

he was given for the redemption of man, be a subject of eternal admiration?

The arguments which have been adduced in a preceding part of this letter, sufficiently prove that this complex personage is with propriety entitled, "the only begotten Son."

But to return, in the course of Mr. W's argument on this passage, I find the following quotation: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. 3, 17. If this passage be fairly interpreted, it cannot be understood, as being solely and exclusively applied to the divine nature. We find, that Jesus, the supposed Son of Joseph, came from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him; and that being baptized, and having gone up straightway out of the water, the Heavens were opened unto him; and a voice was heard from those glorious mansions, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Thus, the very person who went up straightway out of the water, was declared to be the *beloved Son of God*.

But what was this person? I answer, unhesitatingly, he was a complex personage, constituted such by the union of the divine and human natures. In the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, we may see the meaning in which the Baptist understood this declaration. We there learn, that seeing Jesus come unto him, he proceeded to give the most pointed evidence that this is the *Son of God*.

Observe, this evidence was given concerning the person whom John *saw* in the very act of coming unto him.

It was not the *divine nature* which he *saw*; and consequently, his declaration was not applied solely and exclusively to that nature: but on the contrary, it *was* applied to the personage whom he really *saw* and *pointed out*.

When men examine scripture, with the determination of supporting a pre-established creed, they frequently draw conclusions, at once the most monstrous and absurd. Of this,