

answered in a transport of joy, "My Lord and my God." Here it undeniably appears that Jesus, the very person whom the Jews had treated as a malefactor, was acknowledged by the Apostle to be truly God.

But, did the Apostle apply this title, implying divine honor, to a nature infinitely below God? I answer most decidedly, No. It may indeed be asked, how, then, can he be justified, in acknowledging his crucified master to be his "Lord and his God"? Is it possible, that he who suffered death in its most hideous form, can be God?

To this I reply, Thomas addressed the risen Saviour, as a person in whom is included the underived nature; which nature alone, is the real object of adoration; and to which the names and titles of the ever blessed God, are with propriety ascribed. But, let us consider this more at length. Whatever names and titles are appropriate to a nature constituting a person, must be considered as appropriate to the person whom that nature constitutes. Now if it be allowed, that in Jesus, the divine and human natures are united, so as to constitute but one complex personage,* it follows; that the names and titles which are appropriate to those natures, must be considered as appropriate to the one complex personage, whom those united natures constitute. As, therefore, in speaking of Jesus, as an individual person, we may with propriety call him "God," because in him is included the underived nature, to which that title is applicable, so may we also call him "the Son of God" because in him, is included the nature, to which that title is applicable. From what has been said, it must be obvious, to every unprejudiced person, that there would be as much impropriety, in supposing that he is called, "the Son of God," with absolute and abstract reference to the Eternal Word, included in him, as there would be, in supposing the title "God," is applied to him, in reference to his human nature.

* Christ, with respect to his divine nature, has existed from everlasting; and we must consider him as a complex personage, only from the moment in which that nature became incarnate: because the joining together, or complexure which then took place, constituted him a complex personage. The contradictions and absurdities which flow from the supposition of his having been complex from everlasting, are too obvious to need pointing out.