

God." The evangelist informs us, that "when Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his Disciples, saying, whom do men say that I, the son of man, am? And they said, some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets." "He saith unto them, but whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.'" Mr. Watson intimates, there is an opposition between the terms, "Son of Man," and "Son of God;" and that here, as well as in the passage quoted from Romans, the first title stands for the designation of the human nature, and the second for that of a higher nature. But were Mr. W. more careful in studying the sacred volume, he would find that Peter's confession, was not an answer to the question in which the title "Son of Man" occurs; but, on the contrary, it was an answer to a subsequent one, viz. "But whom say ye that I am?" As for the pretended opposition, I am really unable to discover any intimation of it in the passage. Is not the identical person who stiled himself the "Son of Man," declared by Peter to be the son of the living God? If under these two titles the very same person be alluded to, where, I enquire, is the pretended opposition? The titles are indeed different, but they are both applied to the very same person, and consequently, are to be understood of one person only.

If this conclusion be admitted, the asserted opposition will appear, "as the baseless fabric of a vision"; and we shall be constrained to view Peter, as speaking with *sole reference* to that suffering Jesus, whom he had already followed for a considerable time; and whom he had frequently *seen* in the very act of performing those stupendous miracles, which at once explained the prophecies; and which, accompanied with the influence of God, proved the person, by whom they were performed, to be "*The Son of the living God.*" Thus Peter, far from speaking with reference to a supposed eternal generation, of a nature which is invisible and underived, spake with mere reference to a *person, whom he actually saw and addressed.*

Let us now consider the example afforded in Matthew; the 14 ch. 33 ver. "Of a truth, thou art the son of God."

T
tic
Th
su
con

the
this
him
rep
Our
it is
title
pers
to sa
feren
tive
sistib
"wh
hast
eth w

If v
the a
huma
and c
due to
cause
is the
that p
noticed

In t
positio
him to
ed whe
to obta
they pr
claim to
proclair
sisted h