

The Ultimate Argument

Matt 11:2-6, 22:41-46

Chapel Bible Study

April 18, 2021

A Psalm of David. The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

Background: Jesus is in the Temple Courts, and has been asked a series of questions. Now Jesus turns the tables and asks them a question. Who is the Messiah? B. Russell was asked a similar question. What if you die and you were wrong? “I have no guilt because you didn’t give enough evidence.”

- I. What is the argument?
 - a. Whose son is He?
 - b. He quotes Ps 110, where David call Him Lord, but doesn’t call Him son.
 - c. Here Jesus does not give a line of reasoning, (as Greeks demanded), or do a miracle, (as Jews demanded.) 1 Cor 1: 22-25.
- II. Christ provides not a watertight argument, but a watertight person.
 - a. Jesus did not say just believe.
 - b. Thomas Kuhn- on how science works indicates not incrementally. Instead, the data doesn’t work or fit, repeatedly, and eventually a major paradigm shift occurs.
 - c. In the case of John the Baptist, he says go back and re-evaluate the data.
 - d. This man must be true because no one could have thought Him up.
- III. Where will the argument take you? To the edge of offense.
 - a. You can’t have a Jesus only for you.
 - b. You need a sustained look at the Jesus of Scripture, and embrace even the offensive parts.
 - c. Make ourselves available to the Spirit.
 - d. He did not say just believe.

PSALM 110:1-3

A psalm of David.

- 1 The LORD said to my Lord,
 "Sit in honor at my right hand
 until I humble your enemies,
 making them a footstool under your feet."
- 2 The LORD will extend your powerful dominion from
 Jerusalem;
 you will rule over your enemies.
- 3 In that day of battle,
 your people will serve you willingly.
 Arrayed in holy garments,
 your vigor will be renewed each day like the morning
 dew.

It was only a few days before Passover, and the temple courts were bustling with people. The crowd's attention was riveted to Jesus, who was being pried with theological questions by the Pharisees and Sadducees. The crowds were amazed at how Jesus answered each puzzling question. When the religious leaders ran out of questions, it was Jesus' turn: "What do you think about the Messiah?" he asked. "Whose son is he?"

"David's son," came the quick response. "Then why does David call him Lord?" replied Jesus. Then he quoted the first verse of Psalm 110 and silenced the scholars of his day. As the writer of the psalm, David called his messianic descendant "my Lord," declaring that the Messiah would be more than just a human king. A purely human king would have looked up to David as his great ancestor, but David was looking up to this coming King, honoring him in divine terms. Jesus, who was certainly aware of his own messiahship, didn't deny that he was descended from David, but he affirmed an even greater connection with God the Father. Peter spelled out the implications in the same location less than two months later at the culmination of his Pentecost sermon (Acts 2:34-35).

But what does it mean to us? Surely, if David bowed in awe, and if the enemies will eventually be forced to bow before him, it's the least we can do.

Look, ye saints, the sight is glorious:

See the Man of Sorrows now;

From the fight return victorious,

Every knee to him shall bow:

Crown him! Crown him! Crowns become the

Victor's brow.

THOMAS KELLY

A Word on Words

Why does this psalm use the imagery of a "footstool" (verse 1)? It was an ancient

Near Eastern practice for victorious generals to place their feet on the necks of the vanquished leaders (see Joshua 10:24).

Bible

Networking

No other Old Testament prophecy is quoted as frequently in the New Testament as the one in verse 1.

See Matthew

22:44-45; Mark

12:36-37; Luke

20:42-44; Acts

2:34-35; Hebrews

1:13; and 10:12-11.

those at the bottom end of the scale.

WSJ 4/13/21

St. Augustine, Baseball, Wokeism and Pride

In his "Yes, Boycott Baseball" (Wonder Land, April 8), Daniel Henninger states: "Liberals have given in completely to the narcotic pleasure of total guilt." I totally agree with "narcotic" and "pleasure" but disagree with "guilt," as explaining the woke phenomenon. Guilt is a painful act of self-incrimination. But this isn't the feeling expressed by St. Augustine, who, looking at his past, couldn't get over his youthful transgressions. The better reference to modern wokism is Augustine's "City of God," whose invisible citizens are divided into those who are and those who are not going to be saved, and whose diverging identities only God knows. But in the modern version, wokes already know they are going to heaven and are looking down

on the rest of us, who are not so regretfully slated for the other place. In their minds, their easily acquired enlightenment has already saved them. Hence, if you noticed, their mea culpa isn't beating their breasts but beating ours for us. They are not scourging themselves, but triumphantly administering the whip to the backs of us sinners. No, this isn't guilt. It is pride. Which, if we are to follow the religious analogies, comes before the fall.

JACK KACZOROWSKI
Los Angeles, Calif.

Pepper ... And Salt

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL