shall find, that when the heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost had descended upon Jesus, a voice, representing the first person, was heard from Heaven: saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." John informs us, that this testimony was delivered concerning the person whom he had baptized, and whom he saw going up straightway out of the water.

Now, if this testimony had a reference to what John saw, and if that was the human nature of Jesus, must we not conclude, that the glorious person who gave the testimony, is the Father of that nature?

To proceed, Mr. W. offers to our attention the third and fourth verses in the first chapter of Romans, which he views as an express proof of the disputed doctrine. These seem to form his principal fort, I shall therefore quote them at length. "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, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Though Jesus wrought miracles sufficient to demonstrate both his divine mission and his divinity; yet the Jews viewed him as a mere pretender, and considered the power by which his miracles were wrought, as that of magic. - Some even said: "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the chief of the devils." However, the person who was thus treated, and ultimately crucified as a malefactor, was by the resurrection of his body, declared to be the Son of God; invested with a power which, far from being what the Jews basely supposed, was on the contrary, strictly according to the spirit of holiness.

Had Jesus been a mere pretender, his body would not have been raised from the dead. That astonishing event was, therefore, a manifest proof that the identical person who had been crucified was the "Son of God;" and that the power with which he was invested (as has already been observed,) was according to the spirit of holiness. This passage, therefore, shews that though Jesus was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, yet that identical person was, by the

n ?"

hare
ded to
they
rictly
of the
must
speaks
ature.
to the

at once

o those

n those

ld with that tia constiwith due
the title
ble to the
urs in the
at glorious

Now, if
Jesus has
her of that
that Jesus,
ed as having
the first perwho I would
te is not apvolume. Inr of Luke, afder of the naour Lord, we