

resurrection; declared to be the "Son of God." But though the resurrection proves him to be the "Son of God," yet it does not prove the Sonship of a nature which is *invisible* and divine. Had Jesus ever asserted that his divine nature was the Son of God; I would readily acknowledge that the truth of this assertion was proved by the resurrection: for, had he asserted a falsehood, God would not have raised him from the dead.

Mr. Watson, after endeavouring to shew that an opposition is expressed between what Christ was according to the flesh, and what he was according to a higher nature; proceeds to draw the following conclusion:—"Here then I think, whatever may be the sense of the phrase, according to "the spirit of holiness," which follows, and which, whether it refer to the divine nature of our Lord, or to the agency of the Holy Spirit in raising him from the dead, does not at all weaken the argument, because it does not affect the contrast in the text, is a passage in which the two natures of Christ are placed in distinction, and even in *opposition*, and of the higher or divine nature, it is expressly affirmed that it is the Son of God."

What! if the phrase, "according to the spirit of holiness," refers "to the agency of the holy spirit in raising our Lord from the dead," does it not weaken Mr. Watson's argument? Does it not lead us to conclude that *Jesus Christ* is the Son of God, with reference to the agency of that Spirit, in raising him from the dead? And if so, does it not follow that as the Son in question was raised from the dead, therefore the divine nature cannot be that Son? Moreover, if the phrase refer to that agency, then the sense of the passage in debate is as follows: concerning his son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the "Son of God" with power, in reference to the agency of the Holy Spirit, in raising him from the dead. If this sense be admitted it shews that the contrast which Mr. W. seems so anxious to establish, does not exist in the passage of which the controverted phrase forms a part.

To conclude, if that phrase does not signify, according to

The
Matt.

* The
they ten