

Mr. John Stevens says, "Dr. *Burnet* expressed himself *entirely* for the sentiment for which he pleads." He says, "*The Jews in common, and some of the christian Fathers, were of opinion that the soul of the Messiah pre-existed his incarnation, and the origin of the Jewish polity: that it was more ancient than the giving of the law, and was in being through the whole economy of the law and of the prophets.*" In quoting *Dr. Burnet*, Mr. Stevens admits, it is but human authority, and yet he says, "*due respect may be shewn even to great men, and SOMETIMES TO ADVANTAGE.*" 3 Let. 53. But in what respect was *Dr. Burnet* a great man, that he was to have such due respect, as to be believed? Was it because he held an inferiority of nature in the *Holy Ghost*? Or was it because he said, *there was no intrinsic distinctions in the Godhead*? If the testimony of such witnesses are to be received with ADVANTAGE, it must be in proof, that the human pre-existerian doctrine is *not of faith*;<sup>a</sup> but is so reasonable, that *freethinkers*, and *Deists* are the principal sects now, as in time past, who have drank in this poisonous

<sup>a</sup> The human pre-existerian denomination is composed of several sects, who differ in their human pre-existerian notion. There are some, a few of whom I have met with, who consider the Perverter's notion of the pre-existence of the human soul without a body as perfectly ridiculous! and that he must be very weak in his understanding, not to know better. These persons, no doubt, have vast ideas of their intellectual powers, for pride is a human pre-existerian virtue. In their plain reason creed, it appears to be a *Divine attribute*. And to this human pre-existerian virtue, we are indebted for the insolent manner the Perverter speaks of some of the LORD's highly honoured servants. One venerable servant of the Lord, *Dr Hawker*, he says, *is not gifted to handle disputed points with any expertness*, 1 Let. 21. Another great and learned man's memory is attacked, *Dr. Gill*, who is charged with *scholastic jargon*. A *Third*, *Mr. Evans*, is called an inconclusive reasoner, suspected of having had no real belief of our LORD's self-existence! 3 Let 41. A *Fourth*, is accused of incapacity to discover the analogy between the words of *Solomon* and the New Testament, unless by an attentive perusal of what the Perverter has written upon the Passage in question. 3 Let. 47. A *Fifth* is charged with puerility, in addressing such inappropriate notions to withstand what the Perverter calls the Doctrine of our Redeemer's antiquity, or waxing old like a man. 3 Let. 49. And others, he says, have shouted to proclaim their own ignorance, S. D. 197, have mistaken assertion and noise for argument, S. D. 123, and he compares them to a spider, a dog, a crab-apple, a syphax, &c. because they have asserted the *Word of Faith* to be true (Rom. x. 8)—in opposition to the human pre-existerian's plain reason creed.

doctrine; for the best evidence produced by *Murray* and *Stevens* in its favour, are from the writings of men that were either *Infidels*, *Deists*, or the worshippers of a strange God, that our Fathers knew not. That they are subtile in their statements, no one acquainted with their writings will deny. The human pre-existerians say, if Christ existed only in design and purpose, how could actions of pleasure and delight be ascribed to him? Besides, he is spoken of in the past tense: *I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; and my delights were with the sons of men.* Prov. viii. 30, 31. Did they but know the only wise God our Saviour, they would not have asked this silly question; they would have told us, that we were always precious in God's sight, for God loved us from all eternity. Isaiah xliii. 4. Jeremiah xxxi. 3. But the subtilty of their question, with the inference drawn from the Scripture quoted, is as deceitful as the question and statement put by the old serpent to Eve! If it were not, what do the *human* pre-existerians mean by their subtile question, namely, if Christ existed only in design and purpose, how could actions of pleasure and delight be ascribed to him? I repeat, what do they mean by this subtile *if*? For Christ eternally existed as a Divine Person; HE IS IMMUTABLE; and THE NAMES JESUS CHRIST are sometimes applied by the Holy Spirit to a Divine Person in the abstract. And as to the inference that followed, because actions of pleasure and delight are ascribed to him in the past tense, surely, *all things are open to his eyes with whom we have to do!* But why do they not notice, that *the sons of men are also spoken of in the past tense, as pre-existing, with whom Christ delighted?* And why do they not notice that the *daughters* of men, and *Adam*, who were *not sons of men*, are not mentioned as pre-existing; although the sons of men are? Did they not subtilly omit noticing these important particulars? Did they not omit them, because they knew it was *unreasonable* to believe the sons of men pre-existed their forefather Adam, and all their mothers? There can be no doubt, but they were *artfully* concealed, because they dare not to make them known!

Again, the human pre-existerians say, the persons

of God the Father and of the Son could not be supposed to be equally eternal; and assign this *deceitful* reason for it; namely, "Adam was a *man* before he begat Cain, "though he was not a *father* before!" But they never tell you, that Adam and Cain were not *two* self-existent, eternal, and immutable persons in the Godhead; but *were of the dust*; that they were creatures, who began to be, and were as mutable as the climate in which we live. Then what becomes of their vile creature comparison? Again, such is the Perverter's Antichristian hatred to the *essential Sonship* of Christ, the *Rock* upon which Christ builds his Church, that he directly opposes the Holy Scriptures, which declare the *begetting* of Christ's humanity to the Holy Spirit, (see Matt. i. 18, 20, marginal reading) for the Perverter either *ignorantly* or *impudently* asserts, that "the Scriptures constantly attribute *his being begotten, as to his humanity to the person of the "Father!"*" C. F. i. 31.

Again, the Perverter asks, what conception could he retain of the essential Unity that would represent One Divine Person as from the other two? To this I reply, that the same essential Unity would be retained by faith, which Christ himself revealed, and which God the Holy Ghost recorded in John viii. 42, 29. *Jesus said, I proceeded forth, and came from God: and he that sent me is with me.* And again, in John x. 38, *The Father is in me, and I am in him.* And again, in John xiv. 10, *I am in the Father, and the Father dwelleth in me.* Surely no words can more plainly declare the procession of the Son, and the indivisibility of the essential unity.

Again, the human pre-existerians subtilly ask, how could there be an *only begotten Son* in the *bosom* of the Father! But they never notice, or explain what they mean by *the bosom of the Father!* For they dare not give the same spiritual interpretation to the words *only begotten Son*, as to the words *bosom of the Father!* If they did, it would either expose their *Antichristian hydra* to view, or destroy it *with its many heads.*

There are many more acts of deep subtilty in the writings of the pre-existerians, which would fill a volume to relate; some of them will be hereafter men-

tioned: but there is one so full of deceit that it must be exposed at this time. The learned *human* pre-existerians tell us, that the Greek word *prototokos*, which is rendered *first-born*, answers the Hebrew word *bekor*, and they rest upon it with all their strength: but they never tell us that *one true, sacred, spiritual*, as well as *one of its literal* interpretations, is *chief-born*! The Perverter of I Am carefully withholds from his deluded followers this fact, and that *Zagon* is the Hebrew word for *Elder* or *Eldest*, and is rendered by the Septuagint in Greek *presbetura*, Gen. i. 7, &c. It is true the Greek word *presbetura* is sometimes used to answer the Hebrew word *bekor*, as in Gen. xix. 31, 33, 34, 37, &c. But it does not on that account follow, that *prototokos* invariably signifies the first that opened the womb, or that the person so called was entitled to the birth right, as the *Perverter* falsely asserts. For *Bekor* is rendered *prototokos* in I Sam. xiv. 49, and is applied to *Merab*, one of Saul's daughters, who is not called *Zagon*, but *Bekor*; whereas *Jonathan* was the *heir*, and entitled to the *birth right*! It does not therefore follow, that *prototokos* always signifies the *Zagon*, the eldest; but that there are evidently *two distinct meanings* to the Hebrew word *Bekor*: that in some instances *presbetura* is its true interpretation, and not *prototokos*. And that a person is sometimes truly designated the *prototokos* who is neither the *presbetura*, nor the *Zagon*, for when *Bekor* applies to the *female child which opened the womb*, *presbetura* is its proper signification, and the Septuagint ought not to have used *prototokos* for *Bekor* in the I Sam. xiv. 49, but *presbetura*, as they did in Gen. xix. 31, &c. But whenever *Bekor* is applied to the *chief*, the *male heir*, the *first son*, as the *Bekor* of thy sons, (Exod. xxii. 26) although *born after* a daughter, *prototokos* is its proper signification, the same as when applied to *every male that openeth the womb*, Luke ii. 23. Exod. xiii. 12, 13. The HOLY SPIRIT in *two Psalms* hath evidently declared this interpretation to be correct, for the *prototokos* destroyed in Egypt did not mean the *female that was born first*, and *that opened the womb*, but the *chief of all their strength*, Psalms lxxviii. 51. cv. 36.

These truths are generally concealed by all human

pre-existerians, as may be seen by referring to S. D. 151 C. F. i. 20, 21. But there is no rule without an exception; for *Mr. Robert Fleming*, a human pre-existerian of great learning, had too much regard for his character and reputation, as a learned man, to pervert the evident meaning of *prototokos* in Col. i. 15, therefore he never attempted to separate *the sixteenth verse from the words*, “*the prototokos of every creature.*” He was sure from the contents of the sixteenth verse, that the *accent* upon *prototokos* ought to have been placed upon the *third*, instead of the *second* syllable; because the Holy Ghost is proving, that Christ is the Creator of all things; he therefore renders *prototokos pases ktiseos*, “*the first parent, or producer of every creature,*” because it is immediately added, FOR all things were created by him! And further, that all things were created FOR HIM, as well as by him. This rendering is *approved*, and acknowledged to be correct by many *godly* and learned men, such as *Dr. Gill*; *faithful* men who received the truth in the love of it. But this *honest* act on the part of *Mr. Robert Fleming* is a matter of distress to the *Perverter* and his allies. With their usual cunning craftiness they withhold this fact; which they dare not acknowledge, viz. that the *learned* *Mr. Fleming*, the human pre-existerian, was opposed to their perversion of this Scripture, and to their profligate (*Behemoth*) interpretation of the beginning (*arche*) of the creation of God. See Rev. iii. 14. According to their perversion of Rev. iii. 14, Christ was *Behemoth*, the *great beast, that eateth grass as an ox*, the *arche* of the ways of God. Job. xl. 19. But the *Essential* Son of God hath no *arche, beginning of days*. See Heb. vii. 3.

They also artfully withhold from us the following important fact, viz. that the Greek word *monogenes* is sometimes rendered in the Bible *only*, and *only one*, as well as *only begotten*, and answers to the Hebrew word *ihid*! But why do they omit it? With all their learning, they dare not acknowledge its *Hebrew* meaning; for they know that *ihid* never was, and never can be rendered *only begotten*. And further, they know it expresses, when applied to the Son of God, an incontrovertible fact, namely, that the Son is not an assumed or an adopted Son,

but the only Son of one nature and essence with God the Father; as truly as our sons are but of *one*, and of the same nature and essence with ourselves! And it was to pervert the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the Sacred Records to this truth, that recourse was had to this act of concealment.<sup>a</sup>

They also know, that *monogenes* is a compound word, as well as *prototokos*; that it is compounded of *monos*, only, and *genos*, a Greek word, which is rendered *kind*, no less than nine times in the first chapter of Genesis, see the 11th, 12th, 21st, 24th, and 25th verses: and it is sometimes rendered *kind* and *kindred*, in the New Testament, namely, *kind* in Matt. xiii. 47. xvii. 21. Mark ix. 29, and *kindred* in Acts iv. 6. vii. 13, 19. Blessed be the God of Israel, that the Holy Ghost hath given us in the

<sup>a</sup> The perverter of I Am must have the most contemptible opinion of the understanding of his disciples and hearers, or he would never have published such ridiculous nonsense as the following. He tells them, that Isaac was Abraham's *only begotten Son* by Sarah, and by the special interposition of God. C. F. i. 42. Now had he told them, that Isaac was Sarah's only Son by the special interposition of God, it would have been true! But the interposition of God, so far from making Isaac Abraham's only begotten Son,—*that* interposition had made Abraham *the Father of many nations* in his son Ishmael, and in his sons by Keturah! A more ridiculous assertion surely was never made, and shews how *wilfully ignorant* he can pretend to be of the common English word *only begotten*! For the word *only*, he knows, signifies *one* and *no more*; and, when added to the word *begotten*, will not allow Abraham to have another begotten Son. He therefore proposes, that we should believe what *he knows* is not true, namely, that as Abraham had no more sons *by Sarah*, therefore Isaac might be called, what he never is in the *Old Testament*, *viz.* Abraham's *only begotten son*. And the Perverter has said enough about *monogenes* signifying *only one*, to let us know that Isaac need not be called *only begotten* in the *new*, but *the only one of whom it was said*. See Heb. xi. 17, 18. C. F. i. 42. This however is not the whole of his deception on this particular subject; for he says, the human soul of Christ was God's only Son *in heaven*, at the same time that Adam was God's only Son *on earth*: (1 Let. p. 25) so that their inhabiting different places, made them *only* sons. Therefore, if Abraham's six sons by Keturah had lived in different cities, then these six sons in this human pre-existerian's opinion, would all have been Abraham's *only begotten sons*, as well as Isaac! consequently the word *only begotten* has got an extraordinary new meaning in the human pre-existerian vocabulary. For, according to their interpretation, it does not mean *begotten only*, and *no more*, but *many begotten sons by different women, or living in different places!* what a contemptible opinion this Perverter must have of his hearers! No marvel, that he compares them to young rooks receiving food from their dam.

Holy Scriptures, such a testimony of the Son, the only Son of the Father in truth and love, (2 John 3,) as will one day put *Antichrist*, the denier of the Father and the Son, to everlasting shame and confusion of face.

Secondly, the human pre-existerian tradition is an awful delusion. For instance, the Perverter charges the Christ of God with saying several times, Ego Eimi, I AM, for *I was!* He knows that Ego Eimi, I AM, plainly declares Christ's divine person as self-existent and immutable: And that the Jews so understood it; *for then they took up stones to cast at him, as a blasphemer!* But not one of the human pre-existerians dare *now admit it*. They know, if before Abraham was, Christ was I AM, then the WORD was I AM, and not *a human soul with God, or a man in God*. They therefore charge Christ with wilfully saying, several times, I AM, for *I was*, to support their vile tradition, at the tremendous expense of the truth of the Sacred Scriptures, and the sinlessness of Jesus in nature, heart, and life!

Again, the human pre-existerians say, that *paraclete*, or Advocate, is never applied in the Sacred Records to a Person merely Divine. 2 Let. 34. This is another of their deceitful and vile attempts to make Christ the Lord a liar. For it was Christ himself who declared, that God the Holy Ghost was *another Comforter, Paraclete, or advocate*. The same is recorded by the Holy Spirit in John xiv. 16, 26. xv. 26. And some of our English Bibles have advocate in the marginal reading.

They insinuate, that the office of the High Priest can never be exercised by a person merely Divine! 2 Let. 34. Now by this, they ignorantly represent both God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost as persons not merely divine. For as the High Priest laid his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessed over him all the iniquity of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat*, (Lev. xvi. 21;) so JEHOVAH laid upon Christ the iniquities of us all. And God the Spirit speaks of it by the prophet 700 years before Christ's incarnation Isa. liii. 6. Then, as Jehovah the Father laid the iniquities of his people upon Christ, as Aaron laid his hands, &c. upon the *head of the*

scape goat, do not the human pre-existerians intimate, that God the Father, when he thus exercised this office of the High Priest, was not a Person merely Divine? And who sprinkles the blood of Christ upon the lepers, or sinners? Did not the Priest under the law? and does not the *Holy Spirit* apply the blood of Christ now to the sinner's conscience? Is then the Holy Spirit a complex person? It is true, that the Holy Scriptures testify, that to make reconciliation for iniquity, there was a needs be, that the Christ of God should be made in all things like unto his brethren. Heb. ii. 17. That it was of necessity, this High Priest, not *man*, (for *man* should have been printed in *italic* letters as in Heb. vii. 24,) but this High Priest should have somewhat to offer. Heb viii. 3. And that Christ was made of a woman, and made under the law for the purpose of redeeming them that were under the law, &c. Gal. iv. 4, 5. But it is no where said that, he took our nature to be an High Priest otherwise than to redeem or make reconciliation. For the HOLY SPIRIT *dwells in us*, John xiv. 17. Ezek. xxxvi. 27; our *bodies* are the Holy Spirit's Temple,—I Cor. vi. 19. HE maketh intercession for us, (Rom. viii. 26,) and HE maketh intercession, *uper agion, for the saints according to the will of God*. Rom. viii. 27. Is not intercession part of the Priest's office? And is not the Holy Spirit a Person merely Divine?—Surely, the human pre-existerian doctrine is the seduction of men!

Again the Perverter of I AM says,

“The Spirit *proceeding*, as Schoolmen pretend,  
Is all *without proof* in the word;  
They bring but *one text* this truth to defend,  
And that to his mission referred.”—Rhy.

But who are these Schoolmen? The procession of the Spirit from the Father is declared by Christ himself. John xv. 26. Is Christ a *pretender*? Moreover, the Holy Spirit is there spoken of as coming as another *Paraclete*, another Advocate. And is not one text of Holy Scripture, *and that Scripture the testimony of Christ himself* sufficient? And if it did refer to the Holy Spirit's mission; did not *the procession of the Son*, John viii. 42, also refer to the *mission* of the Son? Did not the Holy



Spirit visibly descend in a bodily shape like a dove? Luke iii. 22.<sup>a</sup> And what necessity was there for the Perverter to make the Holy Spirit the Song of the Drunkards *with delusion*? Psalm lxix. 12.

There are *many* facts besides these, which are subtilly passed over by these Antichristians, the deniers of the Father and of the Son. And the *falsehoods* invented, and the deceits promulgated, in direct opposition to the testimony of the Scriptures are *numerous*. But there is another lie so barefaced, invented by the human pre-existerians, that I cannot pass it over. They say, the human soul of Christ was the *Angel of the Lord* that appeared to the Old Testament Saints; and they state, “that since Christ came in the flesh there have been “many appearances of other angels, but not one of “them ever assumed the names, titles, characters, or “worship belonging to God.” S. D. p. 183.

Then, who was the *Angel of the Lord* who came upon the Shepherds, and with him the glory of the Lord, when Christ was in the flesh lying in a manger? Luke ii. 9. Who was the *Angel of the Lord* who appeared to Joseph and said, “Arise, and take the young child and “his mother and flee into Egypt?” Matt. ii. 13. And, who was the *Angel of the Lord* who appeared to Joseph the *second time* and said, “Arise, and take the young child “and his mother, and go into the land of Israel?” Matt. ii. 19, 20. And who was the *Angel of God* who appeared to Cornelius? Acts x. 3. And who was the *Angel of the Lord*, who came to Peter and delivered him from prison. Acts xii. 7-10. And who was the *Angel of God* who stood by Paul, of whom Paul said, “whose I am, and “whom I serve?” Acts xxvii. 23.

After such bold human pre-existerian *falsehoods*, such opposition to the truths plainly declared in those sacred Oracles, which they say a man is bound to *examine with reverence, and believe with assurance*; what can we say for them? The Perverter may truly compare

<sup>a</sup> As light and heat respectively proceed forth and come from the sun, and yet are with the sun and in the sun; so if it were proper I might illustrate the procession of the Son and of the Spirit from, and in unity with, the Father.

his hearers to *rooks*, if they receive such food from their dam.

Thirdly. The human pre-existerian tradition is of the Devil, for he is called an Adversary, and an implacable enemy to the Person of Christ; and such are the human pre-existerians to the person, and also, to the true pre-eminence of the Christ of God. For instance, the human pre-existerians nickname Christ *a man in God*—not a man *of God*!—putting him upon a level *with the reprobate*, who are not *men of God*, but *men in God*; for *in him they live, and move, and have their being*. Acts xvii. 28. This nickname is followed with another token of their enmity. But it is to be hoped they do it ignorantly. For they call HIS soul without a body an immortal man reserved in the Lord Christ, *who came out*, &c. S. I. 19. But our Lord was no human soul pre-existerian; in his doctrine he overthrew this tradition of the Pharisees, for he said, “I am the living bread which came down “from heaven,—and the bread which I will give is MY “FLESH!” This declaration about his *flesh*, so offended the human soul pre-existerians then, as it does the human *soul* pre-existerians now, for they do not believe in man’s originality, that Jesus said unto them, *Doth this offend you? what and if ye see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* John vi. 51, 61, 62. Yea, not only where he was before, but *where he then was*, as he said to Nicodemus, “*No man hath ascended up to “heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the “Son of man which is, (present tense) in heaven.*” John iii. 13. This Scripture, Dr. *Priestly* the Socinian admitted, was much more in favour of Christ’s Godhead than any other, yet, this Scripture the human pre-existerians do their utmost to destroy!

They know this precious Scripture proves, that Christ is God manifest in the flesh; that he is not *two* persons; that he did not take the *person* of a man, but *the nature* of man, into union with himself: and that whilst he was on earth, that is, manifest in the flesh, he was the Omnipresent God, as he said to his disciples, when at Capernaum, “Where two or three *are* (present “tense) gathered together in my name, there *am I* (pre-

“sent tense) in the midst of them.” Matt. xviii. 20. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. John i. 10. Therefore, it was from ignorance of his person that the Jews, said “Who is this Son of man?” John xii. 34. And the Holy Spirit hath testified, that if the princes of this world had known him, they would not have crucified the LORD of glory! 1 Cor. ii. 8.

Let the reader duly ponder over this testimony of Jesus’ *omnipresence*! Remember light and heat proceed forth and come *from* the sun, and yet remain *in* the sun. And JESUS declared that he proceeded forth and came from God the Father, and yet he was in the Unity of the Godhead. “I and my Father are One,” John viii. 42, x. 30. His coming forth, or *manifestation*, was in our nature, the *flesh*. And it was in this *flesh* he descended first into the *lower parts* of the earth, that is the *grave*, and then in the *same flesh* ascended and went to the Father, Eph. iv. 9, 10.<sup>a</sup> Dr. Hawker has the following precious note upon Jesus coming from God and going to God.

“True; the Lord was about to return to the Father, as soon as the last act of the great redemption work, for which he came, he had finished; and which, as this Scripture saith, John xiii. 1, was nigh at hand. But there is a sense in which he had never been absent from the Father, as he said to Nicodemus: ‘no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven,’ John iii. 13. So that in the moment while conversing with Nicodemus on earth, the Lord of life and glory was in heaven. And this was a *riddle* at that time to the Jewish ruler, as it is *this day to all natural unrenewed men; and only to be understood by those that are spiritually enlightened.*” Vol. v. 665. For the human pre-existarians cannot allow the Christ of God was in heaven, when he was speaking to Nicodemus upon earth. Most of them consider it as absurd, and reject it as

<sup>a</sup> N.B. The Apostle Paul is evidently speaking of Christ in the *flesh*, who in the flesh descended into the *lower parts* of the earth! The same that ascended at Bethany, was the same that in the body descended, and had been buried in the grave. Eph. iv. 9, 10.

untrue. Some few of these human pre-existerians were formerly of opinion that Christ had *two bodies*; that he was a secret pre-existing man in heaven; and an *after man* on earth, made of the Virgin, when speaking to Nicodemus on earth; a Christ with two bodies at one time! This notion was so ridiculous, that the principal human pre-existerian writers, Murray, Allen, and others could not receive it. But then what did they do afterwards with this 13th verse of the 3rd ch. of the Gospel penned by John? Verily, they found it so destructive to their tradition, that with *astonishing impudence* they subtilly intimated, that the Holy Spirit had recorded a false testimony concerning Christ! For to understand this text as a blessed revelation of the glorious Person of our Christ, they could not; because the words, "*is in heaven,*" not one of them believed to be true. They, therefore, proposed to read, "*was in heaven,*" because it suited their *man in God* coming out of God, and going back again into God; ascending and descending, John iii. 13, as boys play with a paper messenger upon the string of a kite! But their wicked attempt to pervert this Scripture having been exposed, and as there was not one of them but admitted the Greek word in the New Testament signified *is*—the human pre-existerians deemed a re-consideration of this passage to be necessary! And at last, the Perverter of I AM brought forth the following *seduction* as disgraceful as it is infamous; for if he did not *wilfully* invent this *additional lie*, he must be very ignorant of the Scriptures! And he carefully avoided acknowledging his *former error*, lest he should excite any suspicion in the breast of his disciples, that all was not right!

"Re-consideration of this notable passage has led us  
 "to think, he says, that what has made it so difficult to ex-  
 "plain, has been the supposition of its being spoken by *our*  
 "*Lord to Nicodemus*; instead of which, it should have  
 "been understood as the words of *the Apostle John*, con-  
 "cerning *our Lord*. John wrote his Gospel at least fifty  
 "years after our Saviour's ascension, and therefore, he,  
 "as well as Paul, *might speak of that important fact as*  
 "*past.*" C. F. i. 55.

The Perverter was aware, that an objection would

be raised to this false interpretation; and that, unless it was made very plausible, it would be to a certainty rejected. He, therefore, proposed an objection by asking, "Do not the words, *even so must the Son of man be lifted up*, intimate, that Christ had not been lifted up "on the cross, when the words in the 13th v. were used? "Whereas, if we suppose John to be the speaker, instead "of our Lord, as above understood, he must have been "lifted up long before." C. F. i. 56. Having proposed this artful objection; he replies thereto, by saying, "*It is in like manner said*, that our Lord must needs go through "Samaria, when yet *he had so done*, long before John "made this remark concerning him." C. F. i. 56. This *vile* quibble upon that doctrinal truth the Holy Spirit was stating, as the cause for Jesus' going through Samaria, he suspected would not be swallowed by all his disciples; he therefore *wrests the* Scripture—stated in the objection, and calls it a *slight turn* to the expression, thus: "Even so, it was needful that the "Son of man should be lifted up. This at once (he says) "fairly removes the apparent difficulty, *and the text is cleared of what before obscured the notation of the time referred to by the Apostle.*" C. F. i. 56.

The whole therefore of his re-consideration amounts to this, that he admits the words, *even the Son of man which is in heaven*, are correct, both in the *original text* and in our *translation*! But he would have us to believe *his lie*, viz, that the words were not spoken by our Lord to Nicodemus, but by John, fifty years after our Lord's ascension; and that *John was speaking of our Lord's ascension as passed*.

If, therefore, these words were spoken, as they formerly thought, by our Lord to Nicodemus, viz, by their *man in God*, who, they said, could not be in heaven when speaking to Nicodemus, it is very evident their Christ is not the Christ of God. By this important *fact*, the Reader must perceive the human pre-existerian's Christ is of Satan's invention!

Having this pre-existerian's admission, that the words "*is in heaven*" are correct; and having their declaration, that their *man in God* was not *in heaven* when he was

speaking to Nicodemus *on earth*; I shall now prove, that their statement viz. that, "*the words were spoken by John*" "of our Saviour's ascension, *as an act that was past*," is a *gross fabrication*, and a token of their ignorance of, or of their enmity to "the Christ of God!" Luke ix. 20.

1. It is impossible for God the Holy Ghost to record such a lie as this pre-existerian hath represented him to have done. Because Elijah had ascended to heaven in his body, and had descended again; and both *Elijah* and *Moses*, *fifty years before John wrote his Gospel* had talked with Jesus on the mount, Mark ix. 4. And Elijah even spake of Christ's decease previous to Christ's death, Luke ix. 30, 31. Then, as Elijah had ascended and *descended* in his full manhood, before Christ *ascended*? *but not before Christ spoke to Nicodemus*,—it was impossible for the Holy Spirit, by John, to *lie*, or to record such a palpable lie, as the Perverter of I AM has invented! Secondly. The Apostle Paul had been caught up into the third Heaven and to Paradise before he wrote the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, and several years before the Gospel was penned by John.—These facts are stubborn things! Then what implacable enmity have this sect to the person of the Son of God, and what hatred to Christ's true pre-eminence! And how truly may it be said of this awful Perverter, and of every human pre-existerian, "*Behold, he travaileth with iniquity, and hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood.*" Psalm vii. 14. And here I shall present *the Perverter of I Am* with a small portion of his own food, which he prepared for his *young rooks*; and which is in good preservation to this day; viz, "*If wilful lying be any cause for shuddering, it is very evident he has given the godly ample reason to shudder at his conduct.*" C. F. ii. 23.

If therefore the human pre-existerians were not under Satan's power, they would never have shewn such a deadly enmity to the Christ of God, the blessed and only potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, *and was dwelling in the light which no man hath seen, nor can see*, even at the time he was speaking to Nicodemus *on earth*!

Again, Their malice and opposition to the Christ

of God may be seen in their wresting of the 5th and 6th verses of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Philip-  
pians. The Perverter of I AM, says, the word *morphe*,  
form, does not mean *essence*, but *shape* or *delineation*.<sup>a</sup>  
If this be true, then Christ did not take upon him the  
*essence* of a servant; he could never have been made  
flesh, nor have had a human soul; for he could only  
have had the shape or delineation of one!

The human pre-existerians further contend, that the  
words *Who being in the form of God*, mean Christ's human  
soul, which they call a *man in God*.<sup>b</sup> They say, "Jehovah  
"is never set forth as a pattern of humility; therefore he  
"who is so represented must be man." S. D. p. 163, 164.  
And having declared, that the God of all grace is not a  
pattern of humility, they say, *it must follow, that Christ  
Jesus, who was in the form of God, was really man* before he  
took the form of a *Servant, or was made in the likeness of  
men*." S. D. 167. Now if this were true, then Christ was a  
*double man*, for he was a real man before he was a servant,  
and he was afterwards made a *man*, in the true likeness  
of men; therefore HE must have been, according to their  
statement, a double man. Again, if Christ was a *real man*,  
the first thing created, as they contend, then Christ as a  
man was under the law of his creator, for he was made like

<sup>a</sup> It has been observed, that no one is so difficult to receive instruction  
as self-taught men, who are not so learned as to know their own igno-  
rance. Such persons are generally self-confident; they look with scorn  
upon their superiors; and when engaged with men of integrity, they  
have recourse to nicknames, and to low wit and vulgar abuse, for want of  
better weapons. By such characters, vile heresies have often been  
promulgated, for they are generally wise above what is written. See  
Mr. Brine's excellent sermon upon the proper eternity of God's decrees.

<sup>b</sup> The Perverter acknowledges, "a *term*, or a *phrase* of words,  
"when used of God, may be understood to denote eternity, which, when  
"referred to a creature, only signifies antiquity. Many instances might be  
"given to shew that we are *constantly* in the habit of using the same words  
"and expressions in a very different sense, when applied to God, to that  
"which we adopt when we speak of the creature." 1 Let. p. 41. As the  
Perverter knew this, and even acknowledges it: how great must be his  
*enmity* to Christ the Lord, which made him depart from *his own rule*  
in this instance. Why did he not give the different sense to *morphe*, when  
applied to God, to that which he adopts when he speaks of the *morphe*  
of the creature? There is a day coming when all these attempts to rob  
Christ of His Glory will be duly rewarded. He may deceive his fellow-  
men, but he cannot deceive God.

unto his brethren, and therefore, was bound to obey the law for himself, and could never fulfil it for his redeemed. And if what the Perverter says were true, viz. that "*Jehovah is not a pattern of humility,*" then we ought not to possess *humility*, as the followers or *imitators of God*,—as the original word implies in Eph. v. 1. But this sophistry is completely refuted by the Holy Spirit, in the 113th Psalm. And as the Lord *humbles himself*, so the Lord by the Prophet declares, that every man must *humble himself* to walk with God, Micah vi. 8, (marginal reading.) Indeed there is no walking with God but in humility.<sup>a</sup> That the Devil should intimate pride to be a divine perfection is no marvel! Or that such a doctrine should be found in the articles of a proud human pre-existerian's creed, is not extraordinary! But as many of the human pre-existerians

<sup>a</sup> An objection has been made by a godly man, who observed, "If the word took a human soul into union with itself, before the foundation of the world, such an assumption would have been the first great act of HUMILIATION on the part of the SON OF GOD; but where is there, he asks, the slightest hint of any such HUMILIATION in the word?"

This objection the Perverter could not answer *honestly* and *faithfully*: for *humility* in Holy Scripture language is the *antithesis* of *pride*; and the *Perverter* knows *pride* to be the *antithesis* of *humility*; but *pride* is one of the principal supporters of the fleshly mind of all human pre-existerians: he therefore, immediately had recourse to *sophistry*, for he substitutes *degradation* for *humiliation*, lest the eyes of his young rooks should be opened to see the glory of GOD in the face of JESUS CHRIST. He says, "the *Divinity* of our LORD is not DEGRADED by his having *humanity*." 3 Let. 44. Does *humiliation* then *degrade* the followers, *mimetai*, *imitators* of God, Eph. v. 1. If this *unhumbled* creature had known the grace of humility, the *FULNESS* of which is in GOD *manifest in the flesh*, he would not have called *humility* by the term *degradation*; and which none but a *proud unregenerated sinner* would dare to do. Having instilled into the minds of his young rooks, that *humility* is a *degradation*, he then tells them that he concluded the "assumption supposed, should rather be deemed *an exaltation of our Lord's manhood, than a humiliation of His Godhead. Nor was he sure that we are authorized to speak of the humiliation of God. Is the Eternal, he asks, a pattern of humility?*" 3 Let. 44. Then who is Christ? Is He a Divine Person, or a Human Person? And if a divine person, did the human nature he took make any change in his divine person? Or did the human nature make HIM a person in the Godhead? If his acts are the acts of a human person, call that person by what name you please? or if they are not the acts of a Divine Person, in and through his humanity, then there are FOUR that bear Record in Heaven! That the human pre-existerians mean a *human person*, let them say what they may to the contrary, is very evident from their nicknames, *man in God*, &c. and from their interpretation of John iii. 13. xvii. 4, 5. S. D. 121.



worship a strange God, I shall hereafter notice the Perverter's, and Mr. Joseph Hussey's description of the God they worship.<sup>a</sup>

But, to return; as the human pre-existerians say, that their God does not humble himself, and that the *morphe* of God means the shape or delineation of God, it is impossible for them to support their idea of this Scripture, viz. that their *man in God* is the Lord Jesus Christ; because, to be equal with *their God*, he ought, as they must admit, to be without humility. But as *all men are in God*, although all men are not *men of God*; for instance, Cain, who slew his brother, was a *man in God*, for in him he lived and moved and had his being, for no creature can have life in, and of himself; and as the human soul, they say, is the image or likeness of God, so Cain's human soul must have been, as they say, the shape or delineation of God; and Cain must have been in the form of God.—I shall, therefore, prove by *their interpretation* of this Scripture, they must

That they do mean a human person, may be discovered in all their writings which I have seen, written in support of this awful delusion! Even the Perverter admits this fact. S. D. 121. A delusion, which I believe, God hath sent these *pseudo Trinitarians*, because they received not the love of the *Truth*, the revelation which God hath given of himself, but had *pleasure* in the unrighteousness of representing the most  $\mu\eta\epsilon\eta$  as *Three nondescripts*, or *stage players*, revealed under an *essential lie*, in the *soft words* of "*names*" or "*characters assumed, hereafter to be laid aside.*" 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12. S. D. 28, 252. C. F. i. 62.

<sup>a</sup> I have never read Mr. Hussey's *Glories of Christ*; but I was formerly assured it was a great work, and that the author was no human soul pre-existerian. Upon the faith of this report, I was one of some few subscribers to an intended abridgement of that work. And I particularly requested *by Letter*, that the Editor would state in his *Preface* what I believed to be the fact, viz. *that Mr. Hussey was not a soul pre-existerian*. Since then I have had extracts sent me from the original work; and have read a sermon by that excellent man, Mr. Brine, upon the proper eternity of God's decrees, wherein Mr. Hussey's *strange God* without purposes, and his after date, or *began to be purposes*, are exposed and ably refuted. But as my subscription to the intended re-publication of Hussey's work, and also my *private letter*, have been alluded to by an enemy, who artfully withheld the contents of the letter; it behoves me to state the fact, because, by his artful mode of detailing the circumstance, the reader might receive an impression, *the reverse of what is true*. At the time of my subscription he gave me a pamphlet, which he had published against Pre-existence, with "*Pre-exist-Arians*" printed on the title page! This unhappy man is now a *Defender* of these Pre-exist-Arians; though he disavows, disbelieves, and openly denies the *Pre-existerian* scheme! But, "*Vengeance belongeth unto the Lord!*"

mean *Cain*, and not the Lord Jesus Christ. First, *Cain* was a *man in God*, their *nickname* for CHRIST. Secondly, the *human soul* of *Cain* was the *shape* or delineation of God. Thirdly, *Cain* was without *humility*; which is more like the shape and delineation of *their* God, than *Our* God, that hath humility. And, fourthly, as *Cain* was without humility, it might be said he thought it no robbery to be *equal* with God, for he haughtily and scornfully replied, "*Am I my brother's keeper!*" Surely the human pre-existerians must mean *Cain*! And if *morphe*, as they say, does not mean *essence*, but only *shape* or *delineation*; *Cain* must have been, according to their much reason, *the Image of God!* Thus the seductions of these men tend to draw away unstable souls from the faith. And thus the old serpent the Devil, manifests his power over the minds of men, his instruments, to take counsel together against the LORD, and against his CHRIST.

But the Holy Spirit in this Scripture is testifying of Jesus Christ, who, before he took upon him the essence of a servant, was equal with God! *Morphe* does not in this Scripture mean *delineation*, but *essence*: for the Holy Spirit is speaking of one of the Three Divine Persons before he took upon him the *morphe*, the *essence* of a servant. Whatever is essential to God, is the *morphe* of God; as whatever is essential to a servant, is the *morphe* of a servant.<sup>a</sup> And the Lord Jesus Christ being, or rather *existing* in the essence of God, it was therefore no robbery for him, as one of the Divine Persons, to be equal with God the Father and the Spirit. And it was this self-existent Jesus Christ, that made himself of no reputation, by taking upon him the essence of a creature, the *essence* of which he had never taken before, although he might have appeared, as godly men believe, *in the shape or delineation of one!*

Again, The words are so plain, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err therein. Does the wayfaring man ask, what is meant by Christ being in the form of God? The Holy Spirit replies, EQUAL WITH GOD. Does the wayfaring man ask, what is meant by Christ making himself of no reputation? The Holy

<sup>a</sup> Reader, See note <sup>b</sup> in page 35.

Spirit replies, by Christ taking upon him the form of a servant. Does the wayfaring man ask, what is meant by the form of a servant? The Holy Spirit replies, by his being made in the likeness of men: and when he was found in fashion as a man, **THE MIGHTY GOD humbled himself indeed!** In short the words are so plain, that none but an implacable enemy can hold out against them. And there is a day coming, when the enemy will hold out no longer! In this blessed Scripture, the Holy Spirit applies the titles Jesus Christ to his Divine Person in the abstract, for he is testifying of Christ, before he took upon him *the form of a Servant*<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> He made himself indeed of no reputation, when he took upon him the form of a servant,—for he washed his disciples' feet, and was despised and rejected of men. It was truly said of him by the Prophet, Verily, thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel the Saviour, Isa. xlv. 15. He was in the manger at Bethlehem, the Child-born, the Son-given: his name Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, the Great God our Saviour, and the Only wise God our Saviour. Upon his head are many crowns; but he had an *underived* glory with the Father from all eternity, and which glory Christ had *with the Father, not from the Father!*

Dr. Hawker has truly observed, “that his views and human pre-existerians are as distant as the extremities of the northern and southern poles, and as impossible ever to meet together.” True, for they did not believe in the same God, or in the same Christ! It was, but a few months before the Doctor departed, that he wrote his belief in this precious Scripture, in the words following: “He possessed in the unity of the Divine Essence, in common with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, all divine attributes and perfections. But what upon the present occasion, *I would desire you to have in remembrance, is this; that all those powers were his own, inherent in himself, in his own nature and essence, and underived. And hence we at once see his humiliation carried with it such sovereign value and efficacy.* And when from the contemplation of himself, in his own underived, inherent, and essential Godhead before all worlds, we look through several Scriptural Revelations which are given of him, when going forth in acts of creation, in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost; what sublimity at once appears in proof of his Almighty Power in the numerous Scriptures which reveal these things, all tending to declare the efficacy of his unequalled humiliation. Figure to yourself Him, of whom it is said, *Who being in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross!* Philip. ii. 6—8, Let this and the like Scriptures be contemplated; and then ask yourself what must have been his humiliation, and the infinite value of it, that it took away his judgment? Is this the same Almighty Person of

Upon this occasion I cannot refrain from making a few observations on those precious words, **EQUAL WITH GOD.** Jesus Christ was *Eternal life with the Father.* And he who had Eternal life with the Father, had life given him, and power to give eternal life to as many as the Father had given him, John xvii. 2. Again, He who had a *Glory with the Father,* before the world was, (John xvii. 5,) had a glory given him by the Father, which glory he gave unto them whom the Father had given him; to the intent, as Jesus said, “that they may be one even as we are one,” John xvii. 22. Do not the acts of giving eternal life, and giving the glory he had given him to others, import that he needed them not for himself? Again, As Christ had glorified the Father *on earth,* and had finished the work in his human nature which the Father had given him to do; and as in the performance of this work he glorified the Father *on earth;* yet the glory he had at the same time with the Father in heaven, was not then manifested or known in the world, for the Spirit was not then given, because Jesus was not then glorified in the flesh, he therefore calls upon the Father to glorify him with the glory which he had with the Father, as equal with the Father, saying, “Glorify thou me *with thine own self, with the Glory* which I had *with thee,* before the world was.” John xvii. 5. Now, what was the glory the Father had before the world was? Was it not *un-derived?*

And is not the Father now glorifying Christ with un-derived glory, by the ministration of the Spirit in the ordinances of his appointment; so that he who made himself of no reputation by taking upon him the *morphe,* essence of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, is now

whom, in conjunction with the other Persons in the Godhead, those divine perfections are spoken? Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span; and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Isaiah xl. 12—17. From this statement, it will be very obvious that such a humiliation in one so mighty, must carry with it, in every act, a dignity and efficacy, when as the surety for his people, the **LORD** of life and glory went forth for their salvation, &c.” Dr. Hawker’s Village Sermons, No. 5. Surely Dr. Hawker’s faith was as far off from the *chimera* of the human pre-existerians, as the highest heaven is above the earth.