

HOLY SPIRIT is expressly declared to be sent by the Father and the Son. (John xiv. 26.—xv. 26.)

The above truths are known by all *human* pre-existerians to be destructive of their tradition! The greatness of the mystery is the mystery of faith, which *soul* or *intellectual* men cannot understand, and therefore, the human pre-existerians have been heard to scoff and ridicule *the word of faith by reasoning, how can God send God?* They know the words in the New Testament, which relate to the mission of Christ Jehovah, are used in relation to the mission of the Spirit Jehovah; but they *will not* acknowledge it! Mr. *John Stevens* has even gone so far as to omit the centre of a sentence recorded in John xvi. 29, 30, namely, the Omniscience of Christ, to induce his Readers to believe the testimony of the Disciples was no more than that, Jesus of Nazareth was a man *from God manifest; words not to be found literally in the Holy Scriptures; and which he knew.* If he had quoted the *omniscience* of Christ, he knew his disciples might understand that Jesus of Nazareth was God manifest in the flesh, and *not a man from God manifest*, therefore he perverted *approved* into *manifest* in Acts ii. 22, and never noticed the distinction between *anēr* and *anthropos!* (C. F. i. 52.) Having *wilfully mis-quoted* and *perverted* the Scriptures to feed his young rooks with *his leaven*, he then says, (1) “*Now if the preceding language does not shew, as plainly* “*as language can shew any thing, (2) that the speaker of the greater part of it, had been with God in heaven, and had come from him into this world, in a more literal and local sense (3) than can be attributed either to the Father or the Holy Spirit, it must be useless to appeal to language for proof of any thing.* (C. F. i. 53.)

The above statement, the Reader will observe, (1) is like the argument of all freethinkers, who have the *impudence* to *mis-quote* and *pervert* the Holy Scriptures. For Mr. *Stevens* perverts and *mis-quotes* the Scriptures to suit his *vile* tradition, and then he asserts, if the Scriptures do not mean *what he knew they did not*, and therefore *he perverted* and *mis-quoted* them, that then it *must be useless to appeal to language for proof of any thing.* But let us consider what *he* says; for there never was a *fanatic*

who exceeded *him* in *folly*, namely, that a human soul without a body, which he calls a *man standing in God*, had been with God in heaven, grieving and repenting, and then came out from him into this world with the loss of all his ideas and faculties, *i. e.* his understanding, will, and affection, and the withdrawalment of the spirit's influence! This is Mr. Stevens' literal and local sense! Such language is certainly not applied to the Father, or the Holy Spirit! It is not even applied to John the Baptist, for he was a *man (anthropos) sent from God*, (John i. 5,) who in his mother's womb was FULL OF THE HOLY GHOST; he had such a spiritual knowledge of Christ when in the womb, that he leaped for joy. Now this is God's description of a *man sent from God*! Then what becomes of Mr. Stevens' doctrine? *All his plain reason will never prove what he believes, namely, "that such a non-descript creature, as his Christ, had been with God in heaven, and came out from him literally and locally!"* But his arguments, and statements prove that, "*the infidel would be assisted in his railings against God's Bible, by the use of Mr. Stevens' wise mode of reasoning on the word of faith; (E. S. 13,) which the infidel never would be, by the stupid arguments of his cavillers, as he calls them, (C. F. i. 32,) although he falsely charges them, with encouraging infidels.*"^a (C. F. i. 10.) (2) If Christ was not a Divine person manifested from the Father and the Spirit, why did his disciples testify their belief in the procession of Christ from *his omniscience*? (3) Why did not Mr. Stevens apply the literal and local sense of *coming, descending, proceeding, &c.* to the Holy

^a I have fully proved the *Perverter of I Am* to be one of the freethinking many which corrupt the word of God! (2 Cor. ii. 17.) He is not ignorant of his guilt, if we may judge from his attempt to conceal his iniquity, by the Pelagian trick of charging the godly with encouraging infidels! Such a fox ought to be tarred and feathered; (E. S. 7,) indeed he might expect it for such a cunning trick. Mr. Toplady says, when speaking of such characters, "This is a cunning trick in these people to raise a dust, for their own defence; and like some pickpockets when closely pursued, to aim at slipping the stolen watch into the pocket of an innocent man, that the real sharpers may elude the rod of justice." But unhappily for themselves, they are not complete masters of this art. The dust, they raise, forms too thin a cloud to conceal them; and their bungling attempt to shift the charge upon others, rivets the charge but more firmly on themselves, its true proprietors." Yet these false witnesses against their neighbours, pretend to make the law *their rule of life*!

Spirit? Is such language ever attributed to the Father? Cannot *wise Mr. Stevens* with all the reason in the world prove, the *descent of the Holy Spirit in a bodily shape like a dove*, is language shewing, that the Holy Spirit *had been with God in heaven, and descended from him into this world, in a more literal and local sense than can be attributed to the Father?* If he cannot, then, *for him, it must be useless to appeal to language for proof of any thing!* And as the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove, I call upon *Mr. Stevens* to produce any one instance of the *Father's* descent from heaven in a bodily shape of any kind: and if he does, he must apply his *literal and local sense to the Father*; and if he does not produce the same, he must either apply *his literal and local sense to the Holy Spirit*, or *Mr. Stevens* must *abandon his freethinking argument*, and acknowledge *his ignorance of the Christ of God!*^a And I also call upon *Mr. Stevens* to explain, or to prove unequivocally from Holy Scripture, that *Christ's descent into the lower parts of the earth* is not spoken of as to his *body*, before he ascended up to fill all things? (C. F. i. 52.) And if God is every where and fills all *space*, how could *Christ come out of him*, or proceed from him, otherwise than by *manifestation*? Indeed *Christ's omniscience is expressly and plainly revealed to Mr. Stevens' confusion, and was received by the Apostles in proof that, Christ, a Divine Person, came manifestly forth from God.* (John xvi. 29, 30.) And *omniscience, Mr. Stevens* declares, cannot be applied to *Christ as man*, he says, *it was not even seated in him*, that God could not give it *him*, neither could *Christ as man* receive it! (1 Let. 30.)

To proceed—*Jehovah* was to be sent by *Jehovah*, and because they who touch the Saints of God, touch the apple of his eye: and *Jehovah* said, sing and rejoice, O Daughter of Zion: for, lo, *I come*, and *I will dwell in the midst of thee*, &c. This blessed event was made known to *Adam and Eve the very day they sinned.* (Gen. iii. 15.) Upon this Sacred Scripture, *Dr. Gill* in his Commentary

^a *Mr. Stevens* rejects with scorn the opinion of *Mr. Parkhurst* and others, namely, that the three persons who appeared to Abraham were personal manifestations of the Holy Trinity! (C. F. i. 59, 60.)

observes ; “ the word *seed* sometimes signifies a single
 “ person, Gen. iv 25, and xv. 3, and xxi. 13, and parti-
 “ cularly *Christ*, Gal. iii. 16, and he may with great
 “ propriety be so called” (the seed of the woman), “ be-
 “ cause he was made of a woman, and not begotten by
 “ man ; and *who assumed not an human person*, but an
 “ human nature, which is called the *holy thing*, and the
 “ *seed of Abraham*, as here the *seed of the woman*, as well
 “ as it expresses the truth of his incarnation and the
 “ reality of his being man ; and who as he has been im-
 “ placably hated by Satan and his angels, and by wicked
 “ men, so he has opposed himself to all them that hate
 “ and persecute his people : *it shall bruise thy head* : the
 “ head of a serpent creeping on the ground is easily
 “ crushed and bruised, of which it is sensible, and there-
 “ fore it is careful to hide and cover it. In the mystical
 “ sense, *it* or *he*, Hù, is one of the NAMES OF GOD, Psalm
 “ cii. 27.—Isa. xlviii. 12, and here of the Messiah, the
 “ eminent seed of the woman, who should bruise the
 “ head of the old serpent the devil, &c.”

The *seed* of the woman was not in the order of na-
 tural generation, for we are informed by the Spirit of pro-
 phecy, that a *Virgin was to conceive*, and a *Virgin was to*
bring forth a son, by name *Immanuel, with us God*, or
 God with us. (Isa. vii. 14.—Matt. i. 22.) This wonderful
 event was communicated to the *Virgin* by the *Angel*
Gabriel, in the following words : “ *The Holy Ghost shall*
 “ *come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall over-*
 “ *shadow thee : therefore also that Holy thing which shall*
 “ *be born of thee—begotten of the HOLY GHOST*, (Matt. i.
 “ 20,) *shall be called the Son of God.*” (Luke i. 35.)

Again, The Spirit of prophecy testifies, that *Jeho-*
vah (the Father) spake in vision to his Holy One, saying,
 “ I have laid help upon one that is MIGHTY ; I have ex-
 “ alted one chosen out of the people. I have found him : &c.
 “ Also, I will make him my, or the first-born, higher than
 “ the kings of the earth.” (Psalm lxxxix. 19—27.)

Here the Reader will observe, *two things* are particu-
 larly mentioned, which *after those days were to be accom-*
 plished, (1) *Christ was to be made the first-born*; (2) and as
 the *first-born*, he was to be higher than the kings of the earth.

If *first-born* signified *born-first* as Mr. Stevens says, and *answered to our Lord being brought forth into existence first, and to his being with God first, before any other creature existed*, how could this prophecy have relation to him? ^a If he was a human soul *born-first*, brought forth into being with God first, such a *first-born* from the moment of its existence must have been *higher than the kings of the earth!* And in that case, the Spirit of prophecy would not have spoken of this event as *future*; for, although the Spirit of prophecy speaks in the *present* and *past* tenses of things *future*, yet, in no instance that I remember, I speak subject to correction if I am wrong, has the Spirit of prophecy ever spoken *in the future tense of things that were past!* The Spirit of prophecy is, however, in this *Scripture* most expressly opposed to Mr. *Stevens'* doctrine, for, Jehovah saith, I will make him the *first-born* &c.; it is spoken in the

^a In a work lately published, entitled "*The Religion of Jesus*," it appears, that some human pre-existerians are *not* of Mr. *Stevens'* opinion, respecting the meaning of the word *first-born*: for the author of the above work, by name *Watts*, considers all human souls of one and the same age with Christ's; he says, 'The heavens were first made by God for the habitation of angels and immortal spirits. That next in creation was the vast millions of the heavenly hosts, called "*the generations of the heavens*," including *first the head or essence of humanity, or that immortal soul called "Wisdom*," which the second person in Deity deigned to take possession of—*COEVOUS with which was the creation of all the human souls both GOOD and BAD, destined for heaven and hell*. Mr. *Watts* states, that the human souls of the bad, in consequence of their joining the devil and his angels in rebellion against Christ, were cast out of heaven with the devil and his angels, and have taken up a temporary abode in the element of air, or probably sojourn in the systems of sun, or moon, or stars. That the souls of the good become united in the womb, to their respective bodies, and descend from Christ as the head of the righteous; and the souls of the bad from Satan as the head of all the wicked." Mr. *Watts* also informs his readers, that his essays, of which the above sentiments appear to be the leading features, are the result of more than *forty years of christian experience; and of the knowledge, enjoyment, and holy influence of its sacred truths*. By this statement, Mr. *Watts* doth with *subtlety insinuate* that, God the Holy Spirit *did not faithfully* testify of Jesus, or he would have led *holy men* of old into the knowledge of these pre-existent souls, &c., of which, *not one jot or tittle* is to be found in the Holy Scriptures; and without which, Mr. *Watts* declares, "we cannot withstand those charges made by our *adversaries, who fling in our teeth the following epithets:—Your God "is partial and tyrannical, holding forth salvation to all the world, yet not "granting it to many; your religion is antinomianism, leading to licentiousness and to sin, that grace may abound; and impugning the justice "of God," &c. What an awful delusion!*

future tense as an event that was to be accomplished, for the human nature in hypostatical union with the Divine Person would be in excellence of dignity, &c., higher than the Kings of the earth: and this prophecy, which was to be accomplished concerning Christ, (Luke xxiv. 44,) has been expressly fulfilled, as will be hereafter noticed.

Not only in the *Psalms*, &c., but *Moses* spake of Christ, saying, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet *from the midst of thee, of THY BRETHREN*, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." (Deut. xviii. 15.) This prophecy has been literally fulfilled, the Uncreated Word has taken of the seed of Abraham, has been made of a woman, was a *prophet like unto Moses!* As *Miriam* and *Aaron* pre-existed *Moses*, for *Miriam* was *literally born-first*, and *Aaron* was *older than Moses*, yet *Moses*, the *post-born man*, had the *pre-eminence*; (Numb. xii. 6, 8—John i. 45.—Acts iii. 22.—vi. 37,) so Christ the *last Adam* had the pre-eminence in all things.

2. *The Natural First-born.* The *Bekor*, *prōtotokos*, or *first-born*^a of men *by nature*, are the children of wrath; they have neither excellency of dignity, nor excellency of strength; they are conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity; they are *the servants of unrighteousness*. A *natural child* is the true description of every one born in sin. He is of this world, and "the worldling," a *spiritual* writer saith, "whatsoever be his amiableness and character, is "after all but a *living soul*; for unless a man have the "Spirit of Christ, he is not born from above." Cain was the *first natural, intellectual, or human soul first-born!* Mr. *Stevens* will not say, that Cain was *not* born with a human soul: and therefore Cain was *really* the soul *literally born-first*, but not the first brought forth from Adam, because *Eve*, to Mr. *Stevens* confusion, was the *first brought forth from Adam, and into existence first, and was with Adam first, before any other of mankind existed!* And, therefore, the *title first-born of every creature*,

^a Mr. *Ambrose Serle* observes, "The title *first-born* is not always to be "taken in the strict sense implied in the English word; for the Hebrew word "*Bekor* signifies not only *first-born*, but also the *chief, pre-eminent, most excellent, &c.*" Dr. *Henderson* justly laments the inattention of lexicographers to the *Scriptural meanings* of the original words.

does not in the Scriptures mean, the *first creature brought forth into existence first, before any other creature existed; for the Scriptures are strictly true, and perfectly consistent.* Cain therefore was the *first-born* of Adam, but *not the first brought forth* from Adam! Cain was an *intellectual man*, his genealogy is reckoned after his birth-right, for he was *literally the first-born*, that is, *born first*, and was of the *wicked one*, and slew his brother. By his intellectuality, or reason, he offered unto God the fruit of the ground as a sacrifice; whereas *Abel* the *second born* son of Adam, partaker of a *second birth*, being *born of the Spirit*, a type of the *second man*, by *faith* offered unto God a more *excellent* sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, and one of God's *first-born*, whose names are written in heaven, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh. From this holy record it is evident, that *Abel*, one of God's *first-born*, was *born of the Spirit* AFTER being born *FIRST naturally*; the *second birth* constituting the pre-destinated sons of God, the *first-born* of God, and therefore, *Abel*, *Adam's SECOND born*, was by *election*, and by his *SECOND birth*, *God's first-born*. As for Cain, the natural or *intellectual first-born*, born *first* and before *Abel*, he was of *that WICKED ONE the devil!* (1 John iii. 10—12.) The human pre-existerians *will not deny* that Cain had a *soul*, or that *the birth* of his *soul* was not *previous* to *Abel's*: Mr. *Stevens* says, Cain, previous to the birth of *Abel*, was *Adam's only begotten* son, and *first begotten*, that is, the *first-born son*,^a (C. F. i. 42,) consequently, according to Mr. *Ste-*

^a Mr. *Stevens* says, "As Adam was God's *only son* in this world before others were brought forth, so Christ he considers to have been *the same in the upper world*, of whom Adam was a figure." (1st Let. 25.) Mr. *Stevens* also says, the *Angels pre-existed* the creation of this world, (P. 1st Let. 37, 38,) and are sons of God. (C. F. ii. 22.) As this is Mr. *Stevens'* creed, how could his Christ be God's *only son* in the upper world when Adam was God's *only son* in this world, if the *Angels* were the sons of God and pre-existed Adam? Were the *Angels annihilated before Adam was formed*? Such *nonsense* is the food, with which Mr. *Stevens* feeds his *young rooks*, and by which, he encourages *infidels!* we have another remarkable instance of Mr. *Stevens'* encouragement of *infidels* in his comment on John the Baptist's testimony of Christ! John declared he was the person spoken of by the prophet *Isaiah*, namely, "*the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of Jehovah;*" (John i. 23,) "*twice* he declared, the *first cause of his appearance was as Jehovah's har-binger*" in these remarkable words, "*oti prōtos mou en.*" (John i. 15, 30.)

rens' creed, the *first-born soul* in this world, which was brought forth before Abel's, was of the *wicked one!* It is, therefore, very evident, that the *spiritual first-born* genealogy is not reckoned after the human soul pre-existerians' BORN-FIRST'S *birth-right*, because Abel did not *pre-exist Cain*.

Again, Mr. *Stevens* gives us the following illustration of the words, "*only begotten, and first begotten, or first-born.*" "ONLY BEGOTTEN is evidently intended to point out Christ, who is truly the FIRST BEGOTTEN, and is equally as determinate, as to the identical person, as only one would be. ADAM had two sons sometime before Seth was born. When Cain was born he was Adam's

Upon which, one of Mr. *Stevens'* learned authorities, Dr. *Hammond* observes, "that had *prōtos* here, as in some other places, signified *chief*, *esti* not *ēn* would have been joined with it, and John the Baptist would have said, "he is, and not he was my chief;" and Dr. *Gill* observes, "John was speaking of Christ's eternal existence, for it cannot be his birth, for being born before another, is no proof of superior worth." True, Dr. *Gill* was no worshipper of *dagon*, he did not give creature pre-eminence, as Mr. *Stevens* does, to the fish because they pre-existed Adam! As the plainest mode of exposing Mr. *Stevens'* infidel observations on the word *prōtos*, *first*, I shall place it in juxta-position with the same observations applied to the word *eschatos*, *last*, for Christ is the *prōtos*, *first*, and the *eschatos*, *last*. (Rev. i. 11, 17.)

Mr. *Stevens'* observations on the word, *prōtos*, *first*.

"Who is here the speaker? John the Baptist. He is made to say our Lord was his *first*. His first *what*? Does it mean his *first* father: or his *first* son? his *first* cousin; or his *first* acquaintance? Did ever prophet or apostle so speak of *Immanuel*?"

Mr. *Stevens'* observations applied to the word, *eschatos*, *last*.

Who is here the Speaker? Jesus Christ. He is made to say to John, I am the *first* and the *last*. Last *what*? Does it mean his *last* father; or his *last* son? his *last* cousin; or his *last* acquaintance? Did ever prophet or apostle so speak of *Immanuel*.

John's testimony of Christ the (*anēr*) husband of the Church being his first cause, wherefore he came crying in the wilderness, must be very perplexing to the worshippers of a *began to be Father, Son, and Spirit*. Reader remember, *dagon* is the Hebrew word for *fish*, because the human pre-existerians' argument is, that the fish must be pre-eminent to Adam, because they were pre-existent creatures. But, how came Mr. *Stevens* not to give us his *traditionary* notion of the word *last*? Did the *pre-existent honour* which he puts upon *Cain*, because he pre-existed *Abel*, and *Noah*, and *Abraham*, &c., prevent him? According to his doctrine, how could *Abraham* have the *pre-eminence*, if *Cain* was born before *Abraham* was brought forth? To this question, I will give the Reader Mr. *Stevens'* answer in his own style; "Surely, he must have actually pre-existed, *Cain*, or the ordination of the eternal God must have failed in its object."

“*only one, his only begotten and first begotten*” (first-born.) “But when *Abel* was born, he no longer was the “*only one, nor the only begotten, yet he still was Adam’s “first begotten,”* (first-born.) (C. F. i. 42.) By this illustration, if correct, Christ would not be at this time God’s *only Son*, because there are others sons in Heaven!^a Mr. *Stevens’* wresting of the meaning of the word, *only begotten*, I have heretofore exposed, see note, ante, page 26: it appears to be only of late, that he so distorted its meaning, he was of a very different opinion in the year 1813, for he then stated, “Christ had no other Father but God; “whereas, all other sons, who are said to be begotten, “have other fathers besides God.” (S. D. 29.) This is a very good argument in favour of Christ being *the only begotten Son of God*, and was so used, before Mr. *Stevens* was born, by Dr. *Taylor*. Now, I call upon Mr. *Stevens* to prove, that any *man* was *only begotten* of God, save the human nature of Christ *begotten of the Holy Ghost!* And if he cannot, then *his* perversion of the word *only begotten*, must be acknowledged to be as *wicked* as his tradition is *lieful!*

The next I shall notice in the order of *natural* generation, being *a soul literally born-first* is, *Ishmael the first-born* son of Abraham, who was *literally born first*; and *brought forth before Isaac*: but God declared, he would establish his Covenant with Isaac who did not *pre-exist Ishmael*. Divine Sovereignty also declared, that *Ishmael the pre-born, born-first literally*, should not be *the heir*, for it is written, “*Cast out the bond woman and her son: for the son “of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free “woman.”* So that, Divine Sovereignty appointed Isaac the *spiritual post-born* to be the *first-born* and *heir*, in other words, that the *spiritual first-born* genealogy should not be reckoned after the *human soul pre-existerian’s BORN-FIRST birth-right*.

The next I shall notice in the order of *natural* generation, being *a first-born with a soul*, is *Esau the first-born* son of *Isaac*, of whom the Lord saith, “*ESAU*

^a If Mr. *Stevens* considers *Cain* the *first-born* of Adam a *type* of the *Christ of God*, he will find all the regenerated children of God to *dissent* from, and to *protest against his intellectual type*.

‘HAVE I HATED.’ Now *Esau’s first-born genealogy* is reckoned after the *birth-right*; which *natural birth-right* he sold for a *mess of pottage!* But the *spiritual genealogy* is not reckoned after the *soul or natural birth-right*, neither is it *saleable*, for it is written; “*The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, THAT THE PURPOSE OF GOD ACCORDING TO ELECTION MIGHT STAND, not of works, BUT OF HIM THAT CALLETH, it was said unto her, The ELDER shall serve the YOUNGER; as it is written, JACOB HAVE I LOVED, but Esau have I hated.*” (Rom. ix. 11—13.) It is, therefore, very evident, that the *spiritual first or chief-born genealogy* is according to *ELECTION*, and that it is not reckoned after the *human soul pre-existerian’s literal BORN-FIRST birth-right*. But that the *purpose of God according to election might stand, the younger, or post-born was preferred before the elder or pre-born!*

The next in order is *Reuben*, the *natural or soul first-born* of *Jacob*, to whom *Jacob* said, “*Unstable as water thou shalt not excel.*” *Reuben* was brought forth before his brethren, he was one of the *human souls* which in *God’s Bible*, are expressly said to have come out of *Jacob’s LOINS*, (Gen. xvi. 26.—Exod. i. 5,) his *birth-right* was *mutable*, therefore, *God’s first-born genealogy* is not reckoned after the *soul or natural birth-right*. Amongst other things, it is written; “*Now the sons of Reuben the first-born of Israel, for he was the first-born, but forasmuch as he defiled his father’s bed, HIS BIRTH-RIGHT WAS GIVEN UNTO THE SONS OF JOSEPH the son of Israel: and the GENEALOGY IS NOT to be reckoned AFTER THE BIRTH-RIGHT; for JUDAH prevailed above his brethren, and of him came THE CHIEF RULER: but the birth-right was Joseph’s.*” (1 Chron. v. 1, 2.) And when *Jacob* gave the *birth-right* unto the sons of *Joseph*, he set *Ephraim* the *younger* before *Manasseh* the *natural or soul first-born*, and *Ephraim* had the title *first-born* instead of *Reuben*, which *DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY CONFIRMED*. See ante, page 493. *God’s FIRST BORN* is therefore the *very reverse* of *Mr. Stevens’ literal or natural born-first*; for the *post-born Ephraim had the birth-right*, and was set before the *pre-born Manasseh*, and *Reuben*, for they were *literally born-first*. I shall not multiply evidences upon this

subject; for Mr. *Stevens'* notion of the creature pre-eminence of the *fish*, is certainly *food* for those persons, whom Mr. *Stevens* calls *gudgeons*, and is so much like *dragon*, that it must fall down before the ark of the Lord! The divine appointment of David the *youngest* son of Jesse, and of *Solomon* the youngest son of David, to the kingdom, is *indisputable*: but because they were not *born before* their brethren, Mr. *Stevens'* judgment disapproves of it, he, therefore, approves of "*Jehoshaphat* giving the kingdom to *Jehoram*; because he was the *first-born*," (2 Chron. xxi. 3. C. F. i. 21,) *born-first like Cain*, for he slew all his brethren, and wrought evil in the eyes of the Lord! (2 Chron. xxi. 4—6.)^a For the same reason, Mr. *Stevens* must disapprove of the conduct of *Hosah*, who made his son *Sinri* the *chief*, "*though he was not born first, yet HIS FATHER made him the CHIEF.*" (1 Chron. xxvi. 10.)

The Reader will allow me to observe, the *first* time the word *first-born* occurs in the Sacred Records, it is applied to *Sidon* the *natural first-born*, literally *born first*, of CANAAN the CURSED. (Gen. x. 15.) The *Sidonians* were the *enemies* of Israel! (Jud. iii. 3.) How *blessed*, then, are they, who are born *again*, that is to say, of the Spirit, for they are the first-born of God by *election*, God is the Father of the *spirits* of just men made perfect, their *birth-right* is *supernatural, gracious, SPIRITUAL, unsaleable, immutable, and glorious*; from everlasting they were *chosen* to be a spiritual seed, and were blessed *in Christ* their *eternal* Quickening Spirit Head. Whereas all the *soul first-born* in their *soul-head* are born in sin: *their WISDOM descendeth not from above*, but is, *epigeios, earthly, psuchikē, soul or intellectual, daimoniōdēs, devilish!*

3. THE LEGAL-FIRST BORN, *the heir!* The legal *first-born* had in a *figurative* sense, excellency of dignity, and excel-

^a *David* was a man after God's own heart, it is written of him, that, "*he did right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from any thing that he commanded him all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uria the Hittite.*" Does Mr. *Stevens* mean to charge David with turning aside from the Lord's commandments, in that he made his *youngest son king*? If the Reader peruses 1 Kings, first chapter, 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, 5, and also God's testimony concerning *Solomon's wisdom*, &c., the *personal qualification* of the *first-born*, he will not wonder, that Mr. *Stevens* should reject the books of *Kings and Chronicles* from the Bible.

lency of strength; but the law made nothing perfect; it was *weak through the flesh!* If the Reader will search the Scriptures, he will find the *legal first-born* was by Divine Sovereignty limited to the *male*; so that the *female* which opened the matrix was excluded. This fact ought to satisfy every child of God, that as the *legal first-born* was the *male heir*, who might be born AFTER a daughter, as *Aaron* and *Moses* were born AFTER *Miriam*, (Comp. Exod. ii. 4.—vii. 7,) that *bekōr* in the Holy Scriptures, ought to be rendered *chief-born* when applied to the *male heir*, for *chief-born* is one of its literal meanings; and that it ought to be rendered *the eldest offspring* when applied to the *female born first*,^a and that it *ought only* to be rendered **FIRST-BORN** *literally*, when applied to the *male which OPENETH THE MATRIX*. And as the Most High *appointed* and *chose* the *male*, and not the *female*, which opened the matrix to be his, what an incontrovertible *Scriptural* testimony we have, that the *spiritual first born* genealogy is according to *election*, and not a *creature born first birth-right!* The Holy Spirit has not left us without *his testimony* to the true meaning of the *Hebrew legal* word *bekor*, when applied to the *male*, the *heir*, for the Lord did not slay the *first-born daughters*, but the *sons of the Egyptians, the chief of their strength*; as it is written, “*He smote all the (prōtotokon) first-born in Egypt, THE CHIEF of all their strength.*” (Psalm lxxviii. 51.—cv. 36.)

Mr. *Stevens* pretends to have laid before his readers “*the fullest evidence how the word prōtokos, or first-born is applied, by the inspired writers;*” (C. F. i. 22,) but throughout his twenty-four octavo pages of *pretended evidence*, he has either *from ignorance* of the *contents* of his *revered Bible*, or from some other cause,

^aThe Septuagint translators have sometimes used *presbetura*, (*elder*) and sometimes *prōtokos* (*first-born*) for the hebrew word *bekor!* This fact Mr. *Stevens* admits. (C. F. i. 20.) He says, it shews that they considered the *bekor*, or *first-born*, as meaning the *elder*. And we may say, it also shews how *absurd* they were in using the word *prōtokos* for *bekor*, when applied to a *female*. Throughout the whole of Mr. *Stevens'* observations, he *ignorantly*, or *craftily*, avoids noticing the fact, that the *daughters* are called *bekor*, or the *true* meaning of the plural word *bekorim*, *first-fruits*. See ante, pages 475, 476.

withheld, amongst other things the *important* facts, that by the *first-born* of Egypt was meant the *males*, the *chief* of all their strength; and that the female which opened the womb, although *born-first*, did not deprive the son *born after* her, of the title *first-born*! And he has also *shamefully perverted* its meaning by *subtility* and *lies*. I shall therefore do *what he only pretends to do*, namely, lay before the Reader *the fullest evidence*, how the word *prōtotokos*, or *first-born* is applied by the inspired writers; “*for this, Mr. Stevens admits, is a safe and UNDECEIVING*”
 “*WAY of judging as to the signification of the term in question.*”
 “*By comparing the several passages which are parallel to*”
 “*one another, we are more likely to avoid any arbitrary*”
 “*sense that may be attempted to be put upon terms and*”
 “*clauses; AND AT THE SAME TIME TO DISCOVER WHAT IS*”
 “*THE MIND OF THE SPIRIT INTENDED TO BE CONVEYED.*”
 (C. F. i. 22.) The following Scripture extracts are therefore much to the purpose, and they will assuredly do, what Mr. Stevens omitted, or only pretended, to do; and from them we shall also learn the legal signification of the term FIRST-BORN, namely, that it is expressly confined to the MALE!^a

Exod. iv. 22, 23.—xi. 5.—xii. 13.—“Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh thus saith the Lord, Israel is *my son*,
 “*my first-born*: and I say unto thee, let *my son* go, that
 “he may serve me: and if thou refuse to let him go, be-
 “hold I will slay thy *son*, *thy first-born*.”—“And all the
 “*first-born* in the land of Egypt shall die, from *the first-*
 “*born* of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto
 “*the first-born* of the maid servant, that is behind the mill,
 “and all *the first-born of beasts*.”—“For I will pass

^a Mr. Stevens says, *bekor*, *first-born*, signifies, “one among many who are born, or who entered into existence after him: (C. F. i. 22,) therefore, he must admit, that the plural word *bekorim*, *first-borns*, must signify many coeval *first-born* among many who entered into existence after them! Thus Mr. Stevens’ *subtility* defeats itself, for it turns one into many. But the true spiritual meaning of the word, when applied to Christ and the Church is, *excellency of dignity*, and *excellency of strength*; for the title *first-born*, when applied to Christ, is descriptive of his person as *God incarnate*, the *wisdom of God*, and the *power of God*, and not the wisdom of man and the power of man; and when applied to *the seed of Christ*, it is descriptive of their being *heirs of God* and *joint heirs with Christ*.

“through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite
 “all the *first-born* in the land of Egypt, both man and
 “beast”

The term *first-born* in these Scriptures we are *expressly informed* doth signify THE SONS, who were THE CHIEF of all their strength: (Psalm lxxviii. 51.—cv. 36,) for the CHIEF of all their strength doth signify the males, as thus saith the Lord, (Exod. xiii. 2. xii. 15,) “Sanctify unto me all the *first-born whatsoever that openeth the womb* among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine.”—“Thou shalt set apart unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix, and every firstling that cometh of a beast which thou hast; THE MALES shall be the Lord’s:” and every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck: and all the FIRST-BORN OF MAN among thy children thou shalt redeem. And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say un’o him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage: and it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the Lord slew all the *first-*

^a The Most High was pleased in the exercise of his Sovereignty to appoint Israel to be his *first-born*: it is written, “The Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth, (Deut. xiv. 2.) Israel is my son, even my *first-born*. (Exod. iv. 22.) The selection of Israel from all other nations, to this distinction, was typical of God’s CHOSEN people, his Church, for they are not all christians that are of Israel after the flesh! Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were Christians, they are expressly called anointed in God’s Bible, (Chron. xvi. 14, 22. Psalm cv. 7—15,) and he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; (Rom. ii. 28, 29,) for a man in Christ is a Jew inwardly. The Church of God is therefore but one, they are all one, chosen in Christ, and therefore called the Lord’s *first-born*. Thus they are named, “the general assembly and Church of the *first-born*, written, or enrolled, in heaven.” (Heb. xii. 23.) The *first-born of clean beasts were to be sacrificed*, which no doubt set forth Christ as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If the firstling males that came of the herd and of the flock had any blemish therein, or lame, or blind, or had any ill blemish, they were not to be offered in sacrifice unto the Lord. (Deut. xv. 19-21.) But the *first-born of unclean beasts were to be redeemed or destroyed*. This was typical of the Elect in their fallen state, as unclean, and ignorant as beasts; of the necessity of their redemption, and that the redeemed are God’s chosen, redeemed from the earth. (Rev. xiv. 3.) Therefore God’s *first-born* is Christ, and the Church chosen in God the Father, and in Christ. (1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 1.)

“*born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man,*
 “*and the first-born of beast: therefore I sacrifice to the*
 “*Lord all that openeth the matrix, being MALES; but all the*
 “*first-born of my children I redeem.*”

The *first-born of man* among the children to be redeemed, we are expressly informed doth signify the *males*, the *sons*, and *not the females*; for thus saith the Lord, (Exod. xxii. 29.—xxxiv. 20.—Numb. iii. 12, 13, 41—43.) “*The first-born of thy sons shalt thou give*
 “*unto me.*”—“*All the first-born of thy sons thou shalt*
 “*redeem.*”—“*And behold I have taken the Levites from*
 “*among the children of Israel, instead of all the first-*
 “*born that openeth the matrix among the children of Israel;*
 “*therefore shall the Levites be mine: Because all the*
 “*first-born are mine: for on the day that I smote all the*
 “*first-born in the land of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the*
 “*first-born in Israel both man and beast; mine shall they*
 “*be: I am the Lord.*”—“*And the Lord said unto*
 “*Moses, number all the first-born of the MALES of the chil-*
 “*dren of Israel, from a month old and upwards, and*
 “*take the number of their names. And thou shalt take*
 “*the Levites for me, I am the Lord, instead of all the FIRST*
 “*BORN among the children of Israel; and the cattle of the*
 “*Levites, instead of all the firstlings among the cattle of*
 “*the children of Israel. And Moses numbered, as the*
 “*Lord commanded him, all the first-born among the*
 “*children of Israel. And all the first-born MALES, by the*
 “*number of names, from a month old and upward, of*
 “*those that were numbered of them, were twenty and*
 “*two thousand two hundred and three-score and thir-*
 “*teen.*” As the number of the *first-born MALES exceeded*
 “*the number of the Levites by two hundred and seventy*
 “*three,*” The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, *Take the*
 “*Levites instead of all the first-born among the children*
 “*of Israel, and the cattle of the Levites instead of their*
 “*cattle, and the Levites shall be mine: I am the Lord.*
 “*And for those that are to be redeemed of the TWO HUN-*
 “*DRED AND THREE-SCORE AND THIRTEEN of the first-born*
 “*of the children of Israel, which are more than the Levites;*
 “*thou shalt even take five shekels a piece by the poll, after*
 “*the shekel of the sanctuary shalt thou take them.*”

(Numb. iii. 44—47,) and Moses took the redemption money and gave it unto Aaron and his sons, according to the word of the Lord, as the Lord commanded Moses. (Numb. iii. 49—51.)

The *legal first-born* redeemed was the *male*, and NOT the *female*, it is therefore very evident, that the term *first-born* was by Divine Sovereignty given to the son *born after* a daughter, as well as to the son that opened the womb among the children of Israel; therefore, the (*bekor*) *first-born* means the *heir*, the *chief-born*. And therefore, Mr. *Stevens*, either *ignorantly*, or *wilfully*, errs in his statement. Again, If an Israelite had many daughters and but *one son*, and that son was the *last-born*, yet that son was by Jehovah's law, entitled to be called the *first-born*! Again, if an Israelite had several sons, and the son *born first* died *in his father's life time, under or after he was twenty years of age and unmarried*, would not the title *first-born* and the *double portion* have been given to his brother, although not his father's son *literally born-first*?

Again, The *legal term first-born* signifies the *son*, and not the daughter. For the daughters of *Zelophehad* said to Moses in the presence of all the congregation by the door of the tabernacle, "Our *father died* in the wilderness, and he was not in the company of them that gathered themselves together against the Lord in the company of Korah; but died in his own sin, and HAD NO SON. Why should the name of our father be done away from among his family, *because he had no son*? Give unto us a possession from among the brethren of our father. And Moses brought their cause before the Lord. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, the daughters of *Zelophehad* speak right, thou shalt surely give them a possession of an inheritance among their father's brethren; and thou shalt cause the inheritance of their father to pass unto them. And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, *If a man die and have NO SON, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter.* (Numb. xxvii. 3—8.) By *this law*, the daughters of *Zelophehad* were made *co-heiresses*, and the inheritance of their father passed unto them. Afterwards, as we find it recorded, *Joshua* gave them an in-

heritance among the brethren of their father! [Joshua xvii. 3, 4.] But there was no *double portion* assigned to the eldest daughter, which there would have been, if the term *first-born* meant the *first brought forth*, or the *female* which opened the womb, or the *beginning instead of the chief of a man's strength*.

Again, The legal term *first-born, the heir*, is in a particular case, applicable to the *first* and *second* sons of one man, both living at the same time, the elder as the heir of his uncle, and the younger as the heir of his father: it is written, "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger, her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her. And it shall be, that THE FIRST-BORN WHICH SHE BEARETH, shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel." (Deut. xxv. 5, 6.—Gen. xxxviii. 8.—Ruth. iv. 5.) In this remarkable case, there might be two sons of the same man entitled to the term *first-born* at one and the same time, one son as the *first-born*, the heir of his deceased uncle, who died childless; and the other son as the *first-born*, the heir of his father; the *first* keeping up the name of his uncle, and the *second* keeping up the name of his own father! For, unless the father had two sons, and the *second son* was entitled to the *double portion*, and to the title *first-born*, the father's inheritance would have been marred. Ruth. iv. 6.

Again, If a man had two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they had borne him children, and the *first-born* son was her's that was hated, then, he was to acknowledge the son (not the daughter) of the hated for the *first-born*, by giving him a *double portion* of all that he had, for which there is a *special cause* assigned, namely, because he is the beginning or *chief*^a of his strength, the

^a The female that opened the womb is not the *chief*, although she is the beginning of her Father's strength; our translators have therefore generally rendered the Hebrew word *rashith*, *chief*, when applied to *strength*, for which, see Jerem. xlix. 35, and Daniel xi. 41, as well as Psalms lxxviii. 51.—cv. 36. Indeed the Hebrew word *rash*, which is either the root of, or from the same root as, *rashith*, is very frequently rendered *chief* in our

right of the first-born is his. (Deut. xxi. 15—17.) Here, the Reader will observe, that the Jews must have given the title *first-born*, NOT *according to priority of birth*, but to whom they pleased; for otherwise, there would have been no necessity for a law to *fix the appointment to the chief of their strength*. It is therefore evident, that the title *first-born* was not understood by the Jews to mean *the child BORN FIRST and before all his brethren*, for otherwise, it would have been *impossible* for a Jew to have made the *son of the beloved wife, first-born*, unless he had been his child *born-first*. And I may say, if *first-born* meant *literally* the child *born-first and before the other children*, then, the child *born-first* would have been entitled the *first-born ONLY by birth*, the daughter that opened the womb would have been entitled the first-born, and there would have been no necessity for this law! But, that the child *born-first, and before all the rest of the children*, was NOT therefore to be entitled the *first-born* is *indisputable*, for by *this* law, in Deut. xxi. 15—17, the divine appointment limited expressly the title *first-born* to the *male* issue; so that the *son of the hated born after daughters* was to have the *double portion*, provided he was the **CHIEF** of his **FATHER'S** *strength*, for otherwise, the son of the beloved wife would have been entitled to the *double portion*! It is therefore evident, that the Head of the Family could, as *Jacob* did, previous to this law, exercise the right of giving the dignity of *first-born* and the *double portion*, to whom he pleased. (See ante, page 493.) But to prevent an *unjust* exercise of the *paternal* power, the **LORD** was pleased to limit and appoint the title *first-born* to the *male*, the *chief of the father's strength*, for the Hebrew word *rashith* is rendered *chief* in other Scriptures, when applied to strength; for instance, it is written, the Lord smote the *first-born* of Egypt, the *rashith* of all their *strength*, which our translators very properly rendered "*the CHIEF of ALL THEIR STRENGTH,*" (Psalm lxxviii. 51.—cv. 36,) for the *females born first* were not the *chief* of their strength, although the *females born first* were the *beginning of their strength*!

Bible. A fact, which Mr. Stevens has either from ignorance, or from some improper motive, never mentioned. See S. D. 155, 156.

Then, as *excellency of power or strength* is particularly mentioned, as descriptive of the person to be entitled the *first-born*, (Gen. xlix. 3,) so the son of the beloved wife was not to be made the *first-born* before the son of the hated, if the son of her that was hated, was *rashith*, the *chief* of his *strength*, for *then, the right of the first-born was his!* (Deut. xxi. 15, 17.) It therefore evidently appears, that Divine Sovereignty excluded the *females born first*, and appointed the *chief* of their *sons* to the *dignity of first or chief-born*; and that the title *first-born* is *not confined in the Holy Scriptures to one brought forth before the others had existence!* From these *legal first-borns*, the Reader has now before him the fullest evidence how the word *prōtotokos* or *first-born* is legally applied by the inspired writers, “*and this, Mr. Stevens admits, is a safe and UNDECEIVING way of judging as to the signification of the term in question.*” (C. F. i. 22.) Then, how false is the human pre-existerians’ interpretation of the term *first-born*, namely, “*one brought forth into existence, before any other creature existed.*”^a And therefore, it is very evident, *that the human pre-existerians do pervert the scriptural meaning of the title first-born; and that Mr. Stevens makes void the word of God, as much by his lieful tradition, as by his silly creature notion of the pre-eminence of the pre-existent fish!*

Again, By Jehovah’s law it was also provided, if a *son* was stubborn and rebellious, and would not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and when they had chastened him, would not hearken unto them, then his father and his mother were to lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place—and all the men of the city were to stone him with stones, THAT HE DIE. (Deut. xxi. 18—21.) So that a *stubborn and rebellious FIRST-BORN SON* under the law, might be deprived of his right to the earthly inheritance; and in that case, the *second born son* would

^a The creation of all natural men in Adam is their pre-existence, but not their birth. Therefore, *first-born* cannot mean the pre-existence of one by creation before the rest; for as all natural men pre-existed in Adam, so they were all coeval in Adam, one did not pre-exist another. The word *first-born* in the English language, signifies “the first by the order of NATIVITY.”—Locke.

have the double portion of the *earthly inheritance*, with the title *first-born*. But, in Christ Jesus, the *Quickening Spirit* HEAD, there is neither *male* nor *female*; the *joint heirs* are God's *first-born* BY ELECTION and their *second birth*; they are *all one*; (Gal. iii. 28,) for the *inheritance reserved in heaven* is not of the law, but by *promise*, for God gave it to Abraham by *promise*. (Gal. iii. 18.—Heb. xi. 8-10.)

Now, Reader, what is the mind of the Spirit by the title *first-born*? Surely, the human pre-existerians by their tradition make void the word of God! And, it is little less than mockery in Mr. *Stevens* to tell his hearers, “*turn to the Scriptures and have done with all creeds that are not there expressed,*” when the whole bias of his mind, as appears by the nature or tendency of his writings and *reasonings*, is to destroy “*the Mystery of faith,*” and to set up a NONDESCRIPT *Tri-une God*, an *assumed* Father, an *assumed* Son, and an *assumed* Holy Spirit, in opposition to the LORD GOD OF ISRAEL, and the revelation which HE HATH MADE OF HIMSELF. *Ridiculous* as it really is, nevertheless, *wise* Mr. *Stevens* has not only *fixed the period* when his *Tri-une God* began to be a Father, and a Son, and a Holy Ghost, but he has even *fixed the period* when these characters *are to be laid aside!*^a Surely, if he were *not* a fanatic, he would not make a *mockery* of believers' baptism! Neither would he, if he revered God's Bible, *invent a nondescript creature without a body*, and call it a *man standing in God*, because we find the originality of man recorded in the Scriptures, namely, that the Lord God *formed man of the dust of the ground*, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living soul: A TRUTH which never could have been known but by revelation from God himself. And this revelation is also recorded in terms of *tenderness* and special regard on the

^a Mr. *Charnock* observes; “God in his kindness to man, hath made “revelations of himself, and his goodness is manifested in obliging us to “*believe him*; and he has made them by sufficient testimonies AS CLEAR “TO OUR FAITH, as they are incomprehensible to our reason.” It is very evident, then, that the Devil hath invented a *plain reason* Father and Son to destroy the truth of God's revelation! The Devil knows by experience, that *men of reason* will reject that *revelation* which is, and must be, *incomprehensible to human reason*, namely, the revelation of the *incomprehensible God*.