

## TRULY, AN AMAZING PROPHECY

A thousand years before the coming of Jesus into the world, the Psalmist David gives an amazing prophecy of the Messiah and the coming kingdom, in the second Psalm. After speaking of the raging of God's enemies, the Lord speaks of His viewing their futile efforts to prevent His divine rule in His kingdom. He is pictured as laughing at their vain efforts, like an adult laughs at a small child trying to take him down. In spite of all these efforts, they will not keep Him from setting His king upon the throne. This is more than a prophecy of David himself, or Solomon his son, but its ultimate application is seen in the New Testament regarding Jesus our Savior. Verse seven (7) reads, "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." As the "Son", He would be placed on the throne. This would be after He had been begotten. The word "day" has puzzled students of scripture for ages. Was the day referring to "eternity" itself, or a particular time in the distant future? Some argue that it was in the eternal realm before the earth began, thus making Christ having been "begotten" **as** the Son, before "time" even began.

With reference to two passages in the New Testament that quote Psalms 2:7 (Heb. 1:5 and 5:5). Rees, in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, on page 426, states, "Commentators differ as to whether the act of begetting in these two passages is in (a) the eternal generation, or (b) the incarnation in time, or (c) the resurrection and ascension." Rees combines the resurrection and ascension together. Other writers separate the two, and maintain that Jesus was "begotten" at the resurrection, and even twice after His ascension—when He was crowned King, and when He was ordained the High Priest, as if they were separate events regarding a "begettal". Rees and others seem somewhat uncertain, as the word "seems" is often used to describe them. McCord and others make a distinction. Just because Psa. 2:7 is **quoted** in the New Testament in more than one context, does not mean that the begettal is taking place at

the resurrection, again at the coronation, and yet again at His ordination as High Priest.

Many conservative thinkers and writers are more confident that the application of Psa. 2:7 in the New Testament, is merely **identifying** the one being raised, crowned and ordained, **as** the One who had already been “begotten” by the Father—in His incarnation. The words “beget,” “begat,” and “begotten” always apply literally to the process of a bringing forth of a child into the world, most usually the “father—son” relationship being formed. In the New Testament, it is used figuratively to the process of one receiving the **word** of God as a part of the “new birth”. We need to remember that before there can be a “figurative” application of a word, the “literal” must exist. For instance, the words “adultery” and “fornication”, based on the literal acts, are used to describe those who betray God and turn to idols or false religion. God pictures His bride, Israel, as having committed adultery with stones, as a wife would commit adultery with another man (Jer. 3:8-9). There **has** to be some kind of similarity between two things in order to make a proper application of something, based on the literal. There **is** such a similarity relating to literal begetting, and spiritual begetting, but we see absolutely **no** similarity or connection between a “begettal” and the resurrection, coronation and ordination of Jesus. A figure of something should reflect the original image in some way. Just **how** does (a) An eternal existence of One, or (b) A resurrection of Jesus from the dead, or (c) The coronation of Jesus as King, or (d) The ordaining of Jesus as a High Priest, **in any way reflect a real begettal????** This is a point that must be recognized as the truth on this subject shines forth.

In the “new birth”, the seed (word of God) is sown or planted in the hearts of men and women, and it ultimately produces after its kind. Paul said he had begotten the Corinthians through the gospel. Peter said one is begotten through the incorruptible seed of the “word of God” (1 Pet. 1:23). James declared that God “begets” through the word (Jas. 1;18). Thus, in the new birth, there is the role of the Spirit through the word,

and the delivery of the new babe in Christ into the kingdom of God (John 3:3-5; Col. 1:13). With reference to Jesus, it was said that the Spirit would overshadow Mary, and cause her to conceive, and bring forth a child who would be named “Jesus”, and He would be **called** the Son of the Highest (Luke 1:31-35). Thus, Jesus' appearance on earth involved a “begetting”. Five times in the New Testament, Jesus is properly referred to as “the only begotten Son of God” or “the begotten of the Father”. Then, there other references **to** His being “begotten,” where He is not called the “only begotten,” but simply “the begotten.”

The Jamieson-Fausset-Brown Commentary states:

In Acts 13:37, Paul's quotation does not imply an application of this passage to the resurrection: for “raised up” in Acts 13:33 is used in Acts 2:30; 3:22, etc., to denote **bringing Him into being as a man**; (emph. DWT) and not that of resurrection.”

Bear in mind that Psa. 2:7 first refers to “the **decree**” which alludes to a covenant or plan or purpose of the coming of the “Son” in the flesh—His incarnation, which plan or decree that it was to be done, certainly involved a beginning, at the begettal. The times it is quoted in the New Testament in connection with the resurrection, coronation and ordination as High Priest, are obviously stated to **identify** the One involved, **as** the One who **had been begotten** (prior to His birth to the virgin Mary). If, in each instance, there was a begettal “that day” (literally), it would seem strange indeed that there were three other begettals (relating to a birth) for **One Person—Jesus**.

In checking many of the versions or translations of Psa. 2:7, you will find that over half (50%) of them invariably use the word “begotten” for the original word *gennao* (so rendered in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, the translation in existence during the life of Jesus on earth). Obviously, a majority of the translators consistently saw that “begotten” is the best word to be used. Too bad that those scholars did not have access to some of the “scholarship” in the brotherhood today. Regarding the word “day” of Psa. 2:7, the Pulpit Commentary on Psalms (Vol. 8, page 11) states:

If it be asked, "Which day?" the answer would seem to be, the day when Christ commenced his redemptive work: then the Father "committed all judgment"--all dominion over creation--"to the Son" (John v. 22), gave him, as it were, a new existence, a new sphere, the throne of the world, and of all that is or that ever will be, in it.

According to the "decree" the Word was to become the Son of God, and from that "sonship" He would become King and High Priest. The two offices are always together in the scheme of redemption. Zechariah 6:12 declares that the Branch (Jesus) was to **sit** and **rule** on His throne. When He became King, he was automatically ordained as our High Priest in heaven. The two positions are **always** (from their beginning) simultaneous His "dominion" (given to Him when He went before the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7:13-14) began, and He has always been a Priest on His throne as King. The Hebrew writer stated, "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." (Heb. 8:1). Thus, when Jesus began His reign as King, He immediately and automatically began His role as High Priest. One did not exist without the other. So, the "theory" that Jesus was "begotten twice" (once when crowned King, and another time when ordained as High Priest) is falacious—it simply did not occur in that manner.

In Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible (Bible Study Tools.Google), there is found this statement: ""He was a Son, previous to his being Prophet, Priest, and King; and his office is not the foundation of his sonship, but his sonship is the foundation of his office." **We concur with this without question.**

An interesting thing is taking place at the time of this writing. It has been announced that the Waldorf Hotel in New York City is being sold to a Chinese group for the sum of \$2.95 billion. The television news announced that this hotel, with the enormous size of the price being paid, is "one of a kind" transaction. Would the Greeks say it was a "*monogenes*" transaction? Doubtful! However, some "scholars" just might do so, if put on the spot. With reference to Jesus being born "one of a kind", that simply does not fit. If we use the word "kind" in general, just **how** was He "one of a kind?" He

was born physically like every one else, but, (a) His conception was special, and (b) His mother was different, in that she was a virgin, and had not known man sexually. These two points should not be forgotten. These are the **only** reasons Jesus was “unique”. Now, if we use the word “kind” with reference to His “divine nature”, Jesus was **not** “one of a kind” at that point, for there was also the Father and the Holy Spirit who were and are of the “divine nature”. So, Jesus was not “unique” in this sense either. If we say He was the “only Son” God ever had, we err there too. God had other sons, such as the angels (who are called such in scripture), and then there was Adam, who is said to be “the son of God” (Luke 3:38). So, the **only way** Jesus was *monogenes* was in His “incarnation”--when Mary, a virgin, conceived Him of the Holy Spirit.

Just to say “Jesus was unique” does not tell **how** He was unique. Does this mean that He was “unique” because He was “unique?” Such is to dodge the issue. One may say, “I don't go out in the dark at night, because I am afraid” is a dodge. Just **why** is that one “afraid?” Is he “afraid because he is afraid?” Certainly not! There has to be a “reason” **why** he is “afraid”, and that might be because he is afraid of ghosts or wild dogs, or because his vision is impaired. Just to say “he is afraid because he is afraid” is absurd. Just so, to say “Jesus is unique because He is unique” is just as absurd. Why not tell **why** he is “unique.” John tells us why.

Many gospel preachers have declared that the Lord's church is “different” or “unlike”. But, not one such sermon was delivered without showing **why** it is “unique.” Does one just get up and say, “The church of Christ is unique because it is unique” or does one tell **why** it is unique? To ask this question is to answer it. The church of Christ is unique because of its purchase price, its adherence only to the scripture, its scriptural worship, and its name identification. Just so, we agree wholeheartedly that Jesus **is** “unique,” but He is such because of two things: (1) His miraculous conception, and (2) His virgin birth. Why not leave the references to His being the “only begotten Son” in

place. He is the “only” one ever conceived by the Holy Spirit, directly from God, and that through a virgin, that there ever was or shall be. There will never again be another like Him. He is the “only” one ever “begotten” in this manner. When He thus came into the world, John says they “beheld his glory”. He is different. He is the glorious Son of God in the manner described, and not just some man who came along through the natural birth process, that God decided to use as His son.

Don W. Tarbet, 215 W. Sears, Denison, Texas 75020 <donwtarbet@cableone.net>