

God ; and if the Revelation Jehovah hath made of himself be not *essentially* true, then Jehovah cannot be the true *God*, the *God that cannot lie*.

The human pre-existerian Scribes and Pharisees may mock us, but the Son of *God*, who was preached among the Corinthians by *Paul*, and *Silvanus*, and *Timotheus* is expressly declared *to be not yea and nay*; BUT YEA. 2 Cor. i. 18, 19. And so truly did that eminent servant of Christ, the late Dr. Hawker believe in the Essential Sonship of Christ; and so fully was he impressed with its importance, that in a tract entitled, "The best of remedies for the worst of times," he truly says, that the seductions of men, and the doctrines of devils, "*strike at the very root of all the mysteries of our most holy faith*. And however it may in appearance "be men that would seduce to it, yet the thing itself is "from *hell*, and therefore called, the '*doctrines of devils*.' "And indeed here it is, he saith, that Satan manifests "his deadly hatred against the whole persons of the "Godhead. *For if the Sonship of Christ, in his essential "and natural filiation be denied, the paternity of God the "Father must be denied also!!* For if one be not the "Son, neither can the other be the Father. And then "all the blessed soul-refreshing truths, with which the "word of God abounds, of the Father as Father, and "the Son as Son, are done away, and the Church of God "deprived of every covenant promise." True! for the Son of God would be yea and nay, *like the human pre-existerians assumed Son of God*, and then all the promises of God in him would be yea and nay. 2 Cor. i. 19, 20.

The Holy Spirit hath plainly described the latter days, by forewarning the Church that the doctrines of devils, viz, *lies*, such as the human pre-existerian tradition, (John viii. 44,) would be *privily*, that is, craftily and *plausibly* brought in by certain men *crept in unawares* into the Church; men who appeared to be, and would be received as the ministers of Christ. (2 Cor. xi. 15.) And as the human pre-existerian pharisees, the enemies of the seed of the woman came to John's baptism, it is no marvel, that their disciples should creep into the Church by the profession of *John's baptism*: and under the pro-

fession of believers' baptism bring in their blasphemous traditions, and so tread the essential Sonship of Christ under their feet! And be it particularly remembered, that the *Perverter* scornfully rejects the essential Sonship of Christ! Then let me intreat the Reader to go to Jordan, and hear GOD THE FATHER'S PERSONAL TESTIMONY to the Sonship of his own Son.

But before he enters upon that solemn scene, he will allow the unlettered Reader to be informed that the word *intimation*, used by human pre-existerians, means a *hint* or *obscure declaration*; and that the word *acting*, used by human pre-existerians, signifies *performing an assumed part*. And as this is all the human pre-existerians declare they *perceive* at Jordan; their *reasonable* interpretation of the testimony given at the baptism of Christ shall be set in an opposite column to the faithful interpretation of that *humble follower of God*, (Eph. v. 1.) the late Dr. Hawker; that the Reader may discern the difference between a spiritual man, and a natural man, by their interpretation of the scene at Jordan.

Dr. Hawker's interpretation of the scene at Jordan.

"It is well worthy the closest attention of the church of God, and it should seem to be designed to shew forth the distinction of the persons in the Godhead, that at the very entrance to the Gospel, at the baptism of the Lord Jesus, an open revelation was made, by the Holy Three Persons, in the one undivided essence of Jehovah, of each distinctly." For thus we read: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the SPIRIT OF GOD descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from Heaven, saying, This is

The human pre-existerians' interpretation of the scene at Jordan.

"We perceive no distinct definition given of any divine person at the baptism of our Saviour. There is an intimation of three persons acting; but neither of them is defined; in short, the supposition of such a thing is ridiculous, and the assertion of a definition of the persons of the Godhead, could only be made by an author of more than ordinary critical acumen: one who throughout the whole displays an enlarged understanding of the subject.—Essential pater-nity, filiation, and procedure of one person from the other must be renounced. And we expect no refutation, and affirm without hesitation, that

“my BELOVED SON, in whom
 “I am well pleased. Matt. iii.
 “16, 17. Here is at one view
 “the most plain, palpable, and
 “decided proof, which can be
 “required of GOD THE FA-
 “THER’s testimony of the Person of HIS DEAR SON. Yea, not only
 “to his person, but the whole revelation here made becomes one
 “general testimony to EACH PERSON: and from each other in
 “the undivided essence of JEHOVAH.”

“For let it be first observed, here are present the
 “whole Three Persons, clearly distinguished from each
 “other, and manifestly distinct in such a way and manner
 “as can be necessary to define the person of each other.
 “Here is the person of the Father, manifested by a voice
 “from heaven.—Here is the Person of the SON, man-
 “ifested in our nature, coming up from the water. And
 “here is the Person of the HOLY GHOST, manifested in
 “the form of a dove, lighting upon the SON. But as if
 “to afford a more distinct testimony of each, and of all;—
 “actions also are ascribed to each, by which (actions)
 “the persons of each are more strikingly ascertained
 “and confirmed. For the voice from heaven, declaring
 “the Sonship of God’s beloved Son did, at the same time
 “and by the same words, as fully testify to the person of
 “the Father, who proclaimed. For when he declared that
 “Sonship, he did no less declare his Paternity. And the
 “action of GOD the HOLY GHOST, in hovering over the
 “person of the SON, not only distinguished himself from
 “both the FATHER and the SON, but pointed out his
 “personal agency in the anointing the SON for the
 “ministry, into which he was then baptized. And can
 “anything more clearly define person than is here done,
 “when we behold an express distinction in the Father
 “speaking, from the SON spoken of; and the Holy Ghost
 “distinguished from both. And so unanswerably con-
 “clusive and satisfactory was this testimony considered
 “by holy men of old, in the first ages of the church, that
 “if any enquirers after the truth needed confirmation to
 “the same, it was the custom to send them to this ac-
 “count of the baptism of our Lord, by way of establish-
 “ing them firmly in the faith.”—‘Go, said they, to the

“to contend for an essential
 “Son, begotten or unbegotten,
 “is not pleading for a mystery,
 “but for an absurdity.” C. F.
 p. i. 62, 63.

“ River Jordan, and there learn, from divine teaching, “ the blessed doctrine of the Trinity.”

Before the further testimony of God the Father to the Sonship of Christ is set forth, let the Reader remember, that the greatest mistatements if done in ignorance are here made by human pre-existerians; but if not done in ignorance, then, they are guilty of *as great and of as abandoned* falsehoods, as were never exceeded by the most profligate of mankind.

1st.. As the Perverter has some notions about some people being *superannuated*, I shall here remind him, that, the Scriptures positively and clearly declare, that Christ’s human nature in Mary was *begotten* of the Holy Ghost. Matt. i. 20. And as the *Perverter* admits the Scriptures to be strictly true, he ought to acknowledge that he either told a *lie* or invented the *falsehood*, when he declared that, the Scriptures constantly attribute his being begotten as to his *humanity* to the person of the Father. C. F. p. i. 31.^a

^a There is so remarkable a testimony concerning the taking hold of our nature by Christ, that it ought not to have been overlooked as in general it hath been.

1st. Adam was the figure (*tupos*) pattern of him that was to come. *Forasmuch* then, as the children (God’s people) are *partakers* (in common with all mankind) of *flesh and blood*, Christ also himself took part of the same, &c. Heb. ii. 14, 15, and was *as man* of the same originality.

2nd. Of the *seed* of Abraham he took hold! marginal reading. Heb. ii. 16. *The promised seed*.

3rd. As the *brethren* (the Sons by adoption) were created holy in Adam, and are *made* brethren, new creatures, by being born of the Spirit, so it behoved Christ *in all things to be made holy, and to be born of the Spirit, like unto the brethren*. Heb. ii. 17. And as it is written that it behoved him to be *made in all things LIKE UNTO HIS BRETHREN*, and *not merely like unto all mankind*, it is very evident, that Christ as man must be *made* of the same originality as mankind in general, and also, that he be born of the Spirit like unto his brethren who are made new creatures. The tabernacle which was set up by Moses was the figure (*tupos*) pattern, as Adam was, of the true tabernacle which God pitched and not man. Heb. viii. 2. Pray Reader, turn to the *Perverter’s wretched perversion* of this holy Scripture setforth in the note aute, page 140; for his *vile* interpretation represents Christ as made merely with a soul and body, like all *mankind*, instead of being made like unto his brethren. The word of God is pure. The sons to be brought unto glory are the Lord’s chosen people—and as they partook in Adam of one common nature, and by being born of the Spirit are made partakers of a new nature called the *new man*, the *inner man*, the *spirit without guile*, so it behoved Christ to be the new thing created in the earth, made in all things like unto the brethren, and not merely like unto all mankind!

2nd. That the Scriptures positively declare the *procession* of one Person from *another*, and yet maintain the essential unity. See the procession of the Son (John viii. 42, 29,) and the procession of the Spirit. John xv. 26. Gal. iv. 6. But the human pre-existerians *falsely* declare, that the procedure of one person from another must be renounced.—And that the essential Son is an *absurdity*. C. F. p. i. 63.

3rd. But if the 42nd verse of the 8th chapter, and the 26th verse of the 15th chapter of the Gospel penned by John are to be *renounced*; how came the *Perverter* to withhold this part of his creed, when he stated that the Scriptures were *strictly true* and *perfectly consistent*. S. D. 65. Did he not withhold it to deceive?

4th. That the distinction and definition of the Three Persons so graciously and blessedly revealed at Jordan, when Christ was baptized by John, the human pre-existerians *impiously* declared to be *ridiculous*, (C. F. p. i. 62,) representing them, as the *intimation* of three persons acting under assumed names or characters like impostors or stage players. Could a *Deist* exceed this in malice and wickedness?

5th. That the *Perverter* represents the scene at Jordan in such language as ought to put every man who fears the name of the Lord upon his guard, against the subtilty of *Antichrist*!

But, to return, “Jesus said to the human pre-existerian Jews, “*The Father himself which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me, ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape*. John v. 37. The Greek word here rendered *shape*, is rendered *fashion* in Luke ix. 29.

1st. The human pre-existerians say, *shape* or *fashion* refer to the *body* much rather than the soul! S. D. 184. So that God the Father’s *shape*, according to their interpretation, is a *body*.

2nd. That the human pre-existerian Jews saw *the human nature of Christ*, and yet they had not seen the FATHER’S *shape* or *fashion*; then, according to their notion of the word *shape*, the human nature of Christ was neither the *shape*, nor the *fashion* of the Father!

3rd. Although the human pre-existerian Jews had not seen the Father's *shape*, nor *heard his voice* at any time; nevertheless that gracious person, who bore such testimony to the person of his *own* Son at his baptism in Jordan, was pleased to vouchsafe a renewed instance to the same at his transfiguration in the Mount Tabor. This transaction is related by three of the Evangelists. "Was it not, indeed, saith Dr. Hawker, because the Lord knew, that in the latter ages of the Church, this DARING BLASPHEMY would arise in denying the Person of the Son of God? The Lord therefore caused this precious record to be *thrice* written, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word might be established."—"I stay not to quote the several passages, but rather refer to the Scriptures themselves." See Matt. xvii. 15. Mark ix. 1—7. Luke ix. 28. "But I beg to offer the Apostle Peter's comment upon the whole, as we have it in the 2 Peter i. 15—18; by which it appears, that the Holy Ghost was pleased the Church should have the dying testimony of this man, as if to confirm yet more the glorious revelation, which God the Father gave in the Mount to the person of his Son." "I will endeavour (said Peter) that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed *cunningly devised fables*,^a when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. Now let the regenerated child of God ponder well this delightful relation delivered to the Church by the Apostle, concerning that glorious scene at Mount Tabor, so many years after it took place, and which appears to have been so fresh in his memory, as if it had only been the day before. Yea, the old apostle seems to have for-

^a And is not an assumed name a *fabulous name*? And is not the pre-existence of the human soul a fable?

“gotten both age and infirmities, from the refreshment
 “his soul found in rehearsing it. What other idea
 “could Peter have entertained of this revelation from
 “heaven, but that of God the Father testifying to the
 “Person, Godhead, and Sonship of his Son?”

“When Christ, in order to try the faith of his dis-
 “ciples, enquired what they thought of him, Peter with
 “his usual promptness immediately cried out, ‘*Thou art*
 “*Christ the Son of the living God.*” Can any but a
 human pre-existerian *suppose*, that Peter meant, he was
 an *assumed* Son of God? “How would Peter, above all
 “men, have spurned at the daring blasphemy, who had
 “himself received, from the mouth of the Son of God,
 “an assurance that he was blessed, because he had
 “borne testimony both to the person and Sonship of
 “his Lord; and which Jesus himself assured him, none
 “but God the Father could have revealed to him. ‘Thou
 “art Christ, (said Peter) the Son of the living God!
 “Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, (said Jesus) for flesh
 “and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my
 “Father which is in heaven.’ (Matt. xvi. 16, 17.) Let
 “the child of God ponder over these things: yea, bless
 “God for them. For God the Father’s testimony to the
 “person of his beloved Son is abundantly proved by
 “them. But flesh and blood now, no more than then,
 “can reveal it in the heart. Gal. i. 16.)”^a

^a Dr. Owen has noticed how Grotius, the learned human pre-exis-
 terian Pharisee, shewed his enmity to Christ: but who in dying circum-
 stances would have given all his possessions for a grain of that *faith*,
 which his unlettered neighbour John Ulrick enjoyed through grace.
 Then, what can we expect of such men as Kittson and the Perverter of I
 AM? As *men of reason*, they shew the same enmity, as all Unitarians and
 Deists do, to *what they call absurd* in the Mystery of God. Some of
 them, no doubt, sin from ignorance! Others, such as the human pre-ex-
 isterian pharisees, sinned against their natural light and understanding,
 from spite and malice, as when they said, Christ cast out devils by Beel-
 zebub. In the last century there was a man, who left the Church of
 England, and joined the Arian and Socinian preachers; he wilfully per-
 verted EL GIBBOR into ‘mighty man,’ Isaiah ix. 6. He knew better! Dr.
 Gill said, he was the boldest blasphemer he ever knew. But he did not
 profess to do it in honour, or from love to our Lord Jesus Christ.
 He did not kiss and betray Christ as Judas did! Judas did not lay his
 hands on Christ; on the contrary, he appeared very *harmless and loving*
 for he kissed him. He even said, “hail master!” by way of honouring

“From these two most striking testimonies given
 “by God the Father to the person of God the Son, let
 “us pass on to a third. It appears from the Gospel,
 “that the Lord Jesus had been discoursing with his
 “disciples in the presence of the multitude. On a
 “sudden, he ceased from speaking to them, and ad-
 “dressed his Father: Father, (said Jesus,) glorify thy
 “name! Then came there a voice from heaven, saying,
 “I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The
 “people that stood by and heard it, said, that it thun-
 “dered; others said that an angel spake to him. Jesus
 “answered and said, This voice came not because of
 “me, but for your sakes.” (John xii. 28:) Let the
 Reader duly ponder these solemn testimonies, and he
 will abhor the *Antichristian* doctrine of assumed or
 adopted names, (C. F. 62,) which undermines the es-
 sential truth of Divine Revelation; which represents
 the Most High, as three stage players, or impostors
 under assumed characters.

We have a beautiful illustration of the person of
 the Father and of the Son in the Godhead, in one of the
 Psalms, as is highly conclusive in point, and may serve
 as an example, and to throw light over similar portions
 of a like nature. I mean that memorable passage in the
 40th Psalm, where, under the Spirit of prophecy, the
 Son of God is described as saying to the Father,
 “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire: mine
 “ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering
 “hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo! I come.”
 (Psalm xi. 6, 7.) No one will question but that these
 words were spoken to the Father, by the Son of God.
 But the church of God would never have conceived that
 the human pre-existerian pharisees would have invented a
 man with a *human soul* without a body, not of man’s origi-
 nality for the purpose of making a began to be Father and
 him, but at that very time he was the leader of the band who took Christ
 and led him away as an *assumed Son of God!* and it is astonishing what
 power Satan exercises over the minds of men of *reason*, and the subtilty
 with which he influences their minds, when writing their own deceptions
 for the purpose of deceiving others!! For who can doubt, but the Per-
 verter believes all his own *inventions*. If he does not: I shall leave the
 Reader to his own reflection, as to the state of such an unhappy creature.

Son in the Godhead, had not the Holy Ghost testified of such Antichristian damnable heresies! No marvel that Antichrist, should deny the *heavenly doctrine* our Lord had declared unto *Nicodemus*; after he had said, “*ye must be born again;*” “*If I have told you, said Jesus, earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of HEAVENLY THINGS?*” And one of these “*heavenly things is the stumbling stone to all unbelievers*” who profess to be christians! And that one *heavenly thing* is; *No man* (*oudeis, none*) hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the “*Son of man which is in heaven.*” John iii. 13. Prov. xxx. 4. This is the heavenly doctrine which put Dr. *Priestley*, as well as the human pre-existerians *to their wit’s end*. The human pre-existerians have even invented lies to get rid of it! but *all in vain*.

The importance of the matter contained in the 40th Psalm, was too great to be left at conjecture, for the countenancing of heresy; and therefore the Holy Ghost to the confusion of all human pre-existerians instructed the Apostle to tell the Church it was when the Essential Son of God, at the moment of his assumption of our nature *begotten* in Mary of the Holy Ghost, that he so addressed his Father; “*Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifices and offerings thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure, then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will O God.*” (Heb. x. 5—7.) Here the passage of the prophet is opened and explained by the Apostle; and we behold, as plain as words can make it, that before our Lord came and at the time when the Son of God came into the world, to take the body prepared for *him*, by the offering of which *body* we are *sanctified* according to the will of God, he so spoke to his Father. Consequently, the words were spoken by the Son of God, the *Essential* Son of God then coming, and before he came, for the purposes of redemption, and hence, both his Person and Godhead are hereby at once proved. And as Christ’s manhood was *begotten* of the Holy Ghost, that *begetting* must include his created *spirit*, because that which is born of the Spirit, is *Spirit* (John iii. 6,) and

here, let not the Reader overlook the awful doom of all the human pre-existerians who die wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction. 2 Peter iii. 15, 16. For our Lord said to the human pre-existerian Jews, “if ye believe not that (Ego Eimi) I AM, ye shall die in your sins.” John viii. 24. As these solemn words were spoken to the Jews who were human pre-existerians; and who believed in the *pre-existence of Christ’s human soul*, what words can more plainly reveal their dreadful fate, who believe not in I AM, the *Essential Son of God*. May this solemn truth be sanctified to the rescue of some deluded human pre-existerian from destruction! The *humble* will hear thereof and be glad, but the *proud* will gnash their teeth; for the *proud are cursed*, (Psalm cxix. 21.) they are *an abomination to the Lord*. Prov. xvi. 5. To these decided testimonies, let it be remembered that the Revelation of the Father and of the Word, and of the Holy Spirit, who are One and essentially true, bear witness unto the *Sonship of Christ*, (1 John v. 9.) and to their salvation who believe in him. 1 John v. 9—13. For thus it is written, “If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for *this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son*. He that believeth on the *Son of God* hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a *liar*; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his *Son*. And *this is the record*, that God hath given to us *ETERNAL LIFE*, and *this life is in his Son*. He that *hath the Son* hath life: and he that *hath not the Son of God* hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the *Son of God*; that ye may know ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the *Son of God*.” 1 John v. 9—13. And what is meant by having the *Son* is declared in those solemn words where the names *Jesus Christ* are applied to a divine person in the abstract, viz. *know ye not yourselves*, how that *Jesus Christ* is in you, except ye be reprobates. 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

Surely, the children of God can never be too thankful, that in the Scriptures of God the Holy Ghost, the true features of Antichrist are so clearly described,

that they cannot be *finally* deceived by any of Antichrist's *tricks*, whether it be by denying the *essential* Sonship of Christ; or that *heavenly thing*, viz. Christ being in Heaven when talking to Nicodemus on earth; or by destroying the *incomprehensible* Sonship of Christ, *by a plain reason* for the names of *Father* and *Son*; or by *renouncing the procession of the Son and of the Spirit!*^a For Antichrist, like his brethren the human pre-existential Jews, evidently would, if he could, crucify the *Son of God afresh*, and put him to an open shame as a *deceiver*. (Matt. xxvii. 63,) as an *assumed Son of God!* "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that *Antichrist* shall come, even now are there *many Antichrists*; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but they went out, *that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.*" 1 John ii. 18, 19.) "For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you. (1 Cor. xi. 19.) For of your ownelves shall men arise, speaking PERVERSE THINGS, TO DRAW AWAY DISCIPLES AFTER THEM. Acts xx. 30. *Who is a LIAR, but he that denieth that JAH the Saviour is the Christ! He is ANTICHRIST, that DENIETH THE FATHER AND THE SON. Whosoever denieth the SON, the same hath not the FATHER. I John ii. 22, 23. And we have seen and do testify, that the FATHER sent the SON THE SAVIOUR of the world. Whosoever shall confess that JAH THE SAVIOUR is the SON OF GOD, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.*" 1 John iv. 14, 15.

It will be remembered, the first and great point insisted upon is that, the revelation of the *Faithful God*, which he hath been pleased to make of himself, is *essentially true!* For the Holy Spirit never will bear wit-

^a It is generally considered that Dr. Priestley's principles were nearly deistical; for it is said, he acknowledged *space* to be God! And so long as human reasoners deny the procession of the Son and of the Spirit, we may be assured that *space is their God*: and I call upon them to prove the contrary, if they can, without admitting the procession of the Son and of the Spirit from the Father.

ness but *to the Truth revealed*. And as the Holy Spirit is the *Spirit of Truth*, and leads the regenerated into *all Truth*, so it is impossible for this Faithful Witness to contradict his own testimony in the Sacred Scriptures: and therein he hath declared that Christ the *Son* is the *charakter* or express image of the same substance with the Father, and that *the Son given is the unspeakable gift*. Isaiah ix. 6. Hence the redeemed in all ages have sooner or later acknowledged that *infinite* act of grace, viz. “The Father spared not his OWN SON; and the SON spared not *himself*, but gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour. His blood is truly called the *blood of God*, his *own* blood, for blood is *essential* to the *Word* made flesh, *God manifest in the flesh*. Acts xx. 28.

The Divine names are *proper names*, and not *merely assumed* or *adopted names*. And so truly did God the Holy Ghost convince that gracious man, the late Dr. Hawker of this truth, who had in his early writings used, what he was afterwards convinced was *wrong*, namely, his speaking of, *Jehovah in his threefold character of Person*,” an expression, which he never used in his later writings, that he left behind him the following sweet memorial of what the grace of God can do, namely, that *the truth of God was dearer to him than his own reputation!!!* “I take occasion,” says that *spiritual* man, “thus early in the prosecution of the work to “observe to the Reader, that in this Edition, I have “totally omitted speaking of the gracious acts of Jehovah, in his Trinity of Persons towards his people, as “was injudiciously done in the former editions under “the term of *Office*: I know it is much used by many “well taught souls of the Lord’s people: and *I fell into “the same error.*”^a But according to my present views,

^a N. B. Mr. *Romaine* in the early part of his life appears to have received from men, the erroneous doctrine that Christ was a *son* by office: but in his latter days, he evidently *renounced it*. In proof thereof, I refer the Reader to Mr. *Romaine’s testimony* to the *sonship* of Christ as *God*, in his Holy Scriptural proof of the truth of the *Athanasian* creed, which is inserted in the *Gospel Magazine* for November, 1835. And I can assure the Reader, that Mr. *Romaine* always wrote a *recommendatory preface* to those writings he approved, which were published with his consent, as

“ I consider the term highly *unsuitable and degrading* :
 “ *yea*, SOMEWHAT WORSE THAN BOTH. Jehovah hath in-
 “ deed, in his Trinity of Persons, graciously conde-
 “ scended to guarantee to his Church in Christ an assur-
 “ ance, that each glorious person in the Godhead, in the
 “ economy and covenant of grace, will fulfil ‘ all the
 “ good pleasure of his will,’ and confirm all his promises
 “ in Christ. *But while* GOD OUR FATHER hath engaged
 “ in all these blissful things, as *our Father*, shall we
 “ call this fatherly love an *office*. Is that unparalled
 “ instance of love in one of the Persons taking into
 “ union with him our nature, an *office*. And all the
 “ rich comforts and consolations of the Holy Ghost, so
 “ many *offices*. We do not so in the common charities
 “ and relations of life. My Father in nature is not my
 “ Father in *office*, but in *reality*: and by that tie we are
 “ brought into a very sweet and endearing relationship.
 “ How infinitely more in those spiritual and eternal
 “ connexions into which the church is brought by our
 “ adoption as children in Christ. *John* would not have
 “ called such acts of grace, acts of *office*, when, under
 “ the impression of that love, which passeth knowledge,
 “ he cried out : *Behold what manner of love the FATHER*
 “ *hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons*
 “ *of God!*” 1 John iii. 1. Col i. 13, 14. Indeed, Jesus the
 FAITHFUL and TRUE *Witness* never would have said, that
 GOD *was* HIS OWN FATHER if it were not an *essential*
 truth! neither would the Holy Spirit, the begetter of
 Christ’s human nature, have testified that Christ was
 the Son of the Father, in truth and love, if it were not
essentially true. (2 John 3.) And as we can know no-
 thing of the nature of Jehovah, but from himself, it can be
 nothing short of the influences of Satan, that ever caused
 any man to deny the essential paternity, and filiation,
 and *procession* ! For the revelation of God is not to be

Mr. *Dorney’s* and Mr. *Mason’s* works ! But he never recommended *Allen’s*
 Spiritual Magazine : and I defy any man to produce Mr. *Romaine’s writ-*
ten recommendation to it! For I am sure Mr. *Romaine* never would have
 recommended such a *refined Arian* publication, although *under a form*
of sound doctrine! Mr. *Romaine* even declined all *fellowship* and *correspon-*
dence with Mr. *Elliott*, after Mr. *Elliott* adopted the *heretical notions* of
 the human pre-existerian *Watts!*

received upon man's explanation, but must be taken upon the credit of him who can neither lie, deceive, nor change. And let every man, who enters into the hallowed ground of Holy Scripture, put off his shoes from off his feet, (Prov. iii. 5,) *and not lean to his natural understanding*, Prov. iii. 5, but to "*what saith the LORD:*" (Rom. iv. 3,) because the knowledge of the essential Three, who bear record in heaven, which Three are One, is, as it must be, far beyond the powers of human reason to comprehend; and nothing short of "Thus saith the Lord," can be admitted as an article of faith, on this infinitely sublime and important subject.

The opposition of all men of reason to the essentially true revelation of God concerning himself, arises from one and the same source; namely, the pride and depravity of human reason. And as the Most High, with infinite condescension, hath made known the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ, to be above all human *comprehension*, so he alone can and doth reveal it to his people: and what they cannot comprehend by reason, they acknowledge by faith of the operation of God, to be essentially true. Col. ii. 2. Consider this, ye mockers of believer's baptism, lest your presumptuous plain reason fill you hereafter with confusion. Reader, what must be the end of such men with their Pharisaical tradition, the invention of the Devil, supported only by human reasoning in direct opposition to the word of God? And which word they make void in so *many instances*, under the *pharisaical profession*, viz. that they believe the Scriptures are *strictly true, the few as well as the many, and perfectly consistent!* S. D. 65.

In the next chapter, further testimonies will be produced from the Holy Scriptures, to the *Essential Sonship* of Christ. And may it please God to reveal his Son *in thee*, Reader, as he did *in Paul*. (Gal. i. 16,) Whilst I regret to have been obliged to mention the *Perverter by name*, nevertheless, I have no cause for regret in having *warned him of his wickedness*: (Ezek. iii. 19,) and I hope the perusal of this work may be to him, and others, the *savour of life unto life*. (2 Cor. ii. 16.)

CHAPTER IV.

Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father! Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. 1 John ii. 23, 24.

ALL men have not faith. 2 Thess. iii. 2. Believer, beware of the *cunning craftiness of men, who have all the reason in the world!* (S. D. 16.)

How eminently did the grace of God shine in the conduct of Levi, when Jehovah's *honour* was invaded, and when his *faithfulness* and *truth* was to be vindicated, against those who had sinned with a high hand: "He said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen him." That is, no one mine eye shall pity, nor my hand spare, who has transgressed in this matter! "Neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children." Deut. xxxiii. 9. The Lord our God is a jealous God; HE will not be charged with *assuming names* that are not *essential* to him with impunity! Be not deceived; *God is not to be mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.* And he that has sown the doctrine of *assumed names*, will reap the fruits of an *assumed name* to his confusion! Gal. vi. 7. It behoves, therefore, God's children to be valiant, for the truth is in Jesus. It is our duty to face all the enemies of God's *eternal* and *essential* Son, the *true* Melchisedeck, who is *without beginning of days, or end of life*: and to know no man after the flesh, so as to give up the truth for the fear of man. This is our honour, and is highly acceptable in the sight of our God. Those who honour me I will honour, saith the Lord. But knowing men

after the flesh, always did and always will prove a snare to men! Many have suffered loss by it. Whilst they have conferred with flesh and blood, and listened to the wisdom of sensual, (*psuchikos*) or *soul-men*; and whilst they have consulted the judgment of the *wisdom of this world*, how often have their minds been drawn from the *simplicity* that is in Christ! Reader be not deceived, for the-wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. 1 Cor. i. 20.

Many natural (*psuchikos*) objections have in all ages been made by men under a religious profession to the essential truth of the revelation of God: but so important is the belief of that truth, that it neither allows of *suppositions* nor speculations; because Divine Revelation is an *eternal reality*! Let the Reader remember, that the revelation which the Most High hath made of himself is not *nameless*; but on the contrary, that INFINITE WISDOM, *who cannot err*, hath revealed himself by PROPER NAMES, and not by *improper names*: and let the Reader say, whether the Divine Revelation of the essential God be essentially *true*, or essentially *false*; for it must be either the one or the other? If it be essentially true, then it must be *incomprehensible*: and our Lord himself declared it so to be, immediately after giving thanks, that it was hid from the *wise and prudent*, the human soul pre-existerian Jews! The Scripture reads thus: “In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, “and said, I thank thee, O FATHER, Lord of heaven “and earth, that thou hast *hid these things from the wise “and prudent*, and hast *revealed* them unto *babes*: even “so, FATHER; for so it seemed good in thy sight. All “things are delivered to me of MY FATHER: and *no man “knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the “Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal “him!*” Luke x. 21, 22.

Our Lord's testimony is important: no man, *no creature*, can know how the SON IS THE SON; nor how the FATHER IS THE FATHER. And because no creature can know the modus of the Son, it being unquestionably incomprehensible to a creature;—therefore, for a man to affirm, that it is not *essentially true*, is the most

decided evidence that he can give of his *unbelief*, and *infidelity*: for it is written, he that believeth not the record that God gave of his Son, maketh God a liar. 1 John v. 10.

Every man by nature, since the fall, is averse to divine revelation! What appears to him absurd, is without controversy a GREAT MYSTERY! And that godly proverb is evidently true, viz., "where mysteries begin, the reasonable man's religion ends." And unless the aversion of the wise and prudent to divine mysteries be removed by almighty power and grace, their *enmity* only becomes more manifest, as their folly is exposed and reprov'd. And although we only wound to heal, yet they treat the faithfulness of their real friends with scorn. Nevertheless, their scorn must not put us to silence: and as in the preceding chapter, some of the important Holy Scripture proofs were brought forth, in testimony of the *proper* Sonship of Christ, so in this chapter, further testimonies from Holy Scripture will be produced to the same effect, that the many *Antichrists*, and *mockers* of believers' baptism may be unmasked; that the deceived may be undeceived; and the children of God be on their watch against Satan's ministers, who are transformed as the ministers of righteousness. 2 Cor. xi. 15. I shall therefore begin with,

"The testimony of Christ himself."

Our Lord not only declared his Sonship to be *incomprehensible*, as was proved in the preceding chapter, which carries with it the most decisive evidence of his divine, and eternal Personality in the same essence with, and of his procession from the Father; but when he had healed a cripple on the Sabbath day, he said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." And therefore the "Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but had said also, "God was his (idion) OWN FATHER, making himself "EQUAL with God." John v. 17, 18. A most blessed proof that our Lord had said, what the human pre-existerian Jews understood he had declared himself to be, viz. the co-equal and co-essential Son of the Father

in truth and love. 2 John 3. And for which the human pre-existerian Jews then, as the human pre-existerian christians now, thought he was a *liar*, and for which saying, they sought to *kill* him.

After this, in a conference which Christ had with these human pre-existerian Jews he declared his *essential* unity with the *Father*, "I and my Father are one!" (John x. 30.) But when Christ thus declared the *Paternity* of the Father, he did at the same time, and by the same words as fully testify to his *own Sonship*, for when he declared his *own FATHER's* paternity in the unity, he no less declared his *own SONSHIP* in the unity! And that the human pre-existerian Jews so understood it, and *detested* it, as the human pre-existerian Christians do now, is very evident; for "they took up stones again "to stone him;" but when Jesus demanded the cause for which they did it; they replied, "for a good work "we stone thee not, *but for blasphemy*; and because "that thou being a man (*anthropos*), makest thyself "God." (John x. 33.) An evident proof that they understood him as having declared his divine Sonship. Can anything be more evident than this?

Upon another occasion, when Christ had opened the eyes of one that was born blind, and much altercation and dispute arose between the Jews and the man in consequence of it, which terminated in putting him out of the synagogue, our blessed Lord met him, and proposed to him the *important question*, "Dost thou believe "on the Son of God?" He answered and said, "who is "he, Lord, that I might believe on him?" And Jesus said, "thou hast both seen him, and he it is that talketh "with thee." And he said, "Lord, I believe! And he "*worshipped him!*" John ix. 35—38. Here is another express, plain, and positive evidence to the Divine Sonship of Christ, for the man testified his belief in his Divine Sonship by *divine adoration!* And would Christ have accepted this homage and worship, if he had not been the Essential Son of God? Would not our faithful Lord, who is the truth, have corrected the mistake of the man, and also have availed himself of so good an opportunity of declaring his *Sonship* was only an *assum-*

ed name, unless his essential relationship to the Father had been unquestionable? Or how could the man have known Christ to be the Son of God and worship him, except by divine revelation! Consider then, what the many Antichrist's and mockers of believers' baptism are doing, who are so full of *confidence* that the Sonship of Christ is anything but essential! And who would, if they could, crucify the Son of God *afresh*, and put him to an open shame as a deceiver?

Our blessed Lord had been interrogated by the Pharisees and Sadducees upon certain matters of opinion peculiar to each sect. And upon that occasion, Jesus himself, proposed to them the important question, "What think ye of Christ? *Whose Son is he?*" they say "unto him, the Son of David: he saith unto them, "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? saying, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, "until I make thine enemies thy footstool! If David then "called him Lord, how is he his Son?" (Matt. xxii. 42—45.) Let any man read this passage, and compare it with Rom. i. 3, 4, and he will perceive that Jesus Christ who came by water and by blood, (1 John v. 6,) "was made "of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the SON OF GOD *with power*, according to "the Spirit of Holiness, which was manifested by his "resurrection from the dead." Rom. i. 3, 4. That our Saviour's question put the human pre-existerian Jews to silence is very evident; for their tradition was, that all their souls and Christ's pre-existed. And our Lord's question as to David's Lord being David's son so confounded them, that "they were not able to answer him a "word, neither durst any man, from that day, ask him any "more questions." To a mind *open to conviction*, the many passages we meet with in Holy Scripture, which fully and unequivocally declare Christ to be the Son of the Father in truth and love, must, one would think, produce his assent, although it be, as it must be, *incomprehensible!*

I shall mention one passage more, where our Lord's testimony concerning his Sonship is recorded. When the High Priest demanded of Jesus, by a solemn adju-

ration, to tell him, "whether he were the Christ the Son of God, (Luke xxii. 70,) or as another Evangelist expresses it, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" Can we for one moment suppose the High Priest meant, whether he was a *Son by Office*, or an *assumed Son*? Did not the High Priest, by declaring our Lord had spoken *blasphemy*, prove he clearly understood him to mean he was the essential Son? And would the High Priest have rent his clothes, and have pronounced our Lord a blasphemer for any thing short of an *avowal*, which in the full sense and acceptation of the word, he really believed to be blasphemy? But if there can be a doubt upon the mind of any one open to conviction, that doubt may be removed by the Holy Spirit's testimony concerning the Rulers of the Pharisees, viz. *that they knew not the LORD OF GLORY*, for had they known him, they would not have put him to death! And if we have any authority to believe in the *mystery of God*, viz. that there are *three testifiers* which are one, we have the same authority to believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, whose human nature was begotten in Mary of the Holy Ghost, is the *essential Son of the Father*; for the Holy Scriptures testify both to the one and to the other. And if men receive the witness of men, surely the witness of God in the Holy Scriptures is greater; and this is the witness of God which he hath testified of THE SON, that he is the brightness of Glory, and the express Image of his Person,* or the CHARAKTER

* In these days of Antichrist, the reader will not be displeased with the following notes of Dr. Owen and others, on that important Scripture: "The brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." Heb. i. 3.

Dr. Owen.—"There is here evidently a comparison with God the Father: he is infinitely glorious, eternally subsisting in his own person; and the Son is the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person. The hypostasis of the Father is the Father himself. Of him the Son is said to be the express image. *As is the Father, so is the Son.* Man was created in the image of God, and is again by grace renewed thereunto. Eph. iv. 23, 24. Col. iii. 10. But to say, a man is the express image of God, is to depress the Glory of God by *anthropomorphism*; so that when God asks that question, *Whom will ye compare unto me; and whom will ye liken me unto?* We cannot answer of any one who is not God by nature? There is nothing in these words that is not applicable unto the divine nature of Christ. He is in his person distinct from the Father; another, not the Father; but yet the