

ed from the seed of a human creature; and if he were thus begotten by the Father; it incontrovertibly follows, that in these respects, he is the only begotten of the Father. Let the persons who differ from me on this point, adduce a single instance, tending to prove that any other Son is in this sense, the begotten of the Father. If there never were another, then, Jesus must, in respect to the immaculate human nature, thus begotten, be the only begotten of the Father. To say, therefore, that this title is applied solely and exclusively to the divine nature of Christ, is to contradict matter of fact. But to proceed, if the title in question be appropriate to that immaculate human nature, which is a constituent part of the complex personage, called Jesus, it must also be considered as appropriate to that person.

If the arguments advanced in the preceding pages, do not prove this, they prove nothing; and I have, consequently, written in vain. But, if this point has been proved, the propriety of applying that title to Jesus, as a complex personage, is placed beyond the power of successful contradiction.

On the glory of this person, I remark, that if whatever is suitable to a nature, constituting a person, must be suitable to the person whom it constitutes, it follows, that whatever is suitable to the united natures which constitutes Jesus a complex personage, must be suitable to him, as a personage thus constituted. I conclude, therefore, that the glory suitable to the divine nature, must also be suitable to the complex personage, in whom that nature is included. I have sufficiently proved, that the personage just mentioned is with propriety entitled, "The only begotten of the Father." If, then, the disciples saw his glory, they could with propriety designate it, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." that is, such as was suitable to that person; such a glory as was suitable to the complex personage, in whom the divine and human natures are united; and to whom, their properties conjointly belong. Mr. Watson's argument on this passage, proceeds on the supposition that the title, "only begotten of the Father," is solely and exclusively applied to the divine nature of Jesus, merely, because under that title, assertions are made, which can only suit the *divine nature*.