me, Thou art my Father.... Also I  
will make him my firstborn, higher than  
the kings of the earth’]:—namely, by  
setting Thee on the throne of my people:  
and the term **this day** will most naturally  
be referred to the time of the anointing of  
the King on Zion, as the act whereby he  
was manifested as Son of God in this  
sense.” And so Calvin. The above remarks seem pertinent and unobjectionable,  
as long as we regard them as explaining  
the supposed immediate reference to David  
and present circumstances: but it is plain  
that, according to the above view of Ps. ii.,  
and indeed to the usage of the New Test.,  
in applying this passage to our Lord, we   
want another and a higher sense in which  
both the words, **I have begotten,** and **this  
day,** may be applicable to Him : a sense in  
which I should be disposed to say that the  
words must in their fulness of meaning be  
taken, to the neglect and almost the obliteration of that their supposed lower reference. For, granting the application of  
such sayings to our Lord, then must the  
terms of them, suggested by the Holy  
Spirit of prophecy, which is His testimony,  
bear adequate interpretations as regards  
His person and office. It has not therefore been without reason that the Fathers, and so many modern divines, have found  
in this term **I have begotten** the doctrine  
of the generation of the Son of God, and  
have endeavoured, in accordance with such  
reference, to assign a fitting sense to **this  
day**. As the subject is exceedingly important, and has been generally passed over slightly by our English expositors, I shall  
need no apology for gathering from Bleck  
and Snuicer the opinions and testimonies  
concerning it. 1) One view refers **this  
day** to the eternal generation of the Son,  
and regards it as an expression of the everlasting *present* of eternity. Thus Origen very grandly says, “This is said to Him by  
God, with whom ‘to-day’ ever is present:   
for with God, as I think, is no evening,  
because neither is there morning, but the  
time which reaches, so to speak, over His  
unbegotten and eternal life, is an everlasting ‘to-day,’ in which the Son is  
begotten: no beginning of His being begotten being found, as neither of this  
‘to-day.’” And so Athanasius, Augustine,  
and other Fathers and moderns. 2) A second, to the generation, *in time,* of the Incarnate Son of Man, when Jesus assumed  
the divine nature on the side of his *Manhood also:* so Chrysostom, Theodoret,  
Eusebius, Cyril Alex., and others. 3) A  
third, to the period when Jesus was manifested to men as the Son of God, i.e. by most, to the time of the Resurrection, with  
reference to Acts xiii. 33, where St. Paul  
alleges this citation as thus applying [so,  
recently, Delitzsch]: by some, to that of  
the Ascension, when He was set at the  
right hand of God and entered on His  
heavenly High Priesthood [ch. v. 5]: so Hilary, Ambrose, Calvin, Grotius, and the Socinians. Owen also takes the same  
view [“the eternal generation of Christ,  
on which His filiation or sonship, both name  
and thing, doth depend, is to be taken  
only declaratively, and that declaration to  
be made in His resurrection, and exaltation over all, that ensued thereon”]. Of these interpretations, I agree with Bleck  
that the *first* is that which best agrees  
with the context. The former verses represent to us the Son of God as standing in this relation to the Father before the  
worlds: and ver. 6, which plainly forms a  
contrast to this ver. 5 as to time, treats  
distinctly of the period of the Incarnation.  
It is natural then to suppose that this  
verse is to be referred to a time prior to  
that event) ? **And again** (how is the ellipsis  
here to be supplied? Probably, **and** [*to  
whom of the angels ever said He*] **again**:  
or perhaps, **again** [see below on ver. 6]  
merely serves to introduce a fresh citation), **I will be to Him as** (for) **a father, and he shall be to me as** (for) **a son** (the citation  
is from the Septuagint, as usual. It occurs in the prophecy of Nathan to David respecting David's offspring who should  
come after him. The import of it has been  
above considered, and its connexion with  
Ps. ii. shown to be probable. The direct primary reference of the words to Solomon, 1 Chron. xxii. 7–10, does not in any way  
preclude the view which I have there  
taken of their finding their higher and  
only worthy fulfilment in the greater Son  
of David, who should build the only Temple  
in which God would really dwell)?

**6.] But** (because a further proof, and a more  
decisive one as regards the angels, is about  
to be adduced) **when He again** (or, *“when  
again He?”* Does **again** introduce a  
new citation, or does it belong to the