



*Library of the Theological Seminary,*

PRINCETON, N. J.

---

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

SCC 10,776  
Carne, Robert Harkness  
Three letters on the generat  
of the manhood of the Son o





# THREE LETTERS

ON

THE GENERATION OF THE MANHOOD OF THE  
SON OF GOD.

---

A REVIEW  
OF THE DISCUSSION ON THIS SUBJECT.

---

AND AN ESSAY  
ON THE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE DEATH OF  
CHRIST.

---

WITH NOTES.

BY ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE, A.B.

LATE OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD; AND NOW MINISTER OF HIGH-  
STREET CHAPEL, EXETER.

---

SOLD BY EBENEZER PALMER,  
18, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON;

W. STRONG, 26, CLARE-STREET, BRISTOL, AND 56, HIGH-STREET,  
EXETER, AND W. C. POLLARD, NORTH-STREET.

MDCCCXXXIII.

*Price 7s. 6d.*



A DEFENCE AND EXPLICATION OF THE SINLESS-  
NESS, IMMORTALITY, AND INCORRUPTIBILITY  
OF THE HUMANITY OF THE SON OF GOD.

A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING WATCH,  
OR, QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

BY ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE, A.B.

LATE OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD; AND NOW MINISTER OF  
HIGH STREET CHAPEL, EXETER

PRINTED FOR EBENEZER PALMER,

18, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

MDCCCXXIX.

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY E. JUSTINS AND SON,  
BRICK LANE, SPITALFIELDS.



## A LETTER,

§c. §c.

---

MR. EDITOR,

IN your first number, I see much said about the body assumed by the Son of God, and the nature of the flesh of which it was constituted, and the condition it was in when he assumed it; and from the whole of the statements, I conclude, that thus much is meant; namely, that the body prepared by God for his Son was substantially the flesh of sin, and not only having some likeness to it; but that at his resurrection a change ensued in it, so as that it then became *sinless*. Thus, for example; Mr. Irving says, in your 24th page, ‘Christ, for the love he bore the human soul, consented to become a servant to her, and to be clothed with her body of sin and death.’—‘God prepared a body of fallen humanity for his Son, through the power of the Holy Ghost.’ And, in page 30, he avers of Christ, that ‘he bears their naked and complete sufferings without a remedy, in order that, after he had sucked all the poison of suffering out, and into himself, *into his body compressed* all the venom of sin, he might, by dying, make it all die, and by rising again, triumph over it in the souls of his people, who, if they had faith, would have no suffering, as they would have no sin.’ And then, in the theological department, I find it stated at page 98, that the Son of God ‘did by the Holy Ghost take a soul; and with and in that soul, he

did take flesh and blood of the Virgin,' that is, as it follows, 'fallen flesh.' To this it is added, that '*his* perfect holiness, *in* the human nature, is as necessary to the orthodox faith, as is *the unholiness of the nature* which he took.' And in the 99th page, I read, that 'his days of flesh put him into possession of our pitiful case, which he had undertaken to advocate; his taking *holy flesh at the resurrection*, brought him up into God's presence, to advocate it there. Each is needful in its place to our Mediator; both must meet together in our High Priest; and this hath ever been the doctrine of the orthodox church, and must remain so unto the end.'

Now, Mr. Editor, you will allow me to confine my remarks to the body of Christ, or what may be called, his flesh and blood. For, with respect to the *soul*, it does not interfere with the present question; nor would the question be at all materially affected by any particular opinion we might adopt relative to the soul's origination, whether it were that of its generation, or that of its immediate creation by God. With respect to the *body* then, I think, that the expression, at the beginning of your 'Theological Department, page 75, exceptionable; namely, that Christ is 'man, of the *substance of his mother!*' I know that this has place in what is called, the Creed of St. Athanasius; and I can suppose that it has found its way into the creeds of what are styled orthodox churches. But as there is only one orthodox church, which is the body of Christ, and is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets; so there is but "one *faith*," or *creed*. Similar to the above expression, to which I make exception, is that already quoted, 'He did take flesh and blood of the Virgin.' Is this, Mr. Editor, common sense? Is it matter of fact? Is it scripture? Did you ever see a man, or hear or read of a man, who owed his substance

to his mother?' But, to heighten the mystery, we are told that Christ had no father. 'With respect to his human nature,' says Doddridge, on Heb. vii. 3. 'he had *no father!*' Gill tells us the same story; 'as man, he had no father! Joseph was his reputed father only; nor was the Holy Ghost his father; *nor is he ever said to be begotten*, as man, but was *born* of a Virgin!' Here is a birth, without any begetting. Here is a case of equivocal generation; a perfect man, spontaneously produced, without seed, and without a sower! But your Journal, Mr. Editor, steers clear of this mistake; because it expressly refers the incarnation of Christ to 'the power of the Holy Ghost.' But we are not told how; except that the human flesh in Christ, owed all its *substance* to the Virgin mother. And as sin is supposed, though as I think erroneously, to have its chief seat in the body, hence we are told that the Son of God came into the world in the flesh of sin; and by consequence in a mortal condition, as other men.

But, in the first place, this is contrary to the quotations actually made in your Journal; in the two first of which we read thus, he 'became man, in all things like unto us, *except sin.*' Again, 'Christ did take flesh, which of nature was *subject* to sin; which, notwithstanding, he sanctified, even in the very instant of his *conception.*' And again, 'in all things like unto his brethren; not only as touching nature, but also qualities, *only sin except.*' Every creature is, of nature, subject to sin, if left to itself; and therefore, angels sinned, and Eve sinned, and also Adam. It is of God only, that we can say, he, of nature, cannot sin. But if "the Word that was God," and "was made flesh," or a man, did sanctify that flesh or man-nature which he assumed, not only from the womb, but in the very instant of its conception there, it was never, from the first moment of its embryo formation, subject to the

contagion of sin, or liable to the desert of sin, which is death. Your Journal admits he was kept from *sinning*, but the above quotations assert that he was without *sin*. Without that quality, or principle, or property; without the being of sin. So the apostle tells us, that God “made him sin,” in the eye of law and justice, “who knew not sin” at all himself. He does not say, that Christ knew *no* sin, as though he referred to action; but that, though he was legally and judicially constituted that, for the abolition of which he was the destined victim, namely, sin, in its entire being, in relation to his body, the church, yet he himself had no knowledge of sin, or acquaintance with it, as a person has who has it in his own nature and constitution. For if God the Son sanctified the body he assumed, even from its conception, through the intimate union subsisting between it and himself, then, as the union continued undissolved, so the consecration remained unbroken and undisturbed. Now you quote Hooker to prove this indissoluble union. ‘These natures, from the moment of their first combination, have been, and are, for ever inseparable. For even when his *soul* forsook the tabernacle of his body, his *deity* forsook *neither body nor soul*.’ You also quote Archbishop Sancroft; who says, ‘Always full of the Holy Ghost, and free from sin, he needed no cleansings nor expiation.’ And again, ‘clothed with all the *innocent* infirmities of our nature, and indulging himself in none of the contentments thereof, but exercising a perfect abnegation of himself, and of his own will, he suffered, being perfectly innocent.’ And, to refer to but one witness more, you quote Calvin against Menno: and to meet his objection, that no one sprung from sinful flesh could fulfil the law of God, he points to the 8th of Romans, where ‘Paul teaches that expiation was made in the *similitude* of sinful flesh,’ and not in the flesh of sin itself. ‘For

the nature of man, it is well known, was not corrupt from the beginning, but through a vitiosity accidentally superinduced. What then makes it less possible for God to sanctify the flesh of his Son?’

But, in the second place, as there was an impeccable sanctification of the manhood in Christ, both through its union with the person of the Son of God, and through the unction of the Holy Spirit, so I contend that it had an original holiness in its primitive formation; this I must endeavour to prove from the scriptures; your quotations, Mr. Editor, not supplying me with sufficient evidence to substantiate this part of my subject.

It was said of John Baptist, “ he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb.” And to Jeremiah, the Lord said, “ Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee.” And in the Notes to Barker’s English Translation of the Bible, in 1608, we have already noticed this declaration, ‘ Christ did take flesh, which he sanctified even in the very instant of his *conception*.’ But I am to shew still further, that the manhood was itself holy in its generation. We have remarked on the error of Gill and Doddridge, in respect to the *fatherless* origin of it. We have now to ascertain the generator of it, and also the generative principle. For the Virgin herself was no more than the ‘ *mother* of our Lord,’ as is well expressed by the Rev. Henry Cole, in his treatise on the Immortality of Christ’s Human Nature, ‘ the Virgin herself was a passively recipient vessel;’ whilst he himself, as incarnated, was the seed, that is to say, the *offspring* of the woman. Seed is used often in the scriptures for issue, for progeny; nor in any other sense is it ever applied to a woman. Nor can it be applied to the female in any other sense; because the seed, as the principle of production, is always in the male; and this holds generally good through all

nature, whether human, or merely animal, or vegetable. So that Dr. Gill, as quoted by Mr. Cole, is at a fault, when he asserts of the Holy Ghost, that ‘ he first took a part and portion of the Virgin, of her semen, or blood, and conveyed it to a proper place; and purified and sanctified it.’ For this is perfectly unnatural; it is a doctrine of self-impregnation; it is in diametrical opposition to what is now certainly known to be matter of fact, namely, that semen does not belong to the female, and is a secretion entirely foreign from her. And therefore, the promise to Eve, about “her seed,” related to the man Christ Jesus, as destined to spring from a future daughter of her’s, namely, Mary; as, on the other hand, the denouncement on Satan, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between *thy seed* and her seed, respects those whom Christ calls “the *children* of the wicked one.”

Now, because of the first promise to Eve, therefore it was that the predicted Shiloh, Messiah, and Prince of Peace, became “the desire of women;” and marriage and fruitfulness became so honorable among them. For they were held ignorant of the manner in which the child to be born, and the Son to be given, was to be produced. For although it was told them by Isaiah, “A *virgin* shall conceive, and bear a Son, and they shall call his name, Emanuel,” yet they did not imagine that this would transpire without the intervention of a human father. And although Jeremiah had said, “The Lord will create a new thing in the earth, a woman shall compass a man,” still, the precise fact intended in this, was not understood, until she, who was a travailing without human agency, had brought forth her first-born son. For even Mary herself replied to the angel, and said, “How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?”

But now for the *generator*. “Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise; when as his mother, Mary, was espoused to Joseph, before they came toge-

ther, she was found with child by the Holy Ghost," or, was found, having a fœtus or embryo in the womb, by or from the Holy Spirit. "And the angel said to Joseph, Fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is *begotten in her*, is by the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name, Jesus." And this was done, adds the evangelist, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, "a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son; and they shall call his name, Emanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us."

Such is the account of Matthew. Let us now produce that of Luke. "Gabriel was sent from God to a virgin, espoused to a man whose name was Joseph; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel said unto her, Behold, thou shalt *conceive* in thy womb," or, "shalt become with child, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called *the Son of the Highest*." And on Mary's enquiry, as to how this should be effected, which comes most naturally and most satisfactorily in, as it so clearly flows instantly from her, from a consciousness of her being then actually in a virgin state, "The angel said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also, *that holy thing* which shall be born of thee," or rather, "wherefore also, *the holy offspring*, shall be called *the Son of God*."

With such scriptures before us, how can we hesitate for a moment to acknowledge the Holy Spirit to be the generator in this most highly important case? Here is a virgin. She conceives; that is, receives impregnation, and becomes pregnant. This is said to be by the Holy Spirit. That which is begotten in her is by this blessed agent. That holy thing, or offspring, which was to be born of her, or of which she was to be delivered, was

from him. And for this purpose the Holy Spirit was to come upon the Virgin, and to overshadow her with his all-efficient energy and influence. Now Gill confesses, of the first of these phrases, "shall come upon thee," that it most plainly answers to *ba el*, in frequent use among the Jews, in respect to man and wife. And of the other phrase, "shall overshadow thee," he tells us, 'that some have thought the allusion may be to the nuptial covering, which was a veil or canopy like a tent under which the bridegroom and bride were betrothed.' Or, as Dr. Lightfoot thinks, 'it is a phrase alluding to a man's spreading the skirt of his garment over the woman; which Ruth desired of Boaz.' And then, in perfect coincidency with the other particulars of the evangelical records, the Virgin's child was to be called the "Son of the Highest;" her "holy offspring" was to be called "the Son of God."

So far, Mr. Editor, in respect to the party who is the generant and begetter, all is plain; because the scripture leaves not the thinnest vapour to obscure the aspect of the transaction in this particular of it. But another point remains to be disposed of. What was the generative principle, element or substance? For the generative faculty or power is one thing, and the mean employed is another. At the creation God originated man, the inferior animals, and the teeming subjects of the vegetable kingdom, with *seed* in themselves, according to their kinds. And the seed involves in itself, and preserves, and determines, the nature of the production. So that although there be but one common mother earth, whose womb is the matrix for all descriptions of seeds, yet every seed produces its own peculiar body; nor, because the same earth is the nurse which yields her own nutriment to all these innumerable bodies, do they, on this account, become deprived of their primordial and specific differences and distinctions. But



there must be seed sown. For it seems now an universally acknowledged principle, that there is not, in all nature, any perfectly and absolutely spontaneous generation ; but that all things come, somehow or other, by propagation. Therefore, in the account of the generation of Jesus Christ by both Matthew and Luke, there is not merely the announcement of the intended fact to the Virgin by the angel, that she should have a child, without the consummation of her marriage with Joseph, but there is also the most explicit avowal of the proposed agent. And this agent was able to *create seed*, and with it to impregnate the Virgin. In the instance of Abraham, who was through old age as one dead, God renewed the powers of nature in him, as well as in Sarah ; so as that, by virtue of this miraculous renovation, the generation of Isaac should be in the ordinary way. But here the miracle was after another manner ; it consisted in an instant act of the Spirit, who created what was requisite for the occasion. Yet it was no greater a miracle in itself than the creation of the wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee ; or than the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, to feed the five thousand ; or indeed, than the begetting of John, when Elizabeth was barren, and Zacharias and herself, “ were both well stricken in years.” This then I consider to be the plain, obvious, and positive matter of fact. The Lord the Spirit did, in a way consistent with his personal divinity, “ *create a new thing in the earth.*” This *hadashah* could not refer to a woman, as such, encompassing or enclosing a man-child ; but to the virgin, as *a novel daughter* in Israel, who would be the *nechebah* or maternal receptacle of this *gebur*, this El-gebur, or mighty God, who would be called Emanuel, God with us. It was a new creation ; it was the zera-el, or seed of God, the zera-kedosh, or *holy seed*, which was the *substance* of the manhood in the second

man and the last Adam. It is true that the Virgin was the medium of the production of this man, who was God's fellow, or associated One, the very Levi or united One; and that she did yield nutriment to the manhood, both before and after the birth; but it is not true that the substance of the manhood was derived from her.\* Will any one contend for the substance of the oak being inherent in the ground, and not in the acorn? Where is the germ of life for all bodies, unless in their several seeds? A soil is requisite as a matrix for them, and this aids and assists in their develop-

\* This mistake has been generally made by divines, from a deficiency of physical knowledge, as by the following—'The act of the Holy Ghost in this matter was a creating act. Not indeed like the first creating act, which produced the matter and substance of all things out of nothing, causing that to be which was not before, neither in matter nor form, nor passive disposition; but like those subsequent acts of creation, whereby, out of matter before made and prepared, things were made that which before they were not, but of themselves they had no active disposition unto, nor concurrence in. So man was created or formed of the dust of the earth, and woman, of a rib taken from man. There was a previous matter unto their creation, but such as gave no assistance, nor had any active disposition to the production of that particular kind of creature whereunto they were formed by the creating power of God. *Such was this act of the Holy Ghost in forming the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. For although it was effected by an act of infinite creating power, yet it was formed or made of the substance of the blessed Virgin.*'—*Dr. Owen*, vol. ii. p. 182.

'He formed Christ's body in the womb of the Virgin and of her substance; it was not like the first creation, wherein all things were made out of nothing: but like the forming the body of Adam out of the earth, and the body of Eve out of a rib taken from Adam. There was previous matter to work upon, though such matter as would never have produced that body but by an almighty creating power. Such the Holy Ghost exerted in forming Christ's body, and animating it with a living soul, that he might in all things be like to us, sin only excepted; for the Holy Ghost in this wonderful work, purified and sanctified that part of the substance of the Virgin Mary, so that what was conceived and born of her was perfectly holy and void of sin.'—*Iheron's Works*, vol. iii. p. 291.

ment, expansion, growth, and maturity ; but their substance is in themselves, a principle seminally inherent in them and vital.

As then the virgin did bring forth a son, so she must have conceived ; as she conceived, she must have been impregnated ; and this impregnation requires not only an agent, but the implanting of precisely that species of seed which is the organized germ from which alone *man* can be produced. Nor would the connexion with the maternal soil in which it was sown, and where it was quickened, and nourished, essentially alter its nature or qualities. It would remain itself in itself, and would be the rudiment, radicle, or root, of the specific body about to be produced from it ; and which therefore would at last prove the truth of the apostolic position, “ God giveth ” to the seed sown, “ a body, as it hath pleased him ; and to *every* seed its *own* body.” And hence, as the seed in question was holy, and it was the seed of God, that is, of God’s creating, even by the power of the Lord the Spirit, so the offspring was “ holy,” and was called “ the Son of God,” and was made “ a quickening spirit,” and it had “ a spiritual body,” and not a natural. For so in truth we find in the process of budding, ingrafting, and so on, the foreign stock into which the bud or the scion is inserted, does not change their nature ; but whilst they get nutriment from a source not precisely similar to themselves, they still preserve their own species, and at length produce their own respective fruits. As therefore Christ’s *prepared body* was holy, or sinless, so it was naturally immortal ; it had in itself no principle of mortality or corruption, nor did he become actually guilty by any personal criminality so as to deserve death ; but when he died he laid down his own life, or offered up himself, voluntarily, yea officially also as priest, a *living* sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God. Death is, properly

speaking, that necessary thing which must come to man, soon or late, as being the appointment of God on account of sin; the original sin of man being the transgression of the first law God gave to him, and whose declared penalty was death. Now Christ was not mortal in this sense. Death is also the one desert of sin, or its wages, under whatever law of God, whether natural or revealed, the sin may be committed. But Christ did no sin, and knew none; and hence there could be found no cause of death in him. Again; death is the consequence, and the outward expression of our moral condition, we being "dead in sins." Here plainly we have cause and effect, but in Christ we have neither; not a birth in sin, and therefore no innate principle of mortality. But yet again, children may be involved in the mortal estate of their parents at least two ways; the one by a derivation of a mortal disease from them, the other by a legal act including them in the state of their parents. Thus Adam begat in his own likeness, and this posterior to his sin and the sentence of death which ensued; and therefore his offspring are all naturally sinful and mortal. Thus, too, the law of Moses involves the children, even to the third and fourth generation, in the fate of the offending parents. But neither of these cases apply to Christ. For not Joseph, but the Holy Ghost, was the begetter; and he produced *a holy offspring*. Accordingly, not being *seminally* in Adam, he could not be any more involved in Adam's penalty of death, than he could derive from him a fallen, sinful, and sinning nature. But as Christ was constituted *sin* for us, or in our stead, by a legal transfer at his own option, so it is clear that the curse and penalty were undergone by him voluntarily, and in consequence of his own suretyship undertakings. Here I would just add a word or two from Mr. Toplady. "We no where find, to the best of my remem-

brance, that Christ ever so much as once experienced any attack of sickness or disease. The reason of this extraordinary circumstance was, no doubt, owing to the *sinless formation* of his humanity, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost. *Sin* was that which introduced every kind of *ataxia* (or *disorder*), into the human system, and disease among the rest. But the Man Christ Jesus was formed and conceived totally without stain. Hence he was like our first parents before the fall, naturally immortal! *Nor could he have died*, had he not, by an act of gracious susception, taken the guilt of man upon himself, and became responsible to divine justice for the utmost payment of their penal debt. And even under these circumstances we read that his death though *violent*, was *voluntary*. His resignation of life is constantly represented in scripture as his own act and deed. For exclusively of his union with the second Person in the Godhead, his absolute freedom from sin would, of itself, have been *a certain security from dying*. Hence the evangelists express themselves thus, “He dismissed, or let go, his Spirit. He resigned, delivered up, or made a surrender of his Spirit.”

I shall now, Mr. Editor, in the third place, confirm my main position by particular scriptures; meet some grand objections; and then show reasons for the necessity of my position.

1. The first scripture I pray your attention to, is that of Paul to the Corinthians; “for the man is not of the woman;” that is, from the woman, from her substance. The man was not originally from the woman or her substance; nor does the man now owe his being to the woman. For whatever man exists, is indebted to man for his being and substance. The next scripture will confirm this; it is that of Paul to Timothy, “I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority

over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve." And therefore, Adam could not owe his existence to Eve. But another scripture will carry us still further; for in Genesis we find, not only that the man came not of the woman, and that he preceded her in his formation; but, what is more, that the woman was indebted for her being and substance to the man. "And the Lord God took one of Adam's ribs, and the rib made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman," or *aishah*, "because she was taken out of man," or *aish*. And what woman is there now, who traces her origin to any other source than to some man? Therefore Paul observes to the Corinthians, "But the woman is of the man." And again, "for as the woman is of the man." But "nevertheless, neither is the man *without* the woman, neither is the woman without the man in the Lord. For although the woman is and was "of the man," of his substance; "even so is the man also *through the medium* of the woman. The preposition is purposely changed here from *ek* to *dia*, to preserve the necessary distinction. But if the first man was not of or from the substance of a woman, from whom came he? Adam, says Luke in his genealogy, was "the son of God." His son by his own creative energy. And how well this type and figure becomes the great Antitype, we have now reason to admire, seeing that the second man and last Adam was generated in the Virgin by the Spirit of God, and thence was called the Son of God, and became a life-giving Spirit to his body and spouse the church. He is thus "the beginning of the creation of God." He is the "living stone" laid in Zion for a foundation. He is "the heavenly man," as Paul styles him in the 15th chapter of his 1st epistle to the Corinthians. "There is a natural body, and

there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul, but the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit. Howbeit, that body was not first which is spiritual," namely, Christ's, "but that which is natural," or the body of Adam. For "the first man was of the earth, earthy; the second man was the Lord from heaven." That is, in his personality he was *the Lord*, and even as to the manhood he assumed, it was itself *from heaven*. "As was the earthy man, such are they also that are earthy; and as was the heavenly man," namely, *begotten by the Holy Spirit*, "such are they also that are heavenly."

This scripture, Mr. Editor, seems of great importance in the debate. Here is a heavenly man; not merely from the union of the manhood to the Lord, but because the assumed body is spiritual, and from heaven. That it was from heaven we have already shown from Matthew and Luke's account of the impregnation of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit; not through any personal contact with her, inconsistent with a pure immaterial Spirit, but simply through creation of the generative principle.\* And in the 3rd of John, Jesus speaks of this as one of the heavenly things, in the contrast with which our regeneration by the Spirit is but as an earthly thing. "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things? For no man hath ascended up to heaven, but *he who came down from heaven, even the Son of Man* who is in heaven." I grant that this may refer to his official character, in which he was with the Father always as the Son of Man; and Daniel speaks of him in his 7th chapter under this very title; but I think it likewise alludes to the celestial origin of

---

\* See my Sermons on the Two Covenants, published by E. Palmer; particularly Sermon VIII. p. 237, on 1 Cor. xv. 44—49.

his manhood. Because John proceeds strongly to enforce his superiority over himself on this ground. "He that cometh from above," *anothen*, "is above all. He that is of the earth," has his origin from the earth, "is earthly," in his nature and propensities; "and speaketh of the earth. But he who cometh from heaven is above all." Besides, in the 6th of John, Jesus says, "I am that *bread* of life. This is the bread which cometh down *from heaven*, that a man may eat thereof and not die. And the bread that I will give is my *flesh*. Except ye eat the *flesh* of the *Son of Man*, and drink *his blood*, ye have no life in you." Now this I hold to be a new lump; bread, unleavened with the acid and bitter of sin. This flesh I take to belong to him, who is proposed to every true Israelite as the Lamb of God, as Abraham's lamb for a burnt-offering of God's own special providing, as the true passover lamb, as a lamb *without blemish and without spot*. And this blood I count it to be unpolluted—the precious blood of Christ—the blood of God, the God-man, with which he has purchased the flock, and redeemed it from all thralldom. It is the blood that hath life in it, and not death; that transmits life to the body and all its members, and not death. It is the blood, not of that one man, who became polluted in his blood, and by whose one disobedience the mass of mankind became sinners, and by whose one offence death reigns over all his progeny; but it is the blood of *the second* man, of *the last* Adam, even of him by whose one obedience the mass of his people are made righteous, and by whose one righteousness they attain unto justification of life.

But if I contend for Christ's manhood being from heaven, from above, and spiritual, on the ground of its being gendered by the Holy Ghost, I feel I am countenanced in this by what is averred of those who are "God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus."



Of such, the above scripture declares, that they are *heavenly*; "such are they also that are heavenly." They are elsewhere said to be "created in righteousness and true holiness;" to be "renewed in knowledge after the image of him who created them;" and to be "conformed to the image of the Son of God." But what is the origin of their celestial character? Their celestial descent. "Except a man be born," that is, *begotten* "again," but rather *anoother*, "from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." That which is begotten, or is the offspring of "the flesh is flesh; and that which is begotten of the Spirit is spirit." It is well known that the ordinary sense of the greek verb, is, to be, to be made, formed, created, produced, and so on; whereas our bible renders it *to be born*. Birth is the consequence; but there is a very necessary antecedent, and that is, a begetting. It is passing strange to say we are *born* of him by whom in fact we have been *begotten*, namely, the Spirit. So in the first chapter of John, we are said to be *born*, not of the will of man, "but of God." But it really means that we are begotten by God. "Of his own will he hath begotten us," says James, "through the word of truth;" which word of truth Peter calls the "incorruptible seed." And if we ask for a mother, Paul will direct us to Sarah, or Shurah, the elect lady, the true spouse of him who is the great *Shur*, or *Prince* and Lord of *peace*; he will direct us to the church in her gospel dignity and liberty, even to "Jerusalem, which is above, and is free, and is the mother of us all." Here, all looks like nature; the Spirit the agent; the word of truth the principle; and the church as the free-woman, the medium. We want a similar simplicity of process in the incarnation of the Son of God. And the scriptures help us to it; the virgin, the mother of our Lord, and the Spirit, the agent in her impregnation;

and from whose creative power, the embryo, or first germ of conception must have sprung. The apostles' creed therefore, says not amiss, of Christ, "who was *conceived* by the Holy Ghost," that is, formed in the womb, and "*born* of the Virgin Mary."\*

But I must produce one scripture more, and then pass on. "Destroy this *temple*," said Jesus; "and I

\* Charnock has given a good sketch of Christ's body, but a sorry account of its origin. 'It was a body so fitted, as to be obedient to the soul; to have no rebellious power in it, against reason and command; but to be fully and readily obedient in all its motions to God; not barely a body, but a body so tempered as to do the service required of it. It was not indeed fit, that the body wherein the Deity was to tabernacle, should be framed by a less wisdom, and slighter order, than the Mosaical tabernacle, which was a shadow of it, which was done by exact order, and by the inspiration of the Spirit, filling the workmen with skill. Exod. xxxi. 2, 3. Yet he was to have a holy body, free from any taint of moral imperfection, fit for the service he was devoted to; for which the least speck on his humanity had rendered him unfit; this could not have been had he descended from Adam by way of ordinary and natural generation. He had been a debtor himself, a lamb with blemish; and so wanted a sacrifice for himself. His sacrifice would have been defective, and have needed some other sacrifice to fill up the gaps of it. It was necessary he should descend from Adam in a way of birth, but not in a way of seminal traduction; that he might have the nature of ADAM, without the spot. Such a knot could not be untied without infinite skill, nor such a way of production be wrought without the infinite power of God. 'Therefore, the Holy Ghost frames this body of Christ of the seed of the woman, that it might be mortal, and have his heel bruised by the devil,' (Gen. iii. 15.) — *Vide his Works in folio, Vol. II. pp. 198.*

Who would have expected what follows from what had gone before? *Therefore*, because so holy and so spiritually fitted and disposed a body was required, 'the Holy Ghost frames this body of the seed of the woman!' And this too, 'that it might be mortal!' To which is added, 'not of the seed of the man, in an ordinary way of generation, that it might be without any taint of sin, sanctifying therefore the seed of the woman in a peculiar manner!' First, there is no such seed of the woman. Secondly, if it could have been so produced, to make it mortal, it must have been clearly sinful. But if it was really gendered, without *any* taint of sin, it was naturally exempt from death.

will raise it up in three days. But he spake of the temple of his body." And who built this temple? "A body," says Jesus, "hast *thou* prepared me." It was God's building. It was the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. The greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, "*not of this building*;" but rather, not of *this creation*. Christ was a new creation; and if any man be in Christ, he also is assimilated to him, he is a new creature. This Holy One could not see corruption even in the grave; but his very flesh rested in hope. He offered himself without spot to God. He rose released from the sin of his church; of which, having made an end by expiation, he could not possibly be holden in the hands of death. He rose, in his own manhood, precisely as he died. "Ye denied the Holy One and the Just," said Peter; he was so, when they denied him. He was "the holy *child* Jesus." And was it not as typical of Christ, that every hebrew male child was reckoned *holy* to the Lord? In a word, as he was begotten at first by the Spirit, so he was afterwards begotten again from the dead by the same quickening agent; and in both instances he has the pre-eminence over all his brethren as the first begotten. He is "the most Holy," of whom Daniel spoke; the holy place of the Holy Ones, or temple of the God-head. Therefore John says, of the true Jerusalem, "I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." This, as it is the Bethel, or house of God, so it is the dwelling-place of God's people. "Lord, *thou* hast been our dwelling-place," said Moses, "in all generations." And is it not to this sanctuary that the apostle alludes when he says, "For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens?"

I think it possible, that whilst he plainly refers to the dissolution of the body at death, he delicately hints at the then very near approaching destruction of that once holy and beautiful house at Jerusalem, in which the Jews were wont so much to glory.

But 2. I must now meet objections. And the first is this. Was not Christ predicted as the *seed* of the woman, and of Abraham, and of David? And does not Matthew call him the *son* of Abraham, and the son of David? This is very true, and the one expression will suffice to explain the other. Seed means offspring. "I am," said Jesus, "the offspring of David." Literally, seed signifies the matter in which is contained the procreative property, whether in reference to man, to the irrational animals, or to vegetables. But figuratively, it stands for the product; the cause is put for the effect. Thus Eli said to Elkanah, "The Lord give thee *seed* of this woman;" that is, a child from or out of this woman. And in this sense alone is Christ the seed of Eve. He is her offspring by her grand-daughter Mary; and by the same medium Christ is the son of Abraham, and of David; Mary springing from that line. For in the literal, primary, proper, and direct sense, seed is peculiar to the man; and only as figuratively employed, the causative principle being put for the thing produced, can it ever be applied to the woman. And therefore, in the genealogy by Matthew, the men *beget* from Abraham, down to "Joseph, the husband of Mary;" and then, instead of its being added, and Joseph begat Jesus, it is said "of whom was begotten Jesus." Not of Joseph; but of Mary; for the *whom*, in the greek, is feminine, and not masculine. It will therefore read thus, "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, out of which Mary was begotten Jesus, who is called Christ." Now Joseph being thus excluded from this begetting, it remained

for the evangelist to supply the omission; which he does by instantly declaring that, “when as his mother Mary was *espoused* to Joseph, before they came together, she was found *having that in her womb, which was from the Holy Ghost.*” Jesus then was truly the seed or son of Eve, of Abraham, and of David, by their daughter and his mother’s side, as proved by Luke; who calls Joseph, her husband, the son of Heli, because he was betrothed to Heli’s daughter Mary. For Joseph himself was the son of Jacob; and Mary was the daughter of Heli; but in virtue of the betrothment between them, Joseph became the son-in-law of Mary’s father. This reconciles the two genealogical accounts; Matthew proving Joseph, the reputed husband of Mary, to have been the son of Jacob, who was lineally descended from Abraham, Judah, and David; and Luke calling Joseph the son of Heli, because of his union with Heli’s daughter Mary, who was likewise lineally descended from Abraham, Judah, and David, though by a different family. They came of the same tree, though by different branches; and the tree itself, with all its branches, is then shown to have had but one root, and that one root to have had but one origin; that is to say, Adam, who was planted by God. “God hath made,” said Paul at Athens, “of one blood,” or “from the blood of *one man*, all nations of men.” For the seed, or producing principle, is nothing but a secretion from the blood of the man; and therefore it follows necessarily, that all mankind, as naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, owe their origin equally and alike to that one original fountain, the first man, who was from the earth, and was earthly. But in the special case of Christ, the natural order was broken; Joseph was superseded from being the communicating channel; and as in the first formation of the first man Adam, he could call the earth his mother, but could

only look to God as his Father, whose son therefore he is said to have been, so in respect to Christ; Mary, that earthen vessel, was truly the mother of our Lord, and his nurse; but God was his Father. Here was, as it were, “the residue of the Spirit;” and it produced “a godly seed;” or literally, *the seed of the Alehim*.

A second objection is this. If Christ took not a fallen nature, as immediately from the offspring of fallen Adam, how could he be at all a subject for temptation? And how, more especially, could he suffer, being tempted? And how, except he was of our fallen nature, and was tempted just as we are, and did suffer just as we do, how else can he be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and sympathize with us?

For the first particular in this complex objection, how could he be subject to temptation? The answer is easy. None but God is by nature immutable, because none but God is impassable; he cannot suffer from without, because he cannot become a patient, so as to be acted upon by external causes; and being in his own constitution absolutely perfect, infinitely and everlastingly, he cannot suffer from within. But the creatures differ from the Creator in this. They may suffer from within and from without. Not being of an infinite understanding, they are limited in their apprehensions of things; this leads them to reason about them; and reason is very liable to deceive them. Thus the angels were created pure and perfect according to their kind; but, somehow or other, they were beset by a temptation, when as yet they had no sin, and knew it not. So Eve; she was at that instant what God had made her, when the serpent tempted her. And so was Adam, when Eve tempted him. Now God could have restrained them from complying with the temptation, had it been his pleasure to have prevented their fall; and in that case, they would have severally been

tempted, and yet severally without sin. God being a sovereign, and having no superior, his own will is his sole law; and therefore, in this view also, it is impossible for God to be tempted to any transgression. But men and angels, even though they had no sort of supernatural revelation made to them, relative to the being and will of God, could yet be tempted to evil, in running counter to the dictates of right reason, and to the deductions which reason ought to make from those proofs of the Creator's Godhead, eternity, and power, which are so amply afforded them in the visible universe. And the manhood in the person of Christ, considered simply as a creature, was liable to be tempted to evil. The rational soul, if left to itself, might have gendered desires or imaginations contrary to God's will; or else it might have been solicited, through the medium of the body, to some improper indulgence of the lusts of the flesh. Else, how could it have so happened in the instance of Eve, who was the immediate creature of God? Yes, Christ was in all points tempted like as we are. Nay, it was impossible for him to have the perfect human nature, and to be any time performing his part on the stage of this world, without being tempted. If he had only taken a body and not a soul, clearly he could not have been tempted by any improper "desires of the *mind*;" or, if he had taken a human soul alone, with merely the semblance of a corporeal frame, without the substance of flesh and blood, then he could not have been tempted through the medium of the senses to indulge in "the lusts of the flesh." But since he was invested with the entire humanity in its full perfection, he was liable to every possible temptation, whether mental or corporeal.

But then, in the next place, how could he *suffer*, being tempted, except he assumed the flesh of sin? The query is, how did he suffer? Are we to suppose that

he suffered as Eve did, and as Adam after? That is, that he suffered a fall into actual sin:—no. For it is admitted that he “did no sin;” and that he “knew no sin.” Therefore, even Calvin, who contends for Christ’s having taken manhood of the very seed and substance of the woman, says, that ‘the same apostle, where he teacheth that Christ was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh to satisfy the law, doth so expressly sever him from the common estate of men, that he be very man, without fault and corruption.’ And again, ‘we do not make Christ free from all spot, for this cause, that he is only engendered of his mother, without the intervention of man, but because he is sanctified by the Holy Ghost; that the generation might be pure and uncorrupted, such as it should have been before the fall of Adam. And this always remained steadfastly determined with us, that so oft as the scripture putteth us in mind of the cleanness of Christ, it is meant of his true nature of manhood; because it were superfluous to say, that God is clean. Also, the sanctification that he speaketh of, in the sentence of John, could have no place in the nature of God. Neither are there feigned two seeds of Adam, although there came no infection to Christ; because the generation of man is not unclean or vicious of itself, but accidental by his falling. Therefore it is no marvel, if Christ, by whom the estate of innocency was to be restored, were exempt from common corruption.’ On no principle then, could Christ have *suffered* by temptation precisely as we ourselves do, unless on that; not only of his liability simply as a creature to commit sin, or of his having taken a portion of our fallen humanity in its corrupt condition, but on that of his having actually transgressed at times, through the force of overwhelming solicitations. If, however, he did not so suffer, how did he suffer, being tempted? The very temptation to



evil, to a holy nature, is the severest of all sufferings. The presentation of any thing evil to it, and much more, the solicitation of it to the commission of evil, necessarily grieves and distresses it. And we may safely argue, that in exact proportion to *the holiness* of Christ's manhood, in that very degree he suffered from every particular instance of temptation. And as he had all the feelings, emotions, passions, yea, and all the innocent infirmities of the human nature, he could not but have incessantly come into contact with one solicitation or another; and, therefore, his whole life on earth was one unbroken chain of connected trials, because he was called on to deny himself, in respect to his manhood, almost every thing in which it was able to take delight. So truly did he therefore declare, that he came not into the world to do his own will, but the will of his God and Father. Nor was it only and singly in the garden of Gethsemane that Jesus was constrained to exclaim, "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done!" But now, if Jesus suffered, being tempted, although his nature was holy from its conception, and united to his divine person as the Word that was God, and always under the unction of the Spirit of grace and truth, how well and truly could he *feel* for his body, the church, and for all and every of her members, exposed, as he knew them to be, to an entire world of temptation, and to all the subtle devices of the infernal spirits, and rendered so liable to concur in all and every solicitation through the frailties of their own corrupt constitution!

This, then, brings us to the third particular in the objection. How can Christ be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, so as to sympathize with us in them, and help us out of them, or succour us in the midst of them? I reply at once, as above, that having, although *without sin*, suffered severely from exposure

to the strongest temptations of the world and of hell, he cannot but feel most intensely for his people, obnoxious as they are to such hostile attacks, and having in themselves a traitor feeling, always but too disposed to betray them into the power of their enemies.

But now, genuine sympathy or fellow-feeling supposes some existing *relation*. Christ is the head of the church ; and so he sympathizes with it, and becomes the Saviour of the body. The church is of his flesh and of his bones ; and therefore, he nourisheth and cherisheth it. He is the bridegroom, and the church is the bride, the Lamb's wife ! therefore " he gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, and present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." He is the shepherd of his people ; and so he gives his life for the sheep, and pledges himself to them that they shall never perish. But then, if with the existence of relationship, there exist no *natural affection*, then there is no sympathy. Can a woman forget her sucking child ? Yea, she may. Created beings are liable to the most mortifying defects, because they are susceptible of all sorts of impressions from external circumstances. And hence, in the extremity of the siege of Jerusalem, " the hands of the pitiful women," of women who are pre-eminently endowed with tenderness towards their offspring, even these " have sodden their own children ; they were their meat, in the destruction of the daughter of my people. Even the sea-monsters draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones ; but the daughter of my people is become cruel, like the ostriches in the wilderness." But in Christ there is *love* in agreement with *every relation* in which he stands connected with his people ; and such love, too, as never faileth. Zion saith, " the Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a

woman forget? Yea, that is possible. *Yet will I not forget thee!* Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me!" Thus, Christ *loved* the church, and gave himself for it. "He loved me," says Paul, "and gave himself for me." "Unto him that loved us," sings John, "and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests to God!" And having loved his own, says the evangelist, which were in the world, "he loved them unto the end." Nor were the ancient declarations other than these more recent ones. "Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love, and therefore with *loving-kindness* have I drawn thee." And again; "I will mention the *loving-kindnesses* of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed on them according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his loving-kindnesses. For he said, "Surely they are my people! children that will not lie. So he was their Saviour! In all *their* afflictions *he* was afflicted: and the angel of his presence saved them. *In his love* and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them and carried them all the days of old."

But there is another requisite, in order to universal sympathy between Christ and his people; and that is *knowledge*. I may have a friend that loveth at all times; and yet, from ignorance of my situation and circumstances, it may often be impossible for him to sympathize with me. I may not feel disposed to tell him every thing; or distance may intervene, combined with other obstacles, so that I cannot tell him of my troubles, distresses, or dangers, if I would. Now, Christ knows all men, and needs not that any should testify of man to him, for he knows what is in man. This he does, as the wisdom of God, universally. But of his people, his church, to whom he is intimately related to

and united, as head over all things to it and them, it is superlatively true, that he “knoweth us altogether.” And this recondite knowledge of, this profound acquaintance with his people, and with whatever relates to them or concerns them, so far from confounding the faithful, and dismaying them, and making him a terror and a dread to them, becomes a vigorous and a copious spring of consolation to them. Hagar very beautifully called the name of the Lord who spake to her in her affliction, *thou God seest me!* He does not look and see as a spy, to become an informer, and to betray; he is no more the accuser, than he is the tempter of his brethren; no! but as God looked after Hagar, to espy her in her trouble, and to relieve her wants in the wilderness, so is it with Christ, the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. The consequence is, that *we* naturally *look after him*; casting all our cares upon him, because he careth for us. And, therefore, with exquisite feeling, did Hagar superadd to the name which she had given to the Lord: this, as a reason for it—“for she said, have I also here looked after him, who looketh after me!” And she also called the well of water, “the well of Him who liveth, who looketh after me!” Well, this is just what Paul states to the Hebrews for their encouragement, in his fourth chapter, “For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked, and opened up unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.” He sees all men and devils, and watches all their movements, yea, and all their inmost devices; as is obvious in that instance of Peter. “Simon, Satan hath desired to have thee, but I have prayed for thee.” And what then? Why, says Paul,—“Seeing then that

we have a great High Priest, who is passed into the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a High Priest, who cannot sympathize with us in our weaknesses and sufferings, but he was tempted and tried after a similar manner, although without sin. Let us therefore come, with all liberty of access, and freedom of speech, unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help, in time of need."

But there is one ingredient more, necessary to the constitution of an efficient sympathy; and that is *power*. Vain would be the love of Christ, was he not also the wisdom of God; and equally vain would be his wisdom as his love, was he not likewise the power of God. Now, his power is not mere force; is not a mere resistless might; a mere overwhelming omnipotency. But his power is founded in the purest justice. With him, power is not right; but right is power. He first conflicts with what is hostile to the welfare of his people; and then, becoming victorious, he turns all his success to their favour. "Forasmuch then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also, himself likewise, participated of these; that through his own death he might destroy him *that had the power* of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage. For, verily, he took not hold on the angels, but he took hold on the seed," that is, "the *children* of Abraham," who is the father of all them that believe. "Wherefore, in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, *to make reconciliation for the sins of the people*. For in that he hath suffered, being tempted," and also *tried*, "he is able," he has legitimate power and authority, "to succour them that are tried and tempted." He has his

proper commission from the court of heaven, as the captain of our salvation; he is the leader and commander of the people; and he has been perfected as such, by his own individual *sufferings* in our favour, and on our express account; so that he is entirely justified in bringing the many sons unto glory, as he is thoroughly qualified for the undertaking.

3. It now remains, Mr. Editor, that I show reasons for the necessity of my position.

The first reason I have alluded to already. It is a matter-of-fact reason; the manhood of Christ must owe its existence to seed created by the Holy Ghost, because there is no source in the woman whence it could otherwise arise at all. Calvin, indeed, asserts, "that he was man, truly issued *of the seed of mankind!*" And to establish this, he avers that to "affirm that women are seedless," is to "overthrow the principles of nature!" This we must resolve into the want of thorough information on the subject, in the days of this great reformer. The Greek word for a *father*, is derived in the lexicons from the verb to *sow seed*. The Hebrew word *ab*, whence the Greek *abba*, equally shows the father to be the author, cause, or origin of offspring. Besides, the scriptures speak with the most philosophical precision on this subject, tracing the origin of offspring to the loins of the man. "Kings shall come out of thy loins," said God to Jacob. And in the new testament, Paul, with the most exact physical propriety, says of Israel, that "they came out of the loins of Abraham."

My second reason grows out of the preceding statement. For if Christ is to be considered as the seed of Abraham, in any other sense than as being begotten by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary, who was Abraham's grand-daughter,—if Christ is at all considered, beyond this, to have derived his manhood from the seed and substance of Abraham, then was

Christ seminally and radically in Abraham's loins. It is said of Levi, comprehending the whole tribe, that they "came out of the loins of Abraham;" and what then? Why it follows of course, that prior to their birth, or begetting, they were substantially "yet in the loins of their father, when Melchisedec met him." Well, and what was the consequence? Just this: that the Levitical priesthood, who received tithes under the law, did, prior to the law of Moses, pay tithes to Melchisedec, in the person of their forefather Abraham; and by this act, they acknowledged the superiority of Melchisedec over themselves, as well as by receiving from him, and not giving to him the sacerdotal benediction. But if this argument hold good against the Aaronic order, it is equally strong against the claim of Christ to the priesthood; supposing we admit that he also was seminally and radically in the loins of Abraham. For it was not peculiar to Levi, as counted to have thus paid tithes "in Abraham;" for if any tribe had been exempted from this inference, it would have been this, on the ground of its right to *receive*, instead of *paying* tithes: and, therefore, we must certainly include, in the apostolic inference, all the other tribes, whose bounden duty it was to pay tithes to the priests of God. And then it would clearly follow, that Christ himself did likewise pay tithes in Abraham, and did in him receive the blessing from Melchisedec, and did, by both acts, confess the superiority of his type and figure over himself.

My third reason is near of kin to the above. If we imagine Christ to be the Son of Man, as owing his substance to man's seed, proceeding from a fallen individual of Adam's race, then was he not only born of Mary, when the church was in a fallen *condition*, but he was begotten of the *substance* of the church's fallen and polluted *nature*. Not in "the likeness of," but in

“the flesh of sin.” Of course, the consequence is inevitable. Christ was seminally and radically in Adam, when Adam was created; and he was in Adam, when Adam fell. And because the wages of sin is death, and so, “in Adam all die;” therefore the man Christ Jesus must equally have deserved death, for his own share in Adam’s transgression, with every other man; and then, truly, he would have taken our fallen and mortal nature. Nay, and besides the involving of Christ in the original offence, and all its consequences, this doctrine makes Christ a brother to all men, as men; whereas, Christ restricts brotherhood to the church, to the children of Abraham, to the children of God. And therefore he *lays hold on* these; he becomes their *Goel*, or near kinsman Redeemer; not by taking manhood from the seed, or substance, of a fallen son or daughter of Adam, but by being *born* of a virgin and believing daughter of Abraham, *from seed generated in her by the Holy Ghost*. And thus he was truly, as is said of the regeneration of his people, “*begotten*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man,—but *of God*.” Accordingly, Mr. Editor, he is properly the second man; the second man of God’s creating. And he is the last Adam.

In conclusion. As the chief stress seems to be laid on the sympathy of Christ for his people, which is much doubted of by many, supposing him to have been without sin, I would add, to what has been already advanced on that subject, the following remarks:—When God is said to be love, and to have purposed to himself as objects of his love an entire family of children, what is the circumstance introduced, which was to become the proof and the commendation of his love? It was this. “Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” He felt for us in our low estate. He knew our condi-



tion, that we were ungodly, that we were full of enmity to him, and that we were without strength to deliver ourselves. And then he “commended his love towards us, in that whilst we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Again; “But God, who is rich in mercy, and for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ.” But God’s language to Ephraim—it is the very utterance of sympathy itself. “Is Ephraim my precious son? Is he a child of delights? For since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still. Therefore, *my bowels are troubled for him*; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord.” Thus, it was not necessary for God to be in the circumstances of his people, to feel for them; but it was necessary that he should be well acquainted with them, and with their circumstances, in order to the calling forth of this commotion and yearning of the bowels in tender affection towards them. The whole is a beautiful process of natural affection; because God begins by establishing a relationship; “At the same time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people.” He then avows a corresponding passion for them; “Yea, I have *loved* thee with an everlasting love, and therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee.” And this love, as it exerts its influence in alluring the objects of it to itself, so it is excited by every thing relating to them, and drawn forth in strong expressions of powerful sympathy. For when he sees them in captivity, he then says, “behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth; they shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them; I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters, in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble. *For I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born.*”

Now we are sure that parental sympathy does not flow from a recollection of the parents, in respect to their having been once themselves in a helpless infantile state ; for the state of infancy is gone through by us in a sort of unconsciousness ; and although afterwards we trace our maturity back to its beginning, and feel satisfied we were at first in a condition of childhood, yet we cannot be said to act from our own past experience of what childhood is, in a way of sympathy towards our children, because we really cannot pretend to any positive consciousness of what transpired during the season of our babyhood. But parental sympathy springs from a knowledge of the helpless situation of the new-born babe, and of the various wants with which it is encompassed, and from the natural affection existing towards it in the parental bosom. And this is strikingly alluded to in the 16th of Ezekiel. For here is the church in her infancy, and polluted, and cast out, and abandoned. But the Lord passes by, and looks on her, and his eye affects his heart, for her time was the time of *love*. It was the season for the display of his love to her. And her miserable and destitute condition was itself an irresistible appeal to his heart. Short of love, in such a case, there might be pity and compassion, and relief might be extended ; as in the acts of benevolence, we relieve, befriend, and so on, without having any particular affection for the persons on whom we bestow our benevolence. And in return, the utmost we can expect is gratitude, that memory of the heart. But God's was a case, not of pity, but of love ; and which demands, in return, the very gratitude of the heart, or love for love. In him, it was not compassion excited by the wretchedness of the object ; but it was pre-existing love drawn forth into sympathy and into correspondent action, by the situation of the object beloved. “ God, who is rich in mercy, and *for his great love wherewith he loved us,*

*even when we were dead in sins*, hath “said unto us, *live!*” and so saying, “hath quickened us, together with Christ;” that is, *caused us to live*. Thus, then, all that was required to excite sympathy, was, a combination of love and knowledge; as is well shown also in that of Isaiah. “He said, surely they are my people; children that will not lie. So he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he,” God, “was afflicted; and the angel of his presence,” or the Son in his official character, “saved them. *In his love*, and in his *tender compassion*,” that is, in his compassion issuing from tender affection, “he redeemed them.”

Now, if we apply this to the question as it relates to the Lord Jesus, clearly there is no apparent necessity for his being polluted in his blood, precisely as his church was; nor for his birth and his nativity to be of the land of Canaan. In other words, what reason, Mr. Editor, for the Son of God assuming a *fallen nature*? If a fallen nature, it must be a condemned nature; and it must itself have required to be *redeemed from sin and death*: nay, if a fallen nature, it was *seminally*, radically, and substantially, in Adam, when he fell. Yea, it was *federally* in Adam, and must have been involved in his breach of the paradisaical covenant. It must have been *personally* in Adam. The whole of Adam’s offspring, or all those who were to spring from *the seed* of that first man, were in his loins, personally and individually considered, as certainly as ever Levi, in every member of that tribe, was in the loins of Abraham. If Christ’s manhood had thus a *prior seminal existence*, before its being begotten in the Virgin by the Holy Ghost, and that, into an instantaneous union with the person of God the Word;—then it existed, as all others of the seed of Adam, not merely in a portion of his fallen nature, but in its own proper personality; as in every acorn, there is not only the nature of an

oak, but radically the tree itself. And thus Christ would be personally involved in the fall of Adam, and would not merely be invested with a part or parcel of his fallen nature. And even if we did not push this argument, in respect to personality, what becomes of the statement of those who say, he took our fallen nature, but sanctified it even from its conception? For so Hooker states it, He “therefore took *the seed* of Abraham, the very first original *element of our nature*, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence.” This supposes Christ could derive it from the woman, which is impossible.\* Besides, prior to *sanctification*, there *must be redemption*. If Christ’s manhood was semi-nally of Adam’s fallen nature, the only basis for its sanctification must be laid in an atonement being made for it. The instant Adam had sinned, sacrifice was established, to figure Christ as the great atonement for sin; and this was the foundation laid in righteousness for our sanctification. Hence he who redeems is the Messiah, Christ, or anointed, through whom the Spirit of grace is communicated to us by the Father. And hence the reason why we were chosen in Christ, and blessed in him with all spiritual blessings; he would, “by himself, *purge our sins*,” and thus do away our attainder, and restore us to heritable blood. For as the law had said, of the holy oil, “on man’s flesh,” or on the flesh of man, “it shall not be poured;” so, in virtue of Christ’s incarnation, in which in effect he took hold on, and invested himself with, the *persons* of his people, of all nations and kindreds, and they thus virtually became his body and members, “of *his flesh* and

---

\* So, Mr. Vaughan, of Leicester, in his Translation of Luther, says, ‘The Holy Ghost’s impregnation gave Christ a spotless soul; and the daughter of Adam gave him a sinful body.’

of *his* bones,"—the Lord said by the prophet Joel, "I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh."

In fine, to give one illustration more, of the genuine spring of sympathy having its unfailing source in relationship, love, and knowledge, I would adduce, Mr. Editor, the holy and elect angels. Christ is their head and Lord. By and through him they were upheld when their fellows revolted from their allegiance to him who was then, as he is now, "the truth." And the cause of their preservation was the same as that of ours, even their "election of God;" for they continued *holy*, because *elect*. Now, although not elected as children, but rather as serving or ministering spirits, yet when they reflect on the fate of their fallen fellows, and revolve with themselves how infinitely more glorious, as well as unutterably more blessed it is to serve in heaven than to reign in hell, they cannot but glow with love truly seraphic towards him in whose employ they are engaged, and who, whilst he is *our* Saviour and brother, as well as Lord, was *their* preserver from eternal ruin. But being thus in the house of Christ, and appointed to wait upon, serve, and administer to the necessities of those whom they know to be the heirs of salvation, and who constitute that very house or family of which their sovereign Lord and Master is the first-born and most loving head, they cannot but be most deeply concerned for their welfare, and full of the most lively and intense interest in relation to them. And thus, at the first moment of a sinner's conversion, these angels betray a responsive feeling; "there is joy," said Jesus, "in the presence of the angels of God, over a sinner that repenteth." They see what hell is, in the doom of the devils; and they see what heaven is, in the goodly heritage of the saints in glory; and therefore, when they witness another and another brand plucked from the burning, they recognize in it the

handy-work of their great preserver and sovereign, and hail it with transports of rejoicing. Indeed, with what manifest delight did those morning-stars sing together, in celebration of the Saviour's birth? And this, too, under the feeling of the vast benefit accruing by it to the children of men, as well as of the glory that would redound to God in the highest heavens; "on earth, peace; good-will towards men!" And their unceasing watchfulness and tender care over every little one that believeth, is strongly implied in that touching remark of Christ; "whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for *I say unto you*, that in heaven *their angels* do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." Again; as Jesus was "*seen of angels*," that is to say, nicely contemplated by them all through his mysterious career on earth, so they "desired to look deeply into" those secrets of wisdom which relate to him and his church. And what for? unless that they might glory in the glory of the church, as being the body and bride of Christ; and that they might rejoice in her joy; and triumph in her triumphs; and join in her songs, and swell her sounding mirth? For so we find, that when we are come to Mount Zion, and to the general assembly and church of the first-born, we are no less come to an innumerable company of angels; and who, because their heart-strings are in unison with those of the saints, were heard by John echoing their hymn of praise to the Lamb. For he had no sooner listened to the new song of the elders or presbyters, those representatives of the church, than he hears a grand chorus to it bursting from "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of angels." And they said, with a loud voice, "worthy

is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing!" And I do not question, Mr. Editor, that whilst the Lord gives those ministering spirits charge over us, to keep us in all our ways, although they know not by personal experience what sin is, and what are the multiplied miseries and evils that grow out of it, yet they verily sympathize with us in all our trials and temptations, at the same time that they are ever on the alert to assist and befriend us. I cannot but think that these highly gifted intellectual beings felt intensely for the Lord Jesus, when, having been at a distance spectators of his terrible conflict in the wilderness with satan, at its termination they were at liberty to draw near to him; "Behold, angels drew near, and ministered to him!" And much less can we doubt of the sympathy of that greatly honoured instrument employed in succouring the Prince of Life amid his agony in the garden of Gethsemane; when "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." And I can well suppose, too, that in the instance of the pauper, Lazarus, the angels who were watching his last moments of suffering on earth, and were ready to waft him away to his glory in heaven, were full of the finest sensibilities on the occasion. The inference, then, Mr. Editor, is this:—If God, Father, and Son, and Spirit, can, by means of self-created relationship and self-conceived love, combined with *knowledge of all our circumstances*, so sympathize with us as to neutralize every evil, and bestow on us every blessing; and if the angels also can feel for us, and with us, whilst they are ministering to us; and if parents can feel for and with their children, as far as they are acquainted with the existing state and circumstances of their offspring; surely the Son of God, who has clothed himself with our very nature, in the fullest

perfection of all its faculties, feelings, sensations, appetites, and propensities, both corporeal and intellectual, *and who has actually travelled himself the whole circuit of a life on earth, and felt and seen all that is to be seen and felt*, save and except that only which of all other things blunts the keen edge of natural feeling, and dims the quicksightedness of human perception, as it no less cools, if it does not quench and quite put out, the intensity of the fire of natural affection ; I mean *sin* ; surely, I say, the Son of Man is not such an one as *cannot* be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, merely because in all his sufferings, in all his temptations and trials, we are obliged to introduce an *although*, or a *yet*, in his particular case, to intimate that He “ was still without sin.”

THE END.



THE TRUE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

A SECOND AND THIRD LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF  
THE MORNING WATCH.

BY ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE, A. B.

LATE OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD; AND NOW MINISTER OF  
HIGH STREET CHAPEL, EXETER.

PRINTED FOR EBENEZER PALMER,

18, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

MDCCCXXIX.

[PRICE TWO SHILLINGS.]

LONDON

*PRINTED BY E. JUSTINS AND SON,*

Brick Lane, Spitalfields.

## SECOND AND THIRD LETTER.

§c. §c.

7, PARK PLACE, EXETER,

SEPTEMBER, 1829.

MR. EDITOR,

SOME months ago, early in the present year, I addressed my first Letter to you, on the subject of the Humanity of the Son of God. I certainly expected some reply to have been made to it, or at any rate some notice to have been taken of it, in the second Number of your Quarterly Journal. But in the place of this, you were pleased to write me a private letter, in which you assigned your reason, for not discussing the topic, in debate, publicly; and endeavoured to show that I was 'entirely mistaken in the physical facts,' in which I seemed so confident, and from whence alone, as you intimated, I drew my 'inferences.' To this private communication of your's I immediately returned you an answer in a second Letter, and attempted to prove to you that in respect to the physical facts adduced, or alluded to, by me in my pamphlet, or first letter to you through the press, I was verily right, and not mistaken. You did not reply to this explanatory and confirmatory statement of mine, and in consequence of your silence, I have been looking forward to the appearance of the third Number of the Morning Watch, in the expectation of meeting with something in its pages in reference to the point in dispute. I have just received it; and I am not disappointed. I find a paper from Mr.

Irving ‘on the Humanity of Christ;’ and a ‘Defence of the Athanasian Creed,’ in direct reference and reply to my pamphlet, by Thomas William Chevalier, Esq.

Now this I consider to be purely an editorial manouvre, to get out of a difficulty; for this gentleman, who comes forward as champion in your cause, makes his attack on the pamphlet by itself, without any reference to my second letter addressed to you, in which I had gone still further into the subject in an especial regard to its physiological aspect, and to meet your objections to my statements. The least you should have done, would have been to place before this volunteer in your service that letter of mine; for then, he would either have relinquished the projected enterprise, or he would have come into the field better furnished for the strife. ‘Strange as it may seem, the most prominent point of their arguments is built,’ says your correspondent, ‘upon their peculiar opinions with respect to a question in physiology. Holding it an essential part of my professional duty, Sir, to maintain the consistency of those sciences, to which, as a medical man, I owe my temporal livelihood, I cannot consider it unbecoming in me to answer the reverend teacher *as a physiologist*. Now all these seemingly triumphant queries arise, Mr. Editor, from the reverend gentleman’s unfortunate ignorance of the facts, *as they are in all nature*; of the conviction of the best physiologists of all ages on the subject; and of what it is that constitutes *the essence of the maternal relation*.’

After this charge, you cannot be surprised at my determination to publish your letter to me, and my reply to the same; and I shall append to these epistles some observations on Mr. Chevalier’s defence of the Athanasian Creed. But before concluding these

introductory remarks, I beg to offer a few thoughts on Mr. Irving's paper on 'the True Humanity of Christ.'

1. He tells us that 'the eternal Son of God, in taking human nature, did truly and literally take it of the virgin's substance; and that the properties of his mother's substance, body and soul, were the properties of Christ's human nature, considered in itself, without reference to the work wrought in it by the Holy Ghost.'

This tells us flatly, that if the human nature in the virgin's substance was sinful, Christ's human nature was sinful also; that if sin was at all a property of his mother's substance, body, or soul, or both, sin was no less absolutely a property of the human nature of Christ; and that as sin was a property of the virgin mother, body and soul alike, sin was equally a property in the body and soul of Christ. And this doctrine is thus confirmed in the same page. 'I believe that my Lord did come down, and toil, and sweat, and travail, in exceeding great sorrow, in this *mass of iniquity*, with which I, and every *sinful man*, are oppressed.' This Mr. Irving then calls Christ's 'self-inflicted degradation, for the end of meeting sin in its own strong hold, and redeeming *both soul and body* from its dominion.'

So then, if all this be true, the account of the miraculous impregnation of the virgin by the Holy Ghost, must not be understood as the origin of that holy offspring which was begotten in her, and born of her, but we are to consider it to have been wholly of Mary's substance, and to have had the self-same properties in body and soul, sin not excepted, that Mary's substance had, and that the work wrought in it by the Holy Ghost, to whatever extent it was carried, could be no other than what, in

reference to the body and members of Christ, the scriptures call regeneration, and a being renewed, and born again, or from above, and born of God.

2. But then we are told, notwithstanding this supposed work of the Holy Spirit, that at all events *the flesh* of Christ underwent no change ‘in its conception, or at any other time anterior to the resurrection! Every passage of scripture which declares Christ to have come in the flesh, which declareth the Word to be made flesh, which declareth God to be manifested in the flesh, is a proof, total and complete, that he came in sinful flesh!’

No! it is a proof that he came “in the likeness of *men*,” and “in fashion as *a man*,” and possessed of the true genuine original nature of man, who is the image and glory of God: “for a man indeed ought not to cover the head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God.” But it is no proof at all, that God was manifest in *sinful* manhood, merely because he is said to have been manifest in the flesh. Flesh is not necessarily a sinful substance. Oh yes it is, cries Mr. Irving: ‘for what is the meaning of flesh in scripture? Is it not the sinful, mortal, corruptible, fleeting thing, of which it is said, “all flesh is grass; the flesh warreth against the Spirit; in it dwelleth no good thing?” If then it be said, that Christ came in flesh, who shall dare to interpret that word flesh, otherwise than *all scripture* doth interpret it? Who shall interpret it otherwise than sinful flesh? ‘All scripture!’ Why what sort of a bible is in use in the Scotch church? Or with what eyes does this Scotch churchman read his bible? Flesh was the creature of God in Adam; and then out of his flesh God made the woman; “And Adam said, this is now bone of my bone, *and flesh* of my flesh.” And “Therefore shall a man cleave unto his wife; and

they shall be one *flesh*." This marriage was truly honourable ; and at least in this first pair, flesh was not sin. Again ; " We are members of *his* body, of *his* flesh, and of his bones," as the bride, the Lamb's wife : and " they two shall be *one flesh*." " This is a great mystery," cries Paul, " but I speak concerning *Christ and the church*." For " Christ loved the church, and gave *himself* for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it." But he gave himself for the church as the true *sin-offering*. And " This is the law of the sin-offering, *it is most holy !* In the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation. Whatsoever shall touch *the flesh* thereof shall be holy." We must therefore expostulate, Mr. Editor, with that sect newly arisen in the British metropolis, after the manner of the Lord by Jeremiah ; " What hath my beloved to do in my house, seeing she hath wrought lewdness with many, *and the holy flesh is passed from her ?*" Nay, the very " holy seed," which is the unwithering substance of God's heritage, rather, of the *cleeroi*, his *clergy*, his allotted tenth or tythe of the people, whom Moses therefore calls *laos kai cleeros*, " Thy people and thine allotted portion," the only genuine clergy of the genuine church of God ; I say, the very *zera kedosh*, or holy seed, is passed away from this new sect, and let them see well to it in time, lest its members be left as " Trees, whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots !"

Why, Sir! this imposition on the professing church of Christ,—this cheat and fallacy—this sturdy, bold, and unblushing—this shameless imposture, it proves its propagator to be utterly regardless of the cherubic mystery. " The sound of the wings of the cherubim," that is, of the likeness of the mighty

Ones, “ was heard to the outer court, as the voice of the Almighty God when he speaketh. And there appeared in the midst of the cherubim, the form of a man’s hand under their wings. And their *whole flesh,*” or the *body* prepared, in which God would be manifested, namely, “ their whole *body of flesh,* and their backs, and their hands, and their wings, and the wheels, were full of eyes round about:” will your prophet turn this also into abominable flesh, and out of it will he cook his broth of abominable things, as though it were no better than swine’s flesh, and as though the United One of the Alehim of heaven and earth was no better than those ancient paramours of Israel, the Egyptians, “ whose flesh was as the flesh of asses, and whose issue was as the issue of horses?” Rather, this is the flesh which the living God brings up upon his people, when in themselves they are like withered skeletons, and their dry bones are all covered over with nothing but the sordid dust, or with the nakedness of death. This is the flesh of the holy child Jesus; who said, “ my flesh, —even that bread which came down from heaven, I will give for the life of the world.” With it, having put on Christ, we are clothed with immortality and incorruption; and on it we feed, and find his flesh to be meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed. Thus our youth is renewed like that of eagles; yea, says God to each of his reclaimed ones, —“ his flesh shall be fresher than a child’s; he shall return to the days of his youth;” there shall remain no wrinkle of age, no blemish of imperfection, disease, decay, or damage, no spot or stain of pollution. Nay, the king’s daughter shall be inwraught in wrought gold of Ophir, in the most fine gold, precious and brilliant, as well as pure; and she shall also be “ all glorious *within.*” And how? Why, besides my



Spirit dwelling in you, "A new heart also will I give you; I will give you—a *heart of flesh!*" Can this intend a heart of sin?

3. 'The only two objections to this doctrine,' says its advocate, 'which I can give a form to, are these. To what then served the miraculous conception of Christ? The second, how could he render an atonement for others, if so be that his flesh was sinful?'

For the first, your oracle responds thus. 'Conception by natural means, is that which declares another human person to be brought into existence. We are persons, composed of a soul immortal and a body mortal, from the instant of our conception by natural means. And, had Christ been conceived by natural means, he must have been a human person. And then we should have had, not two natures in Christ, but two persons. The soul is given by the inspiration of God. This is the part which God hath, in the creation of every human being; that it is of Him to bless his own ordinance for propagation, with the fruit of an *immortal person*. But when by conception he hath blessed his own appointed ordinance, then, from that instant of time, a human *person* is constituted by God. Ordinary conception is the method and act by which God manifests the existence of a responsible person. If Christ therefore had come by ordinary generation, he must have been concluded a human person. And the union herewith, of the person of the Son of God, would not have destroyed the personality of the man.'

This is another specimen of Irvingism. Adam the first derived his body from God, as well as his soul; he gat neither by ordinary means, whether by generation or conception; yet Adam, the first man, was a person. "Adam, who was of God." Now this extraordinary generation of Adam, and after-

wards of Eve, bore some similitude to ‘the *generation*,’ not regeneration, ‘of Jesus Christ.’ The scripture says of the virgin, that “that which was conceived in her, was of the Holy Ghost.” Could this mean only the immortal soul of Christ? Yes, says Mr. Vaughan, ‘The Holy Ghost’s impregnation gave Christ a spotless soul; and the daughter of Adam gave him a sinful body.’ But how then does he differ from other men? For you tell us, Mr. Editor, that men owe their corporeal substance or flesh to their mothers. This, your correspondent confirms; “nay truly, from the days of Aristotle until now, there never was any doubt, that the *germ* of every living creature, that is, the rudiment of its future body, together with all the nutriment which the fœtus, and afterwards the suckling, receives, are produced from, and of the substance of, the mother. And as Mr. Irving refers the soul to the inspiration of the Almighty, in conception, in every ordinary case, truly the shade of difference is all but nothing. “The Spirit of God hath made me;” said Elihu; “and the breath,” or inspiration “of the Almighty hath given me life.” Say that the difference is, that whilst Christ and every ordinary man equally obtain their immortal souls from God, the first got his flesh or body from his mother, without any father at all, neither human nor divine, and that the latter do get their flesh or bodies likewise from the substance of their mothers, with some little inconsiderable co-operation and contribution from their fathers; but so little this, as to amount, in fact, to—any thing short of nothing! For—‘a little yellow dust, as much as the tiniest insect may waft upon its wing, and every particle of which, upon contact with moisture, explodes into innumerable minuter globules, *is all*, that the germ, in the female plant, can

receive from the male! Nay, there are experiments, which tend to prove, that any single atom of the pollen, is sufficient to fecundate the germ pre-existent on the female plant! And thus, ‘the body, or quantity of pollen, requisite to the impregnation of the pre-existent germ, may be more or less,—as little as the mind can conceive; any thing short of *none*! Or, in other words, that it is merely accidental; a non-essential to its effect!’ And this is produced, to show by analogy, that man is merely to this amount necessary to the woman, in the propagation of the human species, because she really possesses within herself, *every thing essentially* requisite for the same!

I have heard, Mr. Editor, a saying sometimes uttered, I think the Latins render it by *multum in parvo*, which intimates that some things possess much of substance, or of power, or of value, within an exceedingly small space or bulk. “Behold how great a matter *a little* fire kindleth!” says James. A spark might kindle the universal conflagration. Would you argue in favour of the insignificancy, of the impotency, of the non-essentiality of fire, Mr. Editor, from such proofs of its amazing power and efficiency? Weigh a spark of fire in your scales, Mr. Editor; or measure its bulk; and see if you can calculate its quality in agreement with its quantity, or weight, or size. Some poisons are fatal, in the smallest quantities imaginable; are these, Mr. Editor, in quality as they are in quantity, little, and insignificant, and almost of no power in operation at all? Or is not the very least, the most minute quantity of poison required, where there is superior quality? Suppose then we step beyond even Mr. Chevalier himself, and for the sport, and play, and pastime of argument contend, that the very *aura seminalis*, is

enough ; that the mere *seminal vapour* would suffice, both in reference to animals and to plants ; what would this prove ? Just what the breeze, the merest breathing of the gentlest zephir proves, when tainted with some raging plague, or mortal poison, not its own impotency in accordance with its own insignificance, so much as the subtile power of that which rides unseen upon its wings, and scatters desolation as it flies. Or rather, it would remind us of that *aura vitalis*, that breath of life, which can be but most poorly estimated from the term employed for its designation, the *breath*, or the *breathing in* of life, but whose omnipotency inheres in this, and is developed here, that only with a breath it can waft through all the infinitude of unbounded space, existence, substantial existence, to worlds, themselves unnumbered, and to their incalculable myriads of living beings, which seem, when considered as teeming in water, air, or earth, as absolutely multitudinous as the solid atoms in the solid substance of the material universe, if they do not rather immensely exceed them. “ By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by *the breath* of his mouth.” To me, then, this new position of your large contributor, Mr. Irving, in respect to personality, is any thing but common sense. In truth, your zealous theologian, seems to aim throughout, at something altogether uncommon. I fancy, sometimes, as I read his papers, I meet with neither common sense nor common nonsense ; they are both most uncommon ; so that his sensible things when exhibited, are so uncommon, as rather to dazzle and bewilder than inform ; whilst his nonsense is so overpowering with conviction, as to render it utterly impossible for any one to misunderstand it. When God adds a soul, by his creative power, to the fleshly

substance in and of the woman, (for as for the man he must henceforth rank but as a cipher in the great account) then, from that instant, a ‘human person,’ a ‘responsible person,’ an ‘immortal person,’ is existent. But if the same effect be produced, the same creature created, the same substances gendered of one and the same nature and properties, ‘a soul immortal, and a body mortal,’ by means a little differing, and but very little, God still being the supposed Creator of the soul, and the sinful woman the contributor from her substance of the sinful flesh, and only the little accidental non-essential intervention of the man superseded or dispensed with!—Oh, why then there is no person projected; no human, or responsible, or immortal person produced!

But it is time to descend from the clouds, Mr. Editor; and alighting from our air-balloon, to tread once more on the humble turf of our mother earth. If you had been born king, Mr. Editor, would you have ever had personal existence as a subject? Would not your birth-union to the crown, have severed you from the condition of a subject at your birth? You might do what you would voluntarily, for your subjects; but your native royalty could not be altered by that. Christ was “born King;” and he humbled himself; but in the very act of humiliation, he asserted his dignity; “Know you what I have done to you? Ye call me master and Lord, and ye say well, *for so I am!*” Again; suppose Eve to have been created at once into a nuptial union and oneness with Adam! she certainly was so; why then, I say, Eve never had that separate personal character of a single woman and unbetrothed female, which belongs to others not actually born into a wedded state. And therefore it is said that God created the Adam in his own image; male and female (but still

as it were *the man*), created he them. And he called “*their* name Adam.” In the same manner then, I would say, that the mere *how* a man is created or gendered, cannot interfere with his distinct personality as a man ; but that the instance of Christ, in his assumption of manhood, does quite alter the case. Because the manhood assumed by him, was created at once into an union with the personal Word ; and the prior personality of the Eternal Word took precedence of, or rather prevented that of the manhood, so that “that holy offspring” which was begotten in, and born of Mary, was “called” immediately from the birth “the Son of God.” And Mary herself, prior to the birth of Christ, was saluted by Elizabeth, as “the mother of *my Lord*.”

4. ‘These men do set forth something positive ; it is,’ says Mr. Irving, ‘that in the act of conception, his’ (Christ’s) ‘flesh underwent a *change*, which put it altogether out of the category of sinful flesh, into that of sinless flesh.’ This, it is true, was the old doctrine ; at least, some seemed to state, that his body was *gendered holy* by the Holy Ghost, as Toplady did, without hinting how ; whilst others made it to have been *sanctified* only from its conception, as did Dr. Owen and others.

Now then for something positive beyond this old, and which Mr. Irving entitles, ‘rare’ doctrine. He, as well as Mr. Vaughan, assigns the formation of Christ’s soul to God. How does he account for his body ? Mr. Vaughan says, ‘the daughter of Adam gave him a sinful body.’ But who was its father ? “*We* have had fathers of *our flesh*,” Mr. Editor, and not mothers only ; and so had Christ ! And although Mr. Chevalier would fain have the stagyrite on his side, Aristotle is introduced from Browne by Johnson, as quite on the other side ; “Aristotle, affirming

that women do not *spermatize*, and that they confer a *receptacle* rather than *essential principles* of generation, deductively includes *both sexes* in mankind.' Then let us be positive here; and let Mr. Irving aver one thing or another; let him aver that the body of Christ was the spontaneous production of Mary, as one would imagine Mr. Vaughan meant to intimate, or let him declare that *God created* the sinful flesh, as well as the spotless soul of Christ, and that thus he took 'humanity, fallen, sinful, and under the sentence of death,' according to his own description of it, by God's own immediate creative power.

5. 'The Person of the Son of God took a reasonable soul and corruptible flesh joined together, after the constitution of a man, as men are found to subsist; he, for his condescension to take that soul, and therein to honour his Father, did receive the Holy Ghost; which, ever receiving, and ever using, he did sustain his human will against the law of the flesh. But then, if Christ's body and mind were after the same manner of existence with a regenerate man, how can we pronounce him *holy*, when we cannot say the same of any regenerate man, whose flesh we declare to be sinful, whatever we may say of his mind or will? I answer; the resurrection of his flesh, without seeing corruption, proved it to have never sinned; the relief of his soul from hell (hades), proved it to be without sin. That it was corruptible, proved it to be *fallen flesh*, to the last; that *his soul* descended into hell (hades), proved it to be *a fallen soul!*'

This is one of the finest specimens of proof positive, of 'proof total and complete,' ever yet exhibited to the world. But I chiefly make this quotation, in order to offer a remark or two on that part of it which

first takes for granted that the 'soul' of Christ 'descended into hell,' and then from this its descent thither proves 'it to be a fallen soul!'

In the first place, Mr. Editor, the descent of the soul of Christ into hell, is a wretched figment. Mr. Irving confesses the soul of Christ to have been the instant creation of God; whilst Mr. Vaughan declares the impregnation of the Holy Ghost to have given him a spotless soul. Besides which, they acknowledge it never to have had a distinct and separate personal subsistency of its own, but to have been taken up by the Son of God into union with himself, by which act its own otherwise natural and necessary personality was anticipated and prevented. To which also they add, that in the taking of the human soul 'he did receive the Holy Ghost.' In such circumstances, Mr. Editor, can you imagine the soul of Christ to have descended into hell? If you say, the sins of his people merited hell; and as their Surety, Christ must undergo the utmost of their desert; I reply, that then the entire manhood must have gone thither, body and soul alike. But the *cross* was the climax of Messiah's sufferings. It was on the tree he was made sin and a curse for us, and thereon he redeemed us from both. From thence therefore, with his fast fleeting breath and ebbing life, he declared, "It is finished!"

But what is more, Mr. Editor, father Abraham declared a great gulph impassable to lie betwixt the paradise of God and the hell of the ungodly; "so that they which would pass from hence to you, cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence." But methinks I hear you say, Mr. Irving's hell is hades; very well, and so is that called hades, which the rich man found to be the "place of torment." For the evangelist writes thus; "And



in hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments!" Nay but, say you, there are two divisions in hades; there is hell, and there is paradise, in agreement with the tartarus and the elysium of the ancients. Conceding this, for the sake of the argument, I contend that, whatever the ancients held, about their elysian fields and tartarian regions, as being both alike infernal or beneath, the scripture gives a very different representation of its paradise and its hell; always picturing *this* as beneath, below, and *down*, in reference to heaven, as the presence-place of God, whence men, yea, and angels, are driven far off for ever, when once they are cast down into hell; and always picturing paradise as above, on high, and *up*, even where father Abraham is, and Enoch, and whence came down Elijah and Moses to discourse with Christ on the holy mount, even in the third heavens, hard by the throne of God. Paul tells us of himself, "how that he was caught up into paradise." The Lord Jesus promises thus; "To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Now the only place besides, in which we meet with any mention of this destination in the new testament, is that which immediately affects the case before us. Whither did Christ go, in soul, on that day in the which he left his body hanging lifeless on the accursed tree? The thief said, "Lord! remember me, when thou comest into thy *kingdom*;" and to this petition Jesus replied, "To-day shalt thou" thyself be there with me, even "with me *in paradise*!"

But in the second place, Mr. Editor, what is all this but popery? The apostle says, "I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received; how that Christ *died* for our sins, according to the scriptures; and that he was *buried*," not soul, but body;

“and that he *rose again* on the third day.” Now see the addition made to this, in the creeds of superstitious men. First, in what is most falsely named the creed of the apostles, we read thus,—“was crucified, dead, and buried,—he descended into hell;” that is, into hades, the exact language of Luke in respect to Dives in the place of torment. Then in the no less falsely called creed of St. Athanasius, it stands thus, “who suffered for our salvation; descended into hell.” The *Nicene* creed is a goodly exception altogether; it states it thus; “who for us men, and our salvation, came down from heaven; and was incarnate, by the Holy Ghost, of the virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered; and was buried; and the third day he rose again.” But in the second and third articles of the thirty-nine articles of the established religion, we have the old popish story again, “Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men. *As Christ died for us, and was buried,—so also is it to be believed, that he went down into hell!*”

The sense of this last clause bishop Burnet confesses to have been, ‘that Christ descended locally into hell; and preached to the spirits there in prison. And this (sense) has one great advantage on its side, that those who first prepared the articles in king Edward’s time, were of this opinion. For they made it a part of it, by adding in the (3rd) article, those words of St. Peter, (1 Pet. iii. 19.) as the proof or explanation of it. Now though that period was left out in queen Elizabeth’s time (as it is now), yet no declaration was made against it. So that this sense was once in possession, and was never expressly rejected. Besides that it has great support from the

authority of many fathers ; who understood the descent into hell according to this explanation.' The bishop means the *later* fathers. ' For it is plain,' he adds, ' that the use of them,' of those words ' in the creed, *is not very ancient*, nor universal. *None* of the fathers, in the *first ages*, in the short abstracts that *they* give us of the christian faith, mention *any thing like this*.'

The original article was as follows. ' As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell. For his body lay in the grave till his resurrection ; but his soul, being separate from his body, remained with the spirits which were *detained in prison*,—that is to say, in *hell*, and there preached unto them.' Now, says Burnet, ' these words, said to be left out, are found in the original articles, signed by the chief clergy of both provinces, now extant in the manuscript libraries of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in the book called, Synodalia, but distinguished from the rest by lines of *minium* (which is *red*); which lines plainly appear to have been done afterwards, because the leaves and lines of the original are exactly numbered at the end; which numbers, without these lines, (now lackered over with the minium, or red oxide) were manifestly false.'

The origin of this sentiment is found in the church of Rome ; from which, when the church of England *seceded*, she borrowed, or rather retained it. For in the creed of Pope Pius the IVth, the 19th article reads thus ; ' I do firmly believe that there is a purgatory ; and that the souls, kept prisoners there, do receive help by the suffrage of the faithful ; that the souls of the patriarchs and holy men, who departed this life before the crucifixion of Christ, were kept as in prison, in an apartment of hell, without pain ; that

*Christ did really go into local hell, and delivered the captive souls out of this confinement.'* The fathers assert, 'that our Saviour descended into hell; went thither specially, and delivered the souls of the fathers out of that mansion.' Bishop Horsley confesses that this tenet came to us from Rome. It has no place in the Nicene creed, the earliest of all the creeds, it having been drawn up at Nice in 325, and confirmed at Constantinople in 381. As for the creed of Athanasius, it, says Bishop Burnet, 'was never heard of, before the *eighth* century!' And as for what the rubric styles 'the apostles' creed,' he says, 'there is no reason to believe that this creed was prepared by the apostles; or, that it was of any great antiquity; since Ruffin (who lived in the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century), was the first that published it. It is true he published it as the creed of the church of Aquileia; but that was so late, that *neither this, nor the other creeds, have any authority upon their own account.*'

So much for Mr. Irving's hades, or hell. And now, Mr. Editor, for your letter, and my reply.

---

## LETTER I.

(FROM THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING WATCH, RECEIVED  
JUNE 3, 1829.)

'SIR,

'As I do not intend noticing your pamphlet on 'the Human Nature of Christ,' in the Morning Watch, I think it right to inform you of the reasons for having come to this determination.

‘I am not deterred by any fear of meeting you on the open field of argument, I have no lurking suspicion that I should prove to be in the wrong; but I could not notice one part of your book, without noticing the whole; and one of the lines of argument which you, and those who agree with you, have taken up, appears to me so very unfit to be brought before the public, and even so offensive to delicacy and good taste, that I will never be so far a party to shocking the delicate mind, as even to reply publicly to any such arguments. The nature of our blessed Lord is wholly *sui generis*. Analogies may help to illustrate, but can never wholly explain, much less limit or define that which has no exact analogy, but is that great mystery which angels desired to look into. This mystery is not a question of natural history, or physics, it is supernatural and metaphysical, and to reason upon it according to the laws of ordinary generation appears to me a degree of hardihood little short of blasphemy; and I should have thought that the universally acknowledged fact, of his mother being a *pure* virgin, might suffice to stop at once all such speculations. But having said thus much to account for my avoiding public discussion of this branch of your argument, and waiving the insuperable objection to your view of the matter which the virginity of Mary opposes, I do in this private letter most positively assert, that you, and Mr. Cole, and Mr. Eedes, are entirely mistaken in the physical facts in which you seem so confident, and from whence alone you draw your inferences. Now, Sir, I charge you, as you love truth, not to rest in your pre-conceived notions on these subjects; nor on the other hand do I expect any assertions of mine to be received by you; but I charge you to ask any able surgeon, or any well-informed naturalist, and they

will confirm what I am now about to say. I have studied surgery, though not practising, and I have consulted an eminent surgeon before writing this, and I do assert, that the proper semen *always* comes from the *female*, and that the male only *quicken*s what *already exists* in the *female*. If you find this to be true, you must allow that it subverts your whole argument, and completely establishes ours. I maintain that this fact of the ovum always being furnished by the body of the female is an universal law of nature: it may be seen every spring in poultry, where the eggs are previously formed, waiting the impregnation of the male; and if this be prevented, every farmer knows, that though the eggs are laid they come to nothing: it may be seen in fishes, where millions of roe are at once impregnated: it may be seen in frogs, where the spawn is drawn out by the hind feet of the male, and impregnated in the act of drawing out: it may be seen in bees, where one impregnation, which is always fatal to the male, gives life to all the eggs which the queen bee lays during her life: it may be still more wonderfully seen in the green blight of the rose, in which it has been proved (which else, from its marvellousness, would be denied) that the impregnation of one female renders prolific *ten successive generations* of females. I might extend this catalogue to almost any length, but these will suffice; for if *any one* of them is brought home with conviction to your mind, it destroys the universality of your position, and we are fully entitled to rest on that one analogy, even if it stand alone, for maintaining that our Lord took flesh of his mother; but if you enquire of a competent naturalist, he will confirm *them all*.

‘ You have the candour to confess that all the great names are against you; this surely may lead to a suspicion that you are mistaken. I have shown above

that physical analogies are against you, thus destroying the main basis of your arguments. Your pamphlet is written in a candid tone, and I am bound to presume that you are a sincere inquirer after truth, and do therefore hope you may see reason to abandon the opinions you now profess. In a theological and doctrinal point of view I shall still continue to bring the subject before the public; and when your mistaken physics are cast away, these arguments may, I trust, commend themselves to your mind with greater persuasiveness than they have before: and that we may both see all essential truths in their full verity, and ultimately reach the same haven of blessedness, is the earnest desire and prayer of

‘ Your sincere Friend,

‘ THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING WATCH.’

(PRIVATE.)

## LETTER II.

(FROM MR. CARNE IN REPLY.)

27, DUKE STREET, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

JUNE 3, 1829.

SIR,

IN reply to your communication received just an hour ago, permit me first, to thank you for its gentlemanly and christian spirit, and then, to comment freely on its contents. You are well aware that, but too often, whilst we would be valiant for the truth, or what we think to be truth, we are more resolute in regard to the thing, than courteous in

the manner in which we contend for it. But in the present instance, as you allow my pamphlet to be 'written in a candid tone,' and as becomes 'a sincere inquirer after truth,' so I feel most happy in acknowledging the proper temper which pervades your letter; nor can I refrain from adding an expression of hope, that as it has been given us thus to begin well, we may be kept in the same line of conduct as long as we may have to communicate with each other.

1. The first hint of your's, which requires notice, is, that which conveys to me the reason of your determining not to reply to my pamphlet in the Morning Watch. You consider the subject 'unfit to be brought before the public,' because its discussion is 'so offensive to delicacy and good taste.' I certainly felt it desirable to study to steer clear of any expression, or sentiment, or allusion, which was unnecessary for the elucidation of the point at issue; and for this purpose I submitted the manuscript to a highly respected friend, who, I was aware, had the strongest repugnance to excess in this respect; and at his suggestion I made several alterations and omissions. But I cannot agree with you beyond this. I count it a false delicacy, that would deter from the investigation of any branch of sacred truth. This artificial sense has led people to dislike to read the scriptures themselves, particularly those of the old testament; conscious that they are written in strict accordance with the nature of things, and that even whenever the things of nature are employed as illustrations of such as are supernatural, they are introduced in their native simplicity, and without being encumbered and disguised by any drapery of man's fabrication. This I esteem at once false delicacy and bad taste; not a pure sensation resulting from



the moral sense, but a species of reprehensible ‘effeminacy,’ the offspring of what is spurious and counterfeit. And therefore it will not stand the test of *the new* testament. For here, too, the operations of nature are spoken of in the language of nature; and until I reflected coolly on it, I have, many a time, refrained from selecting the fourth chapter of the Romans, to read publicly, or in social worship, because of the nineteenth verse; and of course the same annoyance beset me in other parts of the holy scriptures. And this is the ground laid down by yourself ‘for avoiding public discussion’ of the incarnation of the Word that was God, and was made flesh. Whereas the accounts of Matthew and Luke are full, express, and particular; and still more strikingly so, in the original language of the Holy Ghost, the Greek, than in our English translation. Still, it never occurred to me, to go into the investigation, until I read the first number of the Morning Watch; and then found that Mr. Irving’s opinion on the human nature of the Son of God was gaining ground, and that, too, amongst some of my own friends. Till then, I was satisfied with the conviction, that the manhood assumed was a holy thing, ‘owing,’ as Mr. Toplady expresses it, ‘to its *sinless formation*, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost.’ But when I perused Mr. Irving’s bold declarations, and your defence of the sentiment conveyed in them, with the quotations made from churches, creeds, and divines, to establish the same as on the adamantine basis of universal consent, I felt an irresistible impulse to go to the field of battle, and go out against the sentiment so supported as against an uncircumcised Philistine; and to say to those of my brethren who would deter me, or would insinuate that the emotion sprung not from the love

of truth, but from pride and naughtiness of heart, 'what have I now done? Is there not a cause?'

2. I have next to notice your allusion to 'those who agree with me;' and whom you afterwards mention, as being 'Mr. Cole, and Mr. Eedes.' What may be the opinion of the latter, respecting my hypothesis, or proposed interpretation, I know not; as I never had any acquaintance or communication with that gentleman. Of the opinion of the former, I can speak more certainly, for I introduced myself to him yesterday, calling on him at his residence, and taking a copy of my pamphlet with me. But Mr. Cole did not agree with me; he strongly protested against my view of the subject, as far as he could judge, merely at the moment from my statement, of its merits. He however accepted of the pamphlet, in order to give it a more deliberate consideration.

3. My next remark must be on your observation, that 'the *nature* of our blessed Lord is wholly *sui generis*.' This is precisely what I contend for. In the first of Genesis, from the eleventh to the twenty-fifth verse inclusive, God is represented by Moses as creating vegetables and animals all 'according to their kind;' and each and every one of these had 'seed in itself according to its kind.' Then follows, in the twenty-sixth verse, the creation of man. "And the Alehim said, we will make man, in our image, according to our likeness;" that is, another creature of another kind; perfectly *sui generis*, of his own particular and peculiar kind; not vegetable, nor merely animal, nor yet simply rational and intellectual, or mental and immaterial, as the angels, —but *the Adam*, created in *the image of the Alehim*; "in the image of the Alehim created He him,—male and female created He them." Now whereas

the man was thus constituted a new kind, and did consist of male and female, there was seed also in *the self* of this creature, as of the others, for its propagation and continuation. And as the woman owed her very substance to the man, so in the after account of the propagation of the species, we are told in the fifth of Genesis, that “Adam *begat*,” that is, generated offspring, “in *his own* likeness, after *his* image.” And because the first man was indebted solely to God for his being, and was moulded in some strong sense after the image and likeness of God, therefore Luke denominates him—“Adam, who was the son,” or offspring, or production, “of God.” We must not omit to remark here, that the man was not permitted to extend his kind, until the *moral* image was forfeited by him, through a breach of the Eden compact; nor until, with the moral image of God, he had forfeited for himself and offspring the garden of the Lord; so that when Adam *begat* progeny, in his own demoralized image and likeness, he truly begat men, or creatures *sui generis*, according to his own *nature* or kind, consisting of a rational soul and human flesh,—but he begat them sinful, and sinning men, and under the penalty of death, and in a state of exilement from the paradise of God, and obnoxious to everlasting destruction.

Now then for ‘the *second* man.’ In his dignity he is truly *sui generis*; even “the Lord from heaven.” And indeed, as you admit, the *nature* of our blessed Lord was purely of its own kind; for ‘the last Adam is a life-giving Spirit.’ The two epithets, the *second* and the *last*, do impress us with the notion of his being a *new* man, and a new stock, and who is never to be superseded by another. And of course, to propagate his own kind, there must be seed in himself after his kind. Now of what nature are the seed

of Christ? “He shall see his seed,—of the travail of his soul.” These are declared in the gospel to be spiritual,—to be heavenly,—to be *anothen* from above, and to be begotten of the Spirit. But if the seed of Christ are so represented, what is told us of Christ himself? “The last Adam is *a Spirit*,” not merely a living soul, as the first Adam was, or simply a rational and intelligent creature, but spiritual and heavenly, and having his entire manhood both sinless in its formation by the creating energy of the Holy Ghost, and preserved such through the combined influence of its inseparable union to the divine Logos, and of the continued unction of the blessed Spirit. And thus he was fitted to beget, in his own likeness, after his own image. “To them he gave power,” as the Christ of God, “to become the sons of God.” These have within them ‘the seed of God;’ and the seed of God remaineth in them. Hence the Lord is declared to be, not only a Spirit in himself, or spiritual in his whole constitution, but also “a quickening,” a life-giving, a life-creating, and life-imparting Spirit, to his body the church. “As is the heavenly man, such are they also that are heavenly.”

4. But further; I am next called on to touch on the grand topic in debate, namely, as to *how* the second and last Adam was generated? I have said in my pamphlet, to this amount, that his manhood, as far as his body is concerned, must have owed its substance to seed created by the Holy Ghost. On this point, you first admit that the nature of Christ was *sui generis*, or of a kind of its own; you then contend that its production is a ‘great mystery,’ and that ‘this mystery is not a question of natural history, or physics; it is supernatural and metaphysical; and to reason upon it

according to the laws of ordinary generation appears to you a degree of hardihood little short of blasphemy ;' and, in a word, that ' analogies may help to illustrate, but can never wholly explain, much less limit or define, that which has no exact analogy.'

Now, in the first place, as I have already shown our blessed Lord's nature to be of its own peculiar kind, I shall at once proceed to remark on your next position, that ' to reason on its production according to the laws of ordinary generation is near akin to blasphemy.' But the real fact is, that I am contending for the statement of the Holy Ghost against the statements of men. " She was found with child by the Holy Ghost ;" and " the holy offspring which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." This is scripture ; but what say your divines ? Why, that this holy offspring, begotten by the Holy Ghost, and born of the virgin, was nothing better than ' a body of fallen humanity,' the human soul's " body of sin and death," and that ' into his body, he compressed all the venom of sin !' And you, alas, as the Editor of a new journal on prophecy, countenance this !

Then, in order to give plausibility to your doctrine of ' the *unholiness* of the nature which he took,' you quote the creed of Athanasius, which teaches us that Christ was " man, of the substance of his *mother*." And now, in reply to my observations on this incorrect statement, in which I proved it to be contrary to nature, yea, to nature in all her departments ; you retort, ' I do most positively assert, that you are entirely mistaken in the physical facts in which you seem so confident, and from whence alone you draw your inferences. Now, Sir, I charge you, as you love truth, not to rest in your pre-conceived notions upon these subjects ; but I charge you to ask any

able surgeon, or any well-informed naturalist, and they will confirm what I am now about to say: I have studied surgery, though not practising, and I have consulted an eminent surgeon before writing this; and I do assert that the proper semen always comes from the female; and that the male only quickens what already exists in the female! If you find this to be true, you must allow that it subverts your whole argument, and completely establishes ours.' Most true. And therefore we come to physics at last. And most clearly, there is a very serious mistake on one side or the other. I must confess, I never was a regular student of surgery, and much less a practitioner, nor am I a professed naturalist; but I am fond of getting information as I can, upon every branch of science, under the thorough conviction that the more the true nature of things shall be understood, the more will the genuine 'form of knowledge and of the truth,' as contained in the scriptures be developed. I am at this moment in lodgings, and therefore without the books to which, on such an occasion, I should most probably refer, was I at home. But, Sir, I recollect perfectly the term '*semen masculinum*,' as the ordinary one in use in medical treatises; and on this, impregnation entirely depends. True, the female is fitted for the reception of this, and for being made to be fruitful by it, and for the nourishment of it, and its growth; but the manner of this, or the process as it respects the mother, we are not now concerned about; what we want to decide is, whether the producing principle does not belong to the father? Or whether, as you state, 'the proper semen always comes from the female; and that the male only quickens what *already exists*,' of course you mean the proper semen, 'in the female?' This is perfectly new

doctrine to me ; and I am happy to find, in the only book of authority I have to consult, and that is the *Lancet*, for the 2nd of May, 1829, that it is yet unknown to the medical profession. At page 136, Dr. Harrison observes, that ‘ in the *ovaria* of the female, a vivifying fluid is generated, which, being mixed with the *male semen*, forms the rudiments of the human embryo.’ With exquisite accuracy, therefore, are children called in the scriptures, “ the fruit of the loins,” as it regards the father ; and “ the fruit of the womb,” in relation to the mother. Because in the loins of the man are situated the spermatic arteries, which convey the blood from the aorta, or great artery, which rises immediately out of the left ventricle of the heart, to be secreted, and prepared into that very specific seed, which you assert to belong always and exclusively to the female. It is peculiar in its constitution, consisting of myriads of microscopic *animalculæ*, which exist not in the blood itself, but only in this singular secretion from it in the male. This nice investigation in modern times, proves the truth, and shows the point of that ancient remark of Bildad the Shuhite to Job ; “ How much less man, who is a worm ? and the son of man, who is an *animalcule* ?” Not that this is exclusively the case with man ; for the case of the inferior animals is the same ; the seed of the males, which is the cause of impregnation, is in these also entirely vermiculous, or full of an infinite number of the most minute living creatures, discernible only, like those which inhabit by myriads a globule of water, through the medium of a powerful microscope. Now, because it is a positive secretion from the blood of the male in man, therefore, in the new testament, God is represented as having “ made, out of one blood,” or “ from the blood of one man, all nations of men ;”

whilst, in the old testament, God pronounces concerning it, that “it is the life of all flesh. The blood of it is for the life thereof. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the *life* of *all flesh* is the *blood thereof*.” I do not here wish to be understood to restrict the vitality of the blood to this one only sense, because there is a second sense in which it may fairly be entertained; for as the *producing* principle, as it regards the human body, is from the blood, so no less does it assimilate itself to all the parts of the corporeal frame for its sustentation and renovation. Therefore, in Hebrew, the blood is called *dam*, and which Hebrew phrase likewise means *red*; and hence perhaps the name of man, A-dam, as being a red-blooded animal. But at all events the verb *damah*, the root of this noun, admirably expresses its wonderful property of assimilation, as noticed by Parkhurst, Horsley, and others; since it signifies to assimilate itself, or become like to, *et cætera*. And in allusion to this property it is asked, in the *Lancet* already quoted, ‘what is it that makes the blood, in the living body, when impelled to the remotest fibre of the frame, deposit in each part, from one simple fluid, the endless variety of dissimilar materials, which in their aggregate constitute the different organs?’

But having disposed of this point, I proceed, in the second and last place, to the topic of analogies. ‘I maintain,’ you say in your defence of the female origin of Christ, ‘that this fact of the ovum always being furnished by the body of the female, is an universal law of nature.’ So then, if analogy makes for your hypothesis, you have no objection to it; and you show no disposition to fly from natural history and physics, to take refuge in what is supernatural



and metaphysical, or to assert, as before, that ‘to reason upon it according to the laws of ordinary generation appears a degree of hardihood little short of blasphemy.’ Unhappily, however, the universal law of nature is all against you. The *ovum*, you now correctly say, is in the female; whereas in the preceding sentence you had most incorrectly averred, ‘that the proper *semen* always comes from the female!’ You have confounded these two together. And in this confusion of ideas, you proceed to say, ‘it may be seen every spring, in poultry; where *the eggs* are previously formed.’ Ay, but where are the chickens? You very properly add, that, in order to *their* production, the eggs are ‘waiting the impregnation of *the male!*’ And, if this be prevented, every farmer knows, that though the *eggs* are laid, they come to nothing!’ That is, there are no chickens. Consequently, the chick, or living creature, is from the male bird; but the female is provided with every thing for its nutrition. Suppose the egg in the hen impregnated by the male bird, and it is laid, and the hen sets on it; the chick grows, and gradually feeds on the egg, and consumes it, and breaking the shell comes forth to open view. But suppose the egg to be put into boiling water, soon after it is laid; we then, on breaking the shell, see the principle of impregnation, and the substance of what would have been the future fowl, distinct from, although connected with, the meat of the egg itself. This one instance, the first adduced by yourself, throws sufficient light on all the rest; for whether in fishes, in frogs, in bees, or in the green animalculæ on the blighted rose, *impregnation* on the part of *the male* is indispensable. My argument, therefore, is perfectly invincible; and I do pray that it may be given you to feel and acknowledge the force of it,—abandon

and abjure the opinions you now profess, — and to alter your present determination as thus by you expressed, — ‘ in a theological and doctrinal point of view, I shall still continue to bring the subject before the public.’

In conclusion, I would wish to subscribe myself most sincerely your’s, in so far as you are a sincere inquirer after, and lover of “ *the truth*, as the truth is in Christ Jesus,”

June 4, 1829.

R. H. CARNE.

I shall subjoin a few notes to these letters, and then proceed to comment on Mr. Chevalier’s Defence of the Athanasian Creed.

1. ‘ The accounts of Matthew and Luke are full, express, and particular; and still more strikingly so, in the original language of the Holy Ghost, the Greek, than in our English translation.’ Indeed, these accounts are to me proof, total and complete, of the fact as I have stated it. I shall therefore just write them down here, as they will confirm what has been contended for, and will form a contrast to Mr. Chevalier’s statements.

“ And Jacob *begat* Joseph, the husband of Mary; out of which Mary was *begotten* Jesus, who is called Christ.” Here, as Joseph is begotten by Jacob, without mention of the mother, so Jesus is begotten out of Mary, but with no mention of her husband as the *begetter*. Therefore the explanation of this follows thus, to account for his generation (*genesis*, Matt. i. 1.) his original extract, descent and birth; ‘ Now the (*genneesis*, from *gemmao*), begetting of Jesus Christ was on this wise. When as his *mother* Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found, having that in the womb

which was from,' not Mary, but 'from the Holy Spirit.' Again; "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is *begotten in* her, is," not from herself, but "from the Holy Spirit." On this passage of Matthew, Parkhurst has this note from Scott; '*genmaoo*, when applied to *females*, does not signify to *conceive*, but to *bring forth*.' To conceive, on their part, is only (*sullambanein*), to take, receive, apprehend; and what is conceived or begotten in them, is not of themselves, but of the begetter. And thus, in the original prophecy, here quoted, it is, as here translated, "a virgin shall be big with child," or, "shall be with child," or, "have a foetus in her womb, and shall bring forth a son." This, in Isaiah, is loosely rendered, "a virgin shall *conceive*." And the prediction in the 31st of Jeremiah is to the same amount; "For the Lord will create a new seed in the earth; a woman," *nechebah*, the receiving vessel, "shall compass," or enclose "a man child."

We shall find Luke's account an entire corroboration of the above. "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb," *sulleepsee en gastri*, comprehend in thy womb; or as Doddridge translates it, "Behold thou shalt be with child." This verb is used in Luke v. 9 "The draught of the fishes which they had *taken*," *sunelabon*, had *comprehended in the net*. It had before been used, in Luke i. 24. relative to Elizabeth, who "conceived;" that is, *sunelaben*, had become recipient of a child. In verse 36, this is still more clearly stated; "Thy cousin Elizabeth, she also hath conceived a son in her old age;" that is, *suneilce fuia yion*, received a son. In Luke ii. 21. we read of Christ, "Before he was conceived," or *comprehended in the womb*." And the remainder of Luke's account of the miraculous conception is in exact agreement with this. "He shall be great, and shall be

called the Son of the Highest. Then said Mary, how shall this be, seeing I know not a man? The angel said, the Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also the *holy begotten*," or offspring, "shall be called *the Son of God*." And thus the first Adam, being the son of God by original creation or generation, was "a figure," or type of him that was to come "as *the second* man and last Adam."

2. You quote the creed of Athanasius, which teaches us, that Christ was 'man of the substance of his mother.' And now, in reply to my observations on this incorrect statement, in which I proved it to be contrary to nature, yea to nature in all her departments, you retort, 'I do most positively assert, that you are entirely mistaken in the physical facts, in which you seem so confident, and from whence alone you draw your inferences. I do assert, that the proper semen always comes from the female.'

I have already shown from Burnet, the non-antiquity, and the no-authority of the Athanasian Creed; I have also shown from Matthew and Luke what is the process of nature, and what are the physical facts, relative to the male and female, in the affair of the propagation of the human species; I have no less shown how most perfectly, in the strictest accordance with nature, the incarnation of the Son of God was effected, although entirely miraculous in the superseding of Joseph, and the substitution of the Holy Ghost, in the actual impregnation of the virgin mother. I have now to add a few authorities for 'the proper semen' being peculiar to the male, and utterly unknown to the female, in direct opposition to your favourite position.

In the first place, you will admit that the *blood*, in the human species, is the great reservoir, from which

all the other fluid, as well, indeed, as solid parts, are extracted. All the other fluids therefore, are called *secretions*; secretion being that process, by which is separated from the blood, every species of animal fluids, and in truth of animal solids; because although in a state of solution, when thrown out of their respective vessels, yet all parts, even the most compact of the frame, the very bones themselves, are built up, as it were, through the medium of the secretory process.

In the second place, in the number of secretions you must acknowledge the *semen virile*. Connected with this peculiar secretion in the male, are the two spermatic arteries. And in its nature this secretion differs from every other, whether in the male or the female, as it is designed for an express and peculiar purpose. It is composed of vast numbers of animalculæ. Lewenhock discovered a thousand or more, within the space a grain of sand would occupy. Huguens says, these animalculæ appear to be born with it (the semen); and are in such great numbers, that it seems to be entirely composed of them. They differ materially from the infusory animalculæ; and in fact are *confined to this animal secretion alone*. Nothing, that has the least token of life, can be discovered, by the best glasses, either in the blood itself, or in the other secretions, whether the spittle, urine, gall, or chyle.

In the third place, these creatures are found in the *semen masculinum* of every kind of animal; so that all animal life springs from living matter, vital seed; *the producing principle of animal life, is animal life*. So that not only, as Dr. Blundell remarks, in reference to the corpuscular stage of the embryo, when from the size of a mustard seed it comes to be like a cheese maggot, ‘in our first *form* we are *worms*,’

but we are no less certainly such in our origination. The number of these vital worms in the semen masculinum of some animals, is almost incredible. In the milt or sperm of a living cod-fish, Lewenhock supposed ten thousand capable of being contained in the bulk of a grain of sand; whence he concludes that the soft roe of this single fish contained more living animals than the population of the world. And Huguens asserts, that in the same given space of a grain of sand, fifty thousand may be counted in the semen of a male fowl.

In the fourth place, I will show the male semen in its proper living perfection, to be absolutely essential to impregnation. Dr. Blundell brings a case, in the *Lancet* for November, 1828, of a ram, which, from a defect stated, was incapable of procreating his species, although it retained the power of sexual intercourse, and perhaps more so than the perfect animal. ‘If one of these rams be employed, the whole flock remains unimpregnated; yet unions are frequent. In the ram (in this case), *the seminal fluid* wants the *generative power*. But the defect rests there.’ This fact will derive confirmation from this, that these vital atoms in man, have not their form or condition always the same, in different periods of life. For in the *vesiculæ seminales* of an infant, the fluid, not yet proper to generation, has its animalculæ, but not of the same figure as those in the adult. Whilst in old men, the semen has lost these animals; and in some, they are either all dead, or so dull as to survive but a short period. And hence the strict propriety of the remark in scripture respecting Abraham in his old age; “Being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body *now dead* ;” that is, seminally so. “Therefore sprang there,” or were begotten, “even from one man, and him as good as *dead*,” or rather

“and he *in this respect* dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude.” But Sarah, you will say, Mr. Editor, Sarah also, ay, “Sarah *herself*, received strength, to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child, when she was past age!” Both parts of the story must be true, I readily concede; they are counter or corresponding parts. God, who “quick-*eneth* the dead,” he revived the defunct powers of nature in Abraham, to cause him to become a ‘father’ in his old age. And after *her* manner, as the mother, Sarah received strength, not ordinary at her time of life, “for the casting down of seed:” that is, for the bringing forth of offspring; which, as it was her first child, and in her old age, required supernatural power. But in scripture the first-born is ever distinguished as the beginning of the strength or vigour of the *father*, but never of the mother. “Reuben,” said the aged Jacob, with all the energy of fond recollection, “thou art my first-born, my might, and the beginning of my strength,\* the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power!” Because the strength or substance of reproduction, that is, the

---

\* The word here, is *aven*. “It refers particularly,” says Parkhurst, “to procreation. Gen. xlix. 3. and Deut. xxi. 17.” He means, that it refers to the procreative *substance* in the man. So Horsley says, *aven*, “signifies activity, or strength and vigour in actual exertion; and, specifically, the generative strength and vigour of the male;” or, as he better expresses it after, “the activity of the fecundating principle,” or substance. “From this primary sense,” he adds, “this noun became a name or title of *the sun*, incessantly active in the perpetual propagation of light and heat to the utmost limits of the universe, and in his genial influences on all nature, as the first physical principle of *fecundity* in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms.” And hence, the *Beth-aven*, or “temple of the sun,” amongst the idolatrous Canaanites, as in Josh. vii. 2.; and likewise, a city of this name in Egypt, as mentioned in Ezek. xxx. 17., in which place, the Greek translation renders *aven*, by *Heliopolis*, the city of the sun. See Horsley on Hosea, p. 102-4.

*living seed*, is wholly in the husband. Hence Dr. Gill observes, on this passage, that ‘sometimes strength itself signifies *seed*, as in Proverbs xxxi. 3. And so, to receive strength, is to receive seed; which the female does from the male. Hence that saying of the Jews; ‘the male does not receive strength from another, but the female receiveth strength from another.’’ ‘But here,’ adds the Doctor, ‘it is to be understood of receiving power of God to retain seed (and nourish it), received from man, and to conceive by it; which Sarah, in her circumstances, without the interposition of the almighty power, could never have done.’ Somewhat different, but to precisely the same point, is Parkhurst’s sense of the phrase. ‘By faith Sarah herself received ability for the dejection of seed; that is, for nourishing and bringing to a perfect foetus, *the seed cast down and received*. For I think, with Beza, Capellus, and other learned men, that *katabolee* is to be referred to Abraham, not to Sarah. Raphelius, in his annotation on this place, cites a passage from Lucian’s *Amores*, where *katabolas spermatoon* is expressly referred to the *male*. And the verb *kataballein* is often applied, in like manner, by the medical writers among the Greeks.’

But there is, Mr. Editor, another possible sense of this phrase; “Sarah received strength for *the foundation* of seed,” or of offspring. For we know that the rudiments are with the female; that is, as you rightly state it, in one place, although all wrong in another,—‘I maintain, that this fact of *the ovum* always being furnished by the body of the female, is an universal law of nature.’ Had you but appended to this, ‘and I maintain, that the fact of *the chick* being furnished by the body of the male, to be fed and nourished in and by *the egg* of the female, is an



equally universal law of nature,'—all had been well. However, I will close this paragraph with a quotation from the London Encyclopædia, by Tegg, under the article, Physiology. 'There still remains some difference of opinion, as to the part which the female performs in the process of generation. It was formerly thought, that the ovaria secreted a seminal fluid, which, mixing with *the male semen* in the uterus, impregnation was the result of the union. That notion is now, however, *pretty generally abandoned*; but it is still supposed, that the ovarium prepares *something* essential to generation (but not *the seed*, Mr. Editor!) since its removal renders the female sterile. Dr. Blundell, who has given his attention much to this subject, supposes, that the *aura seminalis* is not sufficient for impregnation; but that *the semen of the male* must come in contact with the rudiments. This is a return to the old doctrine of impregnation, before the time of Harvey; and it is, most probably, the correct one.'

Now before I dismiss this topic, allow me to subjoin the substance of a lecture on it, delivered in London many years ago, by a celebrated surgeon and eminent physiologist; whose exact words I may not, perhaps, be able to repeat, but his sentiments will be pretty correctly stated. 'You will now expect, that I shall tell you something relative to *conception*. Well, I will endeavour to tell you all I know about it; and when I have told you, perhaps you will say, then you know very little. Now that is very true. But, after all, let me tell you, they are only my ideas concerning it.'

'Now, I do not like the word *semen*; because we have been so used to call the *progeny of plants* by that name,—for *that* in fact is what we call their *seed*,—that it raises a wrong idea in the mind.

Therefore, I am inclined to substitute the word *life*, for it. And I would use the same word, whether I was talking about the impregnation of plants, of mere animals, or of man; for *the pollen on the anther* giveth life to the seed contained in the germen; otherwise, there is *no procreation of their kind.*'

'But, I will give you some reasons, why I fix, in preference, on the word *life*. It is said (namely, in scripture,) that the life is in the blood. And I dare say, it is very true; for the seminal fluid, or life, is secreted from it, and carried by the spermatic vessels to its proper place, and there deposited for use. Again; a man is said to be dead, when he gets so advanced into years, as not to secrete this fluid (in its proper perfection;) because then, he cannot procreate his own life, or perpetuate it, as Adam has done his. An eunuch is also considered a dead man, or dry tree, without vital sap, for the same reason; he secretes none of this (fluid) life.'

'Now then, this life (or vital principle,) seeks for itself a proper nidus or nest; in vegetables, the style; in birds, &c. the egg; *in mankind, the female ovum* (where it reposes, feeds, thrives, and grows.) There, it immediately sets about building itself a house to dwell in. In process of time, the female is said to have *conceived*; that is, become great with child.' So the Hebrew verb *harah*, in Genesis iv. 1.—means; pregnant, large, swollen; and in Genesis iii. 16. the word "thy conception," means thy pregnancy, thy mountain-state; for from this root comes the derivative *hor*, for a mountain. 'And when life has completed its mansion, parturition takes place; and then *the proper seed of man* shows itself,—or, *his progeny*; or another branch of the same tree is produced. The regularity of the work of this workman, life (or the vital principle of reproduction,) may easily be in-

spected in oviparous animals, if a proper degree of warmth is applied to the eggs, *without any further connexion with the mother*; on the contrary, if the most perfect egg from the female, without this *life* taking possession of it from the male, is placed underneath the hen for incubation, she only brings on it, the egg's, putrefaction, the sooner.'

3. 'The verb *damah*, the root of the noun (*dam* the blood,) admirably expresses its wonderful property of assimilation, as noticed by Parkhurst, Horsley, and others; since it signifies to assimilate itself, or become like to.' See Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon; and Bishop Horsley's Hosea. This is effected by means of secretion. And 'this function,' it is well observed, in the London Encyclopædia, 'considered in all its bearings, is one of the most astonishing which vitality unfolds. For, from precisely the same fluid, the blood, are elaborated matters, or substances, both widely different from each other, and as different, in some of their constituents, from the material, the blood itself, out of which they are manufactured! Thus, what can be more unlike, than urine and the blood? Or than urine, and the other secretions? And when we attempt to explain the subject, upon mechanical, or even chemical principles, we still, allowing that our premises and conclusions should be correct, remain in perfect ignorance of the power, which directs to these nice combinations and results.'

Then, in speaking of 'the mode, in which the vital fluid (the blood), effects its circuit,' they say, '*vital* fluid, we say, not under the notion, that vitality can be predicated of the blood, *any more* than of other parts of a living organized body; but merely to express, that *this fluid* is, as it were, the *fountain* from whence *all* parts of the system are supplied with pabulum, for

the various processes and operations of life. That life is in the blood, is as bad philosophy almost, as to say, that the soul is in the pineal gland; or, that affections reside in the heart. All notions, of thus localizing the *living principle*, ought to be abandoned; with indeed every other, that leads to the inference, that we can, by searching, find out what life is, or, where it is.' Certainly there is no great show of philosophy in this, either good, bad, or indifferent. First, the blood is introduced as a vital fluid. Then it is flatly denied, that in the face of common sense vitality can at all be predicated of the blood, or said afore-named vital fluid, *any more* than of any other part of the body, even the raw bones of the skeleton. But instantly it is declared, nevertheless, that this vital, yet non-vital fluid, is the *fountain* whence *all* parts of the living system are supplied with *pabulum*, to sustain life in them, and for all the processes and operations of animal life! Of course, if we add to these concessions, what we have already proved, that *the vital principle of procreation also* is in the blood, we shall be certainly assured, against all such assumptions and presumptions, that 'the *life* of all *flesh*,' from first even to last, 'is in the blood.'

4. 'Suppose the egg in the hen impregnated by the male bird, and it is laid, and the hen sits on it; the chick grows, and gradually feeds on the egg, and consumes it.' When impregnated by the male bird, the egg, in the female, contains an embryo or foetus, of the same species. Life is communicated. Within the shell is the *albumen*, or white, and the *vitellus*, or yolk. The white of a *fecundated* egg is as sweet and free from corruption, during all the time of incubation, as it is in new laid eggs; as is also the yolk. When the yolk grows warm with incubation, it becomes more humid, and like melting wax or fat,

whence it takes up more space. For as the foetus increases, the white insensibly wastes away and condenses; the yolk, on the contrary, seems to lose little or nothing of its bulk when the foetus is perfected, and only appears more liquid and humid, when the abdomen of the foetus begins to be formed. The chick in the egg is first nourished by the white; and when this is consumed, by the yolk, as with milk. Not long *before* the exclusion of the chick from the shell, the whole yolk is taken into its abdomen; and *after* its exclusion thence, the yolk is gradually wasted, being conveyed into the small intestines by a small duct. M. Reaumur observes, that hens' eggs are a sort of chrysalis of the animal; their germ, after impregnation by the male, containing the young animal *alive*, though inactive and insensible, and waiting for warmth, *et cætera*, to grow to its proper form.

5. 'Impregnation, on the part of the male, is indispensable.' That is, for the communication of life, and the continuation of it in every species. Else, a maiden pullet may lay eggs; but not give birth to a chick; because not having received the matter, which only has the quality of life, and the power to transmit and confer it. And this is equally true of fishes; since the ova, or hard roe, in the females, must be indebted for a vital principle to the milt, or soft roe in the males. With respect to frogs (and toads also) 'where,' you say, 'the spawn is drawn out by the hind feet of the male, and *impregnated* in the act of drawing out,'—the fact is just this; that in some reptiles, there are in the males, hard, brown, or blackish tubercles, attached to the thumb and palm of the fore feet; which are most visible during the pairing season. This structure is found in frogs and toads. The female organs resemble those of birds,

except that, in some species, as turtles and tortoises, there are two ovaries. In the female of one species or toad, the Pipa, or Surinam toad, there are numerous hollow cells in the back of the animal, in which the ova are placed by the male, *after being fecundated*, and where they remain shut up, by the skin contracting round them, till they are capable of maintaining a separate existence. As for the bee, what you say of the fate of the male, singularly confirms my doctrine, and but little accords with Mr. Chevalier's insignificance and non-essentiality relative to the males in general, in the various kinds of beings, in the affair of generation. 'It may,' most truly, 'be seen in bees, where one impregnation, *which is always fatal to the male*, gives *life* to all the eggs which the queen bee lays during her life!' It is the same with the silkworm; when arrived at its perfect or moth state, it endeavours only to propagate its species; after which, *the male immediately dies*, and the female also as soon as she has deposited her eggs. And in the green blight of the rose, if the impregnation of one female renders prolific ten successive generations of females, surely this is proof of power and efficiency, instead of the reverse. This is of the genus *Aphis*. It is supposed that each of the many species of the *Aphides*, is attached to one kind of vegetable only. These had long been considered among the *Androgynes*, or *Hermaphrodites*, uniting in themselves the attributes of both sexes. But Bonnet's experiments, with those of his countryman, Trembley, confirmed the course of their generation. Trembley, in a letter from the Hague, dated January 27, 1741, says, 'who knows, but that one copulation may serve for several generations?' This, who knows, induced Bonnet to bring it to the test of experiment. He discovered that the *Aphides* are males and females; that the

males are produced only in the tenth generation, and are but few in number; that these, soon arriving at their full growth, copulate with the females; *that the virtue* of this copulation is not *exhausted* until the tenth generation; and that all these generations, except *the first*, from *the fecundated eggs*, are produced viviparous. Thus all nature declares male impregnation necessary to female fruitfulness; the mode may vary beyond calculation, but the fact remains the same; whether there be a pair or couple only, as in the human species and others; or one male to many females, as in sheep; or many males to each female, as among toads, there being thirty of the former to each one of the latter; or one generation of males for ten generations of females, as in the Aphides.

But sixthly and lastly, you conclude by saying, ‘I might extend this catalogue to almost any length,’ to which you might have added,—and weakened its force in proportion to the elongation of it; ‘but these will suffice. For if *any one* of them is brought home with conviction to your mind, it destroys the *universality of your position*. And we are fully entitled to rest on *that one analogy*, even if it stand alone, for maintaining, that our Lord took flesh of his mother.’

Now, first, what is the universality of my position? It is this. That through all nature, there is no positive equivocal generation; but that some process obtains for the orderly propagation of species; or, for the reproduction of its like by like, or rather of *same by same*. As to what we call plays or sports of nature, those freakish productions, as they are but exceptions, so they can never be brought forward as objections to the general rule itself.

But in the second place, I ask for one, any one, one only instance, of a mother’s child without a sire.

‘That one analogy,’ I will concede to it all the bearing and influence on the subject it can possibly have, ‘even if it stand alone,’ amid the countless crowd of creatures; and will admit that such an instance, solitary as it may stand amid the press and throng of nature’s all prolific families, which people air, and earth, and water, demands its due consideration. But you have advanced not one. You have exhibited proof upon proof, of the marvellous virtue, power, efficiency, of the male, as in the bee, and still more so in the Aphides, where the female is not merely empowered to be fruitful only for life, but for ten generations; but you have not even distantly hinted at the barest possibility of a mother’s offspring without a father. And therefore that sentiment of Dr. Gill I do pronounce again to be utterly untenable; namely, that ‘as man he had no father. Joseph was his reputed father only. Nor was the Holy Ghost his father. Nor is he ever said to be *begotten*, as man, but was *born* of a virgin.’ And to the same effect Dr. Doddridge writes, that ‘with respect to his human nature he had no father.’ Now of these assertions, your’s, Mr. Editor, is but the echo; ‘that our Lord took flesh of his mother.’

---

I must now pay my respects to Mr. Chevalier; in reply to his ‘Defence of the Athanasian Creed.’

1. For the Creed itself, I have disposed of that already, by the sentence of no less a judge than bishop Burnet. But I can bring almost a whole bench of bishops, or of eminent dignified clergymen, as a jury, to give in their verdict against it. Waterland ascribes it to Hilary, bishop of Arles.



This Creed obtained in France about A. D. 850; was received in Spain about a hundred years later; and was not admitted at Rome until about A. D. 1014. As to the Greek and oriental churches, it has been questioned whether any of them ever received it at all. Tillotson says, ‘the account given of Athanasius’s Creed, seems to me no wise satisfactory. I wish we were well rid of it.’ Taylor says, ‘To me it seems very hard, to put uncharitableness into the Creed, and so to make it become as an article of faith.’ Tomline laments, ‘that assertions of so peremptory a nature, unexplained and unqualified, should have been used in any human composition.’ And even Horsley acknowledges, ‘that our church would have acted more wisely, if it had not adopted the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed.’

But I do not object to this Creed, on the ground of the doctrine of the Trinity, in defence of which I have written and published four or five several times; nor on the ground of the incarnation; but on the ground of its explications of these doctrines, and of its condemnations and reprobations, of those persons, who acknowledge these doctrines indeed, but disallow their explications as given in it.

2. ‘Who are all agreed in maintaining, that the female contributes, equally with the male parent, towards the production of their common offspring.’ Very well; but did they maintain, that the female contributes the semen as well as the ovum? Or that the hen contributes the chick as well as the egg? Or that the female fish is the melter as well as the spawner, contributing the sperm as well as the spawn, or the soft as well as the hard roe? If the Creator has wonderfully diversified the process of reproduction, then let us investigate and admire the

existing diversity; but do not let us be concluding, from the process observed in one description of creatures, that the same process will suffice for another. Of analogical reasoning, it has been well observed, that it ‘may be of excellent use, in answering objections against truths, which have other evidence. It may likewise give a greater or a less degree of probability, in cases where we can find no other evidence. But, as this kind of reasoning can afford only probable evidence at best, unless great caution be used, we are apt to be led into error by it. To give an instance of this; early anatomists seldom dissected human bodies; but very often, the bodies of those quadrupeds, whose internal structure was thought to approach nearest to that of the human body; and were led into many mistakes, by their arguing on a greater similarity between the structure of men and of animals, than there is in reality. And arguments, drawn from analogy, become weak, *as the disparity, between the things composed, increases.*’

Now, in the case before us, we have other evidence than what can be deduced from analogy. I therefore first proved the thing from scripture, that the woman is of the man, and not the man of the woman; that thus God made, from one man Adam, and from the blood of that one man, all nations of men; and that, when in the case before us, the man Joseph was suspended, the Holy Ghost himself came upon the virgin, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her, insomuch that, the holy offspring of Mary was said to be “of,” or from “the Holy Ghost.” I then adduced instances, somewhat, although not exactly similar; I mean those of Abraham and Sarah, and of Zacharias and Elizabeth. After this, it was all fair to have recourse to analogy, in answering objections to a truth, which has other evidence. This

led me to make my declaration universal, as to some sort of male impregnation being necessary to female fruitfulness. Or, as Mr. Abernethy has very judiciously altered the term, there must be *life* given to the rudiments; ‘and I would use the same word, whether I was talking about the impregnation of plants, mere animals, or men; *for the pollen on the anther* giveth life to the seed contained in the germen; otherwise, there is no procreation of their kind.’ Now, the difference between the oak, with its pollen and acorns, and the hen with her eggs, is this; that the oak bears the acorn, which has within it the parts of a perfect tree, and the pollen which imparts life to the same. Whereas the hen bears the eggs; but these eggs have not within themselves the parts of a perfect fowl, but only a provision for the nourishment of the chick; which chick is indebted for its origination not immediately to the hen or her egg, but to the semen of the male bird. Hence Lord Bacon says, “The yolk of the egg conduceth little to the generation of the bird, but only to the nourishment of the same; for if a chicken be opened, when it is new-hatched, you shall find much of the yolk remaining.” This being the true state of the case, the question arises out of it, between which does the least disparity exist? Between the hen and her eggs, and the human female with her ova; or between the latter, and the oak with its acorns and pollen? Clearly, the difference is great, between the acorn of the oak and the ovum of the woman; whereas between this last, and the egg of the hen, there is a wonderful resemblance. Why then, if the ancient anatomists blundered, in dissecting quadrupeds, whose structure very nearly resembled that of the human subject, instead of directly dissecting the human subject itself, what else but

blunders can be expected, if we now set to work in dissecting seeds, buds, and flowers? ‘ Let any one tear open the unripe bud of a flower,’ says Mr. Chevalier; ‘ for example, that of the lily or the eglantine; and he shall find, or ever the anthers have yet burst, and when the pollen is still a moist and unformed pulp, with care he shall find the rudiments of those favourite herbs already extant within the germen or ovary.’ Very excellent indeed; but now for the use and application of this. So, in the same manner, if you dissect an egg, even prior to impregnation, you shall find therein the several component parts of a living chick! No indeed you will not. But now reverse this matter. Instead of taking an acorn, or a bud, or a seed, which method has led thousands astray, through inadvertency, let us take an egg, both before and after impregnation by the male bird; let us be certain of its contents before and after; and then upon incubation, let us nicely investigate it, from the first day to the twenty-first; surely we shall certainly conclude for the male origination of the chick, as we shall, for the female origin of the egg itself. Let us apply this to the human subject; not from mere choice or caprice, but because all observation and scripture declare the man to be the spring of life in the propagation of the species, and the woman to be the recipient and the nurse. Thus in the first of Genesis, at the 27th verse, we read that, in the formation of “ the Adam,” God created the first pair of the species “ *zechur* and *nechebah*;” implying that the *strength and vigour* for multiplication centered in the man, and that the female was the proper *receptacle*. Therefore in the 51st of Isaiah at the first verse, God says to Israel, “ Look unto *the rock* whence ye are *hewn*,” or from whose substance ye are cut out, namely, “ Abraham your

*father*,”—“ and to the *hole of the pit* whence ye are digged,” even “ unto Sarah that bare you,” or rather “ brought you forth.” And as for human authority, Galen, that prince of Greek physicians, entertained the opinion sixteen hundred years ago, ‘ that the embryo was produced from the male, but that it obtained nourishment from the female.’ Whilst Dr. Blundell, now existing, asserts that ‘ it may be demonstrated, that in this curious process of generation, the male furnishes the semen, and the female the rudiments.’ In other words, *life* is communicated from the man to the ovum of the woman; and this is the proper *quickenig*. The English law is founded on an error; as though, at a certain period *after conception*, the fœtus became endowed with the principle of life. On the contrary, from the moment of impregnation the fœtus is in possession of the vital principle; but at this particular time, when the child was supposed to quicken, it only affords increased manifestations of this property *already existing*.

3. ‘ The earth is to the seed, as an oven to the eggs hatched therein.’ This is an additional proof of bad comparison, and which goes to the demolition of truth, and the erection of error on its ruins. The heated oven contributes the necessary *warmth* to the egg; the egg being already impregnated with life from the male bird, and containing within itself all the nourishment requisite for its support, growth, and maturity. Whereas the seed, say the acorn, if you please, must be indebted to the earth for nourishment adapted to its nature; it must strike root in the proper soil, and then through this, ‘ its slender root attached to the earth,’ there flows to it, not its life indeed, for that it has in itself, but all the pabulum required for its growth, solidity, and expansion, of three hundred years. And thus the human *fœtus*

has a distinct individual personal life of its own, communicated from the vital fluid of the male, and is irrespective of, and independent on the life of the mother; but then, as the chick in its egg, provided for it by the hen, and as the seed rooted to the earth for food, so no less, in the *fœtus in utero*, the umbilical cord is the channel of communication between the mother and the child. For although, for some weeks after conception, if the embryo be examined, no trace of the umbilical cord can be perceived, yet the abdomen of the child firmly adheres to that which afterwards becomes the *placenta*; this bond of union, by its subsequent extension, becoming converted into the *funis umbilicalis*. The *placenta* is composed of two portions, the maternal and the fœtal, each having its own peculiar blood; ‘it is also admitted, that the blood of the *fœtus*, with regard to its formation, increase, and circulation, is totally unconnected with, and independent of the parent, except that the matter by which the blood of the *fœtus* is formed, must be derived from the parent.’ So speaks the London Encyclopædia on midwifery; and it quotes Harvey as saying, that as the pullet in the egg, and separated from the hen, is wont to delight in its own proper blood, which it forms for itself out of the aliment provided for it in the egg by the mother, so also does the *fœtus*, whilst yet contained in the womb, derive nourishment and growth, not from the blood or life of the mother, but by a fruition of its own life and powers. In other words; the child is nourished by means of the nutritious material which is absorbed at the *placenta*, the vessels of the *fœtus* acting like *the root of a plant in the earth*. For instead of the integral red blood of the mother, the subtler parts of it only, the serum and coagulable lymph, are absorbed into the vessels

of the *fetus*, just as the root of the plant supplies it with, not the gross earth itself, but with nutriment from it, duly concocted into proper purity and perfection; or, in fine, as the chick in ovo, forms blood for itself from the yolk and white of the egg, which it absorbs, digests, and *sanguifies*, so the human *fœtus* in utero draws nourishment from the blood in the placental cells, to be afterwards converted into blood by the action of *its own vascular system*. In a word, the earth is to the seed rather, what Mr. Chevalier has in another place confessed it to be, ‘its foster-mother, or nurse;’ and not as a mere oven to the impregnated egg.\* Originally, indeed, the earth was the proper and universal mother, producing all. For who was the first father of all the vegetable tribes but God? And what, but the earth was the all-fruitful mother? The grass, as a general term for pasturage, has its name in Hebrew, *dasha*, to intimate its sprouting or springing up from the earth. “And the Alehim said, let the earth bring forth grass,” or sprout forth her sprouting, “Herbage yielding seed,” and scattering it. “And the earth *brought forth* grass; herbage yielding seed according to its kind.” And from that first maternal production of original offspring, the earth has

---

\* “Seeds, endowed with vitality, remain unchanged, under circumstances in which they would certainly be destroyed, were they destitute of the principle of life. They remain buried thousands of years deep in the bowels of the earth; yet when accident throws them to the surface, and they fall into a *soil* which is favourable to their vegetation, they immediately begin to develop properties which had lain latent for unknown ages, and spring into active life with all the vigour of a seed formed under our own eye.” *Animal Physiology*, No. 59, of “Library of Useful Knowledge.” And so, in the parable of the sower, in the 13th of Matthew, whilst the seed sown is all the same, the difference of *soil* produces the varied results; and that which succeeds, and brings forth fruit, is the portion which “fell into *good ground*.”

ever continued to foster and feed the reproducing seeds of the same. Hence, the Lord alludes to this in reference to his being buried in the earth, and rising or springing up thence again, to be as a vital root to his church. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat *fall into the ground*, and die, (as to the outer husk) it abideth alone; but if it die, it (the living seed) bringeth forth much fruit.” To this we may add, as still more explicit, that of the apostle Paul: “That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. But God hath given to it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every one of the seeds its own peculiar body.” And thus too with regard to the trees, the earth was their first mother; “And the earth brought forth the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, according to its kind.” The oak, for instance, produces its fruit, the rudiment of the future tree, as also the pollen necessary to its impregnation; and when this has been communicated from the male flowerets, amenta, or catkins, to the said fruit, these do afterwards become proper *acorns*, and these acorns are the living seed sown in the bowels of the earth, and which, being nurtured there, as in their proper matrix, do shoot up gradually into several oaks. Nay, and man himself, as God was his original Father, or the giver of life to him, was not the earth as his mother? And does not the earth still yield of her abundance, not to give life or impart vitality to man, for the man has *seed in himself* according to his kind, but to sustain life in man, as well as in all other animals, and all the tribes of the vegetable kingdom?

Thus, then, whether we consider the chick en-



veloped in the egg, or the foetus in the womb, or the acorn in the bowels of the earth, we contemplate cases which tend to illustrate each other : for the earth is to the acorn what the mother is to the child, and what the hen's egg is to the chick of the male bird. In this manner, analogy is of service ; because we do not make it the foundation of our doctrine ; but we merely institute a comparison in order to ascertain what existing resemblance there may be ; and then employ it for illustration and confirmation. For as there is a similitude between the earth, the mother, and the egg of the hen, each contributing support and sustentation ; so there is a similitude between the acorn, the child, and the chick, each having in itself all the component parts of the oak, the man, the fowl ; at the same time that there is this still further resemblance, in that the root of the acorn connecting it with the earth, and becoming a medium of communication for necessary supplies, is similar to the membrane which unites the chick to the egg, and to the cord which ties the child to its mother, and stands for a channel of communication between them. And in the employment of this method of comparison, we have only to remember, that things as they may have two ends, and we may take hold on the wrong one, instead of the right, so there is a wrong as well as a right use of things. For a man might grasp a sword by the blade instead of the hilt, and cut himself with it ; or take a candle by its lighted end, and burn his fingers. Or else if he seize the sword by the hilt, he might use it badly, and kill himself instead of his enemy ; or he might take the lighted candle by its opposite end, and set the house on fire with it, instead of merely filling it with its beams.

4. According to ' Sir William Blane, nine energies

constitute *animal life*, or, the life of an animal. These are what the unimpregnated egg of a virgin hen is destitute of; the aggregate of these is all that the impregnated and fecund ovum has received. They are all, that ever human art either hath or can discover to have been added to the pre-existent barren germ, to make it an independent offspring, a distinct being. These nine energies,' whose aggregate constitutes animal life, or the life of an animal, as an independent offspring, a distinct being, 'these energies, I say, are conveyed from the male, to the pre-existent substance, or germ (the ovum), within the body of the female. For in all the animal kingdom, whatsoever exhibits a body of flesh possessed of these nine energies, as the *impregnated* egg, both before, and during incubation, is a distinct individual. I appeal to all the natural history, both of animals and vegetables, for the truth of my statement; and I say, that the germ, before it receives those energies (from the male), is a lifeless body.' Admirable, Mr. Editor; most exquisitely correct in sentiment, in most perfect correspondency with matter of fact, and most clear and intelligible in the enunciation! The nine energies in detail I confess my ignorance about; but, that the aggregate of life, of independent offspring, of distinct being, whatever its constituents be, whether nine or nine hundred energies, that this is actually conveyed to the rudiments in the female, 'from the male,' this, Mr. Editor, is verily sound speech that cannot be condemned; in doctrine, this is uncorruptness itself. And if we consider, that after this manner the human life was conveyed to the virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost creating what was required, in order to render Joseph unnecessary in the transmission of life, we have then the incarnation before us, simply as Matthew and Luke have both

recorded it. And the objections of Mr. Chevalier will be at once met; who says, ‘ Mr. Carne objects, that if Christ was the woman’s seed, as he is called in Genesis iii. 15. although the reverend gentleman *does not believe him to have been any such thing*,— that he must consequently have been seminally and radically (yes, and individually and personally), in Abraham’s loins when Melchisedec received his tithes; and he adds, that of course the consequence is inevitable, that Christ, as well as ourselves, was seminally and radically (yes, and personally and individually), in Adam, when he fell; and so had share in Adam’s transgression.’ The woman’s seed is, the woman’s offspring; but the woman’s offspring is begotten in her by the seed of the male. And hence in Genesis, chapters four and five, whilst Eve becomes pregnant, or large with child, and obtains or acquires a man, or man child, it is Adam who is himself *the begetter* of the same. He is the original substantial entity, as it were; and is therefore called *aish*, or *ish*, the existing being; whilst Eve borrows her name *aishah*, or *ishah*, from the man’s, in token of having derived her substance from his.—“ She shall be called *ishah*, because she was taken out of *ish*.” Her name and being are alike derivations from his. But in the incarnation of the Word, who was God in himself, the life was supernaturally induced; and he became truly of man’s nature in union with his personal divinity, and Mary, the daughter of Eve, of Abraham, and of David, became the mother of the Lord, and the Lord incarnate became her first-born son, although the Holy Ghost, and not Joseph, *was the begetter*. Consequently, he became a “second man,” in correspondency with “the first;” the first, as his figure or type, getting his being from God, although

out of the womb of the earth,—and he was therefore called the Son of God: as Christ also was generated in the virgin, that earthly vessel, and derived nourishment from the maternal soil in which this tree of life was planted, although the Spirit himself was really the generator and begetter of his manhood; inso-much that whilst he was Mary's seed or offspring, or son, he was no less, even as born of her, but because also as begotten for birth, and to the birth, by the Spirit of God, he was called "the Son of God."

5. 'That which our Lord assumed *not from man*, was, first, the nine energies that *constitute animal life*. Secondly, whatsoever may be added to those (afore-said *nine*) to complete the *animus*, or that *living soul*, which is common to man and all other animals. Thirdly, those energies, which constitute the *anima*, or the *spirit* of man, as distinguished from the rest.' Beautiful, Mr. Editor! We begin to emerge from the clouds, and to make a rapid ascent towards a pure, bright, unclouded heaven. 'So then, our adored Redeemer was truly and properly man, as we are; and he was likened unto us in all points, *as respects our essence*,' that is, as above, body, and soul, and spirit, with their respective energies; 'although he was himself the light of all living, kindled of the everlasting God. For, that is *animal life*, which consists of those nine energies enumerated above, and none others; and that is the life of the animal *bi-manus*, or *homo*, (or *man*), which consists of *those nine*, together with *such others*, as give to *man* his *generic distinctions*.' Now sin has no original place here; it had no being in the male and female Adam when created by God; nor is sin a generic distinction of the human race; nor is it peculiar to man; nor is it confined to the *flesh* of rational beings, seeing that

the unfleshly incorporeal angels sinned, and marred their nature and essence by this grand defect, and ruined it by this mortal disease. And therefore, if Christ took body, soul, and spirit, with all their several native and vital energies, without any thing foreign from true, genuine, unadulterated humanity, in its full health and vigour, and without the hurt of sin, he was verily man, as, by the frequent display of his power and wisdom, whilst on earth, he manifested forth his glory, and demonstrated his proper Godhead. For as in the instance of Adam the first, he was a proper man, although instantly created by God, and not begotten by another male of his own species; so in this instance of *the second* man, and last Adam, Mr. Chevalier propounds his opinion sublimely as well as most charmingly, by saying, that, ‘no matter whence *derived*. Those energies are human life; the life of a man: and of such a man (in real original nature and properties), as ourselves. Even as the flames of two torches, are in all points alike, if the substance of both be the same, although one should have been lighted from a third of its own kind, *and the other with the concentrated rays of the sun!* Superlatively good! Mr. Editor; and what follows is no less supremely conclusive. ‘In what then did the holy child Jesus differ from the rest of men?’ This question, Mr. Editor, I proceed to answer; in observing, that the sentence upon Adam, in Genesis ii. 17. affected *the life* of man; and nothing else, unless mediately. Or, in other words, that that fatal doom exclusively concerned *that*, which every natural offspring receives *from its male* parent. Adam forfeited his life; and if, through the intervention of a Mediator, if under the shelter of an Intercessor, for gracious purposes, that life, which he had

forfeited, was prolonged, still it is prolonged as a forfeited life. And, as all that our progenitor could give, towards the production of his children, is life, so all that we receive from him, and that which we do receive from him, is, a forfeited life. And herein behold the explication of the fact, of *our* participation in the consequences of *Adam's* transgression; namely, as I have said, that we, as the seed of evil doers, possess only a forfeited life. While Jesus Christ, in all truth participating our nature, possessed a life in all points the same as ours (that is, a proper *human* life) except in the accidental circumstance, *of its not having been kindled from the forfeited flame*, but with the *concentrated effulgence of God!* So then, it is explained, that as Immanuel's life *was not of the forfeited life of Adam*, therefore he came not under the *penalty* (that is, *death*), of Adam's transgression; and was in our nature pure from *sin*, even as God is pure; while, nevertheless, we may love him as our brother, and know that he can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, having been tempted in all points as we are.

I will but transcribe here, by way of contrast, Mr. Irving's statement, and add no more. 'God prepared a body of *fallen humanity* for his Son.' 'Christ, for the love he bore the human soul, consented to become a servant to her, and to be clothed with her body *of sin and death*.' He took 'humanity, fallen, sinful, and *under the sentence of death*.' And again; 'he was made of a woman; his substance then, was woman's flesh, and that is sinful. He apprehended not the angels, but the seed of Abraham; and the seed of Abraham is sinful. He was made under the law; and the law is not for a righteous thing, but for a sinful thing. Certainly he was *mortal*, and mor-

tality doth not belong to *a sinless, but a sinful substance!* ‘ And in the face of all these certainties, *of mine*, (Edward Irving), if a man will say, that his flesh was not *sinful* flesh *as ours is*, with the same dispositions, and propensities, and wants, and afflictions, *then I say* (*O tempora! O mores!*) God hath sent that man strong delusion, that he should believe a lie!!!’



JUST PUBLISHED, BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

THE TWO COVENANTS; or, Law and Gospel. Twelve Sermons, on the Abrogation of the Moral Law, delivered in High Street Chapel, Exeter. Handsomely printed in octavo, price in extra boards, 10*s.* 6*d.*

A DEFENCE AND EXPLICATION OF THE SINLESSNESS, IMMORTALITY, AND INCORRUPTIBILITY OF THE SON OF GOD. A Letter to the Editor of the Morning Watch, or Quarterly Journal of Prophecy. Price 1*s.*

ALSO, PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION,

THREE DISCOURSES, Preached at Torquay, Devon, on Gal. iii. 7—9. Psalm cx. 4. 1 Cor. ii. 13.

Also, a New Edition of FAMILIAR THOUGHTS on JOHN XVII. 21, 24. considerably enlarged and corrected.



REVIEW OF THE DISCUSSION ON THE ORIGINA-  
TION OF THE MANHOOD OF THE SON OF GOD,

OCCASIONED BY STATEMENTS OF EDWARD IRVING, AND THE  
MORNING WATCH ON THAT SUBJECT;

WITH SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS,

RELATIVE TO THE BOTANICO-ANATOMICO-THEOLOGICAL ESSAY ON THE  
SAME TOPIC, BY THOMAS WILLIAM CHEVALIER, ESQ. SURGEON, LONDON;

PUBLISHED IN THE MORNING WATCH, AND REPRINTED IN A PAMPHLET  
BY — MOGRIDGE, ESQ. OF SIDMOUTH, DEVON:

AND CONCLUDED BY

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND IMMEDIATE CAUSE OF *THE*  
*DEATH* OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

BY ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE, A. B.

LATE OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD; AND NOW MINISTER OF HIGH  
STREET CHAPEL, EXETER.

PRINTED FOR EBENEZER PALMER.

18, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXII.

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY E. JUSTINS AND SON,  
BRICK LANE, SPITALFIELDS.

## REVIEW,

§c. §c.

---

IN reviewing this discussion, I propose to give the statements of the Athanasian Creed on the subject in question,—those of eminent Divines,—and those of the Morning Watch, Evangelical Magazine, the New Jerusalem Church, and one of the modern Millennarians,—followed by the declarations of the Scriptures, and the concurring testimony of Nature.

The statement of the Athanasian Creed is this: “It is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he also believe, rightly, the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; *and man*, of the *substance of his mother*, born in the world.”

The most eminent divines have followed this lead. Dr. Doddridge says, on Hebrews vii. 3.—“Christ, with respect to his human nature, had no father.” Dr. Gill tells us, that “Christ as man, is without father. For though as God, he has a father,—yet, as man, he had no father. Joseph was his reputed father only. *Nor was the Holy Ghost his father!* Nor is he ever said to be *begotten* as man, but was *born* of a Virgin!” And again; the Holy Ghost, “he first took a part and portion of the virgin, of her semen, or blood, and conveyed it to a proper place; and purified and sanctified

it." Barker's bible, 608, in the notes, says, "Christ did take flesh, which he *sanctified*, even in the very instant of his conception." Dr. Owen is very explicit. "The act of the Holy Ghost, in this matter, was a creating act. Not indeed like the first creating act, which produced the matter and substance of all things out of nothing, causing that to be, which was not before, neither in matter, nor form, nor passive disposition; but like those subsequent acts of creation, whereby, out of matter before made and prepared, things were made that which before they were not, but of themselves they had no active disposition unto, nor concurrence in. So man was created or formed of the dust of the earth; and woman, of a rib, taken from man. There was a previous matter unto their creation; but such as gave no assistance, nor had any active disposition to the production of that particular kind of creature, whereunto they were formed by the creating power of God. Such was this act of the Holy Ghost, in forming the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. For though it was effected by an act of infinite creating power, yet it was formed or made *of the substance of the blessed Virgin*." Hur-  
 rion gives us a similar account. "He formed Christ's body in the womb of the Virgin, and *of her substance*." It was not like the first creation, wherein all things were made out of nothing; but like the forming the body of Adam out of the earth, and the body of Eve out of a rib taken from Adam. There was previous matter to work upon; though such matter, as would never have produced that body, but by an almighty creating power. Such the Holy Ghost exerted, in forming Christ's body, and animating it with a living soul, that he might in all things be like to us, sin only excepted; for the Holy Ghost in this wonderful work, *purified and sanctified* that part of the substance of the Virgin Mary, so that what was conceived and born of her, was

perfectly *holy* and void of sin." Charnock's statement is similar. "He was to have a holy body; this could not have been, had he descended from Adam by way of ordinary and natural generation. He had been a debtor himself, a lamb with blemish; and so, wanted a sacrifice for himself. His sacrifice would have been defective, and have needed some other sacrifice to fill up the gaps of it. It was necessary he should descend from Adam in a way of birth, but not in a way of seminal traduction; that he might have the nature of Adam, without the spot. Such a knot could not be untied, without infinite skill; nor such a way of production be wrought, without the infinite power of God. Therefore the Holy Ghost frames this body of Christ *of the seed of the woman*, that it might be mortal, and have his heel bruised by the devil. Not of the seed of the man, in an ordinary way of generation, that it might be without any taint of sin, *sanctifying* therefore the *seed of the woman* in a peculiar manner!" Calvin says, "he was man, truly issued of the seed of mankind!" For that, "to affirm that women are seedless is to overthrow the principles of nature!" And "we do not make Christ free from all spot, for this cause, that he is only gendered of his mother, without the intervention of man, but because he is *sanctified* by the Holy Ghost!" Hooker says, he "therefore took *the seed of Abraham*, the very first original *element of our nature*, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence." And Vaughan, of Leicester, in his Translation of Luther, tells us, "The Holy Ghost's impregnation gave Christ a spotless soul; and the daughter of Adam gave him a sinful body."

The Morning Watch informs us, "We have always held, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man, *of the substance*

*of his mother*, born in the world. Or, to express it in our own words, we believe that the eternal Son of God, in becoming Son of Man, took our very nature into union with himself, with all the infirmities brought upon it by the fall; but upheld it from sinning, and sanctified it wholly, and constrained it, in his person, to do the entire will of God." And then, Mr. Irving, as a contributor to this new and novel periodical, says, "The eternal Son of God, in taking human nature, did truly and literally take it of the Virgin's substance; and the properties of his mother's substance, body and soul, were the properties of Christ's human nature, *considered in itself* without reference to *the work wrought in it* by the Holy Ghost."

Then comes the Evangelical Magazine, giving its authority to this non-generation, this merely re-generation of the manhood of the Son of God, by the Holy Ghost. In its number for March, 1830, at page 103, we read as follows. "Mr. Irving has also discovered, that Christ was *regenerated* in the conception. But what can this eccentric Divine mean, by such an assertion? That, out of *the sinful substance* of the Virgin, the Holy Ghost formed *the immaculate body* of our Lord? *If this* be what he intends, why then *we are one with him*, save in the absurdity of his diction." And thus, truly, the Evangelical Magazine, the great organ of the Independents, is one with Mr. Irving in absurdity of sentiment; it only varies from him somewhat in absurdity of expression! They both deny "the generation" of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost in the Virgin; and alike contend for the formation of the manhood of Christ by the Spirit out of the sinful substance of Mary, and for its regeneration or sanctification in its formation.

But now for the "New Jerusalem Church." In a Tract published in London, in 1829, on "The True

Object of Christian Worship," are these statements, worthy the pen of the enlightened editor of the *Evangelical*, or of the *Morning Watch*, or of Edward Irving himself. Page 22; "When he had by himself purged our sins—denotes, when he had, by his own divine power, *purified* the assumed humanity from all imperfections *inherited from the human mother*, and thus had glorified or made it divine, and united it completely to his own divine essence." Page 30; "The soul of this humanity was, from conception, the Divine Essence; which, by *purifying* the nature thus assumed, from all *corruptions*, and at length from all finite imperfections, made it also divine, and united it with itself; to accomplish which, *every thing taken from the mother* was gradually put off; and divine principles, in the same degree, brought forth from within, and assumed in the place of the former." Page 33; "The period was approaching, when all sense of separation and distance, arising from the imperfections *inherited from the mother*, would be done away."

I promised, lastly, a quotation from one of our modern Millennialians; he is, I think a Scotch Minister, but not of the Kirk. His pamphlet is a Defence of the speedy Personal Advent of the Lord, according to the sentiments of the *Morning Watch*, Edward Irving, Thomas William Chevalier, Henry Drummond, and other disciples of the school of the prophets. At page 15, we read thus; "We are taught that the offspring of this miraculous conception *was holy*; being *purged* from all sin and taint of impurity, notwithstanding the substance out of which it was produced, and the place in which it was fashioned." Again; "As a miraculous operation was needful, for *the sanctifying* of the substance, out of which the body was prepared, it was most convenient to be generated in a virgin, according to prediction; which was done by the *benediction* of

the Holy Ghost, and not by any communication of his essence." Again; "The only question therefore is, as to the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost in actually *purging the fallen substance*, so that in its assumption by the WORD, it was so thoroughly holy, as to require no subsequent progress or process of purification." Again; "Without controversy, *the substance forming part of the Virgin*, was *fallen and sinful*; but, as *sanctified* in preparing a body for the Eternal WORD, it was immaculate, when assumed into union with his Person, apart from which it never had a distinct subsistence." And again, at page 16; "No sooner is the reference to the work of the Holy Ghost properly considered, than it follows, that *the substance*, as formed into Christ's humanity, *having been purged of impurity*, sin being only accidental to human nature, was immaculate, having only its original properties, and entirely free from every taint or tendency of a sinful kind."

Now in all these various, and very varying statements, who sees not, that the authors are all in a most perfect agreement on one point; which is, that the substance of Christ's manhood was wholly from the substance of his mother? Ay, and on a second point, that such as the whole original lump was, in Mary, such was *the part* subtracted from her, both being at once fallen and sinful? Ay, and on a third point, that being such in itself, as well as in its original, the subtracted part did require, what one party calls sanctification, and another a purging or purification, and another regeneration?

It is fair to observe here, that one of my arguments against this vulgar view of the many, respecting the humanity of our Emanuel, was this; that the sanctification, or purification, or regeneration of man, is founded on, and grows up out of his *redemption*. So that if the original substance of Christ's human nature was fallen and sinful, it must be *redeemed*, or it could not



be the lawful subject of a perfect *renovation*. It has occurred to me, as an after thought, that a reply of this kind might be made to that particular objection. The Virgin Mary was an elect vessel; and as such, she was included, body and soul entire, in the contemplated redemption of Christ; and who, in a way of credit given to his pledge and compact, and in a way of anticipation of the consequences of his incarnation, sufferings, and death, is entitled, "*the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.*" And therefore Mary, being recorded in "the book of life of the Lamb," as one of "the ransomed of the Lord," was in her whole person and substance holy before God and righteous, and without spot or blemish, and stood unblameable and unreprieveable in the sight of God in love. Consequently, the substance of Mary, being thus judicially rendered sinless, was a fit subject in any portion of it, for the positive unction of the Spirit, in order to its actual sanctification. But then it must be retorted to this reply of mine, to my own objection, that in this view of the case, there could be no more impropriety in admitting Joseph for the father of Christ as man, than in holding for his deriving his human substance from the Virgin Mary; Joseph being as sinless before God, as one of his elect in Christ, as Mary herself. For both of them were "*elect*," according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, and through the sanctification of the Spirit, "*unto the obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ,*" 1 Pet. i. 2. And then, in either case, admitting Joseph or rejecting him, since Christ's was but an instance of sanctification or regeneration, the *substance* of his manhood being originally polluted, whether coming instantly from Mary, or through her from Joseph, it is no novel case—because Johanan the baptizer was not only "*filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb,*" but he

was anointed by the Spirit whilst there. "For lo!" said Elizabeth to Mary, "as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, *the babe* leaped in my womb *for joy!*" Luke i. 15, 44.

Waiving then all conjectures, we proceed to the mere matter of fact; first, as it is laid down in the depositions of the inspired penmen; and next, as confirmed to us by the concurring testimony of nature.

I. The matter of fact is this; that we read of no taking of the substance of Mary, whether of her blood, as one describes it, or of her semen or seed, as another, or any thing else of the sort; but we do read of a something being *begotten in* her, and of her being with child in consequence, and of the proper birth of a male offspring in the usual season. We will produce the testimonies of the New Testament first; and then refer to those of the Hebrew scriptures.

The Evangelist Matthew records "the *generation,*" not the re-generation, "of Jesus Christ; the Son of David, the Son of Abraham." He then shows the *males* in succession to have *begotten* offspring. The *mothers*, out of whom they were begotten by the several fathers, are not generally introduced. But there are four exceptions; and these all equally prove the course of nature; according to which, the mothers are but the mediums, and the fathers the principals, in the affair of the propagation of the species. The first three exceptions occur in the 5th and 6th verses of the first chapter of Matthew. "And Salmon *begat* Booz, *out of* Rahab," the Canaanitish harlot; "and Booz *begat* Obed *out of* Ruth;" the daughter of Moab. "And Obed *begat* Jesse. And Jesse *begat* David the king. And David the king, *begat* Solomon, *out of her,*" namely Bathsheba, "that had been the" adulterous "wife," but now the widow "of Uriah," and the wife of David the king. The fourth exception

occurs in the 16th verse. “And Jacob *begat* Joseph, the husband of *Mary*,—out of whom *was begotten* Jesus, who is called Christ.” But there is this solitary peculiarity, in this fourth exception, in which the *mother* of the offspring is mentioned—that its *begetting* is not, as in every other instance, throughout the whole chapter, attributed to the *husband Joseph*! It is said to have been begotten, indeed, and not only born; contrary to that most superlatively inconsiderate declaration of Dr. Gill; “nor is he ever said to be *begotten*, as man—but, was *born* of a Virgin!” But Joseph, the betrothed husband of Mary, was not *the begetter*. Much less is it, in the most distant manner hinted, that Mary was self-impregnated. However, to supply the deficiency, it is expressly, and in the most unequivocal manner announced, that the Holy Spirit was himself the begetter. “Now the birth of Jesus was on this wise. When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, *before they* came together, *she* was found, having *that* in the womb *which* was *from the Holy Spirit*.” This is the literal translation; the sense of it is given in our English Version. “She was found *with child* by the Holy Spirit.” Then, Joseph being minded to put her away privily, “the angel of the Lord appeared, saying, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is conceived in her,—or rather, as the margin more correctly renders it,—“*is begotten* in her, is of,” or from, or by, “the Holy Spirit! and she shall bring forth a Son.” Then it follows; “Now all this was done, that *that* might be fulfilled *which* had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet. Behold! a Virgin shall be with child,” or shall have a fœtus or embryo in the womb; “and she shall bring forth a Son; and they shall call his name, Emanuel; which, being interpreted, is, God with us! Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did, as the angel

of the Lord had bidden him; and he took unto him his wife; but he knew her not, until she had brought forth her first-born Son. And he called his name Jesus."

We pass on, now, to the deposition of Luke, the beloved *physician*. He first records the case of Elizabeth and Zacharias; the former of whom had been always "barren," and "who was *called* barren;" or went by this name of reproach. Besides this circumstance,—“I,” said Zacharias, “am an old man; and my wife well stricken in years.” Notwithstanding, the powers of nature being miraculously restored in them both, as in ancient time in Abraham and Sarah, “his wife Elizabeth *conceived*;" that is to say, *received impregnation* from her husband, Zacharias. Dr. Johnson, therefore, well explains the verb conceive, as signifying, “To admit into the womb; to form in the womb.” We have a somewhat parallel case to this, in the woman of Shunem, in the 4th of the second of Kings. “Gehazi answered, verily she hath no child; and her husband is old. And Elisha said, call her. And he said, about this season, according to the time of life, thou shalt embrace a son. And the woman *conceived*," that is, swelled, and became big with child. The verb is *horah*, the root of *hor*, a mountain. This was an effect; but the cause must have been, the renovation of the powers of the aged husband; and the removal of obstructions, if any, from the Shunemite herself.

Luke then states the case of Mary. “And in the sixth month," namely, from the impregnation of Elizabeth by her husband Zacharias, “Gabriel was sent from God to a Virgin. And the angel said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured! the Lord is with thee! Blessed art thou among women! And she was troubled at his saying. And the angel said, fear not, Mary; for thou

hast found favour with God! And behold, thou shalt *conceive in thy womb*;" or literally, thou shalt *receive in the womb*, "and shalt bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus. Then said Mary, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee; and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also, *that holy offspring*, which shall be *born of thee*, shall be called *the Son*," or the offspring or begotten "of God!" Now this derivation of the manhood from God, by the personal energy of the Eternal Spirit, is confirmed by his titles of the "*second man*," and "*the last Adam*," 1 Cor. xv. For, in the third chapter of Luke, in which we have a genealogical account from Christ to Adam, in every instance the begetting of offspring is traced to some man; so much so, that, in the instance of Christ himself, it is said, "being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph;" that is, by those who knew not of his being begotten by the Holy Spirit. And then, when the evangelist draws to the spring-head, he says, of "Seth, who was the son of Adam; who was himself *the Son of God*." This is the conclusion of Luke's genealogy; and he had prefaced the beginning of it thus: "And the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him," namely, on Christ; "and a voice came from heaven, which said, *Thou art my beloved Son*; in thee I am well-pleased."

But to return to Mary. "And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord! be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her." And Mary, being soon after conscious of having received seed, perhaps in a night vision, and from actual internal sensation and enjoyment, when the ovum escapes from the ovaria through the fallopian tube into the uterus, and comes in contact with the semen; and to which natural circumstance Sarah of old seems to have

alluded, in saying, “After I am waxed old, *shall I have pleasure*, my lord being old also?” being, I say, assured of her real impregnation, from the declaration of the angel, made good by her consequent feelings, she makes haste to go, and tell the wonder to Elizabeth. For the angel had acquainted her with her cousin’s case. “And behold, thy cousin Elizabeth, she hath also *conceived a son*,” or literally, “*received a son* in her old age. And this is the sixth month with her who was called barren. And Mary went into the hill country with haste, and entered into the house of Zacharias and saluted Elizabeth. And when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb. And she said, Blessed art thou among women! And blessed is the fruit of thy womb! And whence is this to me, that *the mother of my Lord* should come to me?”

But we will pass on to John. “In the beginning was the WORD; and the Word was,” in a peculiar official character and capacity, “*with God*;” for being constituted the head of the church, we were chosen *in him* before the foundation of the world, Ephesians i. 4, —as all the twelve tribes of Israel were chosen in Abraham, when God called him alone, and blessed him; Isaiah li. 2. “And the WORD was himself God! The same was in the beginning with God;” in the *beginning of his way*, and before *his works* of old. Proverbs viii. 22. “All things were made by him;” by him, in his official character and capacity; for God created all things by Jesus Christ, Eph. iii. 9. “And the WORD was made flesh; and he tabernacled among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”

Now that he was made flesh, intimates that he took proper manhood, body as well as soul. But although he came in the *likeness* of sinful flesh, and not in the

*external beauty* of its unfallen, sinless, and original condition, yet he did not come in *the flesh of sin*. For first; he was “the holy child Jesus,” yea, “that holy offspring,” which was called from the womb “the Son of God.” In the second place, in prospect of his death, and the burial of his body, it was predicted, “Neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.” For Peter shows it refers to his *flesh*; “neither his *flesh* did see corruption,” Acts ii. 25—31. And Paul declares the same thing; “But he whom God raised again, saw no corruption,” Acts xiii. 37. In the third place, during the days of his flesh, Jesus proved his manhood capable of instant glorification. “We beheld his glory,” says John; and Peter says, “We were eye-witnesses of his majesty.” This was on the holy mount, which was sanctified by his glory; as, when he appeared to Joshua, and to Moses, his presence made the spot holy ground. And in the fourth place, it is hinted here, that his manhood was to be considered as God’s *tabernacle*, which he had said, should be with men, and in which he would dwell with them, as their own God, even their Emanu-el, God with us. Now of his manhood in this peculiar view of it, Jesus himself said to the Jews, “Destroy this temple; and in three days I will raise it up. But he spake of the temple of his body,” John ii. 18—22. Matt. xxvi. 61. xxvii. 40. Paul says, “God was in Christ,” 2 Cor. v. 19. “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” Col. ii. 9. And “God was manifested in the flesh,” 1 Tim. iii. 16. Besides, in the Revelation, xxi. 22. John remarks of the New Jerusalem, “And I saw no temple therein; for, the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are *the temple of it*,” the Lamb its temple, by the in-residence of the Lord God Almighty. For as a king’s residence is called a palace, so is that of God called a temple. To confirm this, Christ’s flesh, or

corporeal frame, is called "the *vail*;" and this belonged to the temple at Jerusalem. And that was rent in twain, when Christ's body was pierced; to intimate, that "the secret place of the Most High," was no longer to be sought to, for protection and a refuge, at Jerusalem, and in Solomon's temple, but in the person of Christ; and in whom, therefore, is developed the Psalmist's meaning, who says, "Lord! *thou* hast been our dwelling-place in all generations;" and "because thou hast made the Lord, who is my Refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee," Heb. x. 20. Ps. xc. 1, 2. xci. 1, 9, 10. Well, and how was this "tabernacle of David" raised up? Paul quotes from the 40th Psalm, relative to Christ's advent, to do the will of God, to the uttermost extent of that predicted *law from out of Zion*, according to which the sacrifices of the law from *mount Sinai* were to cease; and a part of the quotation is this saying of the Messiah, "A body thou hast prepared me," Heb. x. 5—10. Isa. ii. 3. This then seems to be the same with the tabernacle in Hebrews viii. 2.—"A minister of holy things; and of the *true tabernacle* which *the Lord pitched* and not man;" and likewise with that in Heb. ix. 11. "Christ is become a High Priest of the good things that were to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building," or of this old creation. If it should be objected, that heaven itself is called the holiest of all, whither Jesus went, there to appear in the presence of God for us with his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption for us, I would reply, that in this particular view of the subject, I should still look on Christ as the body of the temple, which was the place of worship for all Israel, and called the court of the congregation, and his pierced flesh and shed blood as the *vail* opened, and the new and living way



consecrated for us, by which we have “boldness to enter into the holiest,” Heb. x. 19, 20.

2. But we will now pass to the Hebrew scriptures. The first promise declared, that Eve’s seed, that is, a male child from her, through some grand-daughter of her’s, “He shall bruise” the serpent’s “head,” Gen. iii. 15. Thus, in God’s eternal purpose, Christ ranked as his first begotten, who was destined to revenge the wrongs of the whole family on the head of the betrayer and murderer. And so, in 1 Pet. i. 20. we read, that we were “redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot; who verily was *fore-ordained* before the foundation of the world, but was *manifested* in these last times for you.” This laid the foundation for a typical holy seed, or family of children, that should continue until the advent of Christ himself, Isa. vi. 13. lxx. 8, 9. In Gen. vi. 2, they are called “the sons of God,” or of the “Alehim,” in contrast with “the daughters of men;” these extended from Seth to Noah; and from Noah, through Shem, to Abraham; and from Abraham, through his Isaac, not Ishmael, and through Isaac’s Jacob, not Esau, to all the twelve tribes of Israel. And Israel was God’s “Son,” his “first begotten,” Exod. iv. 22. Hosea xi. 1. Matt. ii. 15. And as such, “Israel was *holiness* unto the Lord,” Jer. ii. 3. But to show that this was through a medium, there was sacrificial worship established, and there was a sacrificing person, the high priest—and he, as the grand figure of our Emanuel, was designated, in the engraving on the golden forefront of his mitre, “Holiness unto the Lord!” Exod. xxviii. 36—38.

The next grand promise of *a seed*, that is, a Son, was given to Abraham; in which seed or son, he was to be the father of many nations, and the heir of the world, for that in that seed or son all the nations and kindreds of the earth were to be blessed. “And that seed was

Christ," Rom. iv. and Gal. iii. "To him," said Jacob, "shall the gathering of the *peoples* be," Gen. xlix. 10. And "to him shall the Gentiles seek," sung Isaiah; "and his rest shall be glorious." Thus then, because the children of God were not angels, but men, and "partakers of flesh and blood," so Christ did at length "take part of the same;" that in him man's nature might be generated afresh, and that he might thus become the sanctifier of his polluted members, and they his sanctified brethren. Heb. ii. 11--18. These are called "the *seed*," that is, the *children* "of Abraham." For "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed*, and *heirs* according to the promise," Gal. iii. 29. Heb. ii. 16. Now because of this design, the flesh of the typical Israel was esteemed holy, whilst that of the Gentiles was as a polluted thing. Therefore they were to eat nothing unclean, nor any thing torn of wild beasts, Exod. xix. 4--6. xxii. 31. Besides, the holy oil was restricted to them, their prophets, priests, and kings, who were to spring from themselves alone. "Upon *man's* flesh it shall not be poured; it is holy, and it shall be holy unto you; whosoever putteth any of it upon a *stranger*, shall even be cut off from his people," Exod. xxx. 30--33. But so soon as Christ had been generated, as the body, flesh, and temple of the cherubim of glory, then the restriction was removed; because he came as a second man, and a final Adam, and not as another Abraham, but as Abraham's seed, son, and heir; and therefore, said the Lord by Joel, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon *all flesh*." Christ's holy flesh came not upon the Jews alone, but on all the families of mankind alike. "What God hath cleansed," said the Lord to Peter, "that call not thou common." And, as he had himself remarked just before, "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew, to keep company with, or come

unto one of another nation ; but God hath showed me that I should not call *any man* common or unclean," Ezek. x. 12. i. 26—28. Acts ii. 16—18. x. 28. xi. 9. The consequence is, that we now find the ransomed of the Lord to consist no longer of Israel alone, but "redeemed to God *out of every* kindred, and tongue, and nation, and people, and made unto our God kings and priests," Rev. v. 10.

Well, in Isaiah vii. 14, we have the Virgin mother introduced, and the Virgin's Son Emanuel ; but no father mentioned. But Matthew interprets it thus ; "A Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son ;" and as for this Virgin, even Mary, "*that which is begotten* in her," is not from herself, but "from the Holy Ghost." For—"she was found with child by the Holy Ghost."

In the 8th of Isaiah, it is said of our Emanuel, "and he shall be for a *sanctuary*;" this scripture being applied to Christ, in 1 Peter ii. 8. And in Isaiah ix. 6, we have him as the child born, and Son given ; on whose shoulder rests the government ; and his name is called, "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace." And in fine ; in Jeremiah xxxi. 22,—we read, "The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth ; a woman shall compass a man." First ; Jehovah *creates* a novel thing ; that is, either he causes to come to pass a hitherto unheard of event ; or, he causes to exist a phenomenon, "a novel daughter" in Israel ; "a woman," who, without knowing a man, "shall compass a male child ;" shall receive and encompass a man child in her womb, with the hymen of virgin purity unbroken ; and which, therefore, would be only ruptured by the *birth* of her child, and not at its *begetting* ! Deut. xxii. 13—17. Consequently, Mary *remained a Virgin* until she was delivered of the Man-child ; in perfect agreement with

Isa. vii. 14. and Matt. i. 23. "A *Virgin* shall swell," or grow large, "with child"—"and she," the *Virgin*, "shall bring forth a son."

3. The fact being thus clearly established from revelation, let us confirm it by the concurring testimony of nature.

The first circumstance of note is this; that the semen of the man is a peculiar secretion from the blood. The second circumstance is this; that in the man are the spermatic arteries; and that those are situated in the loins of the man. Now in reference to the first circumstance, the scriptures declare the blood to be "the life of all flesh;" that is, *the mean* of animal life; it is the life of all flesh, indeed, both in the propagation of life by semen, and in its preservation by its other secretions; from the blood is secreted the semen, the propagator and procreator of life, Genesis ix. 4—6: Lev. xvii. 10—14. In this view it is a vital substance in itself, and it aids in communicating and preserving vitality to all the parts of the body; as will be shown in the instance of the egg of a hen. This is confessed in the Library of Useful Knowledge, under animal physiology. "The blood not only maintains the life of all the other parts of the body, but it is itself alive. Hunter states the fact distinctly; and since his time, the opinion has been extending; and the evidence of its truth may now be considered as completely satisfactory." And again; "the blood cannot owe the preservation of its *fluidity* only to its motion or circulation; nor to motion and a given temperature; but the blood maintains its fluidity, in the living body, in consequence of its being endowed with the property of life." But it is the *arterial* blood, flowing fresh and direct from the heart, being of a bright scarlet colour, as opposed to the dark-coloured modena-red blood of the *veins*, which is the proper vital and nutritive fluid;

the venous blood being that which remains, after the arterial has been subjected to the various processes of nutrition, and it is therefore carried back to the lungs to be renovated there, by fresh accessions of oxygen from the air of the atmosphere continually inhaled. For if the circulation of arterial blood, through the *brain*, be stopped, if only venous blood flow through its vessels, instant insensibility supervenes, and death follows in a few seconds. This then demonstrates the oxygen gas of the atmospheric air to be the source of the vital properties of the blood; for during its passage through the lungs, those admirable air-vessels, the vital properties which it had expended, are received again, and noxious qualities contracted, are removed. Now the Hebrew scholar well knows, that as in Gen. iv, 10, so often elsewhere, the word for the blood is plural; in the just cited place it has also a plural verb,—*dam-im zak-im*; “thy brother’s bloods cry.” This may refer to its twofold condition; whilst its name *dam*, from the root *dam-ah*, declares its wonderful property of assimilation. The same accuracy is seen in the plural form used for the atmospherical expanse or expansion, improperly translated “firmament” in the first chapter of Genesis; for in Job xxxvii. 18. we read,—“Hast thou, with him, spread out,” or expanded,—“the dancing *ethers*, which *are* constringed together,” cohering while dilating “like a mirror of melted and consolidated metal?” Now in the composition of the air, modern science has detected at least two distinct species of elastic fluid,—the one, oxygen gas, or *vital air*; and the other azotic or nitrogen gas.

But be it next observed, that as the blood has vital properties, though not to the exclusion of those of other constituents of the animal frame,—as it furnishes pabulum to the organized system, as it feeds, and renovates, and restores it, and even forms a cement for gaping

wounds and broken bones, so likewise is it the great fountain from which all the secretions issue, as fluids, and out of which again all the solids are formed. "Every part," says Hunter, "is formed from the blood; we grow out of it." But this is not all; it yields that peculiar secretion, in the man, which is the sole principle of the propagation of the species. "It is a general law," says the Library of Useful Knowledge, "that living beings derive their origin from pre-existing living beings, by a process termed generation." The mode may vary ten thousand times ten thousand-fold; from those minutest of animalculi, hatched and developed in, but not generated by, animal and vegetable infusions, up to man himself. Even the polypus must be itself alive, or the cutting of it into halves or quarters will not suffice for the multiplication of its kind; a dead polypus cannot develop in any of its parts, what it has not in its own self; that is, vitality. But where life is generally diffused, as in worms, the polypus, and in trees, and plants, there a part severed from the parent whole, will frequently retain and carry with it the essence and all the peculiarities of the original; as we see in offsets, and layers, and cuttings, and ingrafted scions, and inserted buds. But as, in others of the vegetable kingdom, nothing will prove effectual but *the seed*; and this, as injected into the bowels of the mother earth; so it is with the re-production of the rational creature man. Now on this account it is said that "Adam," the first man, who was himself created by God, but with seed in himself for propagation, "Adam" and not Eve, "*begat*, in his own likeness, after his own image," Gen. v. 3. And then, to intimate the origin of the re-producing seed, the apostle Paul remarks, that God "hath made of one *blood*," or out of the blood of one man, "all nations of men," Acts xvii. 26.

But it may here be asked, may not the necessary seed proceed in part from the womb-man ; the female possessing *blood* of the same nature and properties with that of the male? I answer, no! because our second notable circumstance was this ; the spermatic arteries are in the man and not in the woman ; and, what is more, they are situated in his loins. The *secretion*, then, from the animal blood, in the human species, which we call the semen, has place only in the male. Hence it is called the *strength* of the man, Gen. xlix. 3. Prov. xxxi. 3. And for the want of it we call a man *impotent*. Besides, although progeny may be entitled in scripture the fruit of the womb, of the belly, and bowels of the mother, it is especially referred to the *loins* of the father ; “ kings shall come out of thy loins,” said God to Abraham, Gen. xxxv. 11. see also Gen. xli. 26. Exod. i. 5. 1 Kings viii. 19. And in the New Testament, Acts ii. 30. and Heb. vii. 5, 10. Clearly then, the Lord Jesus Christ, in relation to his manhood, came out of the loins of David, in so far as it was generated in his own grand-daughter Mary, and sustained there, until the birth, and afterwards nourished by her milk, which is itself another of the secretions from the blood ; but not as relates to *generation itself*, because Joseph, David’s grand-son, and Mary’s reputed *husband*, had nothing to do in the transaction ; “ for that which was *begotten in her* was *from the Holy Ghost*,” Matt. i. 20.; and that can be nothing less than semen impregnating the ovum; without which, no *action* for the production of offspring can possibly go on in the female constitution.

On the whole, then, we may say it would be well if, after the investigations of our modern men of science can lead them no further, they would just allow the scriptures to take them by the hand. For truly, if we dare not assert, as of old, that where there

are three medicals, there, there will be two atheists detected, yet we seem compelled to aver, that at least two out of the three will turn out to be infidels. In the case of the brain, after they have anatomized that, and scrutinized it, because they see nothing but medullary substance, and its accompaniments, in the head of a man, the seat of sensation and intelligence, they conclude there is no immaterial soul. Then, of the blood, they question its property of vitality, notwithstanding that it carries the pabulum of life in its current to the whole animal frame, and supplies every requisite for the continuation of its existence, and for the growth, perfection, conservation, and proper vigour and energy of its every part, while it yields the peculiar secretion for its proper propagation. And then, again, they prolong the interminable strife about the origin of the producing principle in man; whether it is peculiar to the male, or to the female, or whether it is common to them both, or, in a word, whether or not it is to be held absolutely and essentially necessary at all! And to make the darkness darker, and the confusion worse confounded, what an admirable expedient has Thomas William Chevalier had recourse to! He rakes together all the instances, imaginary or real, natural, casual, or monstrous; all the instances, I say, ever fancied, rumoured, or recorded, of *hermaphroditism*—and this, from all the fruitful fields, through all the departments of nature, belonging to the respective empires of the animal and the vegetable creation! But no! I correct myself; our practitioner and operator hardly touches with the edge of his knife the living creatures; with truly Pythagorean sensibility he spares these, and is bold only in the unleshly and bloodless dissection of vegetable subjects!

But overpassing all other illustrations, let us confine ourselves to the egg of the hen. Mr. Chevalier tells



us, at page 10, " Among birds, it is notorious, that the *virgin* will lay an egg; and it has been demonstrated, by Haller and Bonnet, that such an egg contains the embryo." "*Article, fetus est a matre*;" that is, the fetus is from the mother. What is this to illustrate? Is it adduced to show, that the Virgin Mary, might possibly have in her womb, and give birth to, a man child, to her first-born son, without any impregnation of the ovum at all? If not, of what use is this case? For except Mr. C. can give us instances of virgin women bearing children, as virgins, the instance of the virgin pullet, with its egg, is no more to the point than if he had told us of the male bird sometimes laying an egg; or, of a boy that once was found with a fetus in his abdomen; or of a mountain in labour, and bringing forth a mouse; or of a block of marble being cleft asunder, and suddenly delivered of, a live toad!

However, the other part of the story is of more consequence; I mean, that the *fetus* is from the mother; and, that the virgin pullet's unimpregnated egg contains the *embryo*. For the first, we know that "Galen believed that the embryo was produced from *the male*; but that it obtained nourishment from the female." Lond. Ency. "Midwifery," p. 538. As for the "illustrious Harvey, whose researches on generation occupied a considerable part of his life, he seems to have been fully aware of the almost impenetrable mystery in which the process was involved." Ibid. And, "with him," namely, Doctor Denman, say the Editors, "we believe that the first part of the process, by which primordial existence is established, from the minuteness and complication of the objects to be described, and from the retirement of the attending circumstances, is probably involved in too much obscurity to be discovered." After these admissions, we can of course only smile at the disposal of the question in such a summary way as this;

“the fetus is from the mother!” To have a fetus or embryo in the womb, is for a woman to be with child; and as this is ordinary language, so is it agreeable to all scripture; and which likewise declares, that that which is thus in utero, is from the male; which is, the life in the semen in action upon the ovum; and, as regards the Virgin Mary, that it was “from the overshadowing power or energy of the Holy Ghost.” But from Mr. C.’s remarks, the Virgin seems to be considered by him as already in possession of the fetus or embryo, and only requires impregnation to enliven it; which runs quite counter to the phraseology of scripture on the subject. I should prefer saying, that “impregnation is that function, whereby the seminal fluid of the male, or *sperma arrenikon*, applied to the female genital organs, *excites* the various generative actions, and thus ultimately *produces* the fetus.” And as Mr. C. is a sort of popular divine, being one of *the prophets*, as well as a medical practitioner, he ought to give some consideration to the apostolic declaration, “For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man, Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man. For, as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman,” 1 Cor. xi. 8—12. In Heb. vii. 5—10. children are both said to *come from* the loins of the father, and also to be, prior to procreation, *in his loins* seminally, but not in the mother, because the spermatic arteries are situated in those of the male alone; and because the secreted seed is deposited in the region of the thighs, hence those allusions in Gen. xlv. 26. Exod. i. 5. and Judges viii. 30. in all which places the phrase is incorrectly translated, it being this, “which came out of his *thigh*.”

Now that I have not deduced too much from Mr. C.’s statements, in representing him as supposing the human female to be, not only the womb-man, but the original

fetus or embryo-possessing-man, is clear from his selected illustration. He produces to us a virgin pullet: see there, he says, and in undissembled triumph—there is a maiden hen, and she has laid an egg; ay, and what is the climax of the story, this maiden pullet's egg, this very unimpregnated ovum of the virgin fowl, “contains the embryo!” Gentle reader! Was this so, the triumph were apparently complete. But although I have heard of the embryo plant, or plantlet, in the seed, in which it lies ready formed, and only requiring the cherishing and nourishing womb of mother earth, for its being developed; and although I have heard also of the embryo of an egg *before* INCUBATION, as the seed has its life before deriving from the earth its genial influences, for its manifestation; yet until now I have never heard, so far at least as I at present recollect, of the embryo of a maiden pullet's egg, or what is the same thing, of *the embryo of a chick* in the egg of a hen *before* IMPREGNATION!

But I will here just set against this marvellous discovery of Haller and Bonnet, and retailed by T. W. C. and his friend Mogridge, the simple statement of one of our own master geniuses on the subject in debate. “It is said, the *life* is in the *blood*; and I dare say it is very true; *for* the *seminal fluid* or life is secreted from it, and carried by the spermatic vessels” of the male “to its proper place, and there deposited for use. A man is said to be dead when so old as not to secrete this fluid, because then he cannot procreate his own life, or perpetuate it, as Adam has done his. An eunuch is a dead man, or dry tree, without this vital sap; for the same reason, he secretes none of this life. Now then, this life seeks for itself a proper nest; in vegetables, the style; in birds, et cætera, *the egg*; in mankind, the *female ovum*,” as it descends from the ovaria to the uterus for the purpose. “In time, the female is said

to have *conceived*; that is, become great with child;” owing to the ovum from the ovaria being impregnated in the uterus by the male semen: “and when life has completed its mansion, parturition takes place; and then, in the birth, the proper *seed of man* shows itself, or *his progeny*; or another branch of the same tree is produced.”

Then follows the illustration thus: “the regularity of the work of this workman, life, may be inspected in oviparous animals, if a proper degree of warmth is applied to the eggs, *without any further connection with the mother*. On the contrary, if the most perfect egg from the female, without this *life* taking possession of it *from the male*, is placed underneath the hen for incubation, she only brings on its putrefaction the sooner!”

On these extracts, I remark, in the first place, that the blood is allowed to have vitality in it, from the circumstance of the male semen, or principle of reproduction being *a secretion from it*. And, in the second place, it is to be observed, that the life or vitality in the vivifying fluid, communicated from the male bird to the egg of the hen, is that only which *preserves it from putrefaction*.

These are two very important concessions. I think they have a grand bearing, not only on the topic in discussion between Mr. C. and myself, but on some experiments and deductions of our most justly celebrated countryman, Mr. John Hunter, in his Treatise on the Blood, edition of 1812. I shall proceed to quotations, and offer remarks on them occasionally.

1. “All the solid parts of the body are formed from the blood.”

2. “A seed, put into moist ground, grows; but the moist ground is only a necessary attendant, and not the immediate cause. *The life* of the seed, stimulated to action by the moisture, is the immediate cause of its

growth ; and it continues to grow, because its action is always excited. All the water in the world, would not make a *dead* seed grow." This is all true ; but only that humidity alone would not suffice for growth, for the generality of seeds ; various substances or agents, in combination with humidity, doubtless afford the nutriment on which vegetables live. Otherwise, soils would know no exhaustion, from being too frequently cropped ; so as, I mean, to require such varieties and quantities of proper manure. But neither is this all ; for vegetables require, as a fit soil, as well as moisture, so likewise some portion of oxygen or vital air. Seeds may remain buried deep in the earth for strange lengths of time, still preserving their *vital principle*, and without germination ; but when thrown to the surface by some circumstance, what with the soil, moisture, warmth, and air, vegetation commences, and they develop the peculiar properties essentially inherent in their *own living germs*.

3. " The time that we can live, without *air*, or breathing, is shorter than that, in which we die from a defect in any other natural operation. Breathing, therefore," that is, the air inspired or inhaled, " seems to render *life* to the blood," or rather *renovation of life* to the blood ; " and the blood" re-oxygenated, " continues it in every part of the body." Now we know that the blood is also replenished by food, through the process of digestion, and by the digestive apparatus. For this is a power in living beings, to assimilate foreign matter to their own substances ; vegetables receiving it, by means of their roots, and animals into their stomachs.

4. " That the blood has *life*, is an opinion I have started for above thirty years." It is—" a living fluid." " Every part is formed from the blood ; we grow out of it ; and if it has not life, previous to this

operation, it must then acquire it in the act of forming." "Organization and life do not depend in the least degree on each other. Organization may arise out of living parts, and produce action; but *life* can never rise out of, or depend on organization. An organ is a peculiar conformation of matter, to answer some purpose, the operation of which is mechanical; but mere organization can do nothing, even in mechanics, — it must still have something corresponding to a living principle; namely, some power."

"I conceived, that the same principle" of *life*, "existed in animal substances devoid of apparent organization and motion, where there existed simply *the power of preservation*. I was led to this, about the year 1755 or 1756, when making drawings of the chick, in the process of incubation. I observed, when an egg was hatched, the yolk, which is not diminished in the time of incubation, was always perfectly sweet to the very last; and that a part of the albumen, which is not expended on the growth of the animal, some days before hatching, was also sweet; although both were kept in a heat of 103° in the hen's egg, for three weeks, and in the duck's for four." "If an egg did not hatch, it became putrid, in nearly the same time with any other dead animal matter. An egg therefore, must have the power of self-preservation; or in other words, the simple principle of life."

"From these experiments, it appears that *a fresh egg* has the power of resisting heat, cold, and putrefaction, in a degree equal to many of the more imperfect animals, which exhibit exactly the same phenomena, under the same experiments; and it is more than probable, that this power arises from the same principle in both. Similar experiments have been made on the blood."

"The embryo of the chick in the incubated egg," is

here shown, “ at three different stages of its formation, beginning with the earliest visible appearance of distinct organization. These preparations are meant to illustrate *two* positions laid down in this work ; namely, that the blood is formed before the vessels, and when coagulated the vessels appear to arise ; and that, when new vessels are produced in a part, they are not always elongations from the original ones, but vessels newly formed, which afterwards open a communication with the original.”

“ 1. In this figure,” of the embryo chick, “ the only parts that are distinctly formed, are, two blood vessels ; on each side of these, is a row of small dots or specks, of coagulated blood, which are afterwards to become blood vessels.”

“ Figure 2. The formation of the embryo is further advanced ; vessels appear to be rising up spontaneously, in different parts of the membrane ; and the specks, out of which they are produced, are in many parts very evident.”

“ Figure 3. The number of blood vessels is very considerably increased ; they now form a regular system of vessels, composed of larger trunks, and a vast number of ramifications going off from them.”

Now from these quotations, John Hunter should seem to esteem the *vitality of the blood*, in the incubated egg, to be the power which preserves its whole substance from putrefaction. And he seems also to think the *blood* the origin of our being ; “ we grow out of it”—he says ; and of course he would think the same of the chick in the egg. But, *blood in animals* is only as the *sap in vegetables* ; now it is not the blood itself, from which animals spring, but from that particular *secretion* of the blood, the male seed ; just as the vegetable tribes owe not their immediate origination to *sap*, but to *seed*. The *saplings* are, in

these cases, *seedlings* in their beginning. The blood and the sap are for nourishment and growth, but it is the *seed* alone, in both departments, which will suffice for propagation. "Nothing exists, within the vegetable or animal kingdom, but secreted substance; and whether we look to the meanest shrub, or to the noblest animal, the most splendid variety of substance and of quality is observed. In the one kingdom, we find flowers of the gaudiest colours, sweets of the most delicious tastes, odours of the most captivating fragrance,—all formed out of a simple and almost insipid *sap*; and in the other, we discover bones hard and insensible, muscles soft and contractile, nerves tender and irritable, fluids insipid, sour, bland, and acrid, juices the most agreeable, and poisons the most pernicious,—all proceeding from one common fluid," the blood! *Animal Physiology in Useful Knowledge*. But then to prove that the original life of vegetables is concentrated in nothing else but the *seed*, it is well observed again, that "seeds, endowed with vitality, remain unchanged for years,"—and this, without any vegetation going on. "Seeds pass uninjured even through the digestive organs of animals, exposed with impunity to the most powerful of all solvents of vegetable and animal matter, the gastric juice. And irresistible as the action of that wonderful fluid is, upon all dead vegetable and animal substance, it has no perceptible influence whatever upon any of those substances, *as long as they retain their vitality*." Again, we know that melon-seed, in particular, keeps so well, without germination, as to better itself by age; and therefore it is advised to be of from three to six years old, before it is used for vegetation. And again, many of our common seeds, such as clover, charlock, &c. will lie dormant for ages within the earth, well preserved for vegetation, whenever they may happen to be thrown to the surface,



and exposed to the atmospherical influences. Mr. Adanson asserts, that the seed of the sensitive plant preserves its virtue, or the germinating faculty, thirty or forty years. And if life preserves itself so well in vegetable seeds, does it not so also in the properly impregnated egg of a fowl? For the parallel of example does not lead us to the *incubated* egg, but rather to the egg *fecundated* by the male bird. This contains the seed, nay, the very life, of the future chick; the embryo of the young animal. Short of this reception of the vital principle, no egg will keep sweet for any length of time; and if subjected to incubation, it only corrupts the sooner; whereas the egg, which is laid with the seminal vitality in it, is possessed of *the preservative power*,—for varnish, prepared with spirit of wine, and rubbed carefully all over the shell, has been found to prevent its perspiration, and thus to enable it to preserve itself, at least for two years, as fresh as if laid but the same day, and so sweet that the nicest palate could not distinguish it from a new-laid egg. And supposing the fecundated egg instead of being varnished, to be placed underneath the hen, how comes it to keep itself so pure, in circumstances in which the most perfect unimpregnated egg immediately begins to turn to putrefaction? “It is well known,” it is said in Animal Physiology, “that the egg possesses the power of self-preservation for several weeks, although exposed to a degree of heat, which would certainly occasion the putrefaction of dead animal matter. During the period of incubation, the egg is kept at a heat of 103°, the hen’s egg for three, and that of the duck for four weeks; and yet, when at the end of this time, the chick is hatched, the *entire yolk* is found perfectly sweet, and that part of the albumen or *white*, which has not been expended in the nourish-

ment of the young animal, is also quite fresh." On the other hand, "it is found, that if *the preservative principle* be destroyed, as it may be instantaneously, by passing the electric fluid through the egg, it becomes putrid in the same time as other dead animal matter."

*What* then is this *preservative principle*? Evidently, after the manner of John Hunter, these editors suppose it to be the *blood*. For they reason thus; "the blood must be a living substance, because it is capable of dying. It is capable of sudden death. For if the electric fluid be passed *through it, it,*" the *blood*, "is killed instantaneously; as has been stated already, in a former part of this treatise." This refers to the quotation just made above. Besides; they, along with John Hunter, make the blood in the fecundated egg to be the originating principle of the first motions and actions that commence their operations in the egg upon its being subjected to incubation. "Hunter," say they, "adduces some facts, to show that the *blood*, like other living substances, *originates* motion and action. We know, that if a living egg be placed underneath a hen, or even exposed for a certain time to a degree of artificial heat equal to that in which it is maintained during incubation, certain motions or actions spontaneously arise within it, which terminate in the development of the chick." And again,—"*the* incubated *egg* commences a series of movements, which terminate in the development of the chick." But now, I rather incline to the notion of our late metropolitan lecturer; namely, that *life*, even *the life* conveyed to the ovum of the hen by the *male bird*, and this, in the *seminal fluid*, that peculiar secretion *from the blood* of the male, is at once the *preserver* of the purity of the egg prior to incubation, and which we have shown may be maintained for at least two years,—and likewise the *workman and operator* that originates motion and action, upon its dormant energies

being roused and excited by the natural warmth of the sitting hen, or the artificial heat of the oven. For this may be illustrated by the instance of the dormant animals; these in winter fall into a perfect state of torpor and inaction; but as *the life* still remains, their torpor ceases with the cold, for nothing seems to awaken them effectually from their lethargy to proper and full action but gradual heat. If we consider that no *food* whatever is taken in by them, during their state of hybernation, we must be sure that the usual vital processes are either wholly suspended, or go on in a very circumscribed way, and with extraordinary slowness. But there are some, as the cuckoo, that, when hybernating, appear like a dead mass of matter; they may be rolled about, and even struck with considerable violence, without their betraying any the least sign of sensation; nay and even their *respiration*, as well as every other manifest vital action, seems to be wholly suspended. In such cases, then, it is the *vital principle*, whatever that may be, but which we must confess to originate in the will of the Creator, and to be dependent on his pleasure, and conserved by his secret concurrence,—it is the continuing *vitality* which is possessed of the *preservative power*. For if we proceed to certain extreme, but exceedingly well authenticated examples of the condition of some hybernating animals, such as the migratory swallows, we shall find that the *actions* of life in them are totally at a stop, and that latent and dormant *life* only remains; just as a machine, when stopped, is as perfectly inactive as a block of marble, but still possesses its main spring, by means of which it may again be put into full play and operation. In the severer climates, the swallows are said to precipitate themselves into the sea, and into deep lakes and rivers, at whose bottom they remain during winter, in a state of profound torpor. How

wonderful must be the power of the *vital principle*, in preserving an animal under circumstances so extraordinary; in an element which would be fatal to it in a few moments in its ordinary state; with its respiration suspended,—its circulation stopped,—*and its blood*, if it do not coagulate, if it remain alive, and therefore fluid, although at perfect rest, yet exposed to a degree of cold for such a length of time.—“How striking an illustration,” says the ‘Useful Knowledge,’ “would this most singular fact afford, of the uninterrupted and enduring and efficient action of the *vital principle*, under circumstances which would seem absolutely incompatible with its existence even for a few moments!”

But to return to the egg. The new-laid impregnated ovum is fresh and living, prior to its being put under the hen; and it can be preserved living and fresh for a length of time. In this condition, then, fecundated but not incubated, suppose the electric fluid to pass through it,—what would be *killed*? Would it be the *seminal life* conveyed in the male fluid; or would it be the *vitality of the blood*? With regard to the latter, is it certain that the merely impregnated and non-incubated egg contains any positive blood? If it does, where is it? Is it in the vitellus, or in the albumen, or in the membrane, or in all these? And as there is no action or motion, no circulation going on, what preserves it in its purity? In the dormant animals, this power has been acknowledged to be in the *vital principle*. In the seeds of vegetables also, that may be kept uninjured for years, *the same* has been confessed. What, then, in the egg, can have power to preserve it fresh, and sweet, and living, except the *male impregnation*?

But in fact, is there any positive blood in the non-incubated egg? Is not the egg *that*, in both its white

and its yolk, which is *to be sanguified*, but which does not already contain blood? May we not then suppose, that the vital principle in the *seminal fluid*, roused to action by the application of warmth in the commencement of incubation, is *that* which operates on the substance of the egg, and in such a manner as to lead to the *production of blood*? For the blood is formed first, according to Mr. Hunter himself; and then, being coagulated, it produces the blood vessels. Now, in his first stage of observation, he saw but two vessels already formed, in the incubated egg; and a row of small dots or specks of coagulated blood, ready for the formation of additional vessels. In the second stage he saw vessels rising up spontaneously, in different parts of the membrane; and the specks of blood out of which they are produced, were in many parts very evident. And in the third stage, the number of vessels were very considerably increased: and they now were seen to form a regular system of vessels, composed of larger trunks, and a vast number of ramifications going off from these. What a regular and very gradual process is here! The vessels multiply by degrees; and these gradually multiplying vessels owe their substance and formation to previously seen specks or dots of coagulated blood; the vessels of course multiply, in proportion to the succession of fresh globules of newly produced blood; and *the production* and re-production of *blood*, must at last be traced to some stimulating cause; and this, what other can it possibly be, within the shell of the ovum, than *the life*, or vital principle, at work, in its proper season, and proper sphere of action, and under the animating influence of the exactly necessary warmth of the incubating hen, or of the heated oven?

Now for confirmation of this view of the case,

deduced from John Hunter's own representation, let us attend for a moment to William Harvey: he says, "that the *pullet in the egg*, and separated from the hen, is wont to delight in its own proper blood, which it *forms for itself* out of *the aliment* provided for it in the egg by the mother." But where then does the *sanguifying system* originate? For true it is, that whilst the chick is still enclosed within the egg, it possesses a sanguiferous system as minute, as after incubation has been completed; its arteries carry scarlet red, and its veins purple blood. "How then is the noxious carbon," asks the Useful Knowledge, "which is ever adulterating the vital current, abstracted from the blood? Where is oxygen procured, to convert it into carbonic acid? And if carbonic acid be formed, how is it expelled? In the incubated egg, this seems to be accomplished in the following way. The shell is exceedingly porous; and it is in close contact, internally, with a *very vascular membrane*, which forms the external envelope of the contents of the egg. This membrane circulates more blood than is devoted to the body of the chick; and it is separated, at the greater end of the egg, into two layers, which form a circular space, or bag, that is filled with air. This bag or air-cell, is at first not more than a quarter of an inch in diameter; but as incubation proceeds, it progressively enlarges; and towards the close of the process, occupies a very considerable portion of the general cavity. Now Spallanzani has ascertained, that eggs freely absorb oxygen from the atmosphere; that the degree of this absorption is directly as the quantity of animal matter they contain; and that the air, enclosed within these air-cells, betrays a deficiency of oxygen, and an excess of carbonic acid. It is therefore believed, that the conversion of venous into arterial blood, during

incubation, is accomplished, by bringing the blood, as it deteriorates, to this vascular membrane which lines the shell; where it is purified by the air, which enters through the pores with which the shell is permeated. This vascular membrane is equivalent to the minute ramifications of the pulmonary artery in man; and the porous shell is a counterpart to the walls of the air-cells of the human lungs. The former furnishes a sufficient surface whereon the venous blood may be spread; and the latter, a convenient medium, through which the oxygen of the external air may exert its peculiar influence upon this fluid. *Air* is as essential to the progress of an incubated egg, as to the existence of the chick after the shell is broken; and nothing more is necessary, to arrest this process by suffocating the chick, than to exclude the external air by closing the pores of the shell with oil." And thus, the very thing which is necessary to the egg's preservation, prior to incubation, and to the formation of blood, and so on, namely, the exclusion of air by shutting the pores of the shell, would, if had recourse to, subsequently, effect the destruction of the chick.

In reply then to the question, Where does the sanguiferous system originate? It may at once be said, with the *vital principle*, and in connexion with the *membrane*, lining the shell, and overspreading the whole egg. Before incubation, this membrane is not *vascular*, but is a very thin, and pretty tough, and white lining, as may be seen in the boiled egg upon breaking the shell. But upon incubation, Hunter saw vessels rising up spontaneously in different parts of the membrane, and at length forming a regular system of vessels. The immediate connexion between the chick and the rest of the egg is formed, by the production of *two* branches of *umbilical veins*, one of which goes to the

vitellus, and the other to the albumen. The one of these substances is for immediate use, and the other a provision in store for the future; for as the fetus increases, the albumen insensibly wastes away and condenses; the vitellus, on the contrary, seems to lose little or nothing of its bulk when the fetus is perfected, and only appears more liquid and humid when the abdomen of the fetus begins to be formed; but, not long before the exclusion of the chick from the shell, the whole yolk is taken up into its abdomen.

The conclusion of the whole matter, then, is this; that either there is no blood at all, in *the virgin pullet's* egg, to preserve it; or if there is blood, it is totally powerless and unavailable, in the absence of the vital principle inherent alone in the seminal fluid of the male bird; and that, consequently, in *the properly impregnated but non-incubated* egg, whether there be blood or no, its purity is preserved, not by the blood, if there be any, but by the vitality existing in the male impregnation; and that, as a further consequence, in *the fecundated and incubated* egg, although when the blood and blood vessels are formed, and the sanguiferous system is all entire, and in full and efficient operation, the circulation, refreshed ever and anon by new accessions of oxygen from the atmospheric air, has very much to do in preserving the substance of the egg pure and sweet, during the whole period of incubation; yet still, the origination of the blood, the vessels, the whole sanguiferous system, and the circulation, must be traced to the male impregnation excited to action by the genial warmth of the incumbent hen; and that, in fine, in this view of the whole case, *the life* of the maternal ovum is communicated to it from *the male parent*;—but that, if we admit the blood to exist in the egg before incubation, and contend that in the



blood is the preservative vitality of the egg, since the blood, on this supposition, must be that of the hen, and in it is the true life of the egg, the egg *does not* receive life from male impregnation, but is possessed of the vital principle, before, and irrespective, and independent of the male fecundation, which only affords a perfect example of the pure *reductio ad absurdum*.

I beg to close the whole, with the brief testimony of a medical friend, Mr. William Wilson Cox, in the neighbourhood of London. "The seed is the essence of the body produced; and this seed quickens the ovum, and from it strike off all the blood vessels into the ovum. This semen, as it was not of Joseph in the generation of Jesus Christ, nor of any other man, must have been from the creative power of the Holy Spirit."

Thus then, Mary was both a medium and a mean, a nest and a nurse; but not the principal in this transaction. Still, her seed was the reputed son of Joseph, and the real son of Abraham and David. For both Mary and Joseph descended from their loins; and by the patriarchal usage, as well as according to the law, after the seed raised up by another man, but through the wife of one deceased, was reckoned the seed of the dead husband. Joseph, the seed and son of Abraham and David, was to be as one dead, and the Holy Spirit supplies his place, and raises up by Mary *a seed*, to those, to whom the promise was made, namely, Joseph and Mary's grandfathers, Abraham and David. Gen. xxxviii. 8—10. Deut. xxv. 5—10. And thus, when Naomi says, "Are there yet sons in my womb?" she means to say, there cannot be any more, "for, I am too old to have a *husband*." Ruth i. 11—13.

In looking into Tegg's London Encyclopædia on "agriculture," I found this concession; "the manner,

in which the eggs of birds are impregnated, by the male, *has never been properly determined!*" page 338. Thus have we, not miraculous conception only, but still mysterious impregnation to be explained, if we hold to the doctrines of the old schools.

---

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND THE IMMEDIATE CAUSE OF THE DEATH OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

IN my first letter to the editor of the "Morning Watch," at page 14, I have quoted, as follows, from Augustus Montague Toplady. "We no where find, to the best of my remembrance, that Christ ever so much as once experienced any attack of sickness or disease. The reason of this extraordinary circumstance was, no doubt, owing to *the sinless formation of his humanity*, by the *immediate operation of the Holy Ghost*. Sin was that which introduced every kind of *ataxia* or disorder into the human system, and disease among the rest. But the Man Christ Jesus was formed and conceived totally without stain. Hence he was,—like our first parents before the fall,—naturally *immortal*. Nor *could he have died*, had he not, by an act of gracious susception, taken the guilt of man upon himself, and became responsible to divine justice for the utmost payment of their penal debt. And even under these circumstances, we read, that his death, *though violent*, was *voluntary*. His resignation of life is constantly represented, in scripture, *as his own act and deed*. For exclusively of his *union with the second person in the Godhead*, his *absolute freedom from sin*

would, of itself, have been *a certain security from dying*. Hence the Evangelists express themselves thus; “he dismissed, or let go, his Spirit; he resigned, delivered up, or made a surrender of his Spirit.”

Now we know, that at man’s creation the tree of life, or rather, of lives, for the Hebrew word is plural, was placed in the centre of the garden of Eden, for a pledge of continual existence to Adam and Eve, and this, in relation to their bodies, as well as their souls, so long as they should abstain from sin, by a non-transgression of the interdict of their Creator. We likewise know, that “as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,—even so *death hath passed upon all men*, for that all have sinned.” Clearly then, according to the original enactment in Eden, mortality is connatural to man, because of sin; “by nature” we are said to be “the children of wrath.” This I produce, at once, before regularly entering on the *nature* of the death of Christ, because Mr. Chevalier, who dabbles in divinity, as children in the water, only to puddle it, tells us, at page 38 of his pamphlet, that,—“it is not sin, but the declared will or fiat of God;—it is not transgression, but the law, which dooms us to die.” To be sure, this is very deep, and very exact! For what is sin, except transgression? And what is transgression unless the passing beyond some limitation of the Creator, which is the law, or the declared will or fiat of God? And then, what is death, but the doom denounced on transgressors as the penalty of sin, by that “one *Lawgiver*, who is able to save and to destroy?” The doom, our divine admits—“the law dooms us to die;” but he would omit the thing on which the judicial sentence passes. “Therefore also,” he adds, “the unclouded intellect of our British Philologist,” Dr. Johnson, “defined mortality, not the

state of being subject to death *for sin*, or doomed to die for sin; but simply, subject to death, or doomed to die." It were to be wished, that when Mr. C. finds an intellect unclouded, he would leave it as he finds it, and not becloud it by his own crudities and obscurities. Dr. Johnson's third quotation, under the word mortal, is from Milton's *Paradise Lost*; and in it we have the all-comprehensive expression, "man's mortal crime!" The crime of which man was guilty was a mortal offence; and mortal means, even by consent of Mr. C. doomed to die; and according to Samuel Johnson, to be *doomed* to die, signifies nothing less than to be "condemned" to it by a "judicial sentence," as "to a punishment." But on looking to Johnson's second sense of the word mortal, (for the above quotation from Milton occurs under his first sense) I was greatly surprised at Mr. C.'s most inexcusable unfaithfulness, and on such a topic too; for Johnson defines *mortal* thus— "*deadly, destructive, procuring death.*" And he afterwards gives, as a fourth sense, "inferring divine condemnation!" Now all this is in perfect agreement with the language of scripture, relative to the Lord Jesus Christ. For first, "he hath made him to be *sin* for us, who himself knew no sin." Secondly, being made sin, he was "made a *curse* for us;" *katara*, from *kata*, *against*, and *ara*, *a curse*—a thing or person execrated, or doomed to some punishment; but not without a cause. For "the curse causeless shall not come." And reason and common sense would expect, that if an express penalty be incurred, and be exacted too, and undergone, some expressed crime is the foundation of the whole judicial process. This mortal crime is in scripture entitled sin; and "the wages of sin is *death!*" Accordingly, in the third place, we read of Christ, that "*in that he died, he died unto sin.*" And

fourthly, that “ God sending his own Son in the similitude of the flesh of sin, *condemned sin* in the flesh.”

These observations will not be quite impertinent as introductory to our first point ; and that is, the *nature* of the death of Christ.

In the first place, then, the death of Christ was not owing to disease, or to debility, or to exhaustion, or to accident, or even to external violence offered to his person.

In the second place, it was not as the direct consequence of the offence of the first man Adam ; this could not affect the second man, the last Adam, the Lord from heaven. If the *grand-son* of Abraham and David had been his father, as their *grand-daughter* was certainly his mother, he must have been seminally in their loins ; and if in theirs, in Adam’s when he fell ; and by consequence, he must have been involved in Adam’s transgression. But because Joseph was excluded, and the Holy Spirit was himself the begetter, therefore his manhood was the production of a perfectly original “ generation ;” it was a new lump, and a new or second man, at once unleavened with the old leaven of sin, and unimplicated in the primeval disobedience ; and therefore, neither was he by nature, or according to natural descent, a child of wrath, as begotten in sin, and shapen in iniquity ; nor yet was his death the self-earned wages of sin.

In the third place, he was himself naturally, morally, and legally, unobnoxious to death ; because he was begotten “ a holy offspring ;” and “ he did no sin ;” and both the Eden-law, and the after Mount Sinai code, restricted death to sin—“ the soul, that sinneth, it shall die.”

But, in the fourth place, Christ was *capable* of death ; that is to say, of dissolution ; or, of a tempo-

rary suspension of the positive union between *himself*, as a human rational soul subsisting in and with the divinity of his person and “the body of his flesh.” For, “the body, without the spirit is dead.” And here, therefore, he appears as made in the scale of being, “a little lower than the *angels*,” and “for the suffering of death;” for the angels are not naturally capable of death; nothing but necessity, that is, the necessary omnipotency of the God who created them, could cause them to cease to live; and which extinction of life in them, would be a total annihilation. Whereas, in man, it is possible to compass death, by the killing of the body, and so rupturing the junction between it and the soul, without any sort of annihilation whatsoever of man’s personality.

In the fifth place, then, the death, of which Christ was capable, but not naturally obnoxious to, nor of himself deserving of, was *a voluntary* death. He was a most perfect volunteer in this affair. He was the shepherd of the sheep: and “the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.” And “therefore doth my Father love me,” he says, “because I lay down my life, that I might take it again.” He was no less the Bridegroom, and the church was the Bride the Lamb’s wife; and “Christ *loved* the church, and *gave himself* for it.” So the apostle Paul avers; he “loved me, and gave himself for me.” And John also ascribes glory “unto him, that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” And again; “Be ye followers of God, as children beloved; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour.” Now what is so free as love? What gift is so free, as that which love bestows? What makes a man so ready a volunteer? What principle, motive, emotion, feeling, or

passion, gives birth to voluntary action, equally with love? Or if we should call it a kind of compulsion, we must confess it to be the purest, most seraphic, and god-like force, the compulsion of the heart. "God so loved,—that he spared not his own Son;" and "Christ so loved the church, as not to spare his own self, but endured the cross, and despised the shame."

But now, in the sixth place, as Christ was capable of death, and love made him willing to die, and he did really die, in what light may we view his death, that we may see further into the nature of it? We may consider it as the act of a Surety,—of a Redeemer,—of one who has made and executed his last will and testament,—and of a High Priest.

It was as the act of a *Surety*. A surety is a person, free in his body, will, and property; but who, from some motive known to himself, whether compassion, friendship, gratitude, relationship, or love, involves himself in the affairs and circumstances of some other. He puts himself into the power of a third party, on the account of a second. Sins are called *debts*, in scripture; and death is called the wages of sin, or what is *due*, on the score of it. Now the Lord Jesus "suffered for sins, the Just One, for the unjust ones, that he might bring us to God, he being put to death in the flesh." Here is the thing he was involved in—our sins; here is the payment of those debts, or the receipt of those wages—put to death in the flesh; here is the party, on whose account, or who had contracted the debts, or earned the wages—the unjust; and here is also the party to whom he had made himself answerable—even God his Father, as the Judge of all, and whom he satisfied, and to whom he therefore brings us all free from sin, and unobnoxious any longer to the curse and death; "And you," says Paul, "that were sometime

alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, *in the body of his flesh through death*,—to *present you* holy, and unblameable, and unproveable, *in his sight*.” For, “He hath made *him* to be *sin for us*, who himself knew no sin; *that we* might be made *the righteousness of God in him*.”

The death of Christ was also as the act of a *Redeemer*. Under the law of Moses, the redeemer or *goel*, must be a near kinsman to the party to be avenged. In such a case, he was the proper executioner of justice on the culprit. The mortal offence,—I hope Mr. Chevalier will, with the further use of the *unclouded* intellect of our British Philologist, understand the epithet,—the mortal offence, committed on a relative, was to be esteemed as though done to a component part of his own and very self, and he was to avenge it, as by a law of retaliation, demanding, not only eye for eye, or tooth for tooth, but blood for blood, and life for life. “The murderer shall surely be put to death. The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer; when he meeteth him, he shall slay him.” This supposed the murder committed, “in enmity,” and not “at unawares.” Numb. xxxv. Now the Lord Jesus Christ fastened the crime of murder, and inscribed the character of murderer, on the prince of the devils. “He was a murderer, from the beginning.” John viii. 44. And as if to beget, a sort of shadow of himself, in the first of the progeny of fallen man, he stimulated Cain to the slaughter of his immediate brother; “Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother,” 1 John iii. 12. This then was the enemy to be destroyed by Christ, in favour of his ruined people, and whom he is not ashamed to call his brethren. “I will declare thy name unto *my brethren*; in the midst of the



church will I sing praise unto thee." Now as Satan had obtained dominion over the Lord's fallen brethren, through sin, so it was by destroying this *work* of the devil, that the Lord would strip *him* of his authority as lawful executioner in the cases of all those related to him. "Forasmuch then, as the children were partakers of flesh and blood," and not of rational souls only, "he also himself likewise took part of the same; that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death," or rather, depose him who had the empire of death, "that is, the devil, and might deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage." The Gentiles, observe, considered death as the king of terrors; they described it as the most terrible of all terribles; and, it was a hopeless event with them, because they had not the slightest notion of a future resurrection. They are therefore characterised as "having no hope." But the gospel was to be the good news to them, and the glad tidings of "Jesus and the resurrection;" on which kindred topics the apostle enlarged, when he was at Athens. And in his second epistle to Timothy, he says, "God hath saved us, and called us, with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which grace was given to us in Christ Jesus, before the world began; but which grace is now made manifest, by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ,— *who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light by the gospel.*" He had of old said, by Hosea, "I will be thy King; I will *redeem from death, and ransom from the power of the grave.*" And this he has now done; so that the believer will undergo a temporary dissolution, and sleep awhile in body in the dust; but he will not die the death of a transgressor, nor by the authority or instrumentality of Satan, nor as

paying a debt due, or as suffering a penalty incurred, or as mortally wounded by "the sting of death," which "is sin;" on the contrary, he will "die in the Lord," and "sleep in Jesus," and his "flesh shall rest in hope," whilst his *soul*, being absent from the body, will be "present with the Lord." Now all this is briefly comprehended in that declaration of the Lord Jesus to Martha, the sister of Lazarus; "I am *the resurrection and the life*. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall *never die*. Believest thou this?" Yea, saith Paul; "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God, who giveth to us *the victory*, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

But the death of Christ was likewise as that of one, who had made and executed his *last will and testament*. He seemed to sign, seal, and deliver it, as his own act and deed, when, in immediate prospect of his apprehension, trial, condemnation, and death, he took the wine, and said to his disciples, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, shed for many for the remission of sins." For he himself was constituted "heir of all things," and "Lord of all," in order that by dying for the atonement of our sins, he might at once cleanse us from all our sins, and bring the New Testament into full force in our favour. "And for this cause," says Paul, "he is the mediator of the New Testament, that, by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called, might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force, after men are dead; otherwise, it

is of no strength at all, whilst the testator liveth." And to show, and record, the extent of its bequests, Paul not only calls us the heirs of God through Christ, and joint or co-heirs with Christ, but says expressly,—“All things are yours; whether Paul, or Cephas, or Apollos; or the world; or life, or death; or things present, or things to come; all things are yours,—for ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” Now that, in this character, as well as in all the others, Christ resigned his life voluntarily, we gather from his own speech. “I am the good Shepherd. The good Shepherd *giveth* his life for the sheep. Therefore doth my Father love me, *because I lay down my life*, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power,” *power and legitimate authority*, “to lay it down; and I have power,” power and authority “to take it again. This,” in fact, “I have received” in charge, or as a “commandment,” in the execution of my official engagements, “from my Father.”

But, in fine, we noticed one other light in which we might view Christ’s death; and that was, as being the act of a *High Priest*, offering up a victim, and pouring out its blood, to make an atonement for sin, and to purify the people. In all the shadows of former dispensations, the priest was a man, and the victim was an irrational brute. In one instance, indeed, a more powerful adumbration was afforded to the church; I mean, in the affair of Abraham’s offering up of his son Isaac, “for a burnt-offering.” Here was a conscious victim; and one therefore, who could give intimations, either of acquiescence and satisfaction, or the reverse. From the whole story, I incline to think that Isaac entirely acquiesced. And then we gather from the sequel, another peculiar and very important parti-

cular, the designed triumph of the great victim over the death to which he would devote himself. Isaac rose uninjured from the fate, to which he, in compliance with his father's will, had doomed himself; and so did Christ, on the third morn. In all other cases, there was never any revivication or resurrection of the devoted victim; their death could never expiate sin,—their blood never purge the people, and make their conscience good and perfect; and so, although they were delivered up to death for the offences of the people, in a figure, yet they did not any of them rise again for their justification from their offences. But Isaac, as he was bound, and laid upon the altar, and the knife and the fire and the wood were all ready, and his father's heart fixed in its purpose, and his hand actually stretched out to do the deed,—so his deliverance is esteemed as equivalent to a resurrection. The will, in this transaction, was taken for the deed. “By faith Abraham, when he was tried, *offered up* Isaac; even he that had received the promise, offered up his only begotten son; accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead,—*from whence* also he did receive him, *in a figure.*” But as respects Christ, Isaac's antitype, we read his willingness in the very deed. He had declared his readiness before; he had anticipated the thing by a thousand years, and had said by David,—“Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God! *I delight* to do thy will; yea, thy law is within my *heart.*” It was not merely will, then, but desire; it was even delight. “Christ *loved* the church, and gave himself for it.” Here, then, is the still greater mystery, that we find the officiating priest, and the devoted victim, in the same person. “Every high priest,” says Paul, “is ordained for men, in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.” “Wherefore, it is of

necessity that this one, *have a somewhat also to offer.*" And what had he, that could undergo death? He tells us; "*a body* thou hast prepared me." And, says Paul, "we are sanctified, through *the offering of the body of Jesus Christ* once." For it was not necessary, "that *he* should *offer himself* often; for then must *he* often have *suffered* since the foundation of the world; but now once, in the end of the world, he hath appeared, to *put away sin*, by the *sacrifice of himself.*" And "so *Christ* was once offered, to bear," and bear away, "the sins of many." And how shall not then, "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, *offered himself* without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God?"

This may lead us on, directly, to our second proposed topic; namely, as to what might be the *immediate cause* of the death of Christ.

If any one should say, it was the wound inflicted by the spear of the Roman soldier; I should answer, no! For Christ was dead before. Should any one intimate that his death was occasioned by the cross, or by the sufferings he endured thereon; I would still reply, no! Because he evidently survived the extremity of his agonies and conflicts, and yet expired before the ordinary period, and in consequence of which the soldiers "brake not his legs," although they came to do so. But I am perfectly satisfied, that he was "saved from" *a violent* death, from any quarter, "in that he feared" and deprecated such a death, and prayed against it "with strong crying and tears, and was heard;" and then, having rode out the storm, he calmly and deliberately yielded up his spirit, and dismissed it to its paradisaic haven of rest. Heb. v. 5, 7.

However, these points must be severally tested by the word of God.

First, then, the wound of the spear was not the

immediate cause of the death of Christ. It was designed for an assuring circumstance of his not having been taken down from the cross alive. The soldiers found him dead already, although he had hung but about six hours on the cross, and therefore they spared his limbs. But had nothing more transpired, this would have been ground for suspicion and surmise, of Joseph having taken him from the cross, when not quite dead, and in a state of possible recovery. And as scripture had predicted, not only that a single bone of him should *not* be broken, but that he *should* be pierced, so an all-directing influence prompted a soldier to thrust his spear into his side, and inflict such a wound, and cause such a loss of blood, as would give an effectual death-blow to any such imaginations. Nay, it should seem, that the hostile weapon reached so far as the immediate region of the heart; because John, who, it is likely, remained very near the cross, and for a longer time than the other disciples, declares that an effusion of blood and water took place. "Now," says John, "there stood by," that is, *near to* "the cross of Jesus," close under the suspended sufferer, marking every circumstance with the most intense interest, "his mother, and his mother's sister," namely, "Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." For of the others, Matthew tells us, that they kept at a distance; "and many women were there, beholding, *afar off*, who followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him;" the above mentioned, along with John, alone drawing close to the cross of Jesus. Mark notes the same thing; "there were also women, looking on, *afar off*." And Luke's account is the same; "and all his acquaintances, and the women that followed him from Galilee, *stood afar off*, beholding these things." So that these three evangelists relate the general circumstance; but the fourth,

namely, John, records the particular exception. To the last, therefore, this disciple displayed, as from the beginning, an undaunted courage; most true to the name given to himself and his brother James, who fell the first martyr of the twelve apostles,—“Boanerges, or, the sons of thunder.” John was not so talkative and boastful as Peter, but far more intrepid in the hour of peril. James and John early displayed that sort of spirit, which Jesus characterised by naming them the sons of thunder. “Lord!” said these brothers, on one occasion, “wilt thou, *that we* command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?” On another occasion they filled their fellow disciples with indignation, in preferring this request to Christ, and prevailing on their mother to back them in it. “Grant unto us, that we may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory!” And when Jesus said, “Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized withal? They say unto him, we can.” James fell, early, by the sword of Herod the king; perhaps as making himself conspicuous by his zeal in the cause of the gospel. And John’s career is strongly marked all through. On Christ’s apprehension, he followed him into the palace of the high priest; but he did not *deny* him there, as Peter did. We have already seen him nigh the cross of Jesus, at a moment of great danger, and when the rest stood afar off. And on the first of the week, in going to the sepulchre, John “did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.” These two, after their Pentecost baptism, first went up to the temple, and proclaimed the gospel, and were seized and imprisoned by the high priest and his attendants, but released by the angel of the Lord. And whilst they noticed

“*the boldness* of Peter and John,” these, after being “beaten,” or scourged, “departed,—rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name.” But, in a word, as on a former occasion, John developed a more unflinching and uncompromising temper than Peter, so he did, on a later occasion. When Peter was at Antioch, Paul found him *dissembling*; “and the other Jews dissembled likewise, along with him; insomuch, that Barnabas also,” that son of consolation, “was carried away with their dissimulation.” So did not John at any time betray himself. And well was it for the church, that the Lord had raised up another thunderer, in the person of Paul, of a like spirit with John and James, and who could withstand even Peter, and Barnabas, and their companions, to the face, in order that “the truth of the gospel” might remain, unleavened with the leaven of the pharisaical and judaizing professors of the day.

Now I have exhibited John, as he was, to prove him to have been the well-selected witness of the latest scene of our blessed Lord’s crucifixion. A fearful man would, in such a situation, have been frequently diverted from the one object; but not so John. Leaving the others still afar off, he gets as nigh as he can, to the cross of Jesus, along with the three women. He is near enough to hear his voice. For “when Jesus saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing by,” that is, *near*, or close at hand, “He saith unto his mother, woman! behold thy son! then saith he to the disciple, behold thy mother!” And still John stands at his post; and watches the soldiers maiming the malefactors on either side of his now already expired Lord, in order to accelerate their death, and overpassing and sparing him, because “when they came to Jesus,” they themselves “saw, that he was



dead already." "But" although they therefore brake not his legs, and indeed because he was God's own passover-lamb, and must not, as such, be *mangled*,—yet, as he must in this character *bleed*, so "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side; and forthwith" or instantly, "there came out blood and water. And he that saw it, bare record; and his record is true; and he knoweth" certainly, "that he saith true, that ye might believe. For these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled; a bone of him shall not be broken. And again, another scripture saith, they shall look on him whom they pierced." These references at once identify the Lord with the paschal lamb; and they at the same time point us to him on whom we are to look as pierced for our sins, in his character of *Jesus*, and as anointed on our behalf in his character of *Messiah or Christ*; and from whom therefore, as the fountain opened for sin and all uncleanness, and the fountain of living water, we may expect the true *blood* of atonement, and the true *washing* of regeneration.

It is further remarkable, that Matthew and Mark and Luke were not to record the showing of the Lord's *side* to his disciples, but only of his hands and feet. "Behold my hands, and my feet, that it is I myself. Handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet." The reason of this seems to be, that most of the others might have been eye-witnesses of his crucifixion, as they could perfectly discover him nailed, hands and feet, to the tree, although standing and beholding afar off; but John alone, with the three women, had ocular demonstration of the flow of blood and water, if not also of the wounding of his

side by the soldier's lance. This last, indeed, the infliction of the wound, it is possible for the distant spectators to have witnessed; but not, the flow of blood and water. And therefore it was left to John to bear witness. Accordingly, in his gospel he most amply supplies the omission of the other evangelists. "At evening, being the first day of the week, came Jesus; and he showed unto them his hands, *and his side!* But Thomas was not with them. The others therefore said, we have seen the Lord. But he said, except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails," to feel as well as see, "and thrust my hand *into his side,* I will not believe. And after eight days," or on the next first day of the week, "again came Jesus. Then saith he to Thomas; reach hither thy finger, and behold, my hands! And reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into *my side;* and be not faithless, but believing." If it should be here asked, how came Thomas to know anything about Christ's wound in his side? It is to be replied, first, that I have supposed it possible for the distant spectators to have seen the infliction of the wound itself; but, whether this was so, or not, it makes no matter, because, in the next place, it is to be recollected that, on his being taken down from the cross, and delivered up at the solicitation of Joseph of Arimathea, his body must have undergone a nice inspection by him and others, whilst they encircled it with the profusion of spices, aloes and myrrh, contributed by Nicodemus, and wrapped it up in the customary envelope of linen, preparatory to their depositing of it in the sepulchre belonging to Joseph. Now John was nigh at hand, to explain to the rest, what he and the three women had seen. The positive resurrection of Christ could only be established on the

positivity of his death. And to confirm this, beyond the possibility of dispute, John was chosen for an especial witness. And from this ground, indeed, he could well contend for Christ's proper manhood in conjunction with his proper divinity, and for his pre-existence, in his official character and capacity, before all worlds, as well as for his after incarnation and open manifestation, in the fulness of time. And thus therefore he begins his gospel with,—“In the beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was himself God. And the Word was *made flesh*; and dwelt amongst us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” For the same reason he begins his first epistle with,—“That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our own eyes, which we have narrowly looked upon, and our very hands have handled,—of the word of life,—for, the life was manifested, and we have seen him, and bear witness, and show unto you, that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us; that which we have seen, and heard, declare we unto you,—that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.”

But more particularly in the fifth chapter of this his first epistle, does John contend for Christ's native Deity on the one hand, and for his real humanity, as proved by his death, on the other. His Deity he bases on his oneness in the Godhead with the Father and the Holy Spirit. “It is the Spirit who is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth. For indeed there are three parties who bear witness in the heaven,

the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three parties are one;" *en theion*, one Godhead. This therefore is described as "the witness of God." If it be said, we cannot deny the Father having witnessed to Jesus at his baptism, and at other times, nor that the Holy Spirit did so; but we object to Christ being a third witness in his own favour; I reply, that in the eighth of John he says, "I am not alone; but I myself, and the Father who sent me. It is written in your law, that the testimony of *two* persons is true. I am one person who bear witness of myself; and the Father who sent me, he beareth his witness of me." Now if we superadd the Holy Spirit as the third, we have, as here, all the fulness of the Godhead concurring and uniting in one testimony. And then, to put the Lord's *manhood* beyond dispute, he rests it on his *death*. For as some of the Gnostics, or knowing ones of John's day, denied his divinity, so others gainsayed his humanity, and likewise the reality of his sufferings and death. Therefore, says John, "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*, is of God." "And whosoever believeth that Jesus is *the Christ*, is begotten of God." And "who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is *the Son of God*? This is he that came by *water and blood*, Jesus, the Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit who is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth." The Holy Spirit in the apostles, enabling them faithfully and correctly to record what they had seen and heard; and also, the same Spirit in the hearts of the saints, enabling them to receive the apostolical testimony, and abide by it, 1 John iv. 4—6. and ii. 20—29. "But indeed, there are three who bear witness in the heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and

these three are one. And there are three that bear witness *on earth*; the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one," in one evidence. And this is "the witness of men;" of John, as the principal, who with the three women saw the side of Jesus pierced, and the blood and water issue out of the wound; and of the others, who either saw at a distance, or beheld the dead body after, and heard from John, and the mother of our Lord, and the two other women, all the particulars. Now, adds John, you receive this testimony; "but if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; and *this is the witness of God*, which he hath testified concerning his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness" of God "in himself. He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God hath given of his Son. And this is the record of God; that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know" certainly "that ye have eternal life, and that ye may" continue to "believe on the name of the Son of God."

Thus then you see how all these links form one chain; the Saviour is the Son of God,—he was made flesh:—he is Jesus, and he is the Christ,—and he did really suffer, and die, and thus expiate our sins, and become the fountain of life to those who believe in his name.

But now, to resume the immediate thread of our discourse; the wound of the spear did not cause the death of Christ, because the soldiers themselves declared him dead already. This is one testimony.

Then Mark and Luke both give us that of the centurion, in particular; "when the centurion, who stood over against him, saw that he so cried out," as he did the *second* time, exclaiming, "It is finished!" and then, commending his spirit to his Father, "he gave up the spirit," "he said, truly this man was the Son of God." He did not merely breathe out his last breath, or *expire*, as we are wont to say; but, as Luke has it, "when Jesus had cried" the second time, "with a loud voice, he said, Father! *into thy hands I commit my spirit*. And having said thus, he then breathed out his last breath." And with this, the statement of John agrees, who says,—“ And he bowed his head, and gave up the spirit.” The verb, here, signifies the delivering over a thing from one person to another, or from one place to another; and it therefore well expresses Christ's act, in his death, of delivering up his soul or spirit to the care of his Father. Now Luke's account confirms this, because he records Christ's, prayer; "Father! into thy hands *I put*," or "to thy hands *I entrust*, my spirit." And Matthew's phrase is much to the same purport; "he sent away," or "dismissed the spirit." Here then is, as John avers, one of the three special witnesses on earth; not only the soldiers, who saw him dead, and the centurion who saw him expire, attest his death,—but his own dismissal of his soul or spirit, and his commission of it to his Father's care: these acts of Christ, in relation to his spirit, are a grand demonstration of his proper death. And then follow the blood and water. The blood issues instantly from the wound in the side; and is followed by the water from the pericardium; a thin membrane, resembling a purse, with a small quantity of water in it, and containing the heart in its cavity. A wound so deep,

could not have been inflicted by a Roman spear without producing in the subject powerful symptoms of life, had not life been already extinct; and thus all the three, the spirit, as dismissed,—and the water, from the very region of the heart,—and the blood from the side, agree in the one testimony of the death of Christ; and by consequence of his real and proper manhood.

But we were, secondly, to enquire, whether the cross itself, or the sufferings Jesus endured thereon, may be esteemed the immediate cause of his death.

It must here be first granted, that Christ's death was verily "the death of the cross." This death was a Roman mode of punishment, and an infamous one. In proof of this, it will suffice to observe, that when Peter and Paul fell martyrs at Rome, the first was crucified; but the second, being a Roman citizen, could not be subjected to such a disgraceful death; and he was therefore slain by the sword. It was so scandalous, that it was inflicted as the last mark of degradation on the vilest of the people. It was the punishment of notorious robbers and murderers; that is, provided they were *slaves* also; for if they were *free*, as Paul was by his birth, and had the privilege of the city of Rome, it was thought too infamous a punishment for them, whatever might be their crimes. And besides this, as it was similar to the Jewish fashion of suspension on a tree, whose trunk and branches formed a natural cross, so it was held equally infamous by the Hebrews; and whose law, indeed, had denounced it as a sort of execration of heaven. "If a man have committed a sin, worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day,—for, he that is hanged, is

accursed of God!" or, "is the curse of God." Deut. xxi. Now this, although contrary to the Roman custom, took place in the case of Christ. Well therefore, in the humbling of himself, is it stated, that he became "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." And again, that he "endured the cross, despising the *shame*." And that, "Christ hath redeemed *us* from the curse of the law, he being himself made a curse for us."

But the death of the cross was the most dreadful of all others for the *pain* of it, as well as for its shame. This kind of death, then, might intimate the severity of those sufferings to which the Son of Man was doomed as made sin, and by *whose* sufferings or "stripes, *we* are healed." But these were not the external violences done to his body on the cross; for these were not such, as to accelerate death. The torment of the cross, was not from intenseness, but from long continuation. It was hardly possible for Christ to have expired in six hours, from being nailed to the wood by his hands and his feet. And because this never happened in so short a space of time, therefore, to accommodate the Jews, when crucifixion was resorted to in Judea, the Roman governors allowed violence to be resorted to, to hasten death, that the bodies might be removed before night. Of itself, the cross proved fatal only by exhaustion. Sometimes the victims lived long on it. St. Andrew is said to have survived at least three days. Eusebius speaks of certain martyrs in Egypt, who were kept on the cross until they were starved to death. The martyrs, Timotheus and Maura, are said to have continued lingering for nine days. And among some nations, the criminals were suffered to remain exposed, until, if exhaustion did not previously deprive them of existence, the birds of prey or wild beasts devoured them alive. Now as the Lord Jesus hung but six hours on the accursed



tree, and died without violence within that time, he being manifestly defunct when the Roman military arrived to execute the accustomed butchery, and on which account they spared his limbs, and only pierced his side—it is clear, that although he did most truly die the death of the cross, and was covered with all its shame, yet he did not expire by the action of the material cross.

Nor, in the next place, can I consent to it, that Jesus underwent a violent death, by the action of his inward conflicts upon the cross. That they were great, no question; no doubt they were awfully tremendous. Emphatically, here, he was the man of sorrows. He was tossed on a raging ocean of affliction, all whose waves and billows did not so much roll over him, and roar around him, as break in and rush like so many mighty torrents on his soul, to spend their fury there. “The sorrows of death” did indeed encompass him, and the very “pains of hell” gat hold upon him. His sufferings then were sharp enough to have cut the thread of life asunder; quite severe enough to have snapt it in a moment. Even his agony in the garden of Gethsemane was amazing; for some little space it seemed all insufferable; and the inward anguish, at last producing an universal perspiration of blood, appeared to threaten immediate dissolution to the outer man. But it was upon the cross he was to endure the climax of his woe. He had undergone shame before, and suffering, but these were only preludes; the catastrophe was reserved for Golgotha, where the last scene was to be, for a while, all derision, and desertion, and the extreme of unutterable sorrow, and inducing such consternation of spirit, and such confusion of soul, as should compel the dolorous exclamation, “My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me!” But here the proud waves were stayed;

the storm was spent, and subsides, and leaves the vessel unwrecked, to hail the succeeding calm. Like a terrible distemper, which has run its stages, even to its height, and in its latest paroxysm has exhausted all its fury, and from that very crisis abates and declines, and gradually forsakes its victim; the vial of the divine vengeance was now emptied, and Jesus had drunken up the full cup of fury to its last drop, and drained it to its lowest dregs, and the dread potion had wrought its deadliest effects, and a reaction succeeds—the life, inextinguishable by foreign force, revives; and, in the perfection of its own self-possession, performs its proper functions in the fulfilment of certain duties; and then, as its latest act, in the calmness of conscious innocency, and with all the complacent dignity of conscious authority to make an immolation of itself for the benefit of others, it pours out itself into the bosom of the paternal divinity, and unto the death of his fleshly frame, that it may become a vital current, a stream of life and salvation to the sons of men.

This was our third question. If the cross, with all its various external offensive and violent circumstances, did not accomplish the death of Christ, and if his inward and very mysterious conflicts and agonies did also fail to effect this event, what was it which did? My answer is, his own self-will, strengthened, and invigorated, and confirmed by the eternal Spirit, in unison with the righteous will of his Father, and in correspondency with his official character, and engagement, and duty, as the great High Priest of God, provided as he was with a “somewhat to offer,” namely, the body prepared for him, in order that he might make an atonement for sin once for ever and aye, and obtain “eternal redemption for us.”

Let us, then, try this sentiment by the scriptures;

for if it be genuine, it will stand the test of that touchstone.

I would observe, at first, that Dr. Doddridge, although he does not pursue the subject to any sufficient or satisfactory length, yet makes the following coinciding remarks. "The evangelists use different words in expressing our Lord's death; which I a little wonder that our translators render in the same manner—he yielded or gave up the ghost. Mark and Luke say, he expired; John, he yielded up his spirit; but Matthew's language is yet more singular, he dismissed his spirit." Though the fact is, that Luke's testimony of Christ's saying, "Into thy hands I deposit my spirit," in connexion with John's, "He bowed his head, and consigned over the spirit," is full as strong, or rather stronger. Still, as the Doctor adds, "Now this expression," or better, these expressions, "seem admirably to suit our Lord's words, "No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself;" showing, as the strong cry which so much impressed the centurion did, *that he died by the voluntary act of his own mind*, according to the power" or authority "received from the Father, and in a way peculiar to himself, by which he alone of all men that ever existed could have continued alive even in the greatest tortures as long as he pleased, or have retired from the body whenever he thought fit. Which view of the case, by the way, suggests an illustration of *the love* of Christ manifested in his death, beyond what is commonly observed; inasmuch as he did not use this power to quit his body, as soon as ever it was fastened to the cross, leaving only an insensible corpse to the brutality of his murderers, but continued his abode in it with a steady resolution as long as it was proper; and then retired from it with a majesty and dignity never known, or to be known, in any other death;

*dying*, if I may so express it, *like the Prince of life!*" This, I think to be in the main, correct; but defective in one point, in not admitting the absolute necessity our Lord was under to endure the entirety of the penal sufferings for our sins, he having once consented to be made sin and a curse in our room; for as it was in the agony in the garden, the conflict was all but insufferable to the humanity, and it therefore wrung from his inmost soul that deep sighing for a little respite, "If it be *possible*, let this cup pass! nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done!" so was it in the full travail of his soul on the cross, travailing in the birth of "his seed," his "holy nation," the throes of labour, the pangs of deliverance, such, in comparison, as sink the severest pains of parturient women down to less than nothing, extorted from him, as by the torture of intolerable anguish, that agonizing cry, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me!" Therefore, I esteem the Doctor in part incorrect, in that he represents the Lord Jesus as endowed with power or authority by his Father, to "have retired from the body, whenever he thought fit;" although, as he confesses, "he did not *use* this power to quit his body, as soon as ever it was fastened to the cross." The fact is, he had power and authority from the Father, to lay down his life, of his own accord, and without any force at all, *after he should have satisfied the divine justice for sin*, by his sufferings, and then again to resume his life by the reanimation of his dead body and its resurrection from the grave; but he did not officially receive power and authority merely to touch the cross, and then immediately desert it. No! He travailed there, and there he was delivered; and of no abortive offspring either, but of a living seed; and he survived the labour too, and himself declared it "finished;" and then, as some

fond mother outlives her trouble and her sorrow, but only just for a little moment, to see, and smile upon, and bless her new-born babe, and to forget her gone by anguish in the joy of a successful birth, being snatched away at once by sudden death—so Jesus, having said, “I thirst,” and then pronounced his labour finished, and the birth complete, he resigns himself to the death to which he had devoted himself, not from exhaustion or disease, like the expiring mother of the living child, but by *a priestly act of self-oblation*, and which is thus interpreted by Paul; “Christ hath loved us, and hath given his own self for us, *an offering and a sacrifice* to God, for an *odour of a sweet and grateful smell*,” Eph. v. 2.

But, in the second place, I have studiously enlarged on this particular, in consequence of having some time ago read a dissertation on the death of Christ in the periodical work belonging to the connexion of the late Countess of Huntingdon. It is by a highly respectable physician of London, a Doctor S——d; and is dated, the first part, December, 1828, and the second part, March, 1829. Some of the observations are good; but others seem decidedly exceptionable. Among the latter, I rank the following. “The voice of prophecy had proclaimed, that the Saviour of mankind would suffer *a death*, at once *violent* and voluntary. His *heart* was to be *pierced*; and he was to die, *suddenly*, as a sin-offering, *by the effusion of his life’s blood*, the appointed means of atonement. The revolting, if not immoral supposition, of *self-destruction*, has been erroneously deduced from the declaration of Jesus, that no man took his life from him, but that he laid it down of himself; and from the expression of some of the evangelists, that he resigned or dismissed his Spirit. But, the first of these phrases

means only, that Christ *voluntarily submitted* to a *violent death*, which he had it *in his power to avoid*; and the second, signifies nothing more than the act of dying. The assertions of the New Testament, that Jesus *was slain* by his enemies, and suffered the death of the cross, are in themselves sufficient to show, that *his death was truly and naturally induced* by the sufferings *incidental to his crucifixion.*” So far in the first part. In the second part, “It is at once alleged, that the *immediate cause* of our Saviour’s death, was, *rupture of the heart*, occasioned by *agony of mind!* Thus, on entering the garden of Gethsemane, he declared, “My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.” And it seems to be intimated by the apostle Paul, in Hebrews v. 4—9. that death would have been the speedy result of the awful conflict in which he was engaged, had he not been strengthened by supernatural aid.”

There is manifestly much confusion in all this. “Christ was to die a violent death. He was to die suddenly, by the effusion of his life’s blood, through the piercing of his heart. His death was truly and naturally induced by the sufferings incidental to his crucifixion. And it is at once alleged, that the immediate cause of our Saviour’s death, was, rupture of the heart, occasioned by agony of mind!” Now, waiving any remarks on the other parts of this statement, which have been anticipated, and refuted already, we will bend our attention to the last particular; from which, and from his whole dissertation, we gather, that this physician’s notion is, that agony of mind caused a rupture of the heart of Christ; that he died in consequence of this, namely, of a broken or ruptured heart; and, that this accounts for the flow of blood and water from his wounded side, or rather,

*through* his wounded side, but *from* his pierced *heart*; for “such rupture,” he observes, “is usually attended by instant death, without previous exhaustion, and by an effusion into the pericardium of blood, which, in this particular case, separates into its constituent parts” the serum and the coagulum, “so as to present the appearance, commonly termed blood and water.”

Now all this may be in some sort true; but as I cannot think his heart was pierced by the spear, nor yet ruptured by sorrow, but only the side up to the pericardium wounded,—so I think his previous death was perfectly *sudden* as well as *voluntary*, by the instant dismissal of his soul or spirit. In such a case, the muscles would neither contract, nor would the blood coagulate, but remain fluid; the whole entire body, in fact, would remain perfect, and uninjured, and only marked by those scars of honour, the fruits of his humiliation and abasement, the impressions of the thorns on his head, the print of the nails in his hands and feet, and the wound of the spear in his side. “Such deaths,” says John Hunter, “as prevent the contraction of the muscles, or the coagulation of the blood, are, I believe, always sudden.” And then there was a natural consequence to be counteracted; for “in all these cases,” adds Hunter, “the body soon *putrifies* after death.” But in the excessively hot climate of Palestine, the dead body ordinarily corrupts most rapidly. True, the Lord Jesus continued dead, only from Friday afternoon three or four o’clock, to the first day of the week very early in the morning. Still, the possibility of the sinister action was prevented, by the recorded decree of the Most High God. “He, whom God raised again,” says Paul, “saw no corruption.” And Peter attests the same; and quotes a prediction to this amount, from

the 16th Psalm. There, David is personating his root and offspring, the Messiah; and says,—“ Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my *flesh* also shall *rest in hope*. For, thou wilt not leave my animal frame in hades,” or the grave; “ neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One even to see corruption there. Thou wilt show me the path of life,” in my speedy resurrection and ascension; “ in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.”

At length, however, we must come to the test. Now the scripture referred to, by Doctor S——d, is very important. In the 5th chapter of Hebrews, the apostle is speaking of Christ as a High Priest, whose office it is, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins; and having quoted the 110th Psalm to prove his priesthood, as not according to the Aaronic order, or Levitical dispensation, but according to the earlier and kingly priesthood of Melchisedec, he adds,—“ who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able *to save him from death*, and *was heard*, in that he feared, though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; called by God an High Priest, after the order of Melchisedec.”

First, what was the death which Jesus feared? It implies a horrific sort of death, of which he had a sore apprehension, and against which he felt a holy abhorrence of soul, and from which therefore he importuned for deliverance. As there is a mysteriousness enveloping the sufferings of Christ, may not this tend to develop a something of their nature? Jesus was to *suffer*, on the score of *sin*. But the doom of sin



reaches beyond death and the grave, and extends even to an "everlasting destruction from the presence of Jehovah, and from the glory of his power;" this is "the second death." Now as the manhood was to be exposed to the extremest point of possible suffering, we may suppose that Satan, with his legions, who began to tempt and try the Lord in the wilderness, did latterly assay him with this terrible test; "thou hast consented to be made sin, and a curse, and to die a death the scriptures pronounce to be execrated by God. What ground hast thou then, for any hope of deliverance?" For be it remembered, that the devil assailed him with holy writ, in the desert; and, that he was busily engaged in the awful transaction of the crucifixion, we see from his entering into Judas at the supper; and from the supper, it was, that Jesus proceeded to the garden of Gethsemane. He had just told his disciples that his hour of betrayal was at hand; and now seemed to begin the workings of what he himself called "the power of darkness." The cup was full in his view, the very cup of fury and of trembling, and whose portion he must drink up even to the dregs, and wring them out. The prospect induced, not only sorrow, but astounding consternation; "Tarry ye here," said he, to his three disciples, "and watch with me." For "he began to be very heavy, sorrowful, and sore amazed;" or rather, "to be in a great dejection, amazement, and anguish of mind." Nor did he disguise the fact; but he said openly to them, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death!" Then advancing a little from them, he kneeled down, and fell on his face to the ground, and prayed aloud, "That if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba! Father! all things are possible unto thee: O my Father! if it

be possible, take away this cup, and let it pass from me! Nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt!" This the Lord repeated, a second, and a third time; and in the third conflict, as though it had gathered treble strength, "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him;" not mitigating his sufferings, but encouraging him to endure them. "And" accordingly, "being" at last, notwithstanding this support, "in *an agony*, he prayed still more intensely; and his sweat was, as it were great drops of *blood* falling down to the ground!" This was quite enough, to have induced death, if this fate had been designed for Christ; I mean to die a violent death. We hear many accounts of such deaths; as of Charles the IXth of France, by Voltaire; and of some, whose bloody sweats were caused by powerful agitations of the soul. Indeed, Dr. S. admits this. "On entering the garden of Gethsemane, he declared, my soul is exceeding sorrowful *even unto death*; and it seems to be intimated by the apostle Paul, in Hebrews v. 4—9. that *death would* have been the *speedy result* of the awful conflict in which he was engaged, *had he not been strengthened by supernatural aid*. Thus supported, he continued to endure the extremity of mental anguish." Let us then carry this on to the cross. There was, no doubt, a respite of his conflict, immediately after the sweat of blood; because the Lord showed a most perfect possession of himself, and wonderful energy of mind, and resolution of character, from that moment, both in his betrayal, and all through his long and tedious trial, and amid the mockeries and insults and cruelties offered him in the course of it and subsequently, and during all the first stage of the crucifixion itself. He was fastened to the cross about nine in the morning of Friday, having

been taken into custody in the evening of Thursday ; and the first action, afterwards, was his prayer,—“ Then said Jesus, Father ! forgive them ; for they know not what they do.” Then the crowd began to taunt, mock, deride, and revile him ; the people, the passengers, and the chief priests, rulers, scribes, and elders ; the Roman soldiers also ; and even the malefactors from their crosses, railed on him, and cast their villainous scoffings and scornings in his teeth. Nay, they blasphemed him as an impostor, and said, “ If thou be the Christ,” or Messiah, “ save thyself and us !” Now one of these was a brand, that was to be plucked from the burning ; and after a little, he showed a better mind. He no longer united with his comrade, in a stream of abuse ; “ but” altering his tone of a sudden, “ rebuked him, saying, dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation ? And we, indeed, justly ; for we receive the due reward of our deeds ; but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he” then turned his address, and “ said unto Jesus, Lord ! remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom.” Now to be convinced that, up to this period, Jesus still possessed his soul in peace and composure, we have only to mark his reply to this robber and murderer, in the midst of all the clamours that still beset him all round ; “ And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise !” The next incident is thus stated. “ Now there stood, close to the cross of Jesus,” while the others stood afar off, “ His mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary of Magdala, along with the apostle John. When Jesus therefore,” being still quite himself, “ saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved, standing near, he saith

unto his mother, Woman! behold thy Son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold, thy mother!"

Thus far then, down, it may be, to the noon of the day, or about twelve o'clock, the Lord Jesus displayed the perfection of patient endurance, and of compassion, thought, and consideration. But now, a preternatural darkness hangs over the scene, sad symbol of the supernatural eclipse of the Sun of Righteousness, the light of the world! "Now, it was about the sixth hour," or twelve o'clock at noon; "and from the sixth hour, there was darkness over all the land;" either contiguous to Jerusalem, or of the whole of Judea, "unto the ninth hour." So then, the first three hours were comparatively a sweet calm in the soul of Jesus, although externally the scene was all a disturbed atmosphere of tumultuous elements; whereas the three last, during which it is likely the outward uproar ceased, put an end to at least by the awful gloom of the frowning heavens, if it continued till then, were hours of internal blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and all but dismal despair. Satan, now desperate, and knowing the time to be short, will make his last effort; and Jesus, now worn with long exposure to every variety of exhausting circumstances, was thus pre-disposed to be wrought upon with the greatest effect; and he might feel within himself as though the sun refused to shine, or the heavens to let it shine on him, to tell him that his Father God must now avert his face from him, as made sin and a curse; he being of purer eyes than to behold evil, or can only look upon iniquity in order to frown upon and condemn it. But nothing is recorded until the last hour, when we may suppose the conflict was at its highest pitch; "and about the ninth hour," or three o'clock of the afternoon, "Jesus cried out with

a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani! that is to say, being interpreted, my God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me! And some of those that stood by there," not clearly understanding what he said, "when they heard him, said, behold, this man calleth for Elias!" But no immediate death ensued upon this paroxysm; but rather, here the storm of vengeance was spent. For, "after this, Jesus," being recovered again, as after his agony in the garden, and "*knowing* that all things were *now accomplished*," but "that the scripture might be fulfilled" in its minutest point, "saith, I thirst! Now there was set there," as the common drink of the Roman soldiers, when mixed with water, "a vessel full of vinegar. And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop on a reed, and put it to his mouth, and gave him to drink. But others of them said, Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to save him, and take him down." But now, that which was written having been sufficiently verified, "when Jesus, therefore, had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished!" This, it is likely, was the sentence which he uttered, when "he cried out again, the second time, with a loud voice." And when he had thus proclaimed the *finis* of the great work which the Father gave him to do, he, according to the authority committed to him, and in filial obedience to his Father's will, would now make the voluntary oblation of his life as a propitiation for sin. "And he said, Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit. And after having said this, he bowed his head, and dismissed his spirit, and expired. And when the centurion, who" with his band of soldiers as a watch, "stood over against him, saw that he so cried out aloud and expired, he said, truly this was the Son of God!"

But secondly, if such was the voluntary death which

Jesus died upon the cross, to which, however, he was sentenced by the Jews and the Gentiles combined, whose sin therefore remains the same, both in their condemnation of him, and in the execution, notwithstanding the secret purpose of God, that so it was to be, Acts ii. 23, 24. and iv. 26—28.—If, I say, such was the death he died, what was the death he dreaded, and deprecated, *and from which he was delivered?* My answer is, a *violent* death; just such as Doctor S. contends for; because he would have expired in despair, and under the hopeless prospect of everlasting destruction. “It is a *fearful* thing,” says Paul, “to fall into the hands of the living God.” And Jesus found it so, when God his Father began to “condemn sin in his flesh.” Rom. viii. 3. and Isa. liii. 5, 10. He had, for a time, “a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation;” and this, made the uttermost of by the temptations of the infernal spirits, might, I conceive, swell the sufferings of Christ to such an inundation as threatened to overwhelm him quite. We discover a somewhat of the satanic power, in the temptation in the desert; the devil was able to create visionary scenes, and to make them as though immediately present to the mind of Christ; first, of the holy city Jerusalem, and of the temple there, on “the pinnacle,” or topmost turret of the king’s portico, of which he seemed to be placed, so as to look down and behold the dizzy depth of the valley beneath; and then, of “an exceeding high mountain,” from whose summit there was seen an entire view, a sort of panoramic representation of “all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.” Now if Satan could give being to such spectacles as these, to tempt the Son of Man, he could as easily conjure up a sight of hell and destruction, and strive to terrify his victim by some horrifying pictures of the

demerit of sin, in the dismal doom of the ungodly, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire in the bottomless abyss of gehenna. And thus “ he *suffered*, being tempted.” And the tide of his sea of temptations and sufferings, having flowed on to the full, about the ninth hour, or three o’clock, Jesus then uttered his cry of despair; but “ hitherto shalt thou come,” the decree had said, “ but no further ;” and at once the rapid reflux of the proud waves brought relief, when the Son of Man had suffered to the utmost of possible endurance. And thus “ the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through sufferings,” Heb. ii. 10. He “ was heard, in that he feared ;” and was heard by “ him that was able to save him from” a violent and despairing “ death.” And “ although he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered ; and” therefore, “ being made perfect” by them, he voluntarily resigned himself to the death of the cross, and thus “ became the Author of eternal salvation to all them that render unto him the obedience of faith.”

We will, in the third place, endeavour to confirm what has been advanced, by a collation of apposite scriptures. The severity of the last conflict had made the mouth of Jesus parched ; and therefore, when it was over, he said, “ I thirst !” And they gave him a sponge full of vinegar ; and after he “ had received the vinegar, he said, it is finished.” John xix. 28—30. But Jesus could have, no doubt, borne the thirst, the time being now arrived for his speedy exit out of the body ; he, however, knowing that all things were now accomplished, saith, I thirst ; “ that the scripture might be fulfilled !” He was now collected ; and he remembered the psalm of David which had said, a thousand years before, “ In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.” For, it is remarkable enough,

that at their first arrival at Golgotha or Calvary, prior to the actual crucifixion taking place, according to the usual custom, there was a mixture offered our Lord, along with the other two victims, of vinegar, and some bitter drug, here called gall; because it was ordinary with the Greeks and Romans to give such a mixture to persons suffering the death of torture; and, the Jews did so to those sentenced by the law to die; to make them less sensible of their pain. We have an allusion to it, in Prov. xxxi. 6. "Give *strong drink* unto him that is ready to perish." But Jesus refused it. "When he had tasted," says Matthew, "he would *not* drink." Nay, all his friends, who accompanied him to the fatal spot, had been thoughtful enough to provide a refreshing draught for him before he ascended the cross; but this Jesus likewise refused. "They gave him to drink *wine* mingled with *myrrh*; or, what they called spiced wine, "but he received it not," Mark xv. 23. But when all had been endured, then he would accept of a soldier's fare, and he received the vinegar, and said, crying aloud, "It is finished!" And then, after invoking and saying with a loud voice, "Father! into thy hands I commit my spirit," he bowed his head, delivered up the spirit, and expired.

Now, be it well observed, that in the 31st Psalm, we have the original in prophecy, of the Lord's resignation of his soul to his Father's care. "Into thy hand I commit my spirit; *thou hast redeemed me*, O Lord God of truth!" This redemption, then, was the ground of Christ's ultimate composure in the last scene of the crucifixion. The Spirit of God, it may be, now testified to him, that the vial of wrath was all emptied; and thenceforth "for *the joy* that was set before him," by that blessed Comforter, "he endured the cross, despising the shame," Heb. xii. 2. And thus was he enabled to



offer himself willingly to God. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, *offered himself* without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works, to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 14. And therefore, in the 31st Psalm, he is represented as saying, "I will be glad and rejoice in thy mercy; for thou hast considered my trouble; thou hast known my soul in adversities; and hast not shut me up into the hand of the enemy; thou hast set my feet in a large room." "I *had* said in my *haste*, I am cut off from before thine eyes! Nevertheless, thou *heardest* the voice of my supplications, when I cried unto thee." In the 22nd Psalm, we seem to have similar proof; "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. But be not thou far from me, O Lord! O my strength, haste thou to help me! Deliver my *soul* from the sword; my darling," my united one, or assumed manhood, "from the power of the dog. Save me from the lion's mouth; for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns. I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee. For he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted; neither hath he hid his face from him; but when he cried unto him, he heard." This is quoted by Paul, and applied to Christ, in Heb. ii. 12. The 35th Psalm is much in the same strain; "Lord! how long wilt thou look on? Rescue my soul from their destructions, my darling from the lions! I will give thanks in the great congregation, I will praise thee among much people." "And my soul shall be joyful in the Lord; it shall rejoice in his salvation! All my *bones* shall say, Lord! who is like unto thee, who deliverest the poor from him that is too strong for him; yea, the poor and the needy from him that spoileth him." And the 69th Psalm

also appears to breathe the same spirit; but enlarging more on his intense sufferings; “But as for me, my prayer is unto thee, O Lord! *in an acceptable time.* O God! in the multitude of thy mercy hear me; in the truth of thy salvation! Deliver me out of the mire, and let me not sink; let me be delivered from them that hate me, and out of the deep waters. Let not the water-flood overflow me; neither let the deep swallow me up; and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me. Hear me, O Lord! for thy loving-kindness is good; turn thou unto me, according to the multitude of thy tender mercies. And hide not thy face from thy servant, for I am in trouble; hear me speedily. Draw nigh unto my soul, and redeem it; deliver me, because of mine enemies. Thou hast known my reproach, and my shame, and my dishonour; mine adversaries are all before thee. Reproach hath broken” or sorely bruised “my heart;” but not ruptured it; “and I am full of heaviness. And I looked for some to take pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none. They gave me also gall for my meat;” as though to break his fast upon, at the beginning of the crucifixion; “and” afterwards “in my thirst, they gave me vinegar to drink!” Then follow the lightnings of his indignation on the wantonly cruel and causelessly malicious Jews, with imprecations on them as in rolling peals of thunder. “Let their table become a snare before them; and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not; and make their loins continually to shake. Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. Let their habitation be desolate, and let none dwell in their tents; *for*, they persecute him whom thou hast smitten; and they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.

Add iniquity unto their iniquity; and *let them not come into thy righteousness!* Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous!" And then the plaintive note returns; "But I am poor and sorrowful! Let thy salvation, O God! set me up on high!" And then the prophetic hymn concludes in a strain of thanksgiving, on a fore-view of the effects to result from Messiah's sufferings; "I will praise the name of God with a song; and will magnify him with thanksgiving. This also shall please the Lord," as evangelic offerings, "better than" the legal sacrifices of "an ox or a bullock, that hath horns and hoofs. The humble shall see this, and be glad; and your heart shall live that seek God. For the Lord heareth the poor, and despiseth not his prisoners. Let the heaven and earth praise him, the seas, and every thing that moveth therein. For God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah; that they may dwell there, and have it in possession. The seed also of his servants shall inherit it; and they that love his name shall dwell therein."

As a conclusion, it may not be without use to offer a few remarks on the *time* of our Lord's sacrifice, as "our *passover* sacrificed for us." That he suffered at this festival, is clear from John xiii. 1. And that he suffered on the Friday, is plain, from Luke xxiii. 54. "And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath was going to dawn forth;" or, to shine out in all the brilliancy of an oriental night, when all the stars, and the milky way, glitter forth; and the moon also, at this season, being at the full, begins to walk in her brightness. For, observe, in Leviticus xxiii. 32. the Jewish sabbath began at the evening twilight of Friday, and terminated the next evening twilight. "From evening unto evening ye shall keep the rest of your sabbath."

Now, the end of day-light, and commencement of twilight, is at the first appearance of the *stars*, after the setting of the *sun*. This begins when the sun is twelve degrees below the horizon; for then stars of the first magnitude begin to shine out. In the temperate zones, however, this does not take place until an hour after sun-set. Nor is it full night until the sun has sunk eighteen degrees, when the smallest stars become visible; but starlight is in all its lustre, at about twenty degrees of depression, when the milky way, that field of vivid light, appears. The evening twilight, then, or nightfall, is the natural limit between day and night; as the morning twilight, or dawn, or day break, is between night and day. And on this astronomical distinction was founded the above hebrew law. Thus, as the one blazing torch of day was now expiring, so all the brilliants of the evening twilight were beginning gradually to glitter forth, to usher in the sabbath; and which, at this period, would likewise be lighted up with the ruling luminary of the night, the moon, full orbed. Of such a light in the east, we can have but the faintest conception here in the west; but in Job xxxi. 26, 27. we see how the heart of an oriental was too often liable to be powerfully enticed to idolatrous adoration, through the admiration excited by the eye dwelling with rapture on the fascinating beauties of the glowing heavens. And hence David's exclamation in the eighth Psalm; and the emphasis of Job's remark, xxv. 5. Hence also the propriety of the hebrew phrase, "the lookings" or "glancings forth of the evening," Gen. xxiv. 63. Deut. xxiii. 11.

Now the above remarks will tend to explain Matt. xxviii. 1. "In the evening of the sabbath, as it began to dawn forth towards (or upon) the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, went

forth, to take a survey of the sepulchre." Observe, that in Matt. xxvii. 57—66. these women had been anxious spectators of what had transpired on Friday, when the evening was fully come, and Jesus was taken from the cross, lest the now beginning sabbath should be polluted, John xix. 31. Nay, the two Marys remained for some time sitting themselves down over against the sepulchre, Matt. xxvii. 61. see also Mark xv. 42—47. and Luke xxiii. 50—55. and John xix. 38—42. "Then they returned, and prepared aromatic spices, and odoriferous ointments; but they rested from their labours on the sabbath, according to the commandment." Luke xxiii. 56. However, so soon as ever the sabbath was over, even "at the evening of the sabbath, as it began to shine out (in the twilight) upon the first day of the week," the two Marys, who had left it on the Friday evening twilight, to keep the rest of the sabbath, or Saturday, "went forth to take a survey of the sepulchre;" to see that all remained as they had left it, Matt. xxviii. 1. compare Mark i. 21—32. For, observe, they did not make this first, and private, and as it were stolen visit, from any expectation of feasting their eyes with the sight of their risen Lord; "for, as yet, they did not know," that is, properly *understand* "the scripture, that he *must rise again* from the dead," John xx. 9. Nor did they go with their aromatics and unguents, in order to embalm his body; for they had seen the great stone rolled on the mouth of the tomb, and the same sealed, and they likewise knew that a Roman guard had been placed over it, to watch it "until after the third day,—lest," said the Jews, "his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, he is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first," Matt. xxvii. 62—66. The disciples, there-

fore, knew that nothing could be done earlier than the morning of the first day of the week; sooner than which, the guard would not be likely to quit their station; nor would the disciples attempt anything, lest they should confirm the suspicion of the Jews. Accordingly, seeing all as it was, they returned again; and, very probably, finished their preparations for the embalming next day. Then, "very early in the morning," Mark xvi. 1, 2. (*lian prooi*), as opposed to "the evening of the sabbath," in Matt. xxviii. 1. (*opse*), they went forth, "and certain others along with them," other women, Luke xxiv. 1. They had now their "sweet spices" with them; "that they might come and anoint him." Indeed, assured that by the time they should have gone through the city, and gotten to the garden, the period would be quite elapsed for the suspected theft of his body, so that they would be allowed to perform the last rites, and pay the last honours, to his remains, they *sat off* "when it was yet dark;" John xx. 1. (*prooi*); when the stars and moon no longer gave their grateful glimmer, and the sun had not begun to shed the dawn of day; but they reach the spot just at day break; "they came to the sepulchre, at the rising of the sun," Mark xvi. 1, 2.

Well, and as they go, being all women, the men not having yet joined them, and having seen all secure on Friday night, and all safe on the night of the sabbath, they say among themselves, "Who shall roll away the stone for us, from the door of the sepulchre?" Mark xvi. 30. Now betwixt the first visit of the two Marys, on the night of the sabbath, and this second general visit, early on the morning of the first day of the week, important events had taken place; which none of them were to see, except in the consequences. "Now, behold (after their first visit), there was a

great earthquake; and moreover an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came, and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it;" to see in silence his Lord and God arise, and depart. "His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him, the keepers did shake, and became as though dead," Matt. xxviii. 1—4. It was a tradition in the primitive churches, that our Lord arose very shortly after midnight. As it stands, in our translation, we must suppose the women present at all this; so that, to pacify these, when they saw even the warrior Roman guards swallowed up in senseless amazement, the angel says, "Fear not ye." But all the other accounts expressly declare, that when they *all* came, *early*, in the *morning*, at the rising of the *sun*, and with their *spices*, in order to *anoint* him, instantly on their arrival at the spot, they perceived that the stone was removed already. Mark xvi. 1—6, and Luke xxiv. 1, 12. and John xx. 1—10.

One other remark will further illustrate the declaration of Paul, that "*Christ*" as "*our passover*," was "*sacrificed for us*." The Jews reckoned two evenings; the one, at the ninth hour of the day, or three o'clock; the other, at the eleventh hour of the day, or five o'clock. Now the paschal lamb was to be sacrificed during the space between these; "the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it, in the evening;" no; literally, it is, "between the evenings," *bin ha-erebim*. And Josephus says, at the passover, they slew the sacrifice, from the ninth hour to the eleventh; that is, from three to five; from the beginning of the sun's manifest declination to its setting, Deut. xvi. 6. "Thou shalt sacrifice the passover, in the evening, at the going down of the

sun." Now, from the sixth hour of the day until the ninth, Jesus was still alive, but suffering; that is, from twelve to three; and a preternatural darkness prevailed. But then, soon after, say between three and four, he made his soul (or life) an offering for sin; he poured out his soul (or life) unto death, Isa. liii. And he continued on the tree of the curse, (Deut. xxi. 22, 23. Gal. iii. 13, 14.) until about the eleventh hour, or five o'clock, that being the other extreme of the paschal evening, Matt. xxvii. 57. Mark xv. 42. Luke xxiii. 44—54. Accordingly, "when the evening was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was the disciple of Jesus; he went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus." "Pilate marvelled, if he were already dead; and when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph."

And "what shall we render to the Lord, for all his benefits towards us? Let us even take the cup of salvation, and call on the name of the Lord," Psalm cxvi. 12, 13.



## NOTES.

---

### FIRST PAMPHLET.

Page 16.—First pamphlet, the feminine of *aish*, the male being drops the *jod*, and instead of *aish-ah*, it is always written *ash-ah*, as in Gen. ii. 23.

Page 19.—“Sarah or *Shurah*,” the *chief* or *principal* woman; as a prince is Shur, the chief or principal man. Hence in Isa. xxviii. 25. “the principal wheat,” is *chatah shurah*; the Hebrew language placing the adjective after the substantive, instead of, as in the English, before it. And as *shurah*, a type of the true church (Gal. 4. 21—31; 2 John 1—5, 13. 1 Peter v. 13.) ranks as a princess, so Jacob, a type of Christ, ranks as a prince,—I-shur-el,—a prince of God. “Taking the initial *jod*, in Israel, as merely formative of the proper name, as I conceive it to be, the exact significance of the name is, *a prince of God*,” —I-shur-al. Horsley’s Hosea, critical notes, c. 12. p. 144. And the *children* of the queen, or king’s daughter, are said to be *shurim* or “princes,” in Ps. xlv. 16—“whom thou mayest make *shur-im* in all the earth;” this is to be children of the free-woman, of “Jerusalem which is above and is free.” Gal. iv. 26—31.

Page 22.—“*Seed* signifies the matter, in which is contained the creative property, whether in reference to man, to the irrational animals, or to *vegetables*.” Respecting the vegetable kingdom, this is generally true, but not universally; generally true, as taken for granted by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 36—38; and as stated in Gen. i. 11, 12, but not universally; because in some vegetables, a bud, a twig, a scion, a layer, an offset, a cutting, a part or particle of root, or even a leaf will suffice for propagation. However, for the *general rule* regarding seed, see the last Note, page 105, where also the difference between *pollen* and *seed* in the affair of propagation, will be considered at some length. Now, because in man, seed is the essence and the producing cause, this term is given to the thing produced by it; man’s *offspring* or progeny is called his *seed*;

and again, because it is sown in, nourished in, and *brought forth* by the woman, although it does not originate with her, it is also called sometimes “the seed of the woman,” Gen. iii. 15. iv. 25.

Page 31.—“He took hold on the seed, that is, the children, of Abraham;” who is “the father of all them that believe,” Heb. ii. 10—18: Rom. iv. 11—18. It is a fancy of many, that except Christ was sinful and mortal, as to his body, there could be no relationship between themselves and him. But except Christ’s *soul* was sinful, as well as his body, the objection would still remain. In fact; what is sin? Is it not either a moral principle, or a moral action? A man, or an angel, is morally depraved, and so far sinful; or they transgress some law or commandment, and then commit an act morally bad. But in either case, can you stop at the *body*? or must you not, in both, go onward to the *soul*? “the *soul* that *sinneth*, it shall die.” Hence we are dead morally; “dead in sins,” Eph. ii. 1, 5.—dead *judicially*, because of sin, Rom. 7. 9—13.—and we are obnoxious to the *punishment*; and the punishment is to reach both *soul and body*, Matt. x. 28. And in truth, Mr. Irving does involve Christ’s soul as well as his body. See my second pamphlet, p. 5. But the error is this; these persons are thinking of Christ, according to the flesh. And according to that, he would have been a *brother* only to the *Jews*, Rom. ix. 1—5. And in this view, he would have been only *their* Goel or *Redeemer*. So that this, by itself, I mean the fleshly relationship, would cut off all Gentiles from any part or lot in the Son of Jesse. But the relationship is spiritual in its nature; as it is eternal, or prior to time, and to the creation, in its origin. “They, who are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for *the seed*.” Rom. ix. 8—13. The fleshly children, whether of Adam or of Abraham, are excluded; the election only are included, Rom. ix. 14—33. xi. 1—7. Therefore, in Heb. ii. the titles are, the children,—the many sons,—the brethren,—the people,—the church;—and the family-feature is, faith; and to *such* characters, Christ stands related as a near kinsman Redeemer, to prosecute their quarrel, and both avenge and redress their wrongs. This is clearly stated in page 34.

Page 39.—“Upon all *flesh*.” There occur in the New Testament many seemingly universal expressions relative to salvation. They are universal, or unrestricted, as respects the *families* of mankind; and in this point of view, they show the new dispensation quite opposed to the old,—whose temple-sacrifices and annual atonements, and its sprinklings of

blood, and of purifying water, and its anointings, belonged to *the one* family of Abraham, and to *none besides*; whereas, the gospel was to proclaim “the common salvation;” and this on the ground of his atonement, of whom a jew could say, “And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world;” and of whom indeed, God had said, in the original promise, “In thy seed shall *all the families* of the earth be blessed.” But when such expressions are construed as universally *personal*, as though every *individual* of all the families of the earth was redeemed by the Lord Jesus, these expressions are misconstrued; because the same construction cannot in fact be put upon Joel, “I will pour out of *my Spirit* upon all *flesh*;” and therefore the present advocates for universal redemption on the part of the Son, are inculcating particular election on the part of the Father, and peculiar and personal regeneration and sanctification on the part of the Holy Spirit,—thus setting the acts of these blessed personages at variance, whereas their goings forth should be as the stretchings out of so many parallel lines, which terminate as they commence, together; or as radii, of the same circle, which meet in the same centre.

## SECOND PAMPHLET.

Page 6.—“*Flesh* is not necessarily a *sinful* substance.” This is noticed here, because it is a point of consequence, and it is there discussed, as well as in pages 7, 8, and 9.

Page 21.—“I charge you, to ask any able surgeon, or any well-informed naturalist, and they will confirm what I am now about to say; I have studied surgery, though not practising, and I have consulted an eminent surgeon before writing this,—and I do assert, *that the proper semen* always comes from *the female*; and that the *male* only *quickens* what already exists in the female.” I confess I met with some such surgeons in the west, as those Mr. Editor fell in with in the east; but this did not deter me from still investigating the subject for myself, and still enquiring after some better informed professional and scientific men,—and in both respects, I may truly say, I have attained to certain valuable *porismoi*, or gains and acquisitions, (1 Timothy vi. 5, 6.) during my career of investigation and enquiry,—*porisms*, not less valuable, in my particular province, than those *porismata*, or peculiar classes of mathematical propositions, which were so named by the ancient geometers, from the verb *porizoo*, which signifies, both to *investigate*, and to *acquire by investigation*. From one friend, Mr. William Cooke,

I obtained some useful hints; and likewise the sketch of a lecture by Mr. Abernethy, as given at p. 41—43. From another friend, Mr. W. Cox, of Turnham Green, near London, surgeon, through Rev. Jesse Hopwood, of Union Chapel, Sloane Street, Chelsea, - I received much encouragement, from his confirmation of my views of both the origination of the manhood of Christ, and the nature and immediate cause of Christ's death on the cross. I have noticed Mr. C. already, at p. 39. 40, of the third pamphlet; and here I quote from a letter of his, of April, 1832—"I have read, the first and second part of Mr. Carne's treatise (namely, of this *third* pamphlet,) and have no hesitation in asserting, that he is right both respecting the father or cause of our Saviour's being, as well as the cause of his end; for, according to my apprehension, both scripture, and the facts for reason to build upon, plainly prove, that he has taken, in these particulars, a fundamentally correct view. It appears to me, that Mr. Carne is right, that our Redeemer yielded up his life, after saying, "it is finished!" as contradistinguished from expiring from exhaustion of the body, or in consequence of the effect of hanging upon the cross, or as the malefactors died, their limbs being broken, right and left of him. And it has, for a long time, been a probable thing to my mind, that the blood which issued from the wound that was pierced, was from the integuments this side of the pericardium; and that the water—or secretion like water—that flowed after it, was from the pericardium itself; for the blood would flow from a puncture, previous to the body being cold and stiff which takes hours commonly to effect, but particularly in a hot climate, like that of Palestine in Asia. But a puncture into the cavity of the *heart*, previous to the body being cold, would have produced such a copious flow of blood, as would have prevented the possibility of witnessing the *watery* fluid. And even supposing the heart to have burst, yet its contents in the pericardium, the crassimentum and serum, would not have separated, whilst the body retained its warmth; consequently, nothing would have appeared, but red blood; and I think I am borne out in the supposition, that the body was not cold, from the recollection, that the gospel says, that He was pierced soon after He had given up the ghost (spirit,) and breathed his last breath, thereby rendering it impossible for the body to have become so, in the intervening time." "Now, although it must be admitted, that our Saviour's death was sudden, although voluntary, yet the muscles could not continue contracted, after death; this cannot be, let death occur how it may; for, with the last gasp of life, all muscular

action ceases; and the muscles instantly, with the last act of vitality which is contraction, drop into an unresisting relaxation or flabbiness, there being no power to resist it, after the extinction of life; and this is proved by every one who dies, whether suddenly or not, for that their muscles are found, when dissected, to have stiffened, in a relaxed state; or, in other words, that the *fibres* are relaxed, although the *substance* is stiff with the effect of the atmosphere, or what the cold has effected upon the unanimated matter."

Page 31.—"The seed of the males is vermiculous." This is denied by Mr. Chevalier. But it being of no consequence at all, in the discussion, the main point being, that the semen, or producing principle, originates with the male, and not with the female,—I shall not here renew the subject, but content myself with the following from Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, p. 687. "To illustrate" Job xxv. 6,—I observe, from the learned Haller, that "the majority of anatomists have agreed in this hypothesis, that the seminal vernicle is the first rudiments of a man, almost in the same manner as a caterpillar or grub is the origin of a fly."

Page 33.—"The chick grows, and gradually feeds on the egg, and consumes it;" rather *absorbs* the egg, that is, the albumen or white, leaving the yolk undiminished, and which the chick at last receives into its abdomen, for its further support.

Page 35.—"A new *seed*;" this is a misprint; it should have been,—"a new thing," as in Jeremiah xxxi. 22.

Page 39.—"Reuben, thou art my *first-born*;" it should have been,—"my first *begotten*,—my might,—and the beginning of my procreative vigour." It is only in relation to the mother and the birth, and not to the father or to the begetting, that the first child ought to be called the *first-born*.

Page 42.—Some are of opinion, that the defect in old men, is not a deficiency in the secretion of semen, but in the necessary energy of body to bring it into contact with the female ovum. This is the opinion of Mr. Cox; and it seems very strongly countenanced by instances of very *hale* old men having begotten children in advanced periods of life; one of the most extraordinary upon record, is that of Thomas, generally called "Old" *Parr*. He married at the age of eighty, and had a son and a daughter. And at the age of one hundred and five, he did penance for an illegitimate child. He died at the age of 152 years and 9 months.

*Page 48.*—“ A mother’s offspring without a father.” Even animal hermaphrodites, although they include within themselves the parts of both sexes, cannot impregnate themselves ; not even the earth-worms, although they by a double union at once impregnate another, and become themselves impregnated by that other. The combination of the two sexes in one *human* individual, has been considered a mere poetic fancy. But in Tegg’s London Encyclopædia, under Physiology, p. 354, a very singular case is stated of mixed sex in one person. “ We saw in London, a person exhibited as an hermaphrodite ; who was said to possess the sexual desires, and capabilities of enjoyment, of both sexes ; and certainly, as to external form, and even to genital formation, there appeared a complete union of the sexes ; but we are very doubtful whether the statements, in reference to propensities and powers, were not invented, or at least exaggerated.” If however it were all true, still there could have been no possible power of self-impregnation.

*Page 55.*—“ The *root* of the plant supplies it with nutriment from the *earth*.” This is the general rule in the vegetable kingdom ; but as in the animal, all flesh is not precisely the same sort of flesh, nor sustained by the same sort of food, some living almost wholly on, as well as in, the air—some on, as well as in the water,—and others on the productions of the earth,—so in the vegetable kingdom certain exceptions to the above general rule exist. Some tribes of the Fuci are said, without any root, without any special organ of any kind, to derive their nourishment from air and moisture alone. Another example of extreme simplicity of structure and function we have, in the Aerial Epidendrum, a beautiful plant, a native of the East Indies beyond the Ganges, and of the neighbouring Island of Java. In the former region, it is not uncommon for it to be plucked, for the elegance of its leaves, the beauty of its flower, and the exquisite odour it diffuses abroad, and to be suspended by a cord of silk from the ceilings of the rooms, where, from year to year, it will continue to put forth new leaves, and new blossoms, and to yield fresh fragrance, excited to continually renovated life and action only by the stimulus of the surrounding atmosphere. Then again, there are the succulent plants of the hot climates of Asia and Africa ; some of these, although they have a root, yet only to stay themselves firm in the sand, and not as an instrument of nutrition ; for they grow in soils or sands so extremely arid, that no moisture can possibly be extracted from them, so that they live on the air, and on the moisture suspended in it.

If exposed to wet, or a rainy season, they quickly perish. (Animal Physiology, in Useful Knowledge, p. 24.—25.)

Page 60, 61, 62.—In Hebrews ii. 14—it is said that our Lord “took part of the same” nature, human nature, which belonged to the children of God, even to the corporeal frame, in order that he might be *capable* of undergoing *death*; for that, not only was it not an angelic nature, nor only an immaterial, rational, and moral principle, as the human soul or spirit, but he likewise assumed a body of very “flesh and blood.” Suppose two men; in one, the flesh and blood pure, and without disease, and in the other impure and all corrupted. Essentially, in both, the flesh and blood are not those of fish, or of fowl, or of the brute beast, but of *man*; and therefore, only suppose a proper remedy applied to the diseased individual, and you have him restored to the condition of his healthy fellow. But before the cure, let the diseased man beget offspring, and in such a case, the disease being in the whole mass of blood, he transmits it along with his own peculiar nature. Adam the first was created with flesh and blood pure; he then became polluted in his blood through the fall in Eden, Ezek. xvi. 6. Now, the blood was still human blood, and perfectly the same in its constituents, but it was judicially tainted in consequence of a capital offence, and as a punishment given up, along with the soul, to satanic influence. Such are all Adam’s children;—“begotten in sin, and shapen in iniquity,” Ps. li.—and “*dead* in sins,” Eph. ii. 1—5. And such must Christ have been, however regenerated and sanctified after, had *Joseph* been his *father*; but the Holy Spirit was the begetter; and thus the thing begotten was a holy thing, and a fit “somewhat” for *the second man* and the last Adam, “to offer,” as an atonement for sin, in his priestly character, Heb. vii. 24—28. viii. 1—3. ix. 11—14. Now to this amount is Mr. Chevalier’s own illustration. “Those energies are human life; the life of a man and of such a man (in real original nature and properties,) as ourselves. *In what* then did the holy child Jesus *differ* from the rest of men? The sentence upon Adam affected the *life* of man; that fatal doom concerned *that*, which every natural offspring receives *from its male* parent. Adam forfeited his life. And as all that our progenitor could give, towards the production of his children, is *life*, so all that we receive from him, is, a *forfeited* life. Herein behold our participation in the consequences of Adam’s transgression; we, as *the seed* of evil doers, possess only a forfeited life: while Jesus Christ, in all truth participating our nature, possessed a life in all points the same as ours, except in its not having been kindled from the forfeited flame, but with the concentrated

effulgency of God! So then, as Emanuel's life *was not of* the forfeited life of Adam, he came not under the penalty of Adam's transgression ;" that is, naturally, but was naturally free from *mortality*, because free from *sin* ; as follows,—“and was, in our nature, pure from sin, even as God is pure.” In a word ; if Christ could be *tempted* in all points, like as we are, and yet without sin ; he could equally be *made* in all points like as we are, with only the same single exception, he knew no sin, 2 Cor. v. 21. Heb. iv. 15.

### THIRD PAMPHLET.

Page 16, 17.—“A typical holy seed, or family of children. The real extent of importance of some revealed truths, is not always discoverable, until certain errors arise, and call it forth to view. By many, it has long been held indifferent, as to whether we esteem Christ a *brother*, in relation to the whole family of mankind, or to “the whole family” of God, of which Christ is the head, Eph. iii. 14, 15. But now that sinfulness of nature is ascribed to Christ, and an universality of redemption,—it is obviously necessary, to show, that he does not stand as a Goel or near kinsman Redeemer, in relation to *Adam's* family, but to *Abraham's* ; Abraham having been constituted a sort of pattern of the whole seed ; “who is the father of all them that *believe*.” “They who are of faith are the children of Abraham.” “If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed.” Accordingly, if Christ gave himself for the church, it is “the general assembly and church of the first-born who are registered in heaven,” Eph. v. 25. Heb. xii. 23. And therefore, he says to his Father, “I will declare thy name *unto my brethren*,—in the midst of the *church*, will I sing praise unto thee.” Now, as Christ was constituted the Goel of his kindred from of old, yea, from the days of eternity, 1 Peter i. 19, 20 : Micah v. 1—3,—so were his brethren “elected” or chosen out of mankind at large, “according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctification of the Spirit unto the obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ ;” and therefore, says Paul, “both he who sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified” in and through him, “are all of one,” of one family ; “for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*,” Heb. ii. 10—18. By this relationship, then, we rise to Christ's height ; “*holy brethren*,” and “partakers of the heavenly calling,” Heb. iii. 1—6. True, Christ came externally in the likeness of sinful flesh ; and because men looked at his exterior, instead of pondering his moral excellencies, although these were shining forth in every action, word, look, and motion, “he



had no form of beauty or of comeliness" in their estimation ; but when David espied him in vision, he exclaimed, enraptured, " thou art fairer than the children of men!" Isa. liii. Ps. xlv. Now all those " whom God did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son ; that he might be the *first-born* in the midst of *many brethren*," Rom. viii. 29.—and these David calls his "fellows," in Ps. xlv. 7, as quoted in Heb. i. 9. The word signifies, to be joined together, or associated, as those in one house and of one family ; from the root *heber*. It occurs in this sense, in Prov. xxi. 9. " It is better for to dwell" by oneself, " on a corner of the house-top" or roof, " than with a wife of contentions and a house *full of company*,"—*heber*.

Page 22.—" Living beings derive their origin from pre-existing living beings, by a process termed generation. The mode may vary ten thousand times ten thousand-fold ;" but the fact is the same, whether in the elephant, or the whale, or the minutest animalcule existing. A glass of water taken from the Canal at Batavia, the capital of Java, and of the other Dutch settlements in the East Indies, becomes in a few hours a collection of animated matter ; the minute portions of which, multiplying by division and subdivision, move about with astonishing rapidity ; and the bay itself, swarming with myriads of living creatures exhibits in the night a mass of phosphorescent light. We do not wonder at finding animal life so teeming and prolific in warm climates, both in the air, and in the water, as well as on the surface of the earth ; but it is surprising to find it equally abounding, although not in the air, nor on the earth, yet in the waters, in the frigid regions of the North Pole. Even the air is often darkened by innumerable flocks of sea-fowl, and the land and rivers have their peculiar animals ; but the sea though a sea of ice, with its naked rocks and shores, is filled with a boundless profusion of life, such as the most genial glow of tropical suns scarcely develops. The whale, the mightiest of animated things, and of by far the most enormous size, is here a native, and at home ; the largest now ever seen, do not much exceed seventy feet in length,—that is to say, of the species called *mysticetus*, the only species, with one exception, the *spermaceti* whale, which becomes the grand object of the regular whale-fishery operations. But those of the *balæna physalis* species, called by the sailors *razor-back*, are considerably longer, and are, on the whole, still larger animals, more powerful, and amazingly swift swimmers, going at the rate of twelve miles an hour. An individual of this species, found dead in Davis's Strait, measured *one hundred and five feet* in length. The

shores of the Arctic Zone are crowded with huge amphibious races, links between the various species of whales and of the quadrupeds, those mammalia of the sea and of the land. The Morse or Walrus, called also the Sea-cow, is sometimes fifteen feet long, and ten feet in circumference; it has two tusks, whose substance is almost equal to ivory, that valuable product of the great Hippopotamus or River-horse of Africa, and of the elephants of both Africa and Asia. But to revert to the whales of the frozen regions of the north; their numbers are immense; of some species, as the Cachalot or Spermaceti whale, large herds are met with notwithstanding the vast size of each, to the number of two hundred together; these are mostly females, under the guidance of a male of very large dimensions. But to afford a more correct notion of their numbers, we will just give a sketch of their *slaughter*. So early as the year, 1697, soon after the Dutch had embarked largely in this fishery, 188 vessels were seen in the Bay of Smeerenberg, with the produce of 1959 whales on board! Killed in such excess, the surviving monsters forsook this Bay for North Bay; and taken with equal facility there, they receded thence also into the open sea, between Spitzbergen and Greenland, called the Greenland Sea. And now, Davis's Strait and Baffin's Bay are much frequented. In the year 1814, a Captain Souter brought home in his single vessel the produce of 44 whales. Mr. Scoresby, father of the clergyman of that name, and who is now the Minister of the Episcopal Chapel in Bedford Circus, Exeter, killed, in 28 voyages, 498 whales. The Dutch in 107 years, from 1669 to 1778 inclusive, captured 57,590 whales! The British fishery has lately yielded a produce much exceeding that of the Dutch even in its greatest prosperity; in 1814, were imported from Greenland only, 1437 whales; and from 1827 to 1830, inclusive, the British captures amounted to 3,391 whales. This slaughter is immense, considering that the whale goes nine or ten months, with young, and bears one suckling only at a time, and never above twins at most.

I must subjoin, here, a reference to another notable scene of whale butchery. This lies off the coast of Scotland; hither large shoals of whales flock, every year, perhaps pursuing smaller fish, and here they meet their doom. In a description of the Shetland Islands, lately published by Dr. Hibbert, a lively account is given, of the pursuit and capture of a drove of whales, that had entered Yell Sound. On the news of their arrival, a large fleet of yawls soon collected, whose main object was to drive them upon the sandy shore of Hamna Voe; when this was effected, the air resounded with the shouts of the Shetlanders, and then

the work of death commenced with sharp iron spits for harpoons. At length the sun set upon a bay that seemed one sheet of blood; not a whale had escaped the slaughter; the strand was strewn over with carcasses of all sizes, from six feet long to twenty feet, and amounting to not fewer than eighty in number. And the Inverness Courier of this year, 1832, gives an account of a shoal in Branahibay; these were driven to the mouth of Stornoway harbour, and at last cooped up in the inner harbour within the quay, when the grand struggle ensued, and which terminated in the capture of *ninety-two* whales, of the bottle-nosed species, and of an extraordinary size.

But on what do these monsters live, only one of whom, of but sixty feet long, weighs seventy tons, just equal to the weight of 300 fat oxen? Their food is fish of the smaller sort; of these, there is a gradation, rising one above another, the higher preying upon the lower, until at last a supply is found for those of larger bulk and most enormous appetite. 1. There is the Genus *Medusa*, or Sea-blubber; specimens are seen on our shores, but beyond the Arctic Circle they increase to a most extraordinary size, and are devoured by the finny tribes of all shapes and sizes. 2. But the most numerous of the *Medusan* races are microscopic, too small to be seen with the naked eye singly, but in a mass they tinge with an olive green one fourth of the whole extent of the Greenland Sea, or above 20,000 square miles; and Mr. Scoresby estimates that but *two* of these square miles contain millions so beyond the range of human thoughts and expressions, that he illustrates the numberless numbers by saying, that 80,000 persons would have been employed, from the creation, in counting them. This green sea of life is the whale's polar pasture-ground; not that his tremendous jaws feed directly on these invisible particles of vitality, although he disdains not worms and even zoophytes; but other creatures feed on them and fatten, to be themselves food for others, and those again for the whale. 3. The various species of the crab, and above all, of the shrimp classes, are vastly numerous. 4. Then comes the herring, with the pilchard, a rich, soft, and delicate fish, of which there exists so boundless a superabundance in the northern icy seas, as not only to support all their whales, but supply all the oceans of the temperate climates. They issue from their icy beds, not for food, but to deposit their spawn in warm situations which quickly mature it, and then they return again to recruit themselves, their own seas swarming with insect food in a far greater degree than those of our warmer latitudes. Their shoals are immense on the coasts of America; and in Chesapeake Bay there is an annual inundation of them

covering the shore in such quantities as to become a nuisance. In one year, 1603, the Dutch, over and above their own consumption, sold to different nations, herrings, to the strange amount for so cheap a fish, of one million, seven hundred and fifty-nine thousand pounds sterling. In 1618 they sent out 3,000 ships with 50,000 men, to catch, and, 9,000 more ships to carry the fish for sale, employing in all, in this fishery, 150,000 persons, besides those first mentioned. The British have of late been very successful; in 1819, they caught 340,660 barrels; each barrel containing, from 5 to 800 fish. Having been so exuberant before the late extended slaughter of the whales, what may not their shoals be expected to be in future times? These will yield abundant supplies to all the nations of the world, when the fisheries shall be properly attended to, and extended; so that with a lesser quantity of oil and bone, the only valuable products of the whale, we shall reap a great increase of food for man,—a very necessary thing, in the prospect of a rapidly increasing population in Europe, North America, the Canadas, and Austral Asia; and in the probability of similar increase, with the downfall of superstitions, despotisms, anarchies, and monopolies, throughout South America, and many parts of Asia and Africa. Another war might be waged with those deadly foes of that most superior fish, the *salmon*,—the seals and the grampusses. Of the latter, it is asserted, that they devour many more salmon in the seas of the United Kingdom than are consumed by all its inhabitants. There are five species of the dolphin, and all of them feed on fish: but the *delphinus orca*, or grampus, is very large and extremely voracious; it is from fifteen to twenty-five feet long, and remarkably thick in proportion, and it abounds in all the sea-coasts about Scotland and Ireland. There is another species, the *delphinus phocæna* or porpoise, in vast multitudes in all parts of the British seas: but in greatest numbers where fish of passage appear, such as mackarel, herrings, and *salmon*, which they pursue up the Bays. The common *seals*, are about five or six feet long; and are valuable for their skins, and for the oil their fat yields. But on the north coast of Scotland the great seal is upwards of twelve feet long. One of this species, larger than *an ox*, was found in the Kamtschatkan seas; these would weigh 800 lbs. each, and were eaten by Behring's crew. But the two very astonishing species of the seal are the following, but not known in Europe.

1. The maned or leonine seal; the males are at times 25 feet long, weigh 15 or 1600 lbs. and have long flowing manes on their necks. Their voice is like that of a bull.
2. The sea-lion of Anson; its hair, on head, neck, and shoulders, is as long as a goat's, and gives this

amphibious animal the air of the lion; but its size is vast,—25 feet long, and from 19 to 20 feet in circumference. The females bring forth and suckle their young among the corn-flags; they live on fish and water-fowl. Their oil is preferred to that of the whale.

We may remark, here, that in Gen. i. 21, the words translated “great whales,”—*ha-taniim ha-gedolim*, signify “the mighty monsters;” and these, whether of the seas, the rivers, the land, or such as are of both, namely amphibious. Of these the whale is the largest; and of which there are several species. The crocodile perhaps ranks next, abounding in the rivers of Asia and Africa; this creature seizes from the banks dogs, men, wild beasts, and even oxen, and draws them into the water. The alligator is a species found also in abundance in some parts of America. The species called cayman, infests all the large rivers of South America; is of immense strength; and is the scourge and terror of man and beast. It is sometimes called the Antilles’ crocodile. Then comes the squalus or shark; there are upwards of 30 species. The white shark is often 30 feet long, and weighs 4,000 lbs. It is the most voracious of all animals; and is the dread of sailors in all the hot climates, as it constantly attends the ships, and seizes whatever falls overboard. The swallow of the *whale* being extremely small, in spite of its monstrous size, the fish of *Jonah* is conjectured to have been of the shark kind. There is another species, called squalus maximus, which has sometimes measured twelve yards and more. It is called the basking shark, from its lying, as if to sun itself, on the surface of the water; and is a migratory fish. The singularity of this great animal is, that it has nothing of the fierce and voracious nature of the shark kind; and is so tame as to suffer itself to be approached, and even stroked. And what is more, its food consists almost entirely, if not quite, of sea plants; Linnæus says it feeds also on medusæ; but no remains of fish, or of any devoured creatures, have been ever discovered in the stomachs of the numbers that have been cut up; but only green stuff, the half digested parts of algæ, and the like. Now this clearly is the likeliest fish ever discovered for the reception of a human being, through a divine impulse and as the disposition of the Sea-monster is so tractable, so the interior; of such would agree with the prophet’s description, when he says, “the weeds were wrapped about my head.” At all events, it is confessed that the jaws of sharks are so large, their throats so wide, and their bellies, so capacious, “that,” as Kolben says, “it may easily be believed they can swallow,” not merely a man whole and entire, but “a full dressed man.”

Then will follow, the elephant, rhinoceros, unicorn, camel, cameleopard, buffalo, river-horse, and the like; but it must be well considered, that, to a certainty, some of the originally created *taninim gedolim* are now quite extinct; and therefore, in striving to ascertain, what those two were, which are described in Job, the behemoth, and the leviathan, we ought not to confine our attention to merely existing species of either land or water-monsters; for although Job lived posterior to the deluge, yet it is likely so early after it as the time of Jacob, or above 1700 years before Christ. A huge animal, for instance, has been detected, in different parts of Siberia, Russia, Germany, and North America, not alive, but by its tusks, grinders, bones, and skeleton, of vast magnitude. Eminent naturalists have concluded these to belong to elephants of a gigantic size, in days gone by; these remains are found in immense numbers, and their unparalleled magnitude admits of no comparison with any animal now known. But others think it quite a different creature from the elephant. It is now called the mammoth; and its skeleton bespeaks a beast at least *five or six times the cubic volume of the elephant*; its grinders are five times as large; and, says Mr. Jefferson, “to whatever animal we ascribe these remains, it is certain that such an one has existed in America, and that it was the largest of all the terrestrial beings of which any traces have ever appeared.” When we consider that the Indian elephant sometimes stands ten feet and half in height at the shoulder, is in weight more than five tons, and will carry a load of a ton weight, what an idea we may form of the mammoth, as having been five or six times as big and as strong! Muller describes the mammoth as being four or five yards high, and above thirty feet long! His colour greyish; his head very long, and his front very broad; two horns under the eyes; and in walking he has the power of extending and contracting his body to a great degree.

In the Morning Herald, Thursday, Dec. 15, 1831, it was stated, that “Miss Gurney, North-repps Cottage, has lately presented to the secretary of the Geological Society various bones of the fossil elephant, found on the coast of Norfolk, between Cromer and Happisburgh, some of which were of gigantic size.” Indeed, M. Cuvier remarks that, “none of the larger species of quadrupeds, whose remains are now found imbedded in regular rocky strata, are at all similar to any of the known living species.” He mentions a bear the full size of a horse, and differing from every known species. The megalonix is a creature that seems to have been of the size of an ox. The megatherium differs little from it but in size, being much larger. Remains exist, of the elk, deer, buf-

falo, rhinoceros, river-horse, tapir, and others, either differing in structure, or in size, from any known species. In 1799, in the north of Siberia, an entire mammoth was found by a fisherman, of an enormous size; it was a male, and had a long *mane* on its neck. Of the *bos* or ox species of cattle, some very remarkable sorts still exist. The *bos arnee* inhabits India, north of Bengal, is of vast size, about fourteen feet high, is very bold and daring, and partakes of the form of the horse, the bull, and the deer. The Cape buffalo is greatly larger than the largest English ox; is very fierce and so strong as to trample horse or bullock with their rider under foot in a moment. About 250 years ago, there was found in Scotland a wild race of cattle, of a pure white, and had manes like lions. Mr. Pennant says, he cannot but give credit to the relation. In South America, near the Cape, is found the *gnoo*, an elegant mixture of the buffalo, which it resembles in its vast head with two horns; of the horse, which it resembles in the body, shoulders, tail, and mane, except that the mane is rather under, than upon, the neck, running from the breast between the fore-legs; and the antelope, which it resembles in the exquisite finish of its legs. It is exceedingly fierce, and bellows like an ox, and is about the size of a galloway. With respect to the *unicorn* in scripture, some have supposed it to be the one-horned rhinoceros; and the horn of this animal has been called "the most singular thing about it;" and "differs from that of every other animal;" it is often three feet long, and more than six inches in diameter at the base; and is so situated as to possess a *maximum* of strength; to the strongest animal the gore of it would be certain death; and such is the ponderous mass of this creature's body, which is at least twelve feet long, and twelve feet in circuit that if it makes a rush, no beast can endure the crush, for he will dash even the elephant himself to the ground, (Picture of India; London; 1830.) It is well observed, that such great land animals seem to have been intended to keep down the too exuberant vegetation, until a country is fully peopled; and hence, in the early stages of the world, still larger species existed, for this, and other purposes. Martial has an epigram on a rhinoceros, which was exhibited at Rome, and which in the presence of Cæsar Domitian tossed a bull into the air with his horn as though it had been but a tennis-ball. However, in the Hebrew of Job xxxix. 9—12, the word translated unicorn, is, *rim*; but in Numb. xxiii. 22, and xxiv. 8, the word is *ram*. The radical meaning determines nothing about horns; but the descriptions, every where, as Deut. xxxiii. 17,—Ps. xxii. 21. xcii. 10.—and Isa. xxxiv. 7,—prove it to be, at once a horned animal, whether with one or two

and very powerful, fierce, and untractable. Sparmann informs us, that the figure of the unicorn, described by the ancients, has been found delineated, by the Snese Hottentots, on the plain surface of a rock in Caffraria; and therefore conjectures, that such an animal either does exist at present in the internal parts of Africa, or at least once did so. Father Lebo affirms that he has seen it. Strabo and Aristotle's account is, that *in India*, there are horses, that have harts' heads, with one horn, and cloven-footed; and Pliny says, the Arcean Indians hunt a wild beast, which is very curst or malignant, untameable, having one horn two cubits long, resembling the hart in the head, the elephant in the feet, the boar in the tail, and in the rest of the body a horse; it has the voice of an ox, but rather shrill; and they deny that this beast is ever taken alive. Now in the face of this, it is remarkable, that a Major Latter, commanding in the Sikkim territories, on the borders of the great Himalaya range, lately procured a curious Tibetan manuscript, containing the names of different animals; and in the class of those, whose hoofs are divided, there was an animal called the one-horned tso'po; "upon enquiring," says the major, "what kind of animal it was, to our astonishment, the person who brought me the manuscript, described exactly the unicorn of the ancients; saying that it was a native of the interior of Tibet, about the size of a Tadoo—a horse from twelve to thirteen hands high—fierce, and extremely wild, seldom if ever caught alive, but frequently shot; and that the flesh was used for food. The person who gave me the information, has repeatedly seen these animals, and eaten the flesh of them. They go together in large herds, like our wild buffaloes, and are very frequently to be met with on the borders of the great desert, about a month's journey from Lassa, in that part of the country inhabited by the wandering Tartars."—*Fraser's Tour*.

But to end this note, the *salamander* was for a long time thought to be but of *one sex*; but like the common British *viper*, the female brings forth her young viviparous indeed, but from eggs, which, instead of being layed, are hatched in her belly. Salamanders have been kept in water carefully changed for six months without food; and the viper has been even kept in a *box* for six months without food, and yet without its abating even of its vivacity, and much less endangering its vitality. So much then for the endlessly diversified principle of generation, or propagation, and likewise of vitality; in both which we see displayed the manifold wisdom and unlimited power of the Creator!

N.B. *Pilchards* are distinct as a species from herrings, but equally belong to the polar regions; vast shoals of the former frequent the



coasts of Cornwall, from Fowey Harbour to the Scilly Islands, from about the middle of July until the approach of winter ; great quantities are likewise caught, during the summer months, on the coast of Devonshire. To prove their value, as food, I need only quote from the Morning Herald, of March 18, 1833, the following—" During the past winter, numerous shoals of pilchards suddenly appeared in Mount's Bay. The people said it was the mercy of heaven, for they had just been wasted by the cholera, and were in poverty and despair. Six or eight thousands of hogsheads were caught. These were succeeded by a large quantity of mackarel ; so that, from the Lizard to the Land's End, every hovel was provided with a stock of *choice food* for the winter ; for such is the love of the Cornish for this kind of diet, that in a season of distress when *soup* was provided for them, they turned from it ; had it been pilchards or mackarel, said they, we should have been content !" And then, as a manure, the blood, oil, and pickle obtained in curing pilchards, are very valuable ; the product of one fish will richly dress one square foot of ground.

Page 25.—" The male bird laying an egg." This by naturalists has been called *centinimum ovum*, the hundredth egg ; by the vulgar, cock's egg, fabulously supposed to produce a serpent, which therefore obtained the absurd name of *cockatrice*, and which, with other absurdities, has been introduced by our translators into the scriptures, Isa. xi. 8. and elsewhere. It was supposed by naturalists to be the *last* egg of a hen ; it is much smaller than ordinary eggs, has no yolk, but in place of it is found a little body like a serpent coiled up, which gave rise to the fabled cock-atrice, or *cock-serpent*.

Page 32.—" The original life of vegetables is concentrated in nothing else but the *seed*." Much confusion has been created by naturalists drawing a parallel between eggs of birds, the ova of the human female, and seeds of vegetables —and between the male animal semen, and the vegetable pollen. The vegetable pollen only goes to perfect seeds, flowers, and fruits ; " the pollen on the anther giveth life to the seed contained in the germen ;" page 42 of second pamphlet, and at page 56, " the acorns of the oak are made to be *perfect seed* by the pollen." But Mr. Chevalier avers, that " before the catkin has yet opened its buds, and long before the *pollen* can have escaped from them, the little *acorns* have appeared ; even then we see the germ of our British pride developed in all the beauty of its *distinctive form*, before the consort twig hath attained maturity to aid or influence its production ! This is a fact of which any one may be easily assured, by

examining the oak, the cucumber, the gourd, or any other monœcious plant, when it is beginning to flower. We are further provided with a whole class of vegetables, the diœcious plants ; upon a female of this class, the germs of future plants, in their *characteristic form*, are annually produced. And in a monœcious plant, like the oak, the *feminine seed* or germs would be produced, although all the *males* should have been previously blighted and destroyed. And let any one tear open the unripe bud of a flower, which is not even monœcious, that of the lily or the eglantine, and he shall find, or ever the anthers have yet burst, and when *the pollen* is still a moist and unformed pulp, the rudiments of those herbs already extant within the germen or ovary *in their proper forms!* I have seen them in almost every kind of flower-bud ; moreover, their distinguishing number and specific form is introduced, as an essential part of the description of almost every genus, in all the best systematic works on botany." Then, he adds, " Sir James E. Smith gives an account of *the fruit* of the *gycas revoluta* fully ripened at Farnham Castle, on the female plant, when there was probably *no male* in England. The fruit is an eatable nut, as big as an apricot. However, Sir James observes, *that no traces of the embryo* were found in it, for want of the impregnation by the male pollen, which is produced on a separate tree. Sir James cannot assert, that any embryo exists in an unimpregnated fruit ; the note on page 14, affords satisfactory evidence, that unimpregnated female seeds *do* sometimes exhibit the embryo ; and I could have added abundant testimony to the same fact."

Now, giving Mr. Chevalier the advantage of all this, what does it amount to, but to this—that the male vegetable pollen is necessary to the perfection of *seeds*, as well as of certain fruits and flowers ? But then he carries the circumstance on to the eggs of birds, and the male semen ; as though the eggs, before impregnation, contained the *embryo-chick*, as perfectly as the *acorn*, without the pollen, possesses the germ of the future oak ; and as the *bud* of the flower does the future lily ; and as the female *gycas plant* produces its fruit fully ripened. " Among birds, it is notorious that the virgin will lay an egg ; and it has been demonstrated by Haller and Bonnet, *that such an egg contains the embryo.*" This, of course, determines the point also in relation to the human subject ; " Nay truly, from the days of Aristotle until now, there never was any doubt, that *the germ* of every living creature, that is, the *rudiment of its future body*, together with all the nutriment which the *fœtus*, and afterwards the suckling, receives, are produced from and of

the substance of the mother." Now as respects the eggs of female birds, I have demonstrated them to contain nothing at all but a fit receptacle, soil, and nutriment for the seed or semen of the male, and for the offspring of that seed or semen, the chick, or young bird. The same is also the fact in respect of the human female; the ovum in the uterus with its accompaniments, is just that to the seed of the man, which the egg of the hen is to the seed of the male fowl. And again, the ground or earth is also similarly that, to *the perfected vegetable seed*, whether of grain, or corn, or of trees, both fruit-bearers and not, or of plants, herbs, flowers, and grasses. And therefore, the fundamental error appears to me to be this, the making the vegetable pollen equivalent to the animal semen in birds, and beasts and men—and *the ova* in the females of these, equivalent to the germs of seeds, and flowers, and fruits. For from this error, that other of Mr. Chevalier springs; "the female produces the pre-existent *germ*, the future nutriment of that germ, and in short *the whole material*; the male parent endows it with a *life!*" page 22. But as he adds, "that some *fruits* will attain," in *vegetables*, "their full magnitude, although not impregnated; and as he tells us, that "among *birds* it is notorious, that the *virgin* will lay an *egg* containing the *embryo*," we might reasonably have expected some such parallel productions from unimpregnated females of the human species. But now, Mr. Knight, observing fruit-trees propagated by grafting or budding, always tending to degenerate, tried *seeds* with much success; and hence he says, "the *only* renewal of an individual, *the only true* reproduction, is by *seed*. Mr. Knight's doctrine in this respect seems now to be established." But it must be proper and perfect seed; and so no insect can propagate its species until it arrive at its last or perfect state, nor can man until he arrive at the age of puberty. It has been said indeed, that "if the seeds or kernels of the cultivated fruits be sown, under the most favourable circumstances of soil and of temperature, the *seedlings* do not produce *fruit* equal to that from which they sprang. But let it be observed, that Mr. Knight paid especial care to the production of superior *fruit*, from which to cull the very best *seed*, by which to raise superior seedlings, and not to soil and temperature alone; for "all the good fruits have been originally obtained from seeds." And when ground is newly dug up to a good depth, often it is soon after covered with several plants never seen there in the memory of man; were this often repeated it might recover certain species of plants, either lost or not yet known to botanists. But, of course, as every *bud* contains, in embryo, a plant in every respect simi-

lar to the parent, plants are perpetuated by means of these, as well as of the *seeds*; but as the seed must have a womb in some fit soil, so must the bud be inserted into a something analagous to it; and as for *bulbs*, these are buds for the earth, as buds are for the branches of trees. But buds, and grafts also, form a communication with the earth, through the medium of the tree, as efficiently as seeds, bulbs, roots, shoots, cuttings, offsets, or layers, that have direct communication with it. Some seeds show their energy by germinating, growing, and coming to maturity, only by water and a certain warmth; as mustard seed and cress sown in wet flannel or baize; also some bulbs, as the hyacinth, narcissus, and others, being planted only in water. But this element, in its ordinary state, consists not merely of oxygen and hydrogen, but of various *earths*, and mineral vegetables, and animal matters; and thus, again, are water melons sustained on water, in Asia and Africa gotten from the atmosphere alone. Now as it is with all these *germs* of vegetable existence, they possess their own several peculiarities, and only require a medium for growth, so it is with the male human semen. Thus in Lev. xviii. 20. "Thou shalt not give thy lying down to the wife of thy neighbour, *to sow seed*, to pollute thyself with her." And in Num. v. 28. for "she shall conceive seed;" it should have been, that as she is innocent, her husband shall do his duty, "and she shall *receive seed*," or "be sown," or "be seeded with seed." Compare Lev. xix. 19. and Deut. xxii. 9. and Exod. xxi. 10.

Upon grounds like these, then, my original position was, that semen was created by the Holy Spirit, by which Mary became pregnant; she became seeded with this divinely created seed. The matrix of the mother is called "the lowest parts of *the earth*," in Ps. cxxxix. 13—16.; and Eph. iv. 9.; literally the *lower* parts, *tahetioth*; the feminine of that in Gen. vi. 16., *tahetim*, the lower stories or rooms of the ark, which were to receive the living creatures of all kinds. "But,"—says a friend, "the seed of vegetables, and the semen of animals, are by no means synonymous substances; but the seed of vegetables is exactly synonymous with the eggs of oviparous animals. Pollen is equivalent to semen, and seed to eggs." And this, alas, is the sentiment of our scientific men. "Pollen,—this dust corresponds to the seminal fluid in animals." London Encyclopædia by Tegg. And the article on botany says, "if almost all animals have eggs, so have almost all plants seeds." But first; that the pollen perfects seeds, and other germs, I have shown; and thus they become *really productive matter*; as is the nature of the *matured semen of pubescent men*. The oak's perfected acorn is

its seed, which when sown in a proper soil, produces another oak ; but pollen is not *seed*, because it cannot be *sown* in the earth ; the soil cannot be *seeded* with it ; nor will it supply the place of a *bud* or of a *scion* in a branch ; nor of an offset, shoot, split, or cutting, in the earth. The date-tree yields *fruit*, and pollen for its being perfected ; and then in the ripe fruit there is seed, that is, a kernel ; and from *this seed*, this kernel, you raise another date tree ; which you may likewise do by *planting shoots* from the parent-tree. The herb yields seed, which produces an exactly similar herb ; but the fruit-tree yields fruit, say the apple ; and the *seed*, that is, the *pip* of that *fruit*, is sown in the earth, and produces another apple-tree, Gen. i. 11, 12. Nay more, Tegg's botany, in another place, confesses the very fact, thus ; "*the seed is that part of the fruit, which contain the rudiments of the future plant !*" page 409. And thus too, Adam begat fruit out of Eve by seed ; and such fruit as had seed in it for reproduction, namely, *sons* ; and the daughters were as the fit soils for this seed. And hence the cultivator of the earth, supplying it with seeds and plants, is called " a *husband-man* ;" an *aish*, or man, or husband, to the *adamah* or soil ; for so Noah is called in Gen. ix. 20. Originally, the earth was " void" or empty ; and the Creator supplied it with the essences of all the vegetable kingdom ; and then he causes this pregnant mother to *bring forth*, Gen. i. 11, 12. But the seed, in this case, was divinely sown without man's aid, and without breaking up the surface of the soil ; so that it was in a virginal or maiden state ; and its surface was ruptured only at the *birth*, when " the earth *brought forth*" her fruit. And thus this original process yields a figure of Isaiah's sign ; " a *virgin* shall be pregnant, and shall bring forth a son." See page 19 of third Pamphlet. In both these instances, the seed was not *cast into* the respective soils ; but it was *created within them* ; and therefore in neither was there any *rupture*, in order to obtain an entrance for the seed into its proper receptacle ; but by its being created there, each womb being before " void" or *empty*, now became *full*, or filled with living seed for the production of offspring ; precisely as it is expressed in the case of a seeded and pregnant woman, in Eccl. xi. 5.—" the womb of *her that is full*," or filled.











