

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IX.

MARCH, 1929.

No. 3.

Perpetual Forgiveness.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part VI.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

(Continued.)

True, it has been noted that there is a difference between the first forgiveness and perpetual forgiveness. This we admit, just as there is a difference between the first breath of a new-born child and its breathing after that. And furthermore, with justification as it takes place for the first time other things are connected. It is, however, important to see clearly wherein this difference consists and wherein it does not consist, lest the foolish talk gain ground in our midst that a person is justified but once in his life and that after that there is nothing but sanctification. The first and foremost difference concerns the person who is justified. At the time of the first justification he is an enemy of God, who is under the power of darkness and in the bondage of sin; afterwards he is merely a sinner, for also the greatest saints remain sinners to the grave. From this follows the second difference: the first justification translates from the state of wrath into the state of grace, from guilt into favor; perpetual justification keeps one in favor. The third difference is this: the first forgiveness which one obtains coincides with regeneration; perpetual forgiveness does not. On the other hand, the difference does *not* consist in the nature of the divine operation; it is the same act by virtue of which God regards Saul at Damascus and Paul at Philippi righteous. Nor should one say that the first act of God is called justification and the second simply forgiveness; for justification and forgiveness are one and the same thing. For when Paul calls the man blessed "unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works," he, in order to prove this statement, appeals to the word of the psalmist: "Blessed are they whose . . . sins are covered." Rom. 4, 6. 7. So Paul understands what David says of forgiveness as referring to justification. And Acts 13, 38. 39 he declares: "Be it known unto

Does Psalm 2, 7 Teach the Eternal Generation of the Son?

PROF. JOHN H. C. FRITZ, St. Louis, Mo.

“I believe in Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, our Lord.” With these words the Christian Church throughout the world confesses its faith in the *eternal generation of the Son of God from the Father*. More specifically does our *Lutheran Church* confess this in the explanation to the Second Article of the Apostles’ Creed, saying, “I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, *begotten of the Father from eternity, . . . is my Lord*”; also in the words of the Nicene Creed: “I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, *the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father, before all worlds, God*

7) “But when the baptized have acted against their conscience, allowed sin to rule in them, and thus have grieved and lost the Holy Ghost in them, they need not be rebaptized, but must be converted again.” (Formula of Concord. *Conc. Trigl.*, 907.)

8) Rev. 3, 18. *Xρυσίον*, fidem. *Suadeo tibi, ut veram Dei cognitionem et fidem per veram poenitentiam et preces a me tibi compares, ut dives fias. Ἰμάτια λευκά sunt δικαιώματα, justitia Christi, quae per fidem credentibus imputatur.* (John Gerhard, *Commentarius in Rev.*, p. 28.)

9) Luke 15, especially vv. 11—24. Compare also 1 Pet. 3, 21. *Petrus post baptismum perceptum in gravissimum abnegationis peccatum erat prolapsus, nihilo tamen minus consolationem ac certitudinem salutis suae petit ex baptismo.* (John Gerhard, *Commentarius*, p. 21.)

of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, *begotten*, not made, *being of one substance with the Father.*" The same confession is also made in the Creed of Athanasius: "The right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; *God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds.*"

What is the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father? Quenstedt says: "*The second person is the Son of God, not by $\nu\lambda\omicron\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ or gracious adoption nor on account of gracious and glorious union with God and love — for thus all the pious, the blessed, and the holy angels are sons of God — nor on account of His wonderful conception by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, as the Socinians wish, but through and on account of a true, peculiar, essential, most singular (unparalleled) and inexplicable eternal generation; and thus He is the Son of God properly, incommunicably, and $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omega\varsigma$ (in an altogether singular manner). In a few words, He is the Son of God, not $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\upsilon$, or by grace, but $\varphi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$, or by nature. John 1, 14. 18.*" Again Quenstedt says: "This generation of the Son does not occur by derivation or transfusion nor by an action which may begin or cease, but it occurs by an unceasing emanation, like unto which there is nothing to be found in nature. For God the Father from eternity beget, and always begets, and never will cease to beget, His Son. For if the generation of the Son would have an end, it would also have a beginning, and thus would not be eternal. Nevertheless, this generation cannot for this reason be said to be imperfect and successive; for the act of generation in the Father and the Son is considered perfect in work and constant in operation."

Concerning the difference between the begetting of the Son and the spiration of the Holy Spirit, Baier says: *Differre generationem Filii et spirationem Spiritus Sancti certum est; modum autem, quo differant, plenius definire non possumus.* As to the difference between *begetting* and *creating*, Gerhard says: "*Begetting* is from one's own substance, producing something similar according to essence. *Creating* is making out of nothing something different from the substance of the Creator."

Like the other great doctrines of the Bible, so also this doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son is a *mystery* to us. Our Lutheran Church teaches and believes the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son *because the Bible clearly teaches it.* Dietrich

says in his *Institutiones Catecheticae*, in answering the question: *Quomodo probas Christum esse verum Deum?* “*Quia in Scripturis expresse et absolute vocatur Jehovah, Jer. 23, 6, et Deus, Joh. 20, 28; Rom. 9, 5; 1 Joh. 5, 20, est et vocatur Filius Dei proprius, Rom. 8, 32, et unigenitus Dei Filius, Joh. 1, 18; 3, 16, et primogenitus, Col. 1, 15; Heb. 1, 6, et aeternus, PER AETERNAM GENERATIONEM PATRIS FILIUS, Ps. 2, 7.*”

So much by way of introduction. My purpose, however, is not to *prove that the Bible teaches* the eternal generation of the Son from the Father, but to answer the question, *Does Psalm 2, 7 teach this doctrine?* If any one believes the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father as the Bible clearly teaches it, the fact that he does not believe that this doctrine is taught in Ps. 2, 7 would *not affect his orthodoxy*, but rather *only the correctness of his exegesis of certain words of the Bible.*

Let us look at, and closely examine, the text and learn what light the Bible itself throws upon it. The text is taken from the Second Psalm, of which the New Testament not only says that David was the penman, but whose Messianic character it also has established beyond any question of doubt. Acts 4, 24—28. The very words of the text, which we shall now closely examine, are said in the New Testament to refer to the Messiah, or Savior. Ps. 2, 7 reads: *יְהוָה אָמַר אֵלַי בְּנִי אֲהֵה אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יִלְדָתִיךָ.* In our English translation it reads: “The Lord hath said unto Me, Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee.” Luther translated it: *Ich will von einer solchen Weise predigen, dass der HERR zu mir gesagt hat: Du bist mein Sohn; heute hab’ ich dich gezeuget.* According to a literal translation it would read: “The Lord said unto Me, My Son Thou; I to-day have begotten Thee.”

The speaker introduced is the Messiah, who speaks of the Lord, Jehovah, as speaking unto Him. What does He say? “The Lord said unto Me, My Son art Thou; I to-day have begotten Thee.” The pronouns very clearly indicate that here we have two distinct persons, the one speaking and the other having spoken. The very fact that the Lord here calls the Messiah His Son indicates, in the light of the Scripture as a whole, the eternal generation of the Son from the Father; for that which proceeds from another must be of the same essence. A difference of opinion, however, arises in reference to the meaning of the words: “I to-day have begotten Thee,” *יִלְדָתִיךָ הַיּוֹם אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יִלְדָתִיךָ.* especially what the meaning is of the two words *יִלְדָתִיךָ הַיּוֹם.*

Let us examine the two words יְלֵדָתִי הַיּוֹם very carefully. An exegesis of these words should not be given according to Fiske's idea of orthodox exegesis. He says: "The ingenuity of orthodox exegesis has always been equal to the task of making Scripture mean whatever is required." The exegesis of the words of our text should be given in accordance with the rules of sound hermeneutics. We must first determine not only the etymological meaning of the words, but especially the *usus loquendi*. We must also distinguish between *usus generalis* and *usus specialis* and must determine whether or not the words are used in their original or in a tropical, or figurative, sense. We also dare not overlook one of the principal rules of hermeneutics: *Sensus literalis in uno eodemque loco et dicto non nisi unicus esse potest*. The *sensus unicus* of the words of the Bible must be carefully preserved. We must also remember that no interpretation of Scripture can pass as correct if it is out of harmony with the context or out of harmony with Scripture as such; for Scripture, being inspired, the Holy Ghost speaking through the holy penmen, cannot contradict itself. The *analogia Scripturæ* must be observed. We should also remember that the same word may have different meanings, depending upon its use; any word, however, has *only one meaning in one and the same place*. Finally, we must remember the hermeneutical rule: *Scriptura Scripturam interpretatur*. We should let the Bible explain itself and not sit in judgment upon it.

"The Lord hath said unto Me," so the verse now under consideration reads, "Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee." The one speaking is the Lord. He is speaking to another, whom He calls His Son. What He predicates of this Son is: "This day have I *begotten Thee*." The Hebrew verb יְלֵדָתִי means to beget; in German, *zeugen*. The Father does not say: I have exalted Thee, glorified Thee, made Thee a king, made Thee a priest, sent Thee into the world to assume human flesh and blood, raised Thee from the dead, — all this is true and is also clearly taught in the Scriptures, but it is not taught in this text. The Lord says: "I have *begotten Thee*." There is no exegetical rule which compels us not to let this word יְלֵדָתִי stand in its original meaning. On the contrary, the very text compels us to take the word as it reads; for the one begotten by the Father is called the Son, and this same Son is also in other Scripture-texts said to be the *only-begotten* Son of God; John 1, 14: "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the *Only-begotten* of the Father"; John 1, 18: "The *only-begotten*

Son, which is in the bosom of the Father"; John 3, 16: "God so loved the world that He gave His *only-begotten Son*"; v. 18: "Because he hath not believed in the name of the *only-begotten Son of God*"; 1 John 4, 9: "God sent His *only-begotten Son* into the world that we might live through Him."

Dogmaticians call attention to the fact that the eternal generation of the Son is on the part of God the Father not *actio ad extra*, but *actio ad intra*. The creation of the world, its preservation, and its government is *actio ad extra Dei*; not so the eternal generation of the Son, for God begot Him *within His essence*, and the Son is not separated from the Father, as happens otherwise, but remains in His Father's bosom. John 1, 18. Says Baier: *Generatio est actio ad intra, qua Deus Pater de substantia sua ab aeterno produxit Filium.*

When was the Son begotten by the Father? The Father says in the text to His Son: "*This day* [or to-day] have I begotten Thee." The little word *to-day*, יוֹם, is perhaps the real troublesome word of the text, that word which first caused a number of commentators to misinterpret the text. Standing by itself, יוֹם means simply the day which is made up of twenty-four hours or a particular moment of such a day. So it is used Deut. 31, 2, where Moses says: "I am an hundred and twenty years old *this day*." Ps. 95, 7, 8: "*To-day*, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness." In this text the word *to-day* means *now*, "at this particular time, when you are hearing the Lord's voice." So Heb. 3, 13: "But exhort one another while it is called *to-day*," that is, at the present time. Jer. 50, 31 the word is given a somewhat wider sense: "Behold, I am against thee, O thou most proud, saith the Lord God of hosts; for thy *day* is come, the *time* that I will visit thee." Here the word *day* is explained by *time*. Also in Is. 65, 2 the word *day* has a wider sense, the Lord saying: "I have spread out My hands *all the day* unto a rebellious people." Also in Ezek. 7, 7: "The time is come, *the day* of trouble is near," a wider sense is given to the word *day*. Micah 4, 1, 2: "*In the last days* it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for the Law shall go

forth of Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Here the expression *in the last days* refers to the whole New Testament time. We also use the word *day* in a wider and in a narrower sense. We say to-day and not to-morrow. And then again we say "in our day," meaning "in our time," not defining, however, the period of time.

The question now is, What does *God* mean when *He* uses the word *to-day*, saying, "*To-day* have I begotten Thee"? Can He mean a day of twenty-four hours or a certain moment of that day? Or can He mean *any* particular time, limited or unlimited? The very idea would conflict with the idea already expressed in the words *son* and *beget*; for these words already establish the *eternal* generation of the Son. By limiting the expression *to-day* to any particular time, even if that time be unlimited, we would deny the eternal generation, *which is already established by the relation of the Son to the Father; for the Father is eternal*, and if the eternal Father says to His Son, "This day have I begotten Thee," He can only mean that *He has begotten the Son from eternity*. This already goes to indicate that *to-day* with God is the eternal day, namely, the eternal day of God, *eternity itself*. In other words, when God uses a word *with reference to Himself*, we must give it that meaning *which it can only have when used with reference to God*. The same word is at times used by different people in a different meaning, the meaning of the word being determined by the relation which it has to the one using it. Two farmers tell us that they sold their farm. In the one case the word *farm* may mean 120 acres, and in the other case the same word *farm* may mean 240 acres. Two people tell us that they have bought a house. In the one case the house may be a grand, magnificent palace and in the other case a small, miserable hut. Two people speak of their hat. In the one case the word *hat* means a new silk hat and in the other case nothing more than a mere old, worn-off slouch hat. It will not do to say that such words as *farm*, *house*, and *hat* have no limited meaning while the word *day* has; for we just learned that this very word is used in a more or less unlimited sense. The question is, What does the word *day* mean *when it is put into relation to God by God Himself*? God is eternal, and with Him there is neither day nor night. The *day* spoken of in our text by God is *His own eternal day*. To bring out this very idea, Peter says, 2 Pet. 3, 8: "Beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand

years and a thousand years as one day." "This day I have begotten Thee," therefore, means, "From eternity I have begotten Thee." Yes, it means more than that; it means that the generation of the Son from the Father is a *continuous process of generation*, even as Quenstedt says: "God the Father from eternity begat, and always begets, and never will cease to beget, His Son. For if the generation of the Son would have an end, it would also have a beginning and thus would not be eternal. . . . The act of generation in the Father and the Son is *constantly in operation*." He says: "Although this generation is most peculiar and most true, yet the *mode* itself of generation is unknown to us and ineffable"; and yet he attempts to form at least an approximate conception of it, saying: "This divine generation, however, can be adumbrated by the similitude of rays of the sun flowing from the solar body with a perpetual dependence. For as the sun is not older than its rays nor the one begetting before, in time, to the one begotten, so the eternal Father from eternity generated the Son; and just as the sun has from the beginning generated its own rays and even now begets them and will continue to generate them, and nevertheless it cannot be inferred thence that the generation of the rays of the sun is not yet perfect, so also from eternity God has begotten, and always begets, and will never cease to beget, His own Wisdom, and nevertheless it cannot on that account be said that the generation of the Son is not yet perfect. The Holy Ghost, Ps. 2, 7, seems to intimate this. In these words the generation of the Son is expressed in the preterit in such a manner that nevertheless it is said to occur to-day, because the generation of the Son is present and will never cease. Yet there is this great distinction between the two: the sun is a substance, but the rays are an accident. But the substance of the Son is the same with the substance of the Father."

The eternal generation of the Son from the Father taught in the words of our text well fits in with the ideas expressed in the Second Psalm. The Second Psalm, from which our text is taken, is a Messianic psalm and speaks of the King, the Messiah: in vv. 1—3, of the raging of the heathen against the Lord and against His Anointed; in vv. 4—6, of the established and ever-abiding throne of God and of the King whom God set upon His holy hill of Zion; in vv. 7—9, of the King, or the Messiah Himself, introduced as the Speaker, telling us that He is the eternal Son of God and that unto Him is given the promise of the inheritance of the

heathen and the promise of Judgment. The fact that the *Son of God* is the *King* explains why He shall receive the heathen for an inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession and explains why the Judgment is given to Him. Vv. 10—12 the psalm closes with an exhortation to kiss the Son, that is, to accept Him as King and Messiah, and not to rage against Him as the heathen do, which was spoken of in v. 1. The psalm, therefore, closes with the words: "Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him." Hence we see that the explanation given in v. 7 of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father very well agrees with the context, in fact, is the explanation which the context calls for and for the sake of which the words are introduced.

We next ask, Is there any direct reference to these words, or even a quotation of these words, in other parts of Scripture? Three times our text is quoted in the New Testament: Acts 13, 33, Heb. 1, 5; 5, 5. Let us examine these passages.

Acts 13, 33. Some think to find that the use which Paul makes of Ps. 2, 7 clearly shows that the words do not teach the eternal generation of the Son from the Father. Let us examine the context. Paul says that Christ had been without cause slain by Pilate, taken down from the tree, and laid in a sepulcher. Then he continues: "But God raised Him from the dead." Then he says that God fulfilled the promise which He made unto the fathers unto their children in that He raised up Jesus again. Here it is where Paul introduces Ps. 2, 7. He does so, as the context shows, not because he thought that Ps. 2, 7 refers to Christ's resurrection, but to prove that *Christ is the Son of God* and therefore had to be raised from the dead, could not be holden of death, Acts 2, 24, and could not see corruption. "This day," therefore, cannot be made to refer to Christ's day of resurrection, as some exegetes assert. That would also conflict with the term *begotten*; for *begotten*, as we learned, does not mean "raised from the dead," but means "begotten" and nothing else. — Some exegetes have tried to help the cause of a right exegesis of Ps. 2, 7 by saying that the words of Acts 13, 33 "in that He hath raised up Jesus again" do not mean that He raised Him from the dead, but that He raised Him up as a prophet is raised up, as a prophet is sent to appear. But this exegesis cannot stand in the light of the context and the words there used, for the apostle had already distinctly said, v. 30, that God raised up Jesus from the dead. He is speaking of Christ's resurrection and therefore takes it for granted that when he simply

speaks of Christ's being raised up again, as he does again in v. 37, he is understood to mean that Jesus had been raised up from the dead, as he distinctly had said and again says in the following verse. The word *ἀνάστημι* is also used by itself, simply to mean "raised from the dead," as, for instance, John 6, 39. 40. 44. 54; so also Acts 2, 32.

The two other places where Ps. 2, 7 is quoted in the New Testament are both found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1, 5 and 5, 5. In the first chapter we are told that God in these last days has spoken to us by His Son, of whom it is said: "By whom also He made the worlds; who, being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Then the writer continues by quoting Ps. 2, 7 in order to prove, as we readily see, that Christ has a more glorious name than the angels, namely, that of *Son of God*. V. 5 reads: "For unto which of the angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee? And again, I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son?" That the writer introduces this quotation in order to prove that Christ is the eternal Son of God is also seen from the following verses, vv. 6—14, where he continues to quote other Scripture-passages for the same purpose.

In the fifth chapter the writer to the Hebrews speaks of the priesthood and says, v. 4: "No man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Then he proceeds, v. 5: "So also Christ glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest, but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son; to-day have I begotten Thee." The writer to the Hebrews quotes Ps. 2, 7 to show that even as a high priest taken from among men was called by God to the priesthood, so also the Son of God Himself, *eternally begotten of the Father*, was called to be a High Priest *by Him whose eternal Son He is*.

A few testimonies of theologians are herewith given:—

Starke says in his *Synopsis*: "*Heute* bedeutet eigentlich den gegenwaertigen Tag, darin man etwas tut oder redet; hernach wird es auch in einem weitlaeuftigen Verstande gebraucht, so dass es auch etwas von der vergangenen und etwas von der naechstkuenftigen Zeit mit in sich begreift; als wenn man sagt: *Vor*

alters war es so, aber *heutigestags* ist es anders. In solchem Verstande kommt es vor 1 Sam. 10, 19; 8, 5. 6; Jer. 34, 15. Bisweilen bedeutet es die ganze Zeit des Neuen Testaments. Hebr. 13, 8. Hier aber bedeutet es nicht einen Tag der Zeit noch den Tag der Auferstehung Christi — denn daran war er nicht erst als ein Sohn Gottes gezeugt, weil er sich dadurch bewies, dass er der Sohn Gottes wesentlich sei, Roem. 1, 4 —, sondern es bedeutet einen Tag der Ewigkeit, darin keine Folge noch Abwechslung statt hat, weil bei Gott weder Vergangenes noch Zukuenftiges, sondern alles gegenwaertig und *ein bestaendiges Heute ist*. Daher sagt man recht: Gott der Vater hat den Sohn gezeugt, *er zeugt ihn noch und wird ihn in Ewigkeit zeugen. Apud Deum nunquam crastinus, nunquam hesternus dies est, sed semper hodie.* (August.) Einige erklaren dieses Zeugen von der Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes; als sagte der Vater: Ich habe dich *heute*, naemlich zur Zeit deiner Menschwerdung zu einem Menschen, gezeugt; allein die Heilige Schrift redet so nicht, dass der Vater den Sohn in der Menschwerdung gezeuget habe.”

Gerok, in his *Explanation of the Psalms*, says: “Heute — wann war dieses Heute? Nicht erst, als er gen Himmel fuhr und sich setzte zur Rechten des himmlischen Vaters; auch nicht erst, als er aus dem Grabe wieder auferstand in der Kraft Gottes; auch nicht erst, als bei der Verklaerung auf Tabor oder bei der Taufe im Jordan es hiess: ‘Dies ist mein lieber Sohn, an welchem ich Wohlgefallen habe’; auch nicht erst, als er als ein Kindlein in der Krippe lag, war dieses Heute, da Gott ihn gezeuget; nein, von Ewigkeit war er Gottes Sohn, so wie kein Mensch, kein Fuerst, kein Frommer auf Erden und kein Engel im Himmel es war oder ist oder sein wird. Von Ewigkeit ist er Gottes Sohn, und darum kann auch keine Zeit ihm seine Krone rauben. . . . Und darum hat er auch von Ewigkeit her das Regentschaftsrecht und die Oberherrlichkeit ueber die ganze Erde.”

Stoeckhardt says that Ps. 2, 7 is the *locus classicus generationis aeternae*. He writes: “Ehe der Welt Grund gelegt ward, sprach der ewige Vater zu dem ewigen Sohn: ‘Heute habe ich dich gezeuget.’ Es ist das Heute Gottes, das Heute der Ewigkeit. Jesus Christus ist Gottes Sohn, vom Vater in Ewigkeit geboren. Er ist wahrhaftig Gottes Sohn, vom Vater gezeugt und geboren. Zu welchen Menschen, zu welchen Engeln hat Gott je gesagt: ‘Du bist mein Sohn, heute habe ich dich gezeuget’? Hebr. 1, 5. Auch Menschen, auch die Engel, heissen wohl Gottes Kinder. Aber

Christus ist der einige Sohn, der eingeborne Sohn Gottes, aus dem Wesen des Vaters gezeugt, nicht gemacht oder geschaffen, der eingeborne Sohn, der von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit in des Vaters Schoss ist. Das Geheimnis ist gross und tief. *Wir koennen keine Silbe mehr davon sagen, als die Schrift sagt.* Jede menschliche Auslegung verflacht nur dieses gottselige Geheimnis. Christus ist wahrhaftig und gewiss Gottes Sohn."

Says Luther: "Von dem Worte: 'Heute habe ich dich gezeugt' haben die Lehrer mancherleiweise disputiert. Denn etliche verstehen es von der Geburt Christi, etliche von der Auferstehung und Zeit des Neuen Testaments. Aber wir sollen bei dem Buchstaben und den einfaltigen Worten bleiben; denn das hebraeische Wort heisst eigentlich *zeugen*. Dasselbe kann hier nicht verstanden werden von der natuerlichen oder zeitlichen Geburt; denn hier wird nicht von Menschen, sondern von Gott geredet. Darum heisst es eine ewige und unsichtliche Geburt. St. Augustinus sagt, dass bei und vor Gott weder Vergangenes noch Zukuenftiges sei, sondern ausserhalb der Zeit und in Ewigkeit sei alles gegenwaertig da. Gleichwohl wollte der Heilige Geist der vergangenen Zeit brauchen, auf dass er eine vollkommene Geburt anzeige. *An ihm selbst wird und ist Gottes Sohn heute, taeglich und allezeit geboren; denn was ewig ist, hat weder Vergangenes noch Zukuenftiges.* Auf die Weise soll man das Heute verstehen von der Zeit, wie sie vor Gott ist, nicht wie wir sie halten. Denn Gott redet hier nicht mit uns, sondern mit dem, der ausser der Zeit bei Gott ist. Wir haben diesen Unterschied der Zeit, dass bei uns ein ander Ding ist heute, ein anderes gestern, ein anderes morgen. Von diesem Unterschied weiss das Ewige nichts, da keine Zeit ist, weder vergangene noch zukuenftige, sondern ein ewiges Heute, 2 Petr. 3, 8; denn bei Gott ist Anfang, Ende und Mitte der Zeit ein Augenblick. Durchs Wort *heute* wird bedeutet die Ewigkeit, so da ist die stete Gegenwaertigkeit Gottes, wie Christus spricht Joh. 8, 58: 'Ehe denn Abraham ward, bin ich.' Denn darin heisst's nicht: er war oder wird werden, ist auch weder gestern noch morgen darin, sondern ist und heute. Er ist nicht gemacht oder geschaffen, sondern gezeugt, nicht geistlicher-, sondern natuerlicherweise gezeugt; auch nicht anders denn heute, das ist, gleich ewig; auch nicht vor oder nach dem Vater, sondern zu dieser Zeit, welche vom Vater *heute* genannt wird, dass also die Meinung ist: Du bist wahrhafter, natuerlicher und ewiger Gott. Diese Worte reden wir nach wie ein Papagei ohne allen Verstand; denn wir sind zeitliche, das ist, vergaengliche

und sterbliche Leute oder vielmehr ein kleines, winziges Stuecklein von der Zeit. Denn was gewesen ist, das ist dahin; was aber zukuenftig ist, das haben wir nicht. Also haben wir von der Zeit nichts denn nur einen Augenblick, der gegenwaertig ist. Darum gehoert das Wort *heute* zu der ewigen Geburt des Sohnes, was unwidersprechlich beweist, dass er nicht eine Kreatur ist. Denn er ist heute, das ist, in Ewigkeit, geboren, ohne Anfang und Ende, und seine Geburt ist stets aufs allergegenwaertigste." (St. Louis, V, 135ff.)

There is no doubt that according to a correct exegesis Ps. 2, 7 teaches the eternal generation of the Son from the Father and that the Church should therefore use also this text as a proof-text for the doctrine which it confesses when it says: "I believe that Jesus Christ is true God, begotten of the Father from eternity."
