Psalter. But to show that, we need to consider the NT.

PSALM 2 AND PSALM 110 IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Without investigating fully the shape and substance of the Synoptic Gospels, we should observe the way Psalms 2 and 110 show up in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Arguing against a prosopological interpretation of these psalms, I believe these Evangelists are incorporating Psalms 2 and 110 in ways that mirror the canonical arrangement of the Psalter.

Taking the Synoptic Gospels together, we find a repeated pattern—namely, that each Evangelist begins their Gospel, introducing Jesus with the Father's use of Psalm 2 at Jesus's baptism (Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22). As Craig Blomberg observes about the Father's voice at Jesus's baptism, "The voice alludes first to Ps. 2:7, especially in its older, Markan form ("You are my Son" [1:11])."²² Similarly, each Evangelist ends his Gospel recording the words of Jesus citing Psalm 110, first in his encounter with the priests in Jerusalem (Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42) and then with his interrogation by the high priest (Matt 26:64; Mark 14:62; 22:69). See Fig. 1.

FIG. 3. PSALMS 2 AND 110 IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

	Matthew	Mark	Luke
At Jesus's baptism, the Father speaks from heaven and addresses his son with the language of Psalm 2:7, as well as Isaiah 42:1, and perhaps Genesis 22.	Matthew 3:17 17 and behold, a voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased."	Mark 1:11 11 And a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased."	Luke 3:22 22 and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased."
In a debate with the priests about his authority in the house of God, Jesus asks a question about David's son and cites Psalm 110:1.	Matthew 22:44 44 "The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet"?"	Mark 12:36 36 David himself, in the Holy Spirit, declared, "The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet."	Luke 20:42 42 For David himself says in the Book of Psalms, "The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand,
In response to the high priest's question of Jesus identity ("Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"), Jesus answers by citing Psalm 110:1.	Matthew 26:64 64 Jesus said to him, "You have said so. But I tell you, from now on you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven."	Mark 14:62 62 And Jesus said, "I am, and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven."	Luke 22:69 69 But from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God."

It is beyond the scope of this essay to examine just how Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 fit into the matrix of each Gospel, but their shared order reflects the possibility that the Evangelists are aware of the canonical arrangement of the Psalms and the meaning of that arrangement as suggested above. At this point, all I can do is offer the possibility. But that possibility is strengthened when we turn to the book of Hebrews, where the same order is found three times (1:1–4; 1:5–14; 5:1–10), notably with two chiasmic conjunctions in the first chapter.

PSALM 2 AND PSALM 110 IN HEBREWS 1

If the inclusion of Psalms 2 and 110 in the Synoptics demonstrates the possibility of an ordered Psalter with an eschatological message leading us to the Son of God incarnate, then Hebrews makes that possibility a probability. Following the chiasmic observations of William Lane²³ and Victor Rhee,²⁴ I believe Hebrews 1 is organized by two chiasms that run in parallel to one another.²⁵ See Fig. 4.

FIG. 4. TWO CHRISTOLOGICAL CHIASMS IN HEBREWS 1

HEBREWS 1:1–4

- A Greater than Prophets (v. 1–2a)
- B Psalm 2:8 (v. 2b)
- C Creation (v. 2c)
- D The Son in himself (v. 3a)
- D' The Son in creation (v. 3b)
- C' Creation (v. 3c)
- B' Psalm 110 (v. 3de)
- A' Greater than Angels (v. 4)²⁶

HEBREWS 1:5–14

- A Greater than Angels (v. 4)
- B The Son in Psalm 2:7 / 2 Samuel 7:14 (v. 5)
- C Son Receives Worship in Creation (6)
- D Angels Serve the Son (7)
- D' Son Receives His Throne (8–9)
- C' Son Renews Creation (vv. 10–12)
- B' The Son in Psalm 110 (v. 13)
- A' Angels are ministering spirits (v. 14)

If these literary structures are correct, then they offer a number of exegetical insights.

First, both Hebrews 1:1–4 and Hebrews 1:5–14 allude to (vv. 2–3) and cite (vv. 5, 14) Psalm 2 and Psalm 110, respectively. Even more, in the chiasmic structure, Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 mirror one another. Furthermore, if these two chiasmic structures accurately reflect the author’s intention, the second chiasm expands and reinforces the first. Put this all together, and the author of Hebrews is doing a lot of work to organize his introduction around the Son who is defined by Psalm 2 and Psalm 110.

Additionally, Hebrews 1 reinforces the possibility that the Gospels intended to follow the outline of the Psalms. And more certainly, in Hebrews itself, the opening chapter sets the stage for Hebrews 5:1–10, where Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 are paired together in the center of another chiasmic structure. See Fig. 4. below.

Second, the seven Old Testament (OT) citations in Hebrews 1:5–13 center on the Son, where verse 5 begins with his resurrection (Ps 2:7) and

verse 13 ends with his ascension and enthronement (Ps 110:1). Paying close attention to the historical context of Psalm 2, where the nations rage against the Lord and his anointed (messiah), Dennis Johnson notes how Hebrews 1:5 employs Psalm 2:7. He writes,

After Christ's suffering, God enthroned and acclaimed him as Son, conferring the nations as his inheritance (Ps. 2:6, 8). Thus this psalm links sonship, inheritance, and enthronement.

These three themes likewise converge in Hebrews 1:2–4 ("Son," "heir," "sat down ... on high," "inherited"). The NT attributes the title "Son" to Christ with respect to his eternal preexistence (e.g., Gal. 4:4), his incarnation (Luke 1:32, 35), his baptism (Luke 3:22), and his transfiguration (Luke 9:35). Here he "inherited" that "more excellent" name *after* his atoning suffering (Heb. 1:3). This means that the "today" of Psalm 2 is the day of Christ's exaltation, encompassing his resurrection (Acts 13:32-37; Rom. 1:4) and his ascension to God's right hand (Acts 2:32-36).²⁷

Johnson's interpretation pays careful attention to the contexts of Psalm 2 and Hebrews 1, as well as the relationship between them. In so doing, he underscores the eschatological progression of covenant history and the way that Hebrews applies Psalm 2 to Jesus in his exalted status—a condition that moves from resurrection to ascension. This exalted position in time and space reflects the Son's exalted position in eternity, but it is not the same. Rather, this progressive revelation of God's Son focuses on the economy of redemption rather than the ontology of the Godhead. The doctrine of eternal generation can therefore be affirmed *in the end*, without strip-mining the biblical text *from the beginning*. We will consider this further at the end.

For now, in Hebrews 1, the progression of Christ's exaltation starts with Psalm 2 and ends with Psalm 110, as these two pillar psalms begin and end a dramatic retelling of the whole Psalter, now fulfilled in Christ. Here's what I mean: With the addition of 2 Samuel 7:14 to ground Psalm 2:7 historically in verse 5 and Deuteronomy 32:43 (LXX) and Psalm 104:4 to speak about the angels in verses 6–7, the arrangement of the Psalms *about the Son* follow the order of the Psalms. See Fig. 5.

FIG. 5. PSALM CITATIONS ABOUT THE SON IN HEBREWS 1

Psalm 2:7	Hebrews 1:5
Psalm 45:6–7	Hebrews 1:8–9
Psalm 102:25–27	Hebrews 1:10–12
Psalm 110:1	Hebrews 1:13

Again, the two chiasms in Hebrews 1 suggest that the author of Hebrews is doing more than rattling off the first few psalms that come to mind. It is better understood that he is making a case that what the Psalter (as a literary whole) anticipated has now come to fulfillment in the exalted Christ. Even more, Psalm 2:7, which begins the catena of verses, follows a statement of Christ’s exaltation in Hebrews 1:3–4.

In these verses, we read, “After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs” (vv. 3b–4). Clearly, this refers to Christ’s reward for his finished work on the cross. As Hebrews 2:9 will say shortly, referencing Psalm 8, Christ is “crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death.”

Thus, the context in Hebrews 1:5–2:18 is not the Son’s eternal glory shared with the Father, even if that is referenced in Hebrews 1:3a (“He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature”). Rather, the glory described in Hebrews 1:5–13 is what he received in his resurrection and ascension. Later in Hebrews 5:5–6, we will see that Psalm 2:7 and Psalm 110:4 refer to Christ’s exaltation to the right hand of God for the purpose of high priestly service. Like Acts 13:23–33 and Romans 1:4, both of which apply Psalm 2:7 to Christ’s resurrection, it follows that Hebrews 1:5 is also focusing on the resurrection, not the eternal “today.”

Confirming this redemptive-historical reading of the Psalms, we find a third observation: That it is best to see Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 focusing on Christ’s royal and priestly offices. Grammatically, Hebrews 1 shows us that we should read these psalms together as mutually interpreting. And it does this because, these Psalms are already held together in the Psalter. To put it differently, Psalm 2 is not just about divine sonship, but is about the son who has the right to be a priestly king.²⁸

Going back to Melchizedek, the exemplary king presented in the OT has always been a king of righteousness, who brings peace by means of his

priestly service. This type was set in Genesis, when Abraham recognized Melchizedek's greatness (14:17–24), and again when he walked in Melchizedek's glorious shadow. For example, he is called righteous because of his faith (15:6); he is told kings will come from his lineage (17:6, 16); and he offers a sacrifice on Mount Moriah, near Melchizedek's Salem (22:1–18).²⁹

With this historical background in place, when God installed David as king and promised him a son to sit on his throne (2 Sam 7), he required that his son would obey the law (7:14). In the Psalter, this righteous requirement accords with Psalm 1 which stands in direct connection with Psalm 2. From the start of the Psalms, therefore, we find an invitation to look for a son of David who will prove to be righteous in every way. Ultimately, no son of David ever proved to be a true son or a priestly king like Melchizedek—and hence the Davidic kingdom came to an end in Psalm 89. Yet, on the other side of God's salvation in Psalms 90–106, there comes the promise of a future king, who will be none other than God himself.

This is where Psalm 110 comes in. In Hebrews, we learn that the son who was promised to David has perfectly obeyed his Father, thus proving himself to be the true Son, and hence deserving the role of priest and king. Making the connection between Psalms and Hebrews, we can say that in Psalm 2, God promised a royal priestly figure who would receive the title of God's son (v. 7). This is the one who would sit on God's holy hill (v. 6), and in Psalm 110, he is given a seat at God's right hand (v. 1), where he would serve as priest and king (v. 4). Only in the fulness of time and the final revelation of Jesus Christ as God the Son incarnate could this reality be fully grasped. And that is exactly what Hebrews is showing—that the Son has taken on flesh (Heb 2:10–18) in order to become to true royal priest.

Indeed, while Psalm 2 and 110 speak of sonship, they are equally descriptive of kingship and priesthood. Therefore, to isolate Psalm 2:7 and Psalm 110:1, 4 as two or three verses that define the eternal divine nature of the Son does more than damage Hebrews and Psalms. Theologically, this kind of reading advances Christ's person at the expense of his work. Put dogmatically, we know the Son in himself (ontology) by means of the Son in his actions (economy). This is what Hebrews 1 is doing. And it is why we do not need to press for eternal generation *on the first pass* in Psalm 2:7 or Hebrews 1:5. Importantly, we need to listen to what the divine voice is saying in all of Scripture, instead of delimiting the divine voice to hot spots

in certain ambiguous parts of Scripture. Indeed, there is at issue here a matter of theological method, but before attending to that, we have one more place to look in Hebrews.

PSALM 2 AND PSALM 110 IN HEBREWS 5

In Hebrews 5:1–10, we have the first step in an argument for Christ’s superior priesthood. After the author of Hebrews explains that priests can never appoint themselves to service in God’s house (5:1–4), he explains how God chose Jesus.

So also Christ did not exalt himself to be made a high priest, but was appointed by him who said to him, “You are my Son, today I have begotten you”; as he says also in another place, “You are a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek.” (vv. 5–6)

Remarkably, Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 show up again. This reinforces my general argument that the NT authors read the Psalter according to its unified arrangement. More specifically, however, there is a theological meaning to the canonical Psalms—namely, the priestly ruler in Psalm 110 is the fulfillment of the promised royal son in Psalm 2. Notice how Hebrews brings these Psalms together at the center of another chiasm.³⁰ See Fig. 6.

FIG. 6. THE CHIASTIC SUPPORT FOR CHRIST’S ROYAL PRIESTLY SONSHIP

- A Appointed High Priest (v. 1)
- B Priest and People (v. 2–3)
- C Aaron Did Not Exalt Himself (v. 4)
- D Psalm 2:7 (Son) (v. 5)
- D’ Psalm 110:4 (Priest) (v. 6)
- C’ Jesus Did Not Exalt Himself (v. 7)
- B’ Priest and People (vv. 8–9)
- A’ Appointed High Priest (v. 10)

As I have argued in other works, true sonship is the true prerequisite for priesthood.³¹ And in the Davidic Covenant, this is what God promises

David—a true son. Hence, it is not surprising that the triumvirate of sonship-priesthood-kingship shows up throughout the Prophets, the Psalms, and finally, in Hebrews. What would be surprising is if sonship was isolated from kingship and sonship, or read out independently from the biblical covenants.

As we find in Hebrews, the identity of the Son is explained in relationship to the biblical covenants. And in Hebrews 5:1–10, where the author begins to explain the way in which Christ’s obedient sonship qualifies him for a priestly office greater than Aaron, he is focusing on the human nature of the Son, not his eternal begottenness. Psalm 2:7 is united to Psalm 110:4 to identify Christ as the long-expected royal priest. And in Hebrews 5, the message is one of covenant obedience—Jesus did not exalt himself to the position of priesthood (vv. 7–10), just as Aaron did not exalt himself (vv. 1–4). Rather, by means of his suffering unto death (v. 8) and his resurrection (v. 9), he was exalted by the Father with the “Son,” which was first promised to David (Ps 2:7). Yet, with this exalted title, Jesus would also receive the priestly office associated with Melchizedek (Ps 110:4).

Of course, it would be possible for the author of Hebrews to conjoin these two passages together on his own. But as it was argued from the Psalter itself, there is an internal logic in the Psalms that connects Psalm 2 and Psalm 110. Or to say more precisely, Psalm 110 is the fulfillment of Psalm 2. In fact, every other royal Psalm (e.g., Pss. 20–24, 45, 72, 89) stand between Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 to help bridge the gap.

To invoke the language of typology that is usually assigned to the canon, we can say that the intermediate royal psalms are “ectypes” that stand between the “type” (Psalm 2) and the “antitype” (Psalm 110). Together, this typological framework established in the Psalms prepares the way for Christ to come and fulfill all the Psalms. And this is why, in other places in the Hebrews, the words of the Psalter (e.g., Ps 40:6–8) can be put in Jesus’s mouth (Heb 10:5–7). This is not because David heard a divine conversation “from the dawn of time,” but because the Spirit of Christ led David and all the prophets to inquire of the Messiah who would suffer and then be glorified (1 Pet 1:10–12, 19–21). In other words, the entire OT, but especially the Psalms, is organized by a series of typological promises that prepared the way for Christ. Yet, only in the fullness of time, when the Son took on flesh, and then rose to glory to send the Spirit, could the full doctrine of Christ and the Trinity be known.

Before then, the doctrine of the Godhead remained a mystery—partially revealed, partially hidden. And attempts to read NT revelation and Chalcedonian Christology back into the OT do not improve our biblical doctrines. These anachronistic attempts only makes the Bible more unwieldy and difficult to understand. In other words, a faithful interpretation of the OT does not need to load the final form of Christian doctrine into earlier periods of revelation. Instead, holding the canon of Scripture together and appreciating the progressive nature of revelation we read the OT with the New, so that we never read the OT without its proper fulfillment in Christ. But neither do we read the full revelation of Christ back into the OT.

Again, the book of Hebrews teaches us how to do that as it recognizes the canonical shape of the Psalter, which in turn leads to Christ. This, I am contending, is a better approach to the Bible and to doing theology, such that we can properly interpret the Psalms *and* apply the Psalms to Christian doctrine.

AVOID IMPATIENCE IN INTERPRETATION: MOVING FROM TEXT TO THEOLOGY TAKES TIME

In the end, as we conclude this two-part study on the Psalms, I am making the case to avoid all theological short cuts. As David Helm has said, as he applies the principles of Edmund Clowney and Richard Lints to preaching: The long way round is the safest way home. This is true for biblical interpretation and for doing theology. Today, PE offers a shortcut to support to various theological doctrines. And thankfully, most of these shortcuts are defending orthodoxy, and in some cases even reclaiming various neglected doctrines (i.e., the eternal generation of the Son). But how long can orthodoxy last when isolated texts are defined extra-textually?

It could be argued that the number of instances and the specifics of the PE delimit such an extra-textual danger. And others, endorsing PE, may deny the premise—that PE is trading in anything extra-textual. But as I have attempted to show, there is a way to read Psalm 2 and Psalm 110 as divine speech that holds fast to the context of each Psalm, the authorial intent of David and the “editor” who arranged the Psalter, as well as the redemptive-historical context of Psalms in the whole Bible.³²

Instead of denying historical context of Psalm 2 or Psalm 110 or inserting a prosopological voice in Psalm 2:7 or Psalm 110:1, 4, there is a way to read these verses in their literary, epochal, and covenantal contexts. When this

is done and carried forward to questions of doctrine, it will lead to a full-throated classical theism—even if it takes longer to make the case.

Indeed, the method offered here affirms the unity of the Scripture and all eternal and ontological glory of the Son, and it does so without compromising biblical clarity and historical context. Certainly, such a reading of Scripture takes more time to articulate, and it does not provide a quick set of proof-texts for eternal generation, but in the process of letting Scripture unfold according to its own timeline, we come to learn in time the triune God who is eternal. This, I have argued, is a better approach to the Bible, because it reads Scripture on its own terms and according to its own timeline.

Certainly, more examples need to be tested. But I would offer that a reading of the Psalms that pays attention to the three horizons in the Psalter is far better than anything that comes from a non-contextual approach to certain verses in the Psalter—even those that claim access to the halls of eternity.

If we gain the full doctrine, but lose the Bible, what have gained? What we have gained is a right doctrine without a right reading of God's Word. And maybe that will fly in academic circles or modern classrooms—for a time!— but it will not sustain the church for long, nor lead the people of God to have confidence in their Bibles. Instead, it will lead pastors and parishioners to depend upon an educated class of prosopological priests, which a dead end that Rome has already tried.

Because PE depends so heavily on later Traditions, I am arguing for a different approach to Scripture which sticks closer to the text. Readers will have to decide if my approach is any better than prosopological exegesis, but ultimately, we, with the help of the Spirit, need to let Scripture interpret Scripture. And that begins when we read the Psalms and every other part of Scripture along the grain. May the Lord help us in that endeavor, so that we might hear the voice of God in every verse of Scripture.

-
1. See Brad Baugham's "Hearing the Canonical Voice of the Psalter: An Exegetical Overview," in this issue of *SBJT*.
 2. David C. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms* (Newton Mearns, Scotland: Campbell Publications, 2003); Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 194–202. Cf. O. Palmer Robertson, *The Flow of the Psalms: Discovering Their Structure and Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2015).
 3. I will not debate PE here. Instead, see my other essay in this journal.

4. For the record, I affirm both doctrines—God’s eternal decree and the eternal generation of the Son.
5. For an excellent example of moving from biblical theology categories to doctrinal assertions about the person of Christ, see Stephen J. Wellum, *God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ* (Foundations of Evangelical Theology; Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016). Importantly, Wellum affirms eternal generation, but he does not make the anachronistic error of reading Chalcedonian Christology back into the OT.
6. John C. Crutchfield, *Psalms in Their Context: An Interpretation of Psalms 107–118* (Paternoster Theological Monographs; Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2011), Kindle Edition, Loc. 467.
7. Richard J. Lints, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 293–310.
8. Crutchfield, *Psalms in their Context*, Kindle Edition, Loc. 467–478.
9. William James Chernell, “Typology, Christology, and Prosopological Exegesis: Implicit Narratives in Christological Texts,” *SBJT* 24.1 (2020): 140.
10. Matthew W. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christians Interpretations of the Old Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 63–64.
11. Bates admits that his mediation on Jesus mediating on Psalm 2:7 is speculative (*The Birth of the Trinity*, 65), but that does not lead him away from making his point “that Jesus himself had made some sort of begotten-Son deduction in connection with his own scriptural meditations” (65). For a different view of Jesus’s own self-understanding, one that derives from Jesus’s reading the OT, but one that does not rely on PE, see Christopher J. H. Wright, *Knowing Jesus through the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014).
12. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity*, 67, 68–71. In this context, Bates criticizes those who fail to appreciate “the value of subsequent interpretations” and he argues that the ways that later church tradition interpreted the Bible “is one of the absolutely essential horizons for reconstructing the most likely original meaning” (*ibid.*, 67). Suppositions like this are why I compare PE to Roman Catholic practices of interpretation. While Bates may differ in the degree to which they rely on Tradition, both Bates and the Roman Catholic interpreters who have gone before him are making the same interpretive move.
13. *Ibid.*, 68.
14. In his evaluation of prosopological exegesis, Dermell, “Typology, Christology, and Prosopological Exegesis,” notes two kinds of PE. He writes, “The former (PE1) is a product of plain reading or, whereas the latter (PE2) seems to evidence a special exegetical strategy” (138). Later he says of Jesus’s reading of Psalm 110, “Therefore, when Jesus identifies the Messiah, the Davidic son, as David’s greater ‘lord’ (Mark 12:36), he does not exercise a unique reading strategy, but offers a fulfillment of the expected figure” (141). And finally, he argues, “For PE1, where the reader finds unspecified dialogue around an ambiguous future figure, no peculiar reading strategy or exegetical technique seems required. A plain reading creates the expectation of the fulfillment of a prophetically-defined role (though there may be disagreement over who best fulfills it)” (142).
15. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity*, 44–62.
16. *Ibid.*, 49.
17. Bates interaction with Mark 12 would require its own full response. In this article, I am addressing the impact of PE on reading the Psalms. Therefore, what follows in my all-too-brief discussion of Matthew, Mark, and Luke is not attempting to respond to what Bates says about Jesus’s use of Psalm 110. That would require another article.
18. Jamie A. Grant, *The King as Exemplar: The Function of Deuteronomy’s Kingship Law in the Shaping of the Book of Psalms* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 41–70.
19. What I offer below comes from a sermon series I preached on the five books of the Psalms. You can find a bevy resources—including five infographics, one for each book—that stand behind the conclusions of that sermon series and this summary in this blogpost, David Schrock “Resources for Reading the Psalms Canonically”, Via Emmaus, September 15, 2017, <https://davidschrock.com/2017/09/15/resources-for-reading-the-psalms-canonically/>.
20. For a closer inspection of David’s life in comparison with Book 2 of the Psalms, see Robertson, *The Flow of the Psalms*, 84–121.
21. These observations on Book 5 are mine, but they have been influenced by others, including Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter*, Barber, *Singing in the Reign*; Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*; and Erich Zenger, “The Composition and Theology of the Fifth Book of Psalms, Psalms 107–145.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 80 (1998): 77–102.
22. Craig L. Blomberg, “Matthew,” in *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 14.

23. William Lane, *Hebrews 1-8*, (WBC; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1991), 6–7.
24. Victor Rhee, “The Role of Chiasm for Understanding Christology in Hebrews 1:1–14.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131 (2012): 341–62. Rhee finds a chiasm for Hebrews 1:1–14. I follow Lane’s chiasm for verses 1–4 and supply my own for verses 5–14.
25. Hebrews 2:1–4 may actually mirror Hebrews 1:1–4 too, but that stands outside the pericope under consideration.
26. Verse 4 is Janus-facing. It serves as a hinge on which 1:1–4 and 1:4–14 turn.
27. Dennis E. Johnson, “Hebrews,” in *ESV Expository Commentary*, Vol. 12 (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018), 37.
28. The idea of priesthood can also be seen in Psalm 2:8, where the royal son petitions God for the nations.
29. On the ways Abraham is portrayed as becoming like Melchizedek, see my *Royal Priesthood and the Glory of God* (Short Studies in Biblical Theology; Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2022), 41–45.
30. Thomas Schreiner also sees a chiastic structure in these verses but not in the same way. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Commentary on Hebrews* (Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation; Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 157.
31. Schrock, *Royal Priesthood and the Glory of God*.
32. On the various levels of reading the Psalms, see my “Four Keys to Reading (And Teaching) the Psalms,” SBTS Equip, July 21, 2017, <https://equip.sbts.edu/article/four-keys-reading-teaching-psalms/>.