

# LETTER V.

TO DARIUS.



**SUBJECT**—*A concise account and explanatory defence of the saints' belief in the fallen, yet sinless humanity of "The Word made flesh," fallen, because made out of or from the fallen substance of a FALLEN WOMAN, which mortal nature was not changed, till it became immortal by its resurrection from the dead. Yet was it SINLESS, because made so by the soul quickening, and body, soul, and spirit SANCTIFYING WORK, OF GOD THE HOLY GHOST; or, "Whether the conception of Christ, through the Holy Ghost, and the subsequent indwelling of the Spirit in the humanity of the Son, did CHANGE, or only SANCTIFY, that humanity? or, in other words, whether Christ received a DIFFERENT nature from that of his mother, at his CONCEPTION, or at his RESURRECTION."*

**HONORED SIR,**

**INTRODUCTORY** to my submitting to your candid and impartial examination, a brief account, explanatory of the primitive saints' faith, in the *now* disputed belief, that by the Word's being made flesh, implies, that he was so made **FROM THE FALLEN SUBSTANCE OF OUR FALLEN NATURE**; I say, preparatory to my entering more fully into this controverted point, allow me to suggest to you, as a foundation

consideration, never to be lost sight of in the present controversy, that human nature, manhood, or human flesh, is *one*, and not many; for, as Mr. Tucker says, "Though there are many human beings, there is but one human nature." Wherefore, if at any time I make use of the phrase, elect human nature, do not let it be thought for one moment, as some have insinuated is the case, that I believe in, or contend for two human natures; although I am frank to confess, and I will dare its advocates to disprove the truth of it, that such must be the case, if either Pre-existarianism, or the *ipse dixit* of the WORD's being made flesh of unfallen humanity, be true. Pre-existarians, for instance, contend, that when God said, "Let us make, human nature or man," (see Gen. i. 26) that "a real man," even created humanity, was then in existence; insomuch, that *Adam was not the first man created, but the second*; the *first man*, called by Pre-existarians the pre-existing man, being no part of the Mosaic creation; so that when Adam, the second man made or created by God, fell, there was, even after the fall, a human nature or man, which continued to stand in its pristine or unfallen holiness; so that one of these two things must follow, viz. all who believe and contend for the belief that "the Word *was not* made flesh of *fallen* human nature," must either believe in the pre-existence of Christ's human nature, before the incarnation, or they must believe, that the human nature took hold of by the Deity of the Son, received at the incarnation an absolute or created existence, inasmuch as it had no existence prior to his incarnation, any more than light had an existence prior to God's saying, "Let there be light;" and then what follows? why the Scriptures are not true, for

they inform us that all the works of *creation* were finished on the sixth day, which is false, if the *human nature* of Christ received a *created* existence four thousand years after all God's creation works are said to have been *finished*; and when God rested from his works, as the Creator of every created existence that was, or should be created; and as for the human nature of Christ having existed prior to the Mosaic creation, that is not only so ridiculous, that it shames its very abettors when they can be prevailed upon to consider the consequences to which it necessarily leads, but it destroys the belief of the incarnation altogether, there being no manhood in mere spirit any more than there is in mere matter. If there is, then angels are men; for their nature is simply spirit, and so also might a horse be a man, for there is no difference on the principles of materialists, between a horse and a man, only that one is higher trained than the other. But all such notions are unscriptural, and therefore, to be rejected, let who will patronise them. Human nature, I repeat, is one, which one species of nature never had a formal or created existence, till God created it in Adam, at the time referred to by Moses, when God said, "Let us make man;" nevertheless, that is, although human nature is one in point of essence, it is, and therefore may be, denominated *two*, in point of destiny, quite as much as there were two nations in the womb of Rebecca; in consideration of which, I hesitate not to talk and write about elect humanity, and reprobate humanity. Now, by elect human nature, I mean that part of human nature which, from eternity, even from the pure mass of creatureship, was elected by God the Father, to be glorified with the

glory *given* to the Son, as the head of the elect body, the church, the bride, the Lamb's wife, in opposition to that part of human nature which was, from eternity, even from the pure mass of creatureship, absolutely reprobated by God the Father, as "vessels of wrath, made up to destruction;" for, as the apostle saith, "Hath not the Potter power over the clay, of the **SAME LUMP** to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" Here then, an important question becomes necessary, that is, to which of these divisions did the human nature of Christ belong? was it included in the part reprobated to eternal dishonor, or was it included in the part which was from eternity elected to obtain eternal honor? That the human nature of Christ was a part of the *one lump*, from which the two vessels had their origin none can disprove; although, to preserve the sentiment of a party they may deny. It being taken for granted then, that is by all who believe in the word of God, that there never did exist, not so much as an *atom* of human nature, but what was included in the *one lump* from whence elected and reprobated human beings were set apart one from the other, as represented in the case of the two brothers, who were separated from one lump, who even, before they had done either good or evil, the one was loved, and the other hated, which words fitly represent the origin of election and reprobation; I say then, to which of these opposite classes did the human nature of Christ belong? Why certainly not to that part of human nature that was reprobated, for the human nature of Christ is universally held to be, as Dr. Watts describes it,

" Christ be my first elect he said,  
Then chose our souls in Christ our head,"

And Isaiah says, "BEHOLD my Servant whom I UPHOLD, mine Elect, in whom my soul delighteth: *I have put my Spirit upon him,*" &c. Now that it was the human nature of Christ that the Father *upheld*, and upon which God's Spirit rested, is too plain to need either illustration or defence. Paul also says, "Both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all OF ONE." Of one what? why of one nature: "for which cause, he is not ashamed to call them brethren," they being his flesh, and he being their flesh; for as I have said before, so I say now, that is, were I on my dying bed, and any one was to ask me which item of my belief I would resign; that is, would I deny my belief of Christ being God in *every sense* in which the Father is God, or would I deny my belief in Christ's human nature, as being neither more nor less, that is, in *no sense* different from my fallen nature, I must answer, that I dare not; I would not deny either, there being no way into heaven for me, if both these items in my faith are not God's truth, so that I dare as soon deny Christ's Godhead, as I dare deny the fact, that his manhood is in every sense common with mine, yea, in itself common with the human nature of Judas; only that the latter consisted of reprobated human nature, whereas the former consisted of elect human nature; one appointed unto wrath, and the other appointed to obtain salvation. So then, as that which never fell cannot inherit the consequences, or what must eventually befall the fallen, unless recovered therefrom by a power superior to that inherited by the nature fallen, so neither can an *unfallen* nature be eligible to being picked up again; in other words, both elect human nature, and reprobate human nature, must become fallen human nature, as an essential pre-requisite

to its becoming, eligible to that for which it was from eternity predestinated ; which was to show forth God's SOVEREIGNTY, or sovereign power, over the same lump of clay, to make one vessel to serve the Potter one way, and the other in another way. Here then I will venture to predicate three things ; the first is this, every atom of human nature must have concentrated in Adam, both elect and reprobate, he being the head of human nature, as human nature ; then, secondly, all human nature must have fallen in Adam, both elect and reprobate ; and therefore, thirdly, the human nature of Christ, which was taken hold of by the divine LOGOS, or God the Son, at the incarnation, must have fallen in common, with the common mass of elect and reprobated human nature ; it being *fallen*, and not *unfallen* nature, of which the woman consisted, OF WHOM the Son is said to have been *made* ; it being *fallen*, and not *unfallen* humanity, OF WHICH the CHILDREN consisted, and he is said to have taken PART OF THE SAME ; it being *fallen*, and not *unfallen*, nature, that could be *feeble* ; even as the children that were fallen, for in no other sense can it be proved true, that the " WORD" when he became flesh, became

" Drest in such feeble flesh as they,"

that is, as those who are fallen ; for let persons say what they will about sinless infirmities, this one thing is certain, which is to say, unfallen human nature, was not a feeble nature, and much less, feeble as our's, whereas the nature of Christ was in *all points* both *tried*, and *tempted*, even as our's ; but to affirm that *unfallen* humanity, is subjected in *all points*, to the same trials and temptations as is fallen human nature, is to affirm more than is true, for, according to that hypothesis, where is the difference between a

fallen nature, and an unfallen nature? besides, it is *fallen* humanity *only*, and not *unfallen* manhood, that is eligible to, or even capable of, receiving the Holy Ghost, in his operations of raising elect human nature to a state of holiness, both in body, soul and spirit, called the sanctification of the spirit; which sanctification holiness, I will contend we have IN Christ as the firstborn among many brethren, and to whose image we shall be conformed, when by the spirit of him which raised up Christ's manhood from the dead, our dead bodies shall also be made like unto his glorious body; one thing however is very certain, which is, that the members will never inherit the least covenant blessing, but what was first received from the Holy Ghost, by the human nature of Christ, as the Head, Father, Husband, and Elder Brother of elect human nature. I say again, the Holy Ghost will never do the least thing, or confer the least benefit on our nature, which was not by the Holy Ghost first conferred on the human nature or manhood of Jesus Christ, otherwise, the members, or one part of elect human nature, would inherit what another part never obtained, so that when the Son himself becomes subject, giving up all regal authority, that God may be all and all, the human nature of Christ would not be in heaven with the possession of Holy Ghost, that is regeneration, and resurrection, but only of an unfallen Adam holiness. We however, have not so learned Christ, wherefore before I proceed further with my subject, allow me to ask you the following questions? First of all then, is it a thing incredible, because impossible, and contrary to the work of the Holy Ghost, as OUR nature's sanctifier, and therefore not to be believed, that the Word should have been made

flesh, of the fallen substance of our nature, and yet to have been so sanctified by the Holy Ghost from its very conception, as to have rendered the nature thus sanctified (though in itself considered, that is in its original or mother existence, totally depraved, and void of holiness) "WITHOUT SIN," although tempted thereto from its birth, to its death, with temptations in all points like unto his brethren, or in common with all mortal flesh? Should my fierce, and findfaulty opponents insist, that such a thing is impossible, or if possible, that such was not the case with our Lord's human nature; I shall be obliged by their furnishing me with proof, and that from the Holy Scriptures too, before I shall be induced to believe them; on the contrary, should they succeed in adducing proof, to the disproof of my present opinion, I will most readily become an unbeliever, in reference to the sentiment, in which I now profess to have the most unshaken confidence. A principal reason for my urging the above question, is this, certain ill disposed persons have made themselves gratuitously zealous, in slandering my preachments on this calumniated item of the Christian faith; yes, they have run up and down among the people, without ever speaking to me on the subject, insisting, that I make Christ a sinful man, not distinguishing the wide difference that must for ever exist, between a thing being in its own nature derived from a sinful substance, and that nature being MADE (what it was not in itself considered) holy, sinlessly holy; most holy; by the setting apart, separating, or sanctifying work, quickening influences, and continually upholding power of God the Holy Ghost. But why I would ask, in the second place, should it be thought a thing incredible, and not to be believed, that a substance which was in itself; i. e.



prior to its being made, a partaker of that, which, though it did not, nor could it *change* the substance to a nature, or substance which it was not originally, as was afterwards the case with our Lord's body in the resurrection of it, by the very same power that first gave it identity of existence; for in its generation it was made a body of flesh and blood; in its regeneration it was made a body of *sanctified*, or *holy* flesh and blood; but flesh and blood, nature or substance, though so holy as to be offered to God as a lamb for sacrifice, without spot or blemish, can never enter heaven; wherefore, a change from flesh and blood substance, to a constitution which it was not, either in its generation, or regeneration, or sanctified nature, must be effected by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the resurrection, before the nature, thus raised, can be said to be, in nature, what it was not in its generation substance. But why, I want to know, should it be deemed a thing the most incredible, and not to be believed, that a nature in itself, prior to its being made partaker of that which makes it what it was not, in *itself* considered, that is holy; (forgive tautology) but, why, I demand, may not a substance, or nature (call it what you please) remain, in point of substance, after its being made partaker of that quality, I mean holiness, which in itself it did not possess, identically the same fallen nature as it was, anterior to its being constituted what it was not, in its OWN, or mother constitution? God, for instance, is said, to have sanctified, or made *holy* the seventh day, and the Jews were commanded to KEEP that day holy, which God had made holy, but surely none will be so perversely obstinate, as to insist, that because God constituted the seventh day what it was not in itself, in common with

the rest of time, which is a *holy* day, or that the Jews *keeping* it, what God had, I may say, new created this said day; I say, who will conclude herefrom, either that the seventh day was not, in itself considered, just the same as any other day, or that the sanctifying, or making holy, and preserving holy from all spot or moral taint, had deprived the day of its original nature; raising it to the inheritance of a nature diverse from the other six days: you know what I mean, independent of the difficulty connected with describing time as a nature. Look then at the *holy land*, at the *holy city*, at the *holy garments*; pray were those things constituted holy, by their being raised, by a change of nature, to the possession of a nature, which they did not inherit prior to their being made holy; or rather, did not those essences, or species of creature existences, continue to retain their real natures, as much after they were constituted most holy, as before? but suppose we bring our inquiries nearer home, and ask, in reference to our own species, as sanctified and made holy, whether their being thus made, authorizes the conclusion, that the nature thus made holy, was another, and not the same nature, as the persons sanctified consisted of, prior to their being partakers of the holy sanctity by which they become holy? The Nazarites, for instance, under the law, were to be wholly holy unto God. The word "*Nazarite*," says Mr. Cruden, "signifies sanctified, or consecrated," so that a true Nazarite, was holy unto God, from the womb to the tomb. And "were not these Nazarites," says Mr. Brown, "typical of Jesus Christ? ALTOGETHER HOLY, he was solemnly *devoted to the service of God*, (and herein with what follows consisted his sinlessness) never was he defiled with carnal comforts and pleasures, nor intoxicated with *sinful* lusts or

earthly cares : never was he defiled by irregular affections towards his nearest relations, nor polluted by his gracious connexions with men, in whom spiritual death or deadness do work :” here however it becomes me to make another inquiry, which is, did the Nazarites, under the law, not only derive their individual nature from their maternal parents, but did they not also *retain* the same although subjected to the holiness brought to them by the medium of sanctification ? And, even admitting, that the holiness of the Nazarites was legal, and not spiritual, we have only to carry our inquiries to those who are called with an *holy* calling, to be *holy* brethren “ by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost ; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour,” with many like passages, which teach us to believe, that our fallen nature, which in itself considered, is as sinful, as the human nature of either Judas or Cain, is made holy ; and yet I warrant you, a certain set of upstart, self-taught divines, of the nineteenth century, are teaching their churches, to nauseate, and repudiate, the truly orthodox and Scripture belief, that the **WORD** was made flesh, by being made man, fallen ; and not man unfallen ; founding their pious scepticism on the assumptions *ipse dixit*, that if the Word was man fallen, and not man unfallen, those Scriptures are all false, which aver that he *knew no sin*, and that though he was in all points tempted like unto us, yet it was *without sin*, overlooking the secret of the Lord, which teaches us, “ Great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh,” yes, fallen flesh, for he was made OF THE SUBSTANCE OF A FALLEN WOMAN, and thus made sin ; and yet, so holy, that in him was no sin, for he that was made of a sinful fallen

nature, was also "*justified in the Spirit,*" which was done, to use the words of a very great divine, of the last century, "by the Spirit of God, *making his human nature pure, and holy,*" which is confirmed by the continuators of Matthew Pool's Bible. Wherefore allow me to ask you one question more, and then proceed; the question is this; must not any thing or creature which is pronounced holy, have been so either in its very nature, or have been made so, from a source out of itself? Doubtless you will say, yes; Adam for instance, was inherently, that is, he was in his very substance as man, possessed of inborn, or innate holiness; how so, but on the principle, that his nature never had a moment's existence, as human nature or flesh, when it was not sinlessly holy. Then would it not be ridiculously foolish to talk of Adam being *made* holy, or *becoming* holy *by sanctification*, thus making that, which is in its very essence an existence of sinless holiness, eligible to being made that, which was inborn, or peculiar to its very nature; and is it not ridiculous to the extreme then, to talk as the apostle does about the man Jesus, being *made* holy, even without spot, *through the Eternal Spirit*, if as some teach, he was so inherently and innately, as was human nature in the *concrete*, anterior to the fall; or otherwise the human nature of Christ must have been a mass by itself, never having been consolidated with its like, and therefore, by itself possessed of unfallen holiness; not eligible to being made so, from a source, out of itself, as must have been the case, if, as the Scriptures teach, he took his manhood, or was made flesh FROM HUMAN NATURE, IN THE CONCRETE POSTERIOR TO THE FALL. That therefore, which such men as Mr. Haldane, Dr. Thompson, with the editors of the World Paper,

&c. &c. have to settle, before we can become *their* disciples, is this, did the Word, when made flesh, derive its flesh and blood nature, from the common mass of human nature fallen? If they say NO; then we must make bold to ask them, one question more; which is; could he, in that case, be made OF, or derive HIS human nature FROM THE WOMAN? IMPOSSIBLE!! But should they say YES, yet it was *holy*, and not *sinful* human nature, to which the Word became united, we shall give them a hearty cheer, as having, for once in their lives, tumbled into the truth as it is in Jesus; to which we also will say amen. But even then, we must oblige them to answer one question more, and that is, on what principle was the manhood or human nature, to which the Son of God became united, without sin, holy, harmless, undefiled, and *separate* from sinners? Was it so innately, that is, did it never exist as human nature unholy, and very sinful? or was it made *sinlessly holy*, by the regenerating and sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost? If they say the latter, then the important question with which I started is answered, in the affirmative; proving, that our Lord's flesh might be fallen flesh, and yet holy. "Christ, the Son of God," says an able writer of the last century, "was incarnate, not to espouse angels, but men; not men in their primitive *beauty and integrity*, but men under a *stain of sin and corruption*; and that not out of error or mistake," as some men espouse vile women to be their wives, "but out of choice and transcendent love, which, as early as eternity itself, delighted in the sons of men, and in time, calls and draws them into conjunction with himself." In another place, he says, "it is congruous, that a mediator should partake of the SAME NATURE with those for whom he mediates;

‘ for *A mediator is not a mediator of one.*’ Gal. iii. 20, but of more than one, and those not in amity, as God and angels are ; but at variance, as God and fallen men are. It would be a very strange thing, for a glorious angel to come down into the ranks of worms, and espouse matter ; much more admirable is it, that the very Son of God (one infinitely more above an human nature than an angel is above matter) did come down INTO OUR FRAIL FLESH, (now whether *frail flesh* and *our frail flesh* too, is fallen or unfallen judge ye) upon design, to espouse us to himself : never did love so stoop and condescend as here. God came down from heaven, and became partaker of flesh and blood, with the sons OF FALLEN ADAM. Nay, further, he himself would suffer being tempted, that he might have an EXPERIMENTAL FITNESS to succour the tempted, so that he is *consubstantial* with the Father, as to his divinity, and consubstantial WITH US, as to his humanity.” Yes, I add, insomuch that when the Son of God, in the days of his flesh, was requested by Philip to show them the Father, he, who was consubstantial with the Father as to his divinity, justly reflected on Philip, saying “ Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Philip ? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ; and how sayest thou then, show us the Father.” Now the meaning refers to the Saviour’s essence, as very God, for he was not the Father in point of personality, but in point of essence only. And on a parity of reasoning, I will insist, that the elect humanity of God’s children, now on earth, is also now seen by angels in heaven, possessing its resurrection glory, as delivered from the low estate into which it *fell*, by the fall of Adam ; such a belief however, could never, no never be substantiated, admitting that

the human nature of Christ, to which I now refer, as elect humanity, now in heaven, was not consubstantial in all points with our fallen humanity ; for had Adam never fallen, then he should never have inherited either regeneration, sanctification, or resurrection glory nor could our Lord, but by taking our fallen flesh ; but Christ did take our fallen nature, and has since carried it in its resurrection glory to heaven, where God the Father as much sees us in our head as Philip could possibly see the Father in the Son. “ A mystery great, and to be adored, as being above nature, and all human bonds,” says the noble SADEEL, “ one of the deep things of God, which are not discernible without the Spirit,” says Dr. Reynolds : “ hence,” says Mr. Pothel, “ it appears, that union with Christ, is the critical point upon which eternal life, and death depend ; upon this account the apostle exhorts us to examine ourselves in this great concern, know ye not, that Jesus Christ IS IN YOU except you be reprobates,” for in that case he is not, inasmuch as he never took hold of the reprobate part of human nature, but of that only, which he had aforetime, that is, from eternity prepared, or ordained to glory. So that while Adam was united to, and stood the head of all human nature, Christ, the second Adam, was only united to, and stood head to the vessels of mercy, called God’s elect ; wherefore my honored friend, knowing as I do, that you are a DARIUS indeed, that is, as your name implies, *one who inquires or informs himself by being “ swift to hear, but slow to speak,”* ever disposed to hear the voice of God, in direct opposition to the various voices that would insinuate themselves into your good graces, I doubt not but you will have grace to direct your inquiries, whenever TRUTH is the object of your researches ;

in this case however, you *must* say to those vile intruders, called the voice of popular opinion, the voice of party prejudice, the voice of carnal reason, the voice of sectarian obstinacy, founded on *we have a law* which is the voice of preconceived notions, too frequently backed by the voice of numbers, as if the multitude, and not the few, *must be* the voice of truth; whereas, a greater lie was never told by devils, or believed by men. To these pretenders therefore, you must deafen your ears and shut your eyes, causing them to be as dust beneath your feet, while you give yourself to searching the Scriptures, and prayer; being determined to renounce every error, however popular, and to embrace truth, however *offensive*; being persuaded in your own mind, that “*the offence of the cross has not yet ceased,*” except in places, where the offensive doctrines of the cross cease to be proclaimed, and among people who are determined on receiving nothing, as a matter of faith, that will make themselves despicable, and their opinions hateful, in circles frequented by **RESPECTABLE** Christians; whereas Darius, without undervaluing the excellencies of literature, believes, with the truly religious, and yet learned Hervey, that “the poor and unlearned, generally understand the gospel *better* than the accomplished scholar:” with what pleasure then, being persuaded as I am that such is the true the real character of my much valued friend; I say, with what indescribable pleasure, do I take up my pen to address you, on the present occasion, and the more so, from the consideration of the subject, upon which I am about to write, a subject, at once confounding to reason, because involved in unfathomable mysteries, **FOR** “Without controversy, **GREAT** is the **MYSTERY** of godliness: **GOD** was manifest in the flesh: justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gen-



tiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." 1 Tim. iii. 16. O yes Sir, to preach or write on the subject of godliness, is to preach and write, on a subject, although of all subjects ever proposed to the consideration, of either men or angels, is certainly most worthy their investigation and reception; nevertheless, it is an unfathomable abyss of TRUTH, in which all the reasonings of grave philosophy, with the literature of the literati, must be as Dagon before the ark, yes, in death like silence, they may for ever prostrate themselves, to be trodden under foot as dross and dung; the specious reasoner therefore, who is determined to believe nothing but what he can first comprehend; to inform himself, I say, on the mysteries of the gospel is impossible; he must ever stumble at the word; with how can these things be? No wonder therefore, that the doctrines of the cross should become a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, to those, who by wisdom, the most profound, can never find out God; while the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein; "the foolishness of the cross being, to them that believe, both the wisdom of God, and the power of God;" it being given *to them* to know, the mysteries of the cross, which is Christ IN THEM, that is, in their nature as fallen, the hope of glory. Now at this representation of divine truth, I find there are many taking great offence, calling it by all manner of evil names, at which I am not at all surprised, though sometimes I feel astonished at the conduct of Christians, who never seem more at liberty to talk, than when they are either lying against their own covenant, and salvation rights, or slandering those, who as ministers of Christ, are zealously defending them. But in what can such unguarded

conduct have originated? why in a want of faith, and in what does a want of faith originate? why in a deficiency of gospel, that is spiritual knowledge; wherefore, only let such persons obtain a clear and accurate account from the teachings of the Holy Ghost, by the medium of the Scriptures, of the constitution of Christ, as God-man mediator, and they will never more offend against the truth, by calling that blasphemy, which is essential to their being saved IN THE LORD. Had Jacob been better *informed* on the mysteries of providential dispensations, he would have had more faith in the God of those dispensations, but being deficient in knowledge, he was deficient in faith also, and being wanting in faith, he stumbled on, and was impatiently offended with that, on which, had he possessed more knowledge, and more faith, he would have been depending for salvation; instead of this, ignoramus like, as is the case with many of God's children in the present day, even down to old age, he was lifting up his unbelieving voice and saying, "all these things are against me," whereas, after all, it was by those very offensive things that he obtained salvation, and it is just the same in the case before me: how many of God's children are bellowing, like great boobies, or self frightened women, against the doctrine which has been preached at Zoar, in favor of the belief, that the Word when made flesh, was so made from the fallen humanity of Mary's substance; but why make all this ado? why, for the very same *reason* that Jacob rejected, criminated, and nauseated God's dispensations, that is, it is so opposed to sense and reason, yes it is so incomprehensibly mysterious, that the more I look at the subject, the more I disapprove of it. And why? but because the word is not mixed with faith, the offspring of knowledge;

no, Jacob did not, he would not be *persuaded* to believe, that all those things, so *mysterious* and confounding to REASON, could be the way, by which the angel of the Lord was to redeem him from all his troubles. And so it is now, in reference to the mysteries of God, being made fallen man, but

“ Blind unbelief is sure to err,  
And scan God’s work in vain.”

O then, let us beware of unbelief, and not less so of ignorance, which is the womb in which unbelief is conceived, and when brought forth, it does not fail to demonstrate its origin, for on every unbelieving action, and word, of which, even the godly may be the subjects, IGNORANCE of God, and his truth, is most prominently inscribed. Thomas’s unbelief in his Lord’s resurrection, proved his ignorance of the Scriptures, nor does the obstinate disbelief of our Lord’s taking human nature, of the very substance of the virgin’s nature, indicate less ignorance of the Holy Scriptures, and the true constitution of God’s Christ; yes, there are two points in particular, in reference to the Word’s being made flesh, on which too many Christians seem to be very ignorant; the first is, in reference to the real meaning of the Word’s being made flesh, that is, whether the eternal Son of God, as man, was in reality the seed of the woman, by being made flesh, of her flesh, or only called so, that is, whether he did not, in reality, either bring his human nature from heaven, or else find it as prepared by his Father, hid up in some niche in this world of dead men, where nobody knew of it but Deity; which unfallen flesh, being taken into union with the divine Word, was miraculously conveyed into the ovary of the woman, from

which it subsequently made its way, by the medium of the womb, after the manner of an ordinary birth, into a manifest dwelling among men; this, from all that I can read, and hear, seems to be the real sentiment of the present day divines; and something like this, must have been what is meant, by his being made of a woman, unless he took *her fallen flesh*, which is denied, owing to the second error to which I refer, which is ignorance of, and consequently disbelief in, the work of God the Holy Ghost, whose province it was to *prepare* the divine Word a body, or portion of human nature to dwell in; which preparation must have been a holy, a sinless preparation, and yet the nature thus prepared, remain unchanged till the resurrection. I am quite aware, that much has been said and written, both *pro and con*, on this subject, and although I am not called upon to *decide*, concerning who have kept the field wherein is the hidden treasure, called the truth, I may nevertheless, give it as my opinion, that not a few writers have rather nullified the august transaction, than either explained, or defended it. How preposterous for instance, is the dogma, which insists, that by the Word's being made flesh, nothing more is meant than that a pre-existent human soul came down, and dwelt in a body, which the divine nature had prepared to receive it, nor are their notions less ambiguous, who insist that the human nature of Christ, was some dividend of unfallen humanity, which they cannot tell where, or how, had been laid up in some hole or corner, apart from that, which fell in Adam; and that when Christ was made a man, this dividend of unfallen manhood, was brought to light, but that it was never known to have any, the most remote, community with fallen humanity; whereas, a third class, have ven-

tured to allow, that our Lord's humanity was certainly derived from the creature substance of the Virgin Mary, but then it was in such a way, as for him not to partake in any sense whatever, of her nature, as *inheriting* any quality of fallen humanity, wherefrom it was obnoxious to moral evil, although unkept therefrom, by a power superior to itself. Such however is not my opinion, inasmuch as I positively believe, that when the Word, or eternal Son of God, was made flesh, he was so made of the woman's fallen substance, as to derive from her, a nature obnoxious to moral evil, except preserved therefrom, by a power superior to itself, from which inherent properties of indwelling evil, in fallen humanity, and not merely from outward circumstances, I believe our Lord to have been, in all points, tempted like unto his people. But to dwell on the bare statement of my belief of this doctrine, is not necessary, with a view to information, my pulpit discourses, having abounded with statements of this, my faith, it being at least three if not four years, since I was first called to an account for preaching it in the pulpit, where I have of late, had more than ordinary occasion to urge it on the belief of the godly committed to my care. So that the uproar, which certain ill disposed persons have endeavored to make, about my preaching the same blasphemy, defended by Mr. Irving, amounts to a mere vapor. That Mr. Irving believes the sentiment, subjected to certain qualifications, in reference to certain points, which I may afterwards name, I do not question for a moment, but prior to the time of my being first catechised, and reprobated by certain dons *then* at Zoar, for advocating the belief, that Christ could FEEL for his tempted followers, having been tempted in all points, like unto them, which

he could not have been, but from a community of nature; I say, at that time I had only heard Mr. Irving once, and as for his writings, I had not read a page of them. Thus much I thought good to say, in disproof of the insinuation, that I have embraced this sentiment from the writings and preachments of Mr. Irving, not that I should think it a mark of ignominy to be called a learner at the feet of Mr. Irving, O no, far otherwise, it being my opinion, that Mr. Irving is both a great and good man, whose fellow for intrepidity and undisguised integrity, is not to be met with, among the evangelicals who might be better employed, than by pouring abuse on that faithful man's reputation. And as for our religious opinions, I believe they are much further afield, than is generally considered by those who would rob me of the confidence of my people, by insisting, that I am decidedly an Irvingite; whereas, I believe, and am sure, that Mr. Irving would nauseate with disgust, the very suggestion of his being an *Antinomian*; whereas my theological tenets, are Antinomian in the extreme; at the same time I am of the late Mr. Vaughan's opinion, where he says, "high respect is due to the opinions of a godly, God-raised, God-owned man," &c. and such a man I believe Mr. Irving to be; but it is neither to Mr. Irving, nor to Mr. Vaughan, though they both advocated the sentiment, in explanation and defence of which I am now writing, but to the Holy Scriptures that I would direct my friend's researches for proof of my belief, which is, that when the Word took flesh, or human nature, it was from the very substance of Mary's compound fallen nature that he derived it, insomuch that he did not merely take our sins by imputation, but by derivation, it being impossible, that the matter of the vir-

gin's impregnation, should have been conceived from any other source, than her own very self; which accounts for the apostle's saying, he bare our sins IN, not merely on, but IN; yes inhaled, if I may be allowed the expression, into his very existence, as it was impregnated from the fallen nature of the woman; for in no other way, could he have been MADE SIN, so as to bear OUR sins; and that in the very same sense (for if the nature is the same, the meaning and interpretation of the words cannot be contrary) as we do IN his body. To THIS however, it will be furiously objected, that, at the salutation, the angel declared to Mary, that "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, shall be called the Son of God" "Now how can these things be," say they, "if the descending Word, was made flesh, of the fallen substance of Mary's nature!" But what am I to understand by that holy thing, being born OF the woman? am I to understand, that the woman *brought forth*, into manifest existence, the "holy child Jesus," as having been previously, either *infix*ed, or *infused* into the woman, the substance of which infused, or infixed thing, was NO part of herself? or am I to understand it, as having reference to a substance, which the woman, previous to its being born, had received (from the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost) power to conceive, FROM THE VERY SUBSTANCE OR INDIVIDUAL NATURE OF WHICH SHE HERSELF CONSISTED? if the former, then the Saviour's humanity was not made *of* the woman, but *in* the woman, in the same way as a formed *image* might be made *in* a vessel, although the nature of the vessel in which the image was made, and the matter of which the image was

formed, were decidedly foreign to each other. If however, the nature, flesh, child, or thing, conceived by Mary, under the overshadowing influences of the Holy Ghost, was conceived or formed of, and FROM, the woman's very nature; then necessarily, it must have been formed of fallen humanity; unless Mary was a woman made up, either of two distinct natures, or ONE simple nature in TWO states; one fallen, and the other unfallen; which is a chimera hardly to be believed in, by those whose *Anti-Christian* system, could it be proved true, renders such a circumstance unavoidable. Wherefore, the first thing necessary to be settled by our opponents, is this, "Was the individual nature of our Lord, as taken into personal existence by the Divine Word, derived from the very nature of the woman Mary? If they say no, we shall urge our caveat against such unsound doctrine; but if they say yes, we shall say yes too; only with this difference, we shall contend, that when the Word took flesh, he took it just as he found it, better for worse; now, how, or in what state he found our nature, as concentrated in Mary, must be too evident to need illustration, it being proverbial, that ALL flesh had corrupted its way, prior to the coming of the Saviour; and therefore, for him to have taken up into a union existence with his divine nature any flesh then in existence, he must have taken it as it was, or not at all; and as for the objection urged against this belief, from the sayings of the angel, which is, that "that Holy One born of thee, shall be called the Son of God;" this I say is both groundless and supercilious, and only serves to show, that those who urge it do not, in this instance, consider either the power of God, or the true meaning of Scripture. Only let it be considered,



with due deliberation, why, wherefore, and in what sense, the Son of God, as born of woman, was to be called that holy thing; and the objection will vanish, like fiction before truth. Socinians, for instance, on account of the Saviour's candid acknowledgment that the Father was *greater* than he, will insist, that therefore he cannot be divine, and truly this is quite as consistent as to contend, because the Holy Ghost calls the Son of God, as born of the virgin, that Holy One, that therefore it was impossible that he should have taken his mother's fallen nature; whereas, the true state of the case is positively this, "That holy thing born of the woman, and called the Son of God," was called that holy thing, or Holy One, in a sanctification sense; it having been at the time of impregnation, prior to the woman's bringing it forth, regenerated by the Holy Ghost, as the elect's sanctifier, from its first creation, or man's natural state, to a NEW CREATION state, insomuch, that it was made an individual partaker of that holy calling, which would make Christ, in *fact*, what from eternity he had been by purpose, which is the head of the regenerate church, by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, whose unctions, and sanctifying influences, being without measure, manifested him to be the Son of God; for this unction, or sanctifying influence, of which that *thus* manifested, and *manifestively* holy thing, was the partaker, did not *constitute* it the Son of God: no, but the individual part of our fallen nature, born of the woman, was from that circumstance of unbounded sanctity to be called, because thereby identified to be, the Son of God, who should, in the fulness of time, come into the world in our nature, as the seed of the woman, being made of her as fallen, and there-

fore under the law ; so that this sanctity of character was designed to identify him, as being that promised seed of the woman which should be called the Son of God, no other individual portion of our nature being predestinated to obtain such an immeasurable quantity of divine influence, as was that holy or sanctified part which, from its union to his divine person, should be called **THE SON OF GOD** ; no other part of our nature being that part of the **ELECT** body, the church, known by the head ; it being on Aaron's head, that the oil was to be poured, that it might from thence descend in measure to each member of the body ; but who will deny, that the head and members of one and the same body are *alike* "in **ALL** points," not only prior to the unction being received, but also afterwards ; for as the apostle saith, "*they are both one,*" not two distinct natures ; if Christ therefore, as the head, received sanctity in common with his members, then he must have needed it in common with them, otherwise Christ received that for others, of which he was never made partaker himself ; but to talk of an unfallen nature, needing sanctification, and communicated holiness, is logic the most monstrous ; whereas, I am persuaded, that Christ was made partaker of sanctification, not only for others, but for himself in common with others, in which sense (it being *our* nature that was sanctified **IN** him) he became our sanctification, and we became sanctified in him, our sanctification head, as we became polluted in Adam, when he became our unholy head. "The Word," says John, "was made flesh." Now, of what I should like to ask those who deny the sentiment for which I am pleading, I say of what did this nature or flesh, adopted into personal union with the Divine Word, con-

sist? Was it a nature, either as it respects its very essence or quality, peculiar to itself, or did the descending Godhead take up a *part* of a nature, which was, prior to its adoption by Deity, common to the existence of all mankind? If the latter, the controversy ceases, there being but one species of human nature existing under heaven, at the time when the Word was made flesh, and that was human nature fallen; but if the former, that is, if the nature called the flesh, in which "*God was manifested,*" &c. I say, if the flesh taken up by our incarnate MAKER to dwell in, was a species of unfallen manhood, peculiar to itself, its likeness not being to be met with; then, from whence did the Word derive this unfallen manhood? surely not from the fallen humanity of a fallen woman. But why should I take up your time by parleying with an obstinate set of professors, who will hold their own (and truly their *own* it is, for it never came from God the Holy Ghost) brainless whim, in manifest opposition to all Scripture and plain matter of fact. To the law therefore, and to the testimony, and if they persist in being at war with this unerring standard, we must leave them to the baneful evils resulting from sectarian pertinacity. The Holy Ghost himself has told us, in reference to the Word's being made flesh, that he was thus made by a personal participation of the very SAME flesh and blood, which was, anterior to the Word's incarnation, inherited as the *essential* nature of the many sons and daughters whom the Word came to redeem and bring to glory; and this is confirmed by plain matter of fact. Was the eternal Godhead then, in the person of the SON, made flesh? he was; for what then was he made? was it not to redeem the very flesh, or human

species, taken hold of by the Divine Word in the act of incarnation? I should think it was, but this would have been altogether impossible, if that nature, which the Divine Word became united to, had never fallen; for unfallen humanity stands no more in need of sanctification, regeneration, or redemption, than does Deity itself. But who will be daring enough, in denial of all truth, and plain matter of fact, for the paltry purpose of supporting a hackneyed error, because forsooth it is sanctioned by popular opinion; I say, who is so determined in favor of an hypothesis, as to aver, that the manhood, or flesh and blood nature of Mary, did not need to be regenerated, sanctified, and redeemed? and yet, this glaring falsehood, some will even dare to tell, rather than bow to the truth, which affirms, that fallen flesh was the only nature taken hold of by the incarnate Word. The evangelists Matthew and Luke, have taken considerable pains, for the purpose of establishing our Lord's pedigree after the flesh, the first by tracing it from David down to "Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ," while the latter undertakes to establish his Lord's pedigree, by tracing it upwards, that is, from Joseph to Adam. Now to these two evangelists, we have been accustomed to think ourselves under great obligation, on account of the able manner in which they have contributed to substantiate the truth of the Christian religion. This however is all fiction, on the assumption, that Christ did not take fallen humanity; it being undeniably true, that pedigree, and oneness of nature, are inseparable; wherefore, either the Word was made flesh, by taking into union with his own personal existence, a part of the nature, of which fallen

Adam was the fallen head ; or otherwise the evangelists' controversy with infidel Jews, in defence of the generation of Jesus Christ, is sheer falsehood ; there being no oneness, or consubstantiality of essence, between the humanity belonging to Jesus Christ, and that from whence it was derived ; even the fallen substance of Mary, a daughter of fallen Adam. But the latter is not true, for the Apostle Paul in writing to Timothy, charges the latter to " REMEMBER, that Jesus Christ, of the seed (or family, and therefore of the very same nature) of David, was raised from the dead," &c. Again, in speaking of the promises in Rom. ix. 5, he says, " whose are the fathers, and of whom as CONCERNING THE FLESH, Christ came." Now although this is in perfect agreement with the generation of Jesus Christ, as given us by Matthew and Luke, it is nevertheless self-evident, that all the inspired writers, were both deceiving, and being deceived, if after all, as concerning Christ's flesh, he was not partaker of a nature, as much fallen, as was the nature of either Cain or Judas. But does not this latter assertion in particular, as some will say, militate greatly against the perfect *immaculacy* of Jesus Christ, as God-man Mediator ? and consequently, against the truth of those Scriptures, which attest, that he knew no sin, &c. &c. ? certainly not ; for proof of this, only let us refer to our own, and every real Christian's belief, in reference to the fallen humanity of every regenerate child of God. Now who will deny, for a moment, that the human nature of John the beloved disciple, was identically the same fallen manhood, as the individual humanity of Judas or Cain ; but does the belief of this militate in the least against the *holiness* of the beloved disciple, as viewed in his saintship, or

holy calling? I should think not indeed. Well then, the controversy is not, whether Christ was unholy, or holy, for the latter, no one solitary individual, writing in defence of Christ's flesh, being fallen flesh, has ever denied; on the contrary, Mr. Irving, in language that cannot be misunderstood, and that over and over again, all through his writings, has insisted that Jesus Christ, was so holy as to be WITHOUT SIN. "We hold," says he, "that it received a Holy Ghost life, a regenerate life, in the *conception*: in kind the same, which we receive in regeneration, but in measure greater, because of his perfect faith: which perfect faith, he was enabled to give by being a divine person, one of substance with the Father. The thing, therefore, which we maintain, is, that as Adam was the perfect man of creation, Jesus was the perfect man of regeneration: PERFECT IN HOLINESS, by being perfect in faith, &c. This is the substance of OUR argument, that his human nature was holy, in the only way in which holiness, under the fall exists, or can exist, is spoken of or can be spoken of in Scripture, namely, through in working or energizing of the Holy Ghost, under the direction of the Son, enforcing his human nature, inclining it, uniting it, with God; sin in a nature, is its disposition to lead the person away from God; sin in a person, is the yielding thereto. The point," he goes on to say, "between us, the precious truth for which we contend, is, *not* whether Christ's flesh was holy, FOR SURELY THE MAN WHO SAITH WE DENY THIS, blasphemeth against the manifest truth; but whether during his life, it was one with us, in all its infirmities, and liabilities to temptation, or whether, by the miraculous generation, it underwent a change, so as to make it a *different body from the*

*rest of the brethren.* They argue for an identity of origin merely; we argue for an identity of life also. They argue for an inherent holiness; WE ARGUE FOR A HOLINESS MAINTAINED BY THE PERSON OF THE SON, THROUGH THE OPERATION OF THE HOLY GHOST. They say, that though his body was changed, in the generation, he was still our fellow, in all temptations and sympathies; WE DENY, THAT IT COULD BE SO, for change is change; and if his body was changed in the conception, it was not in its life as ours is." THEREFORE, my dear Sir, without filling my paper with further quotations, from other men's works, (which, by the by, I could do, were it allowable, both with pleasure to myself, and real benefit to my spiritual reader) permit me *preparatory* to what I may hereafter propose, for your consideration, in further defence of my subject, permit me, I say, to remark, and do you, injustice both to your friend, the subject under consideration, and for your own safety, in case of further attack, by the medium of a misrepresentation of my real belief, by my slanderous and malevolent enemies; I say, note it down in your own mind, that whenever I speak of the WORD'S assumed nature, as being sinful, in common with the rest of Adam's fallen seed, or posterity, I refer to my Lord's humanity, as considered in itself, apart from the sanctification, to which it *became* heir, as the firstborn among many brethren, by the indwelling and energizing operation of the Holy Ghost; in the latter sense, it being SINLESS, without spot, forasmuch as God, in other words, the divine essence, so took charge of our Lord's regenerate nature, as to prevent the possibility of a rising *thought*, contrary to the immaculate holiness and spotless innocency of a perfectly *sanctified* nature. This, however, by no means

precludes the existence of fallen nature's temptations and liabilities to sin, in the unchanged, and therefore still fallen, though sanctified nature of our Lord—for instance, the apostle prays for the believing Thessalonians thus, “ Now the very God of peace SANCTIFY YOU WHOLLY : and I pray God, your whole spirit, soul, and body, be PRESERVED BLAMELESS, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Now who, but a downright ignoramus, or perjured person, would infer from this prayer that the apostle prays for that *change* to take place, in the bodies of the saints, at Thessalonica, which would so *disinherit* their natures of *indwelling* sin, as to introduce them into a resurrection state, and yet such *must* have been the design of his prayer, on the assumption that BLAMELESS SANCTITY, OR ENTIRE PRESERVATION from actual sin, by the indwelling influence on, and operation of the Holy Ghost, over regenerate humanity, yes in reference to every part of their compound nature, is INCOMPATIBLE with the doctrine of *indwelling* sin, and UNCHANGED, though not unsanctified nature. Now, whether this manifestly orthodox prayer, so perfectly analogous with the real sanctification, or sinless holiness, for which our whole nature in union with the divine person of the Word is so justly celebrated, in the Scriptures, I say, whether this apostolic prayer to his God was ever answered, on behalf of the persons for whom it was first offered, is of no moment in the present controversy ; one thing, however, is manifestly observable, and that is this, admitting for argument sake, that our apostle's prayer, for the Thessalonians, had been answered to the fullest extent of which the Holy Ghost was requested to answer it, even that would not have been incompatible with the belief that they would even



then have retained an *unchanged*, sin inheriting nature, ever obnoxious to the conception, perfecting and bringing forth of sin, unless kept therefrom by the upholding influences of the Holy Ghost; such liabilities, however, would have been impossible, on the supposition, that if the God of peace had SANCTIFIED them WHOLLY, by PRESERVING them BODY, SOUL, and SPIRIT, BLAMELESS, unto the coming of Christ, they would not have inherited a sinful nature; wherefore the conclusion is plain, that is to say, that our Lord, notwithstanding his *sinless holiness*, of which he was the subject through the sanctification of his nature, by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, did, independent of all his attained sinless holiness, still possess in his creature nature, that disposition which ever subjected him to temptations, in all points like unto his brethren, not only *from himself*, but from all those external objects which tempt saints in common to sin against God, and into which sins he would have assuredly fallen, as much as did David or Peter, for all his creature nature could have done, to prevent it, had it not been preserved therefrom, by the Holy Ghost's sanctification, by which alone, and not from any independent holiness of mere unfallen sinlessness, like unto the Adam state, or like unto that which alone can be possessed in the Millennium glory, or the church's reign with Christ, a thousand years on this very earth, in its new created constitution; during which reign, there will be no need of divine unction to keep the saints from falling, and that for this plain reason, there will be no occasion of falling IN their then existing nature, there will be no curse there, which is sin, indwelling in God's humanized earth, there will be no sea there, by which a Millinarian saint can

be liable to danger, either from within or without; there will be no sorrow there, because the existence of that, which even in Christ's militant state, was the cause of sorrow, will not be found to exist, that is the co-operation of indwelling sin, and outward allies, which continually tempted both Christ and all his alike tempted followers, to commit sin, during every day's warfare, in the militant state. Thus far, dear Sir, I have submitted to your consideration two particulars, the first contains a simple *statement*; the second an explanation, though very brief, of my opinion concerning the true import of the WORD'S being made flesh: the point stated was simply this, by the Word's being made flesh, or by GOD'S becoming man, we understand, and therefore believe and propagate, that the eternal Godhead, in the person of the Son, took hold of or adopted into a oneness of existence, with himself, a portion of Adam's fallen nature, which he derived from the fallen substance of the Virgin Mary, "believing," as I do, to use Mr. Irving's words, "beyond a doubt, that the eternal Son of God, in taking human nature, did as truly and literally take it of the virgin's substance, as he took his divine nature, before, all worlds, of the Father's substance," or, *as I should say, as he was in his divine nature of the Father's essence*, "and that the properties of his mother's substance, body and soul, were as much the properties of Christ's human nature, considered in itself, without reference to the work wrought IN IT by the Holy Ghost, as the properties of his divine nature, were the same with the properties of the eternal Father. In the next place, I believe that my Lord did come down, and toil, and sweat, and travel, in exceeding great sorrow, in this *mass of temptation*, with which I and every sinful man

are oppressed." But as Mr. I. further states, "men understand not this, from their not understanding, that human nature is *one* thing, which Adam possessed complete, which hath not been added to, for creation hath not been added to. It is a commonwealth of flesh and reason, or in one word, of manhood, into which many persons are sent to prove its innate vileness, and irresistible violence against God, until *he came*, whose power is the SON of GOD; it could not overcome, though it assailed him as it doth us; but he overcame it, and redeemed it from its oppressions. Now," by way of explanation, "for the end of preventing all mistake, and if possible, all misrepresentation, I count it good, thus early, to make an important distinction between sinful flesh in the *regenerate* and in the *unregenerate* state; and while I assert that Christ's flesh, or human nature was in the *former*, utterly to deny that it was in the *latter* condition, I maintain that, from his generation, his life was the Holy Ghost's life, and not the *natural* life, of flesh and blood." "The truth then is," as says an anonymous writer, "that the sin of humanity, and the work of the Spirit are two things, without which in union, men cannot, and by which united, men can rightly expound the *mystery* of perfect holiness, elicited from sinful flesh." But as I intend subjoining a few extracts, at the end of this letter, from the writings of divines, whose praise is in all our churches, I shall proceed to urge on your attention, a few of the many passages in Holy Writ, from whence I have derived the fullest assurance of faith, in the doctrinal helief, that the Son of God did verily become flesh, by taking hold of our fallen nature. Now the first of these is the sixteenth Psalm from which I do not choose to exclude a single word, much less verse, as applicable to Christ, in its most spiritual sig-

nification; there are, however, three or four considerations which must not be overlooked, in proof of the truth, for which I am contending; the first is, his praying for safety, "PRESERVE me, O God; for in thee do I put my trust," or as the learned Ainsworth renders it, "FOR I HOPE FOR SAFETY in thee." Now what saith the apostle, why that "we are *saved by hope*," but then salvation supposes liability to danger, and so hoping in another, supposes, that we do not possess the thing hoped for, in ourselves. Now the thing hoped for, by our Lord, was salvation, from all liabilities, which salvation was so consummated in him, as it is in all his members, by the resurrection of his fallen nature, which, in death, was sown in weakness, but raised in strength," &c. &c. See 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; at which period, and by which salvation transaction, on behalf of Christ's fallen nature, by the energizing influences of the Holy Ghost, death was swallowed up in victory, and the Devil's works in our fallen nature destroyed; how sweetly is this illustrated by the sayings of Paul, and Peter. Paul writing to Timothy, speaking of GOD, saith "who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to OUR works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was GIVEN US IN CHRIST JESUS BEFORE THE WORLD BEGAN; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought LIFE and IMMORTALITY to light through the gospel. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10. Now in what respects has the gospel brought life and immortality to light, but by revealing to us what Jesus Christ, as God manifested in *our* fallen flesh has done, which is, *abolished* death; but if this was not done in our fallen nature it never was done, it being impossi-

ble to abolish death from an unfallen nature, inasmuch as death could never have been inherited, but by a nature fallen; again, could such a thing have taken place in an unfallen nature, it not being done in a nature circumstanced like our own, no hope whatever could have been derived therefrom, whereas Peter makes it a matter of thanksgiving, "that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance*" (the very opposite of that which we have as children of fallen Adam) "incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. i. 2, 3. All this *hope* however, would be nothing but the hope of the deluded hypocrite, and self righteous pharisee had not Christ by his resurrection brought over prior fallen nature into newness of existence, and thus

" Made our standing more secure  
Than t'was before we fell."

" For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, but every man in his own order: CHRIST THE FIRST FRUITS; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." There were certain persons however among the Corinthians, who denied the resurrection of the dead, and well they might, allowing that they disbelieved the truth of Christ's having existed, when on earth, in fallen manhood: the apostle himself declaring, that mortality, and death must precede a resurrection; now if Christ's body was not mortal, it could not have died, for to talk of that, which is in its own nature immortal, dying, is to talk nonsense. "THOU FOOL," says the apostle, without mincing the matter, "that which thou sowest, is not quickened, except it die. And

that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body THAT SHALL BE," &c. Wherefore, for Christ to have risen, he must first have died; yes say some, he did die as a substitute we fully admit, but not as mortal, this however is vague; the question is not, whether he died as a private person, or a public person, simply considered, but could that which was in its own nature immortal die? certainly not. Well then, unless Christ's nature was mortal, he would have been ineligible to the work of a substitute, forasmuch, as the surety must be able to meet the utmost of the law's demands on his behalf, for whom the surety volunteers his services; now Christ, as God, did from eternity, engage to meet the exigencies of his people, as fallen, even to the redeeming them from the fall; then to do this, he must have engaged to take their fallen nature, in which he was in every way eligible to meet the liabilities of this nature, in every point in which it might be attacked, either from indwelling sin, out dwelling circumstances, the Devil's temptations, or God's righteous law; wherefore "Take me, and let these whom I represent go their way," was well understood by God the Father, personifying justice on the behalf of essential Deity, while the Son, could with propriety, say, take me as fallen human nature, sued by justice for the payment of the debt contracted by the fall: God says, "He will by no means clear the guilty;" what then is to become of God's eternally beloved and chosen people? seeing, they in common with the rest of mankind, fell and became guilty as a nature in Adam; must they all perish, and go to hell? no, certainly not; God must put them in a way whereby they shall clear themselves, but how was this to be effected? seeing Milton says, and justly so too, that man

“ To expiate his treason hath nought left,  
 But, to destruction sacred and devote,  
 He with his whole posterity must die.  
 Die he, or justice must; unless for him  
 Some other able, and as willing, pay  
 The rigid satisfaction—death for death.”

Now, had the immortal bard left off his versification here, he would have left his subject wrapped in opacity the most obscure; it being altogether impossible, absolutely considered, for any being to die but man, and man as fallen too. God is a spirit, and therefore could not die; angels also, being immortal, were equally ineligible to

---

pay

The rigid satisfaction—death for death.”

Wherefore, for either God or angelic spirits, however willing, to be able also, to pay the rigid satisfaction, they must become MORTAL; therefore

“ Say, heavenly powers, where shall we find such love!  
 Which of you will be MORTAL, to redeem  
 Man's mortal crime, and just the unjust to save.  
 Dwells in all heaven—Charity so dear?”

Now Sir, is it not evident from these lines, that Mr. Milton understood the doctrine of the incarnation, as involving the fact, for which I, with my superiors, are called horrid blasphemers? which is, that the immortal nature, whether creature or Creator, that would undertake man's redemption from man's mortal crime, must itself become mortal. Now how was this to be done but by taking the very nature which was to be redeemed, and that as found in a state, eligible to its becoming a redeemed inheritance, which must be a fallen state; for to talk of redeeming from fallen crime, that which was unfallen, is to talk more brutish than mere ignorance is capable of, wherefore it must be knavishness itself, to persist therein. Again, for either angels or Deity

to become mortal, it must be by becoming man fallen, and not man unfallen; mortality having ever been considered the effect of the fall: this is admitted, I believe, by our greatest opponents, so then, when the Son of God is represented by the same poet, as saying on fallen man's behalf,

“ Behold me then, me for him, life for life  
I offer, on me let thine anger fall,  
Account me man; I for his sake will leave  
Thy bosom, and this glory rest to thee  
Freely put off, and for him, lastly DIE.”

I say, the Son of God must here be understood, as freely offering to become *mortal*, and therefore to become *fallen*, that, as a mortal man, he might die. I have dwelt longer on this point than I intended, but I hope I have not detained your attention in vain, it being more important to understand one foundation consideration, than a hundred collaterals. Now the point here advocated, which is, whether the Word, in being made flesh, must not have been made mortal flesh, seeing his object in being made flesh was to die, I say this is a foundation consideration, which being substantiated, it matters not whether we write little or much subsequently; the truth of Christ's taking up fallen manhood, being for ever demonstrated, beyond all contradiction. Wherefore, seeing the Son of God prayed for salvation, night and day, during his life, which an unfallen nature would never have done, **FALLEN NATURE ONLY BEING POSSESSED OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF BOTH GOOD AND EVIL**, I believe him to have taken my fallen nature, which nature also shrank from death, and yet rejoiced at the prospect of being raised again, and that, not to a state of being, the greatest comforts of which should be marred, by the thoughts of unavoidable death, coming like an armed man, of which man, in an unfallen state,



could have no more dread than can risen humanity, or there must have been bondage in Eden; I say the Lord Jesus rejoiced at the thought of his being raised from the grave, the house prepared for ALL *flesh*, (but not as unfallen flesh, any more than hell could be the house of the reprobate, as unfallen) to a state of immortality, and the apostle rejoiced, at the hope of immortality given to the followers of Jesus, from the circumstance of their Lord's resurrection, and therefore, I do again conclude, that Christ must have been made in all points like unto his fallen brethren, when as GOD, he became man, for he had no brethren, whose nature was not fallen. Nor am I a little grieved in my spirit, to think of any man's calling himself a Christian, living in disbelief of it; oh, who can read the Scriptures, believing them to mean what they predicate, of Christ and his sayings, and not see that nothing short of the SON's becoming fallen man, could have enabled him to say "*I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people. I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death.*" Do pray read the whole of the twenty-second Psalm, and see if there is one word therein, that was not applicable to the Son of God, as made man, and then say, whether the language, therein found, sounds like the language of a nature fallen, or unfallen; could unfallen nature be brought into the dust of death? Again, who will dare to say, that the whole of the fortieth Psalm, does not exhibit both Christ's circumstances, and sayings, but who will be so foolish as to imagine unfallen manhood, saying "I WAITED

patiently for the Lord, &c. and he brought me up also OUT OF AN HORRIBLE PIT, OUT OF THE MIRY CLAY, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings." Again, "Withhold not thou thy tender mercies from me, O Lord: let thy loving kindness and thy truth CONTINUALLY PRESERVE me, for innumerable evils have compassed me about: MINE INIQUITIES HAVE TAKEN HOLD UPON ME, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of my head: therefore my heart faileth me. Be pleased O Lord to deliver me; O Lord, make haste to help me." Now what help or deliverance an unfallen nature can need, I must leave my opponents to explain, but surely they will not say, from the penal sufferings of the cross, as made a surety, nor yet merely from the attacks of external foes, for on these attacks depended his glory, as victor over all that might encounter him, for said he, "who is mine adversary? let him come near to me." What deliverance then was it that the SON of God prayed for? why to be kept from falling into sin to be sure, for proof of this, read every word of the fifty-sixth Psalm, in particular the third, and last verse, "what time I AM AFRAID, I will trust in thee, for thou hast delivered my SOUL FROM DEATH: wilt not thou deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before God in the light of the living:" besides, what is the meaning of these precious words? "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness; according to the clearness of my hands, (actions) hath he recompensed me For I have kept the ways of the LORD, and have not wickedly departed from my God, I was also upright before him, and I KEPT MYSELF FROM MINE INIQUITY." Now what iniquity an unfallen nature could be possessed of, I know not, but

perhaps it will be said, that they are the words of David, and I admit they are, but not in reference to himself, for David had not kept himself from HIS iniquity, for he wickedly departed from his God, and became a most awfully fallen saint. The Son of God however, never sinned, but kept himself from the inherent iniquity of his fallen flesh, by living a life of faith on the word of his Father, so that when the Devil tempted him to sin, telling him at the same time, of the promise, "Because thou hast made the Lord which is my refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." See the rest of the Psalm, I say when the Devil tempted the Son of God to sin, dastardly referring to this Psalm, there were three sins, which the Devil wanted the tempted Saviour to fall into, the first was pride, the second was presumption, and the third was murder, the tempter however was overcome by being told of another Scripture, where it is said, "thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," by which conscientious adherence to the statutes of his God, the tempted Jesus kept himself *unspotted* and *innocent* from his iniquity. But admitting, as some would insinuate, that the Son of God had no inherent foe to tempt him, I mean such as innate pride, presumption, and liabilities\* to secret sin, then of course his temptations to sin, were not to be compared with the temptations of his people, for it

\* Seeing that our nature in its unfallen Adam existence was liable to sin, I cannot tell on what principle modern divines found their assumptions, in contradiction of the Saviour's liabilities, if unkept therefrom by the power of the Holy Ghost.

must be allowed, not only that a man's greatest foes, are those of his own house, but that a man's greatest temptations, are those which proceed from his own fallen nature, or heart; whereas, I believe it was from indwelling infirmity, peculiar to fallen manhood, that the Saviour became, in the strictest sense of the word, "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," so that his countenance became more marred than any man's; yes, it was internal conflict, occasioned by fallen manhood's coming in contact with objects of external enticement, or the suggestions of all manner of horrid blasphemies against God, and all that was good, which made the Saviour cry so often through fear, of which, he was so manifestly the subject, I say it was this that made him cry to God with strong cries, and tears, as to him that was able to save him. Isaiah says, "Surely he hath borne OUR griefs, and carried OUR sorrows." This however would have been impossible, except he was of *our* nature, as fallen, for *our* griefs and *our* sorrows, as inhabitants of a fallen nature, can never be carried by a person existing in unfallen manhood; the latter however we know, and are sure was not the case with the blessed Jesus, for he was in ALL POINTS tempted like unto us, yes, "He took OUR infirmities, and bare OUR sicknesses;" "this passage of the prophet Isaiah is expressly referred to the Messiah, by the *Targumist*, who renders, "surely he will pay for our sins;" &c. In the *Talmud*, is this remarkable passage—"what is the name of the Messiah?" Some said LEPROUS; according to that, "surely he hath borne our sicknesses," &c. "And Messiah sitteth in the gate of the city, and by what sign may he be known? He sitteth among the diseased poor." It is also said in *Zohar*, that "ALL THE DISEASES, ALL THE GRIEFS, and all the punishments, due to Israel,

shall be borne by him." "Christ fulfils the prophecies in all respects, and is himself their completion." See Bagster's comprehensive Bible. The Apostle Paul says also, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit, that dwelleth in you." Now had not the Son of God had a mortal body, as well as those believers to whom this precious promise was made, then I say, there would have been no sameness whatever between the head of the body and its members; but understanding, as we must, that the Saviour's body was quickened from mortality to immortality, we can see *also* the ground of hope afforded to the sanctified in Christ Jesus, concerning *their* bodies being quickened *also*. I am surprised therefore, how any man, calling himself a Christian, can like, as far as he has power, to invalidate this hope of Christianity, by insisting that Christ's body was not mortal, and it is most certain it was not, if it was not fallen; and if not fallen, and not mortal, then quickening is all a farce; yea, and death too, for a body must be either mortal or immortal; if the latter, then death was impossible; for that which is immortal can never die; but Christ's body did die, consequently it must have been a mortal body, needing to be quickened to newness of life, in common with all fallen humanity. "Forasmuch then, as the children are made partakers of *flesh* and *blood*, he *also himself likewise* took part of the same; that through 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 lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. 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 himself being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." Now, how foolish it would be for me to ask, whether the children's flesh and blood, mentioned by our apostle, was fallen flesh and blood? and yet such a question must be asked; for in having this question answered, we need ask no more questions, nor trouble ourselves to answer any more of the foolish quibbles, about whether the Son of God took fallen or unfallen nature; for whatever was the state of the children's nature, such was the condition of the nature in which the Word was made flesh, for he took part of **THE SAME**, and that for these reasons, such a nature only being compatible with a life of grace, which implies regeneration, faith, hope, and charity, none of which, in the sense made use of them by the apostle, that is in a spiritual sense, being existencies, or properties of unfallen flesh and blood, these being new covenant blessings, whereas unfallen manhood inherits nothing but what the creation covenant had to bestow; besides, unfallen flesh and blood can know no more of fallen flesh and blood temptations, than unfallen manhood can know of the grace of contrition, spiritual joy, and godly sorrow for sins forgiven, insomuch, that allowing for a moment that our Lord was not partaker of our fallen nature, neither could he be of our temptations, our godly sorrow, or the spiritual joy of our reconciliation; in a word, he could neither weep with those who weep, nor rejoice with those that rejoice, in which case his character as High Priest would be destroyed.

My friend, there are a thousand other passages in Scripture to which I might refer your attention

in further illustration and confirmation of the sentiment, in defence of which I send you this letter; but it will be time enough for me to extend my defence, when its present contents and arguments have been overturned by my unbelieving opponents from the Holy Volume, from whence my defence is principally derived; two things however are most certain; the first is this, no holiness but regeneration holiness can enter heaven, for saith the Saviour, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" wherefore except the Saviour's holiness, on account of which we contend with Paul, that "HE KNEW NO SIN," and with John, that "IN HIM WAS NO SIN;" I say, if this SINLESS HOLINESS was not SANCTIFICATION HOLINESS, produced by the work of the Spirit, and not holiness peculiar to Adam's nature holiness, prior to the fall, which was but natural, then the Son of God, as man, cannot be in heaven; for NO MAN, if the Scriptures are true, can go to heaven, but in the new creation holiness. The second fact is this, regeneration, or the Spirit's sanctification holiness, being as far superior to Adam's holiness, as the final glory of saints will be superior to the glory and happiness of the Eden state, it must be more worthy of Christ, as head of the spiritual creation, to be the subject of spiritual, or regeneration holiness, than it would be for him to be the subject of the unfallen Adam holiness; besides, to have it otherwise, he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, would not be one, the head would inherit the mere moral holiness of unfallen manhood, while the members would possess the more glorious regeneration and resurrection holiness. Such however was not the case; the Holy Ghost, who was

the Son of Man's sanctifier, having assured the church, that it was not by the WORD'S taking unfallen manhood, but "THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT," that HE, Jesus Christ, "offered himself WITHOUT SPOT to God;" wherefore, if it was through the Holy Spirit, as his sanctifier, that Christ was WITHOUT SIN, though tempted in all points like unto his brethren; if it was through the Eternal Spirit's sanctifying influences, that he, who was made sin, by being made man, KNEW NO SIN; if it was by the Holy Ghost's holy sanctity, communicated to a nature eligible to the grace of sanctification, that in Christ was NO SIN; again, seeing that it was through the Eternal Spirit, that Christ offered himself WITHOUT SPOT to God, then of NECESSITY, to say nothing about a parity of reasoning, I say then of necessity, his being tempted in all points, yet *without sin*, with his being made sin, who *knew no sin*, and his offering himself *without spot*, could not refer to an *unfallen nature holiness*, but a regeneration, or second creation holiness, of which Christ, as the head of his spritual body the church, was made to partake, in the very same way, and from the very same source and agency, as are all his mystical members, who were PREDESTINATED TO BE CONFORMED TO HIS REGENERATION AND RESURRECTION IMAGE. Here, then, I might end what I have to offer, although "I am quite aware," to use the words of Mr. Drummond, "that to all who are unused to the contemplation of these subjects, much that has been advanced would require far more extensive elucidation, to render it perspicuous," at least, so far as copious prolixity has the advantage, in point of elucidation over studied brevity. It is a great gratification to me, however, to be able



to inform you, that if you wish to see the controversy *logically* handled, I can recommend to your notice three works, in which the points herein so briefly stated, are more ably and copiously defended; the first is, "The Morning Watch," the second is, Mr. Irving's excellent work on "The Human Nature of Christ," the third is an anonymous publication, called "The Word made Flesh," &c. Wherefore I shall now conclude my letter, by subjoining, according to my promise, a few extracts from authors, whose testimony, as divines, merit both attention and credit; the last mentioned author, for instance, begins his preface with the following pertinency, both of style and matter, "BEING satisfied, that unscriptural views on the subject of our Lord's incarnation, are peculiarly dangerous, because it is the great object of faith, and involves in it the whole work of redemption; and being no less satisfied that at present, the most unscriptural views do prevail, on the subject, I feel myself called upon, amid the silence of many who ought not to be silent, to state and support the orthodox faith in the matter. It is this—that, in the fulness of time, the Holy Ghost did, under the will of the Father, and with the free consent of the Word, prepare, as a *holy body* for the latter, the substance of fallen humanity;—that this fallen humanity being in the virgin, united to, not mixed with the Word, did constitute, under the personality of the Word, one new and compound, yet single person, Christ Jesus,—who, by the complete sanctification of his fallen humanity, through the Spirit lived, willed, worked, and suffered, in perfect and ABSOLUTE HOLINESS; until, being quickened from the grave by the same Spirit, and under the same will, he sat down at the right hand of God on

high, *no longer* with a humanity fallen, mortal, or corruptible, though sanctified in birth, life, and death; but with a humanity changed into glory, inherently pure, immortal, and incorruptible. Such is the doctrine; but such is not the picture of it given by its opponents; they call it the doctrine, that our blessed Lord dwelt in a sinful nature, and not in a fallen nature, *kept from all sin*, in will or deed; that his humanity rebelled against God, and not that it was continually prevented from rebellion of any kind, or in any degree;—that his was a dubious purity, and doubtful allegiance, not a perfect separation from sinners, and delight in the law of God; and that, instead of his offering to God a sacrifice, made by the Spirit, from out pollution, either his sacrifice was all but a deserved infliction, or else God was well pleased with sin.” Again he says, “THERE is a fearful heresy abroad on this vital topic. The body is apparently on the eve of disavowing her unity with the head; the saints incline to do without an elder brother; and many a faithful one now fears or fails to confess the basis on which he truly stands. The truth, regarding our Lord’s literal humanity, is a doctrine of the Holy Ghost. There are in Jehovah three persons, Father, Word, and Spirit—one essence—that when the Word became flesh, he became man; which manhood did, and does consist of, two parts, a human body and a human soul, included under one designation—flesh; that, in doing so, his Godhead, becoming united, not confused with this bipartite manhood, did constitute for ever the compound and single person, the incarnate Word or Son of God; and that, in this new person and character, as he is now made perfect, so also, from the moment of his con-

ception, to the moment of his death, he neither willed nor worked at variance, in the very least, with the will and redeeming purpose of God. The question then remains—What was the method of his holiness, of his sacrifice for, and of his purchase of the saints? If Scripture says no more than that he was holy, offered a sacrifice, and hath bought us; then accursed and Satan-bred were the desire to know more; for although the Spirit knoweth, and so by his indwelling can cause the spiritual man to know all things, the man's ALL, means but the all revealed; the all revealed lies in the Bible. Now, the Word either took our humanity, or took no humanity at all; for a humanity not human is a contradiction. Well, admitting that he took humanity, and not something else, and that humanity had, at his incarnation, never been in any but one of two states—fallen or unfallen—the question arises, which did he take? Not unfallen; for he was the Son of David, the seed of Abraham, the seed of the fallen Eve,—a very Jew in the flesh, and as no creature was his father, must have been so, through the inheritance of the substance of his mother, a fallen and sinful woman. Therefore fallen. Now, if the humanity of the Word was taken in its fallen state to be first upheld and then redeemed; *how* was it so? it was fallen, mortal, sinful flesh. It would have continued to be so, unless upholden; and the fact that it was upholden from the moment when the Word became flesh, it is so far from being at variance with this, that it pre-supposes it. We know that the humanity of Christ never willed or acted sin, from first to last. We also know, that fallen humanity must will and act sin, therefore we know that his humanity was upholden. But how? *Mr. Irving, I reply, shall*

*answer.* “Holiness is of two kinds: the one belonging to the creature in its creation state, as it came forth from the hands of the Creator; the other belonging to the creature in its fallen state as it is upheld by the Son and energized by the Holy Ghost. Of the former mention is made in Scripture in such passages as these: “God made man in his own image, after his own likeness; and God saw every thing which he had made, and behold it was very good.” “This only have I found, that God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions.” Of the latter it is spoken in such passages as these—“RENEWED after the image of God in RIGHTEOUSNESS and TRUE HOLINESS;” “He that is born of God sinneth not; for his seed abideth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God;” “That holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.” Holiness in all the Scriptures except in the few passages where reference is made to the creation state, is a work of the Holy Ghost in the fallen constitution of things; but if Christ was not in that constitution of things how should holiness be predicated of him also, in the very same places and in the very same words in which it is predicated of his people, seeing the same words in the Old and New Testament are used indiscriminately of him and his members, one of two things must be true, either that his members are also brought into the creation state of Adam, above the fall, while they are still in the world, which no one asserts; or, that Christ’s holiness was, like their’s, wrought in the fallen creature, by power of the Holy Ghost!” &c. *Again,* “a man who is united to Christ, is spoken of as holy, and as not being able to sin, because he is born of God, through regeneration of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit, in uniting us to

Christ, gets us that holiness IN HIM, which, flowing into us, as the blood of the mother into the child, as the sap of the tree into the branches, doth make them holy and righteous, prolific of all good fruit, possessed of a life which ever beats in harmony with God. This is the only method of holiness, under the fall; holiness in Christ's body; and out of it, holiness is there none. I may say, that the whole of John's first epistle, is to teach this one truth of OUR BEING HOLY, BY BEING IN HIM; and no otherwise are we holy." But, as Mr. Irving asks, "how could he be the head of the regeneration, if no regeneration was accomplished in him? It is not *I, myself*, that live a new life, but Christ that liveth in me. I am *made* willing, I am *made* obedient, by him of whom I am *made* a member; HIS person, NOT MINE, hath the glory. It is "God that worketh in me, to *will*, and to do of his good pleasure." If this be the orthodox doctrine of regeneration, then cannot Christ be the resurrection head, otherwise than by being in the same state, by being holy through the same means, as I assert he was: the first, the complete regenerated man, unto the end of being exalted to become the head of the regenerated ones. This completely sets aside the reasonings of those, who would lay a great stress upon the expression used in the salutation, "the holy thing, born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." For unless *holy* here were used in a different sense, than in the rest of the New Testament, where it is continually applied to the regenerate, '*the saints*,' '*the holy ones*,' unless a new import altogether were given to it, which hath had no reality in the world since Adam fell, it cannot be otherwise understood than as sanctified by the Holy Ghost. And why it should be called the

*thing*, and not the person, is because the *thing*, and not the person was sanctified. We hold that *it*, even *it*, was a *thing*, MADE holy from its conception, and *kept* holy by the same power which *made* it so, through the incidents, and trials, and endurances, of a whole life. When any man will find in my writings upon this subject, a passage capable of being even *tortured* to mean that there ever was a time when Christ's flesh was not *made* holy by the Holy Ghost, in the hands of the incarnate Son, I will arraign myself of heresy, and submit to the utmost penalties of the church; nay, I would myself arraign of heresy any member of my church, or co-presbyter, who should deny the *holiness* of Christ's flesh; and I would do the same by any one who would obstinately and *perversely* maintain that it was so, otherwise than by operation of the Holy Ghost." Wherefore "the question is, WHETHER THE FLESH OF CHRIST HAD THE GRACE OF SINLESSNESS FROM THE HOLY GHOST, OR FROM ITSELF?" why from the Holy Ghost; this I am happy to say, Mr. Irving has proved beyond all possibility of disproof, nor would I give up the belief of it for ten thousand worlds, knowing as I do that a regenerate church without a regenerate head is too anomalous to be allowed an existence, in that body where in every point, he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified are *one*, yes, one in nature which was once one in an unfallen state, then it became *one* in the fall and afterwards one in regeneration holiness; whereas admitting, (which I will not for one moment no not for a second) that when the Word was made flesh, he was not made flesh of the woman's *fallen* nature, but that the Word's manhood consisted of *unfallen* manhood, I say, if this be correct, "God's love

is proved only to human nature, in that better form of it which Christ assumed; it has not come so *low* as *our* state, and therefore we have no ground of hope, but rather the reverse." Such a notion however, is at war with the Bible which testifies that the Godhead, in the person of the Son, has through the Eternal Spirit, remembered *us in our* low estate, that is, in our fallen state, and that by redeeming our natural, or fallen Adam, life, from destruction, crowning the same nature which the Godhead became covered with, even our fallen nature, with loving kindnesses and tender mercies. Watts says

"He wrapped his GODHEAD in a veil  
Of OUR INFERIOR clay."

Now surely by OUR INFERIOR clay, he must have meant our fallen nature, yes

"Down from the shining seats above  
With joyful haste he fled,  
Enter'd the grave in MORTAL FLESH,  
And dwelt among the dead."

Now if his flesh was *mortal*, then it must have been fallen, for as I have before proved, mortal flesh is fallen manhood, and this indeed is the meaning of the words, man, enosh, flesh. Dr. Hawker fully substantiates this in the following comment of his on John i. 14, "The Word was made flesh," &c. "If," says the doctor, "there be a single verse in the Bible marked with the emphasis of God the Holy Ghost, surely this is one; every word tells. Here is the glorious person so much and so highly spoken of before under the name of the WORD, declared to be MADE FLESH, and this distinct from the person of either the FATHER or the HOLY GHOST. It is

the SON of God only. He is made flesh. The original word, translated *flesh*, is very strong; it is *sarr*, the same word as is used in Rom. iii. 20, where no flesh is said to be justified; and elsewhere, Christ is said to be made in the likeness of SINFUL flesh, Rom. viii. 3; and it is a word of the same *significancy* with one in the Hebrew, used in Gen. vi. 12, CORRUPT flesh, so that no word of stronger *import* can be found to denote the *vast humiliation* of the SON of God, in the assuming of OUR nature. Had the verse expressed that the WORD was made MAN, though the same nature would have been implied, yet it would not have been so strong, *as to the point of degradation*. The word means our full nature, both of soul and body, complete man; and is so very fully expressed by the word *flesh*, that the assumption implies the most perfect union of both the natures divine and human; not by any change or alteration of the one by taking the other; but by the junction forming and constituting *one* whole person. God and man mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ. As Augustine hath happily expressed it, when speaking of the Word being made flesh. "Not," said he, "by changing what he was, but by taking what he was not." Nor is Matthew Henry less full in his comment on the same passage, "He was made flesh; flesh speaks man weak, and he was crucified through weakness. Flesh speaks man *mortal* and dying." Yes, says Toplady, in the words I have elsewhere quoted—

" HE took up a life, to be able to die."

"Wonder at this," continues Mr. Henry, "that the Eternal Word should be made flesh, when flesh was come into such an ill name; that He,



who made all things, should himself be made flesh, one of the meanest of things, and submit to that from which he was at the greatest distance."\* Wherefore, says Mr. Scott, "*the holiness and obedience of our Saviour, his miraculous powers, and the supports given to his human nature, are constantly ascribed to the Holy Spirit, with which he was anointed without measure.*" See Scott on Heb. ix. 14, or Morning Watch, page 135. Nor can any one contradict, except for contradiction's sake, the truth of Mr. Scott's remarks. But such would not have been the case, had the flesh or manhood, embraced by the Eternal Word, been *unfallen*, for unfallen humanity being holy in itself, can be obedient in all holy obedience, *without the sanctification of the Holy Ghost*; otherwise, Adam was incapable of holy obedience in his pristine glory. "The term flesh," says Mr. Goode, "implies first, that the body which the Saviour assumed, was in all things like ours; and was to pass through the very same stages of existence. It implies secondly, the weakness and infirmities of a *mortal, dying nature*; and to this also my Jesus condescended. 'Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses.' Certain we are, that the body which the Lord Jesus assumed, was equally liable as ours to all the sorrows and sufferings of sin, and to all the *diseases and infirmities of our fallen nature*. 'He took not on him the nature of angels,' this had been great condescension: nor of Adam in his paradisiacal glory, this had been still greater; but he condescends to be-

\* Query, was the human nature of Christ at the GREATST DISTANCE from his divine nature, admitting, that the former was human nature *unfallen*? If it was, must not the same distance from God, even in the superlative degree, have marked human nature in its pristine glory?

come LIKE US. And as Jesus became like us, we shall soon become like him. He took *our nature* to the throne, and glorified it; as a pledge, that it should not always remain in this *miserable state*, but that through HIS debasement, IT should be exalted; through his sufferings, it should be glorified.\* On the contrary, "if the very same nature as ours, has not prevailed in Christ, over sin and death, we cannot be sure of prevailing: for if it differ from ours, in any respect, that difference may have been the cause of victory; and we, wanting it, may well fear a defeat: if fallen humanity have not risen from the dead, our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins. 1 Cor. xv, 14. The triumph of a better armed combatant, is no pledge of victory to us: he must have fought in the same lists, and armed with the same weapons as his followers, to call upon them to enter boldly after him. Just to that degree, in which our opponents maintain that our Lord's human nature differed from ours, in the same degree do they negative the possibility of our salvation. If our fallen nature was too vile to be taken into union with Christ, in the days of his humiliation, how can we, in our fallen natures, be united to him in his present glorification? They fear, lest it should seem a degradation of our Lord, to suppose such a nature as ours, taken into union with the Godhead; and yet they *profess* to believe, that Godhead is brought into union with our very fallen nature, by the dwelling of the Holy Spirit, in us; if this be no degradation to the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, how is the other a degradation, to the Godhead of the Son?† But that the Godhead of the Son did participate in the manhood of fallen

\* Goode, on the Names of Christ, from the Morning Watch.

† Morning Watch, page 116.

men, ought to be allowed by all, who allow him the title, by which the Saviour so frequently referred to himself, in the days of his flesh; I mean *the Son of Man*, which he would not have been, had he not derived his human nature from pre-existing manhood, much less could he have been "IMMANUEL; *truly with us, with us as men; with us as sinful men; with us IN ALL THINGS.*" He the head, and we the members, we in him, and he in us, which terms are so expressive of the oneness of nature, and condition, between our anti-typical Joseph and his brethren, that though they may be disliked, and denied, they cannot be disproved. Let it be otherwise, and then, as Mr. Irving says, "He is not capable of being a high priest to *me*, which standeth in this very thing; that in ALL things, he was likened to his brethren." Whereas, allowing for a moment, that he was not flesh of my flesh, then "he had only *two* of my enemies to contend with, the Devil and the world;" while I, poor wretch, am a greater man of sorrows, and more acquainted with grief, than was my incarnate *head*, for I have a third, and that by far the greatest enemy, and source of sorrow, marking my militant warfare, than fell to the lot of the captain of my salvation. Again, "he never was one with me, and I know not how I can ever be one with him," whereas, Dr. Watts says, "he feels *afresh*," that is over again, even that which he felt before, "what every member bears," in which case, I am indeed encouraged to "address his mercy and his power," but not otherwise; for as Dr. Hawker says, "I could not reconcile it to myself, that under my soul travail, and soul exercises, he could enter into *my feelings by his own!*" on the contrary, "I feel a boldness to go to him at all times, and upon all occasions, as one that not only *knows* as God, but

*feels as man.*" Indeed, my dear Sir, I have far exceeded the limits, I meant to have observed in this letter, I cannot conclude, however, without adopting the language of my favorite Brine, where he says, "may the good Lord eternally preserve me, from lessening the glory of a precious Jesus, in his human nature, which ought ever to be dear to my soul! I humbly hope, that I shall never express any thing, detracting from his honour in his human nature; my heart cannot possibly bear the killing thought." SUCH, however, I do most firmly believe, is the sin, yes, the unavoidable sin, into which they are fallen, and in which they are living, (O that the good Lord may speedily redeem them therefrom) who deny Christ's human nature, the more glorious new covenant holiness, called the sanctification of the Spirit, or spiritual holiness, assigning him, at the same time, no better holiness, than that which Adam possessed before the fall, which was as far inferior to the Spirit's regeneration, and sanctification holiness, as Adam's pristine glory, which was our unfallen holiness, was *inferior* to our Lord's resurrection glory, which is our once fallen nature, raised to the glory image, to which all the predestinated sons of God are to be conformed, as the offspring and seed of the second Adam. Here then, my brother, I stand, as your pastor, charged with preaching blasphemies, because I contend that God, even Christ the Word, loved his church so well, as to "give himself *for our sins*, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God, and our Father." Gal. i. 4; which I contend, could not have been done, but by the eternal Son's being made that very flesh, which had the sins, that he, as the Son of God, gave himself for, and which same flesh,

called us, he came to deliver; for to talk of his delivering a nature from sin, that had never fallen, is like making that holy which was never otherwise than holy. Indeed, my dear Sir, I do pity and grieve over those individuals, whether laymen, or public teachers, who have used me so cruelly, endeavoring to spoil my dear people through their vain conceits, persuading them to **BEWARE**, for that I am a dangerous character, propagating doctrines of horrid blasphemy, &c. &c. charges too numerous to be named; of one thing, however, I am most certain, and that is, I would rather be ruined, by being stoned from place to place, if that could ruin me, than cease to explain, and defend to the end of my mortal existence, the doctrines which I have hitherto taught in your hearing; and in further defence of which I am now writing; it being for my Lord's glory, to contend, that he loved his eternally chosen bride, as well, and as much, as Adam loved his woman Eve. Did Adam then prove his love to Eve, by going away from God, while yet personally existing in unfallen holiness? I say, did he so love Eve, as to join himself to her fallen nature, thus making himself one with her, in all things; and shall not the Creator of Israel, the husband of his chosen bride, so love his anti-typical fallen Eve, as to take into union, with his personal existence, her fallen nature, thus taking all her sins, to the end, that he might not only pay all her debts, but by the washing of regeneration, and the renewings of the Holy Ghost, destroy sin in her flesh, "that he might 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." Yes, indeed, such was the love of the church's husband, such the design, and such will be the

end. But for the SON of God to have done all this to, or for an unfallen nature, would have been impossible: indeed, the whole Bible is at manifest war with such an opinion. Our incarnate God, is said to have been made OF the woman: was the woman fallen, or unfallen? He was made in the *likeness* of *sinful* men; but what likeness there is, between a nature marred and fallen, and a nature unfallen, I must leave others to judge. Adam is said to have had a son, after *his own likeness*. Now probably my opponents may explain the *likeness* of Adam, in which his son was made, to refer to his unfallen state, and then it would be a fallen son, made in the *likeness* of what his father was, before the fall. Again, "Eve *conceived*, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord." "OR a man, the Lord, as the words *properly signify*, q. d. God-man, or the *Messias*, hoping that this was the promised seed," so says Mr. Pool; and indeed, so says almost every commentator of the Scriptures. Dr. Gill, for instance, "*I have gotten a man, the Lord*; that promised seed, that should bruise the serpent's head; by which it would appear, that she took that seed to be a divine person, the true God, even Jehovah, that should *become man*," &c. &c. "The *Targum* of *Jonathan*," he adds, "favors this sense, rendering the words, 'I have gotten a man,' the angel of the Lord." Again, "no doubt," says Mr. Allen, "but Eve expected her firstborn, to be the promised seed; but experience taught Eve, that she was greatly mistaken." Now, from the whole, is it not self evident, that Eve, although ignorant of the mystery, how it should be effected: I say, is it not evident, that Eve understood that the promised seed, called the seed of the woman, should be conceived by, and born of a *fallen* woman?

and is it not equally evident, that the very spiritual authors, whose notes on the passage I have inserted, believed the same? Mr. Allen, for instance, says, that "she was the mother of all living, and of the promised seed, as Jesus, the **SHILOH**, came from her loins," &c. And "Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, OF YOUR BRETHREN," &c. And with this the apostles endeavored to convince the unbelieving Jews, that Jesus, whom they had killed, and whom they all knew to be a *very man, the son of a woman, whom they all knew*, was that very promised prophet: one thing, however, is certain, and that is, if Jesus was not raised up of the seed of the Jews, called their brethren, then he was not that prophet; but if he was that prophet, then by necessary consequence, he was of the brethren, in point of nature, as man, which nature alone was *raised up* from the horrible pit, and miry clay, of our fallen nature; for whether the brethren, of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, were fallen or unfallen, judge ye; I can have no controversy to offer, my mind being made up on the subject. But permit me to remind *you*, moreover, that Christ was chosen to be a king; now the law, concerning the choice of a king was this, "one, *from among thy brethren*, shalt thou set king over thee," and therefore Christ was called the King of the Jews, because he was of Jewish *extraction*. Now whether the Jews were fallen, or unfallen, my wonderful judges may decide, I shall not lose time to controvert a matter so plain. But again, did not Christ, as God, from eternity, in a covenant, ordered in all things, and sure, *betroth* to himself elect humanity, given to him according to the ancient mode of marriage contract; but was

elect humanity fallen then? no, certainly not: then when this elect human nature became fallen, was not the eternal Son of God at liberty to repudiate it? certainly not; the decree was past, she was his before fallen, and therefore he must take her to himself, when fallen, doing his utmost to redeem her, in every sense of the word, from her fallen circumstances. Now this, the eternal Word did, so that when he was made flesh, the marriage contract which took place in the eternal covenant transactions between the HOLY THREE, in behalf of one divine person, and the nature which that divine nature then betrothed; I say that eternal act, which took place prior to the betrothed nature's fall, was not, in reality made good, at least consummated, till the Word became flesh, in which incarnate act he took to himself to dwell with, to rule over, cherish, and be responsible for, as his prior chosen bride, a nature to which, as God's Son, he had engaged himself from eternity, and therefore now takes her to his bosom, irrespective of the sad circumstances into which she had been introduced by Adam's fall. It is by no means my wish to extend my remarks on this subject, but I cannot help asking, whether the solitary consideration of what is meant by the word MAN, would not serve essentially to settle this point? that is, whether the Word did or did not take hold of our nature as fallen. Now a *Hebraist* would insist, that "the Hebrew word *for* man is enosh, that is sorry, wretched, and incurably sick, to denote his condition in his apostacy from God." Cruden on the word man. This therefore, being the legitimate meaning of the word, we are taught to believe two things; the first is this—when God



created our first parents, he called them man, not in token of what they then were, but what they would be subsequent to the fall, which fall was as much decreed by God, as was the redemption of the woman's seed therefrom; the second thing is this, the Word was either made flesh out of *fallen* manhood, or his name, as man was a name without any meaning in it, either in reference to himself, or to the nature from whence he was made man, for an unfallen nature can neither be *mean, frail, diseased, wretched, nor mortal*, whereas the Son of Man is called a root out of a dry ground, a bush, a sparrow, a vine, a worm, and a leper: yes, he is said to have been a man of sorrows, and lastly, to have *died*; none of which things could ever have been said of an unfallen man. Yes, Sir, such was the nature which our incarnate God came to quicken, to sanctify, make holy, and redeem, by the *washing* of regeneration, and the *renewings* of the Holy Ghost, according to the saying, "a body hast thou *prepared* for me; so that though our dear Lord took our fallen nature, it was so sanctified, THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, (*never forget that*) as to enable our precious Lord to offer himself as a Lamb WITHOUT SPOT to God;" wherefore Sir, "Remember that Jesus Christ, MADE of the seed of David, was raised again from the dead, according to my gospel; wherein I suffer trouble as an evil doer; but the word of God is not bound; therefore I suffer all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory. For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign; IF WE DENY HIM, HE WILL ALSO DENY US."

With these precious words, therefore, I close  
my epistle, subscribing myself,

Most worthy Sir,  
Your most obliged and  
Devoted servant,  
WASHINGTON WILKS.

“ O love divine, thy gracious stoop demands  
Seraphic powers, to celebrate thy praise,  
Eternity, with all its years shall ne'er exhaust  
The mighty theme, but leave a vast abyss  
Unhonored, and unsung for lack of time.  
O LOVE! Jehovah's name, most justly so ;  
For who but he could e'er the title claim,  
Who wills to love, and loves because he will.  
Behold ye angels, who delight to learn  
His wondrous ways. Oh, strike your golden lyres  
And aid my tongue to hymn his worthy praise ;  
For should it e'er refuse the darling theme,  
The very stones themselves would rise, and cry  
Behold the trait'rous, the ungrateful wretch !  
Jehovah Jesus, God's eternal Son,  
Stupendous thought, divests him of his robes,  
Comes down and dwells IN FALLEN FLESH, to save  
His dear, though sinful, ruined, guilty bride ;  
He bears her woes, her sorrows, griefs, and pains,  
Stands firm, and wrestles with her every foe,  
And in her VERY NATURE combats and condemns  
That monster sin, who spoiled her at the first.  
Thrice holy Lord, Emanuel, God with man,  
With ruined man ; yet holy, spotless pure.  
Victorious conqueror, o'er corruption's self ;  
Thy deathless fame, thy sanctifying grace,  
Thy lamb-like meekness, and thy saving pow'r,  
Proclaim thee Judah's Lion, Israel's King ;  
While devils rage and tremble at thy name.  
Then why, ye saints, forbear to join the song ?  
Nay worse, why raise your tongues against his love,  
And dare insult such condescending grace ?  
Be mute, or like the worthy saints of old.  
GO SEARCH AND SEE IF THIS BE TRUTH OR NO.”