

titles is applicable to that person? Is it not that of "Son?"

We should ever remember that the names and titles which are strictly appropriate to one nature only, are frequently applied to that complex personage, even when the passages in which they stand, refer to a nature, to which those titles are not strictly applicable. An instance of this, occurs in the 13th verse of the 3d Chapter of John's Gospel. Whoever reads that passage, must be convinced, that under the title, "*Son of Man*," Jesus speaks with *express* and *distinguishing reference to his divine nature*. But we cannot consider that title as strictly applicable to the *divine nature*. If, however, we view Jesus as a complex personage, constituted such, by two united natures, we shall at once see, that the names and titles which are appropriate to those natures, are also appropriate to the personage, whom those united natures constitute.

If this be granted, it must follow, that Jesus could with propriety stile himself the "*Son of Man*;" because, that title is appropriate to the human nature, which forms a constituent part of his person. If the above argument meets with due attention it will also shew the propriety with which the title "*Son*" is used. Thus, the title "*Son*," is as inapplicable to the divine nature, as the title "*Son of Man*," which occurs in the passage just quoted. The foregoing observations point out the propriety with which those titles are given to that glorious person, who "*liveth and was dead*."

Mr. Watson informs us, page 12, that "*of the human nature of Jesus, the first person is not the Father*." Now, if Mr. Watson allows that the human nature of Jesus has a Father, and that the first person is not the Father of that nature, he must, in order to be consistent, believe that Jesus, viewed as a complex personage, must be considered as having two Fathers. Mr. W. endeavours to shew, that the *first person* is the Father of the *divine nature only*. But, who I would ask, is the Father of the human nature? That *title* is not applied to the *Holy Ghost* in any part of the sacred volume. Indeed, the 32nd and 35th verses of the first chapter of Luke, afford strong proof, that the first person is the Father of the nature in question. If we turn to the baptism of our Lord, we