

was his "*proper father*;" accused him of blasphemy for this assumption; took up stones to stone him; and at last brought him to trial and condemned him on this charge." From these positions, he draws certain conclusions; and immediately proceeds to illustrate and confirm them, by making some quotations from an able discussion on the subject, in a modern work.

But though these positions be fully admitted, yet, they do not prove the disputed doctrine. If we admit that the title "*Son of God*," was understood in the common language of the Jews, as one of higher import than the official term "*Messias*," still we must acknowledge, that the Jews in question, considered Christ as applying that *higher title* to himself,—to the identical person, whom they accused of blasphemy, and had attempted to *stone*;—to that person, who was brought to *trial* and condemned to an ignominious *death*.

Now, if the title "*Son of God*," was applied to him, who was thus treated, and if it was not the invisible nature which was thus treated, we shall be constrained to acknowledge, that the title in question was not applied to that nature. If, however, we view that title as applicable to a nature, which forms a constituent part of that complex personage, we at once see the propriety with which it was claimed. Thus, the very person, who stood before the Jewish council, and was ultimately crucified, did with the strictest propriety profess to be the Son of God.

Several arguments might be advanced, in order to prove that this title does not necessarily and inevitably imply deity, in the person to whom it may be applied. One proof, however, will be sufficient. The Scripture applies this title to Adam, if then, it necessarily and inevitably implies deity in the person to whom it is applied, we must conclude that Adam was divine. This cannot be admitted; I therefore, conclude, that the title in question, does not always imply deity in the person to whom it is given. That inspired men have with propriety applied it to Jesus, who is confessedly a divine person, I readily admit: because a moment's reflection must convince us that as the above title is strictly applicable to a nature forming a constituent part of that complex personage, it is also, appropriate to him in whom that nature is included. To

I
person
on the
son v
into h
entire
lay hi
quota
ing an
tled "