

**THREE LETTERS ON THE
GENERATION OF THE
MANHOOD OF THE SON OF
GOD, PP. 3-42, PP. 3-109**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649252046

Three letters on the generation of the manhood of the Son of God, pp. 3-42, pp. 3-109 by Robert Harkness Carne

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE

**THREE LETTERS ON THE
GENERATION OF THE
MANHOOD OF THE SON OF
GOD, PP. 3-42, PP. 3-109**

THREE LETTERS

ON

THE GENERATION OF THE MANHOOD OF THE
SON OF GOD.

A REVIEW

OF THE DISCUSSION ON THIS SUBJECT.

AND AN ESSAY

ON THE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE DEATH OF
CHRIST.

WITH NOTES.

BY ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE, A.B.

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

SOLD BY EBENEZER PALMER,

18, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON;

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

MDC'CCXXXIII.

Price 7s. 6d.

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

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

BY ROBERT HARKNESS CARNE, A.B

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

PRINTED FOR EBENEZER PALMER,

18, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

MDCCLXXIX.

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

A LETTER,

§c. §c.

MR. EDITOR,

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

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

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

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

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