

Every regenerated man *feels, hears, sees, and knows* sin to be exceeding sinful, which he could not do, if sin was only a *negative*. Sin is not merely the *absence of good*, but the *presence of evil*. (Rom. vii. 21.) *Sin*, said an apostle, *dwelleth in me*, (Rom. vii. 20,) and if any man saith, that he hath *no sin* (*negative sin*,) *he deceives himself, and the truth is not in him!* I John i. 8. And if the Perverter of I AM had ever known it to be an *evil* and a *bitter* thing to sin against the Lord, he would never have made such a mock at sin: his cry would have been, "For thy name sake, O Lord, pardon mine *iniquity* for it is *great*." (Psalm xxv. 11.) But this negative sin doctrine is necessarily a part of the human pre-existerian creed; for their CHRIST who suffered, they say, was not Jehovah's EQUAL; (C. F. ii. 30.) and therefore, an INFINITE satisfaction in their opinion was not made nor required. For negative suffering, and a negative satisfaction, may be proved by human pre-existerian syllogisms, to be sufficient for *their* negative sin! But a man enlightened by the Spirit of holiness and truth, to see the spirituality of the holy law of God, doth truly know that lust is *adultery* in the heart, and hatred is *murder* in the sight of God. Convinced of the sinfulness of sin, he feels sin to  *dwell* in his flesh, and to be a *positive* thing committed against a Holy God, whose wrath is not a negative thing! He has felt the deep malignancy of sin. He has viewed the Holy Lamb suffering for sin on the cross; and has heard the direful agonies of God's *own* SON, on account of it. And he knows, that nothing short of an *infinite* satisfaction and an *infinite* righteousness could satisfy the demands of God's holy law, for a company which no man can number: and

The Doctor was not a *young rook*; he had demanded "*Thus saith the Lord*," and he was surprised to find in Mr. Stevens' second letter, nothing but *shuffling*, with a statement of *freethinking principles* respecting God's foreknowledge of vision, Pelagian sentiments as to original sin, and *Socinian* notions that infants are born with sinless souls and sinless bodies: of which no man would be guilty, who *revered his Bible*. The Doctor, as might be expected, repeated his demand, with which he was determined the correspondence should close. And as *Mr. Stevens*, the *Perverter of I AM*, could not bring "*thus saith the Lord*," to support his human pre-existerian tradition, he never replied.

therefore the righteousness of an *immortal man reserved in the Lord Christ and coming out, &c* (S. J. 19,) cannot be the righteousness of God his Saviour, (2 Peter i. 1,) because "*the Christ of God,*" (Luke ix. 20.) in whom he trusts, is not a Christ of man's invention, but the great God, his Saviour; the Christ Jehovah. Luke ii. 11.

The tremendous evil of sin further appears in the Lord's displeasure on account of it. For HE says, he will visit the iniquity of his people upon the children, and upon the children's children unto the third and to the fourth *generation*. Exod. xxxiv. 7. And HE visits the iniquity of the *image and likeness makers* upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them, for he says, THEY HATE ME. Exod. xx. 4, 5. A solemn and an awful truth! The Lord our God is a God of *truth* and *without iniquity*, just and right is he. Deut. xxxii. 4. He is *true to all his threatenings*, and *righteous in his judgments*. In the descendants of Eli, we see the iniquity of the Fathers visited upon the children's children. 1 Sam. iv. 11.—xxii. 16-22.—1 Kings i. 42-49. The sword was never to depart from David's house, because David had despised the Lord, and had taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be his wife. 2 Sam. xii. 10. *Seven of Saul's sons* were hanged *for their Father's conduct to the Gibeonites*. 2 Sam. xxi. More instances of God's faithfulness to his threatenings might be produced from Holy Scripture; and many more proofs, if it were necessary, might be produced from the misery and *disease*, of which many are the subjects in this generation, in consequence of the sins of their progenitors. But misery and *disease* would never have fallen upon them, if they had not been in Adam and in their progenitors. But the human soul pre-existerians in the days of Christ's flesh, as well as *Pelagius* and the *Perverter of I AM*, were so ignorant of original sin, and of their *sinful* depravity, that they said, "*If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.*" Whereupon our Lord said, "Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, *that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets*"—"that upon

“you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth,  
 “from the blood of the righteous Abel unto the blood of  
 “Zacharias, WHOM YE SLEW BETWEEN THE TEMPLE AND THE  
 “ALTAR. Verily I say unto you, *all these things shall*  
 “come upon this generation.” Matt. xxiii, 30—36.

The Reader will observe, that the Lord charges that generation with the guilt of all the blood which had been shed from the death of Abel, and *expressly* with the guilt of Zacharias' blood, *whom ye slew*, he says, *between the temple and the altar*; although he had been slain many years before! But what was done by their ancestors, they in them did; and *actually* would have done again, if they had the opportunity:—so truly are we all guilty of Adam's original sin, and of the sins of our progenitors!! But this is a hard saying to the *Perverter of I Am*. Had he believed the Scriptures of God, they would have been his study and his delight; and then, we should never have heard him declare the Holy Spirit's testimony, viz. that the seventy souls, which came into Egypt with Jacob, came out of Jacob's loins, to be *materialism*. For when he charged Dr. Hawker with being a *materialist*, he did in fact bring that charge against the Holy Spirit; because Dr. Hawker did not believe any thing more respecting the natural generation of mankind than what the Holy Spirit had *expressly revealed*.<sup>a</sup> But what may not such a *scornful* man assert, that denies he was guilty of Adam's sin? That it may not be said I have misrepresented his *Pelagian* creed; I will quote his statement, word for word; as it forms a part of his *sophisticated* arguments, and is one of his depraved reasons, for his absurd notion of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul without a body. He says, “*If our souls were drawn from our parents, must we*  
 “not have been guilty not only of Adam's first sin, but of all

<sup>a</sup> The Reader will not be surprised that Mr. John Stevens, the *Perverter of I Am*, who appears to be so ignorant of *sin*, and of the Scriptures, should have the *impudence* to assert, that some part of Dr. Hawker's spiritual lectures on the person, godhead, and ministry of the Holy Ghost were fraught with darkness and FALSEHOOD and that mere assertion was substituted for argument; that the Doctor's eyes had failed him; that he had taken the wrong turn: and had brought himself and followers into a maze, without once suspecting that he had left the good old way. 1 Let. 12.

“*the sins of our progenitors since the first man. Neither could the soul of Christ escape the guilt and defilement of original sin any more than others.*” 2 Let. 43.

1st. The Holy Ghost answers all these Pelagian questions. He declares that *Levi* was in the loins of his great grand-father Abraham when Melchisedic met him. Heb. vii. 10. And that the souls which came into Egypt with *Jacob*, seventy in number, came out of Jacob's loins. Gen. xlv. 26. Exod. i. 5. The Reader will observe, the Holy Spirit is speaking of them as the *seed of man*; whereas Christ is the *seed of the woman*!

2nd. The Holy Ghost declares, that all mankind in the order of natural generation are guilty of Adam's *first sin*, for it is written, *By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, (eph o pantes emarton) in whom all have sinned.*<sup>a</sup> See marginal reading, Rom. v. 12.

<sup>a</sup> In the life of Dr. Thomas Goodwin, we have an acknowledgement of his guilt of *original sin* in the following words; which, compared with the Perverter's creed, will shew the difference between a regenerate man who has the power of godliness; and an unregenerate man who has the form of it. In the Doctor's life, we read as follows. “But next I was brought to enquire into, and consider of what should have been the original cause at the bottom of all this fore-mentioned sinfulness, both in my heart and life. And after I had well debated with myself that one place, Rom. v. 12. *By one man sin entered the world, and death by him, and so death passed upon all men, in whom, or in that, all sinned*: that it was in him they all sinned, for they had not in and of themselves *actually* sinned (as those that die infants) after the similitude of Adam's transgression, which limitation is cautiously there added by the Apostle, to shew that they had not *actually* sinned of themselves, but are simply involved in his act of sinning; and *that sin* wherein we are all involved, as guilty of it, which is expressly said to be the *disobedience of that one man*; for by one man's disobedience, many of his children of the sons of men were all made sinners, for disobedience notes an act of sinning, not a sinful nature or habit. This caused me necessarily to conceive thus of it, that it was the guilt or demerit of that one man's disobedience, that corrupted my nature. Under such like apprehensions as these did my spirit lie convicted so strongly of this great truth, that being gone to bed some hours before, and filled with these meditations, I in the end of all rose out of bed, being alone, and solemnly fell down on my knees before God, the Father of all the family in heaven; and did on my own accord assume and *take on me the guilt of that sin, AS TRULY AS ANY OF MY OWN ACTUAL SINS!*”

Another gracious man, now deceased, whom the Perverter grossly insulted when living, has written to the following effect upon the same

3rd. The Holy Spirit also describes the reign of death in consequence of Adam's *first sin*: a period of *two thousand five hundred years had passed*, when there was *no written law*, yet death reigned! and even over infants also it had reigned; a plain palpable proof of original sin, and that death was the sure consequence of it. "Nevertheless, saith the Holy Spirit, death reigned from "Adam to Moses, *even over them that had not sinned after "the similitude of Adam's transgression;*" Yet they over whom death reigned, *were sinners*, although they were *infants that had not sinned out of Adam*; therefore, they were guilty of original sin *in him*. Hence come the violent convulsions, and all other diseases, that carry so many infants into another world. Some even die in the womb; some in being delivered, and some shortly after birth. Solemn as the consideration is, yet how evidently true is that Scripture, "Therefore by *ONE offence* (marginal reading) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; (Rom. v. 18,) for the judgment was by "ONE offence to condemnation; but the free gift is of "many offences unto justification?" Rom. v. 16. Adam, therefore, did not merely represent us, for we were *in him*; hence it follows, "*in Adam all die.*" I Cor. xv. 22.

4th. If what the Perverter of I AM says be true, viz. that "the soul is sinless as to formally immoral "qualities, and as it comes out of God's hand yet void "of positive holiness; and that the body antecedent to "its union with a rational soul, is not the subject of "moral obligation, being a mere animal, so not formally "sinful;" (2 Let. 45.) then death could not have reigned over infants with sinless souls and sinless bodies, unless they had sinned in Adam. Thus, according to his own creed, they must all have sinned in Adam! but where did he get his doctrine from, viz. of infants coming into the world with sinless souls and sinless bodies?

subject: "In the instance of Adam, the Apostle considers all his children "implicated in all that concerned him. And it is said of *Levi*, that he "was in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him, and blessed "him, (Heb. vii. 10,) so the whole race of mankind, in the order of "natural generation, were in the loins of Adam when he transgressed "the commands of God, and were with him involved in the same condem- "nation,"

5th. That the Perverter of I AM should question his being guilty of Adam's *first-sin*, and the sins of his progenitors is no marvel ; for the human pre-existerian Pharisees hated CHRIST the Lord, because he charged them with the guilt of all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, whom they slew between the temple and the altar. Matt. xxiii. 35. This, no doubt, is a doctrine perfectly incomprehensible, unreasonable and unjust in the opinion of all intellectual human pre-existerians. But if they had known the plague of their own hearts, they would have known that the natural or soul man looks at the outward transgression, but God looks *at the heart*; for *out of the heart, an important part of a man, proceeds every evil thought*, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. Matt. xv. 19.

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, in the midst of judgment he remembers mercy. He can sanctify his judgments *to his people* when visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, and children's children. And as HE is true to his threatenings, so he is faithful to his promises ; for he will shew, and he hath shewn, mercy to thousands of the descendants of them that love him, and keep his commandments. Reader, compare Exod. xx. 6, with Ezra i. 5.—ii. 1, 3, 14, 35.

But there is another objection made by Mr. John Stevens, the Perverter of I AM, to the doctrine of original sin ; for in his opinion, if we are guilty of Adam's first sin, he boldly affirms, "*Neither could the soul of Christ escape the guilt and defilement of original sin any more than others.*"

1st. If Mr. Stevens did not lean unto his own understanding, (Prov. iii. 5.) he would not be deceived by the writings of profane men, and he would not have made such a vile assertion. For is Christ the *sinful* or *polluted seed of man*? Was he not the seed of the woman? Was Christ's human nature conceived in sin, or shapen in iniquity? Psalm li. 5.

2nd. Was it not a *supernatural* act for a *Virgin* to conceive, and for a *Virgin* to bring forth a son?

3rd. Was not Christ's human nature *begotten in Mary of the Holy Ghost?* Matt. i. 20,

4th. To silence all blasphemers, Jehovah hath expressly declared, concerning the whole human nature of Christ, "The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, a woman shall compass a man. Jerem. xxxi. 22.

5th. It is said that Christ was *made* (not conceived) in all things like unto his brethren. Man was not created sinful; but holy! Our sinful nature did not constitute our original state. Our created state, and our sinful state, ought never to be confounded. Christ's human nature was not begotten in Mary after the manner of man, for it was accomplished without the co-operation of man by the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost! The angel of the Lord said to Joseph, that which is, (*gennethēn.*) *begotten* in her is of the Holy Ghost. Marginal reading Matt. i. 20. And as Mary the Virgin *conceived* without sin, (Luke i. 31, 35,) so she brought forth without sorrow, as it is written, "Before she travailed she brought forth, before her pain came she was delivered of a man child," (Isaiah lxvi. 7.) the (protokos) the *first or chief* born among many brethren; the first or chief of every creature; and the first or chief born of the dead, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, *I will make him the first or chief born.* Psalm lxxxix. 27. And when he came into the world, all the Angels of God worshipped him. Heb. i. 6.

Lastly. The *Mystery of God* is only apprehended by faith, and by them who hold the *mystery of faith in a pure conscience!* it is the revelation God hath given of himself, and of his revealed will, which the Church of God is to believe; and not man's explanation of the mystery. And this is one great cause why the *illiterate* christian enjoys through faith the great mysteries contained in the Holy Scriptures, *because he believes them* through faith, whilst the learned christian attends to his *reasoning* power; and reads with his *reasonable salvos*, "this is only to be understood in such a way; it is not reasonable to believe it in any other sense; it would be absurd to receive for truth what cannot be reasonably comprehended! Whereupon a spiritual

writer hath justly observed ; that he was sure the devil and the pride of man were at the bottom of all this ! Satan does not care, said he, about our reading, provided we reason upon the Scripture ; for by our reasoning he expects to steal away from us the kernel and to leave us the shell ! Satan knows that *whatsoever is not of FAITH is SIN!!*

Satan is more subtle than *man*. After many years experience, he knows it to be very difficult to convince a man against his *conscience*, though *fallen*. To obtain for himself an easy victory over the difficulties of a natural man's *conscience*, he suggests that *men ought to believe what may be proved by syllogisms!* and as the *Perverter* of I AM artfully, and from a *false* principle, introduced them to support the *tradition* of the Pharisees ! so I have taken the course, of presenting his young rooks with some *syllogistic food*, because it is written, *God taketh the wise in their own craftiness.* Job. v. 13. I Cor. iii. 16.

The argument generally used by all the Pharisees in favour of their tradition is, that as *the souls of dead men pre-exist the taking of their bodies until the resurrection, BY THE SAME LAW, the soul of Christ might pre-exist his taking a body of the virgin mother.* From this sophisticated reason I shall form *three human pre-existerian syllogisms*, that the reader may not be deceived by such acts of subtilty.

1st. As the souls of dead men pre-exist their taking of their bodies until the resurrection ; so Christ's soul pre-existed his taking a body *of the virgin* ; therefore Christ's soul was in the state of dead men.

2nd. The cause why the soul of a man-pre-exists in a separate state, his taking of his body until the resurrection is, his having sinned. Christ had the soul of a man pre-existing in a separate state, his taking a body *of the virgin* ; therefore Christ *had sinned*.

3rd. *The souls of the damned* pre-exist their taking of their bodies until the resurrection, and abide under the wrath of God ; Christ's soul pre-existed his taking a body *of the virgin*, and was to suffer the wrath of God ; therefore Christ's soul pre-existed in the state of the damned.

Now these are three of the *Perverter's syllogisms*,



formed by THE SAME LAW as laid down by Mr. Samuel Stockell, a human pre-existerian Dam, and *approved* of by Mr. John Stevens, (1 Let. 22, 23,) who calls them heavy things to toss out of the way. And therefore, according to his syllogistic creed, Christ's human soul pre-existed in the same state as the souls of the damned until the resurrection of their bodies. Now, however profligate this statement may appear, nevertheless, all the human pre-existerians intimate, that their pre-existing *human* soul Christ lived a life of misery previous to his incarnation; for they describe the human soul of their Christ as *grieving, repenting, &c.* (S. D. 195.) so that Paradise, where, they say, the human soul of Christ was placed, was to their Christ a place of torment.

4th. The Perverter of I AM declares, that Christ's pre-existing human soul possessed similar faculties and properties with our own; (S. D. 16,) and that God produces our souls sinless as to formally immoral qualities, *yet void of positive holiness.*—2 Let. 45. From this statement, I shall form another human pre-existerian syllogism.

All our souls are produced sinless as to formally immoral qualities, yet void of positive holiness; Christ's soul possessed similar faculties and properties with our own; therefore Christ's soul was sinless as to formally immoral qualities, *yet void of positive holiness!* Now this is a heavy thing, the *Perverter* says, to toss out of the way.

But if he means to say, that Christ's soul *did* possess positive holiness, and ours not; then Christ's soul did not, according to his *plain reason* creed, possess similar faculties and properties with our own. Now these syllogisms prove, that if the Perverter had believed in the revelation God hath made of the creation of all mankind in Adam, and of that new thing created in the earth, he never would have been the dupe of the Pharisees, nor have published such abominations. But like his predecessors, the Pharisees, he renders the word of God void by his traditions!

*Secondly.* He says, "It is not the act of generation that defiles the begotten; the whole mass of nature is defiled

“before that takes place. And further, that all the souls “of men were represented by Adam *as well as their* “bodies, though they were not seminally in him.” 2 Let. 44, 45. “And further, that the seed of the woman, strictly speaking, denotes *the matter* of which the Lord’s body was formed.”—1 Let. 26. From this statement I shall form two or more human pre-existerian *sylogisms*.

*The whole mass of nature is defiled before the act of generation takes place*; Christ’s human body was part of that whole mass of nature; therefore Christ’s human body was defiled! What a horrid doctrine! This is another *pre-existerian* syllogism, which the Perverter says, is a heavy thing to toss out of the way, and this is another of the awful consequences of his perversion of the Holy Scriptures.

But, he says, “The souls of men were represented by “Adam as well as their bodies, though their souls were “not seminally in him!”

Now, for another human pre-existerian syllogism. Adam represented ALL the souls of men *as well as their bodies*, though they were not seminally in him; Christ had the soul of a man; therefore Adam represented Christ’s soul! Here is another human *pre-existerian* syllogism, a heavy thing to toss out of the way; and another of the sad consequences of the *Pelagian* and human pre-existerian heresy!

But probably, the *Perverter* of I AM means, that Adam did not represent Christ’s soul, because in his opinion, it pre-existed Adam; yet nevertheless he admits *without any exception*, that Adam represented Christ’s body! And as he and *Pelagius* say, *our souls were not in Adam when he sinned*; and as he further states, we were represented by Adam, whereby our moral rectitude was lost (not by our being in Adam) but by the one offence of Adam as our common representative and public head, (2 Let. 45,) therefore, I shall form two more human pre-existerian syllogisms from this statement, that the enmity of the *serpent* and its *seed may* be seen in its *reasonable* form opposed to the *woman* and her seed. Gen iii. 15.

Adam represented all mankind, the bodies of men being seminally in him; Christ had the body of a man in Adam; therefore Adam represented Christ’s body!

Moral rectitude was lost by the one offence of Adam, by all whose bodies were seminally in Adam; Christ's body was seminally in Adam; therefore the moral rectitude of Christ as man was lost. Now, this is the human pre-existerian's display of their *plain reason* creed, proved by their own syllogisms, *those heavy things*, which the Perverter cannot toss out of the way.

Reader, you here see some of the sad consequences of believing *a lie*, even the enmity of the serpent and his seed to the woman and her *seed!* Thus human pre-existerian Pharisees, with subtle questions and sophisticated statements, *always* did, and *always* will, manifest their deadly enmity to the woman, and her *seed*. Gen. iii. 15.

*Thirdly.* The *Perverter* of I AM tells us, "The bodies "of men antecedent to their union with a rational soul, "are not the subjects of moral obligation, being a mere "animal, so not formally sinful."<sup>a</sup> 2 Let. 45. But how does this agree with his former statement, "that the "whole mass of nature is defiled before the act of gene- "ration takes place!" 2 Let. 44. If the whole mass of nature is defiled before the act of generation takes place, where do *his* bodies of men not formally sinful come from? Are these bodies no part of the whole mass of nature? Thus this poor deluded fabler sometimes says one thing, and sometimes the very reverse, as he thinks it may suit his pharisaical lie. So true is that Scripture concerning the *false witnesses* who arose, and who do arise, to bear witness against "the Christ of God;" viz.

<sup>a</sup> The *Perverter* of I AM has not one portion of Holy Scripture to support his *fabulous* doctrine of *sinless souls*, and of the generation of *sinless human bodies*. This, *his error*, has been *pointed* out to him, and he felt the rebuke; but instead of acknowledging his error as a godly man would have done, he tried to conceal his iniquity by intimating that *Dr. Gill*, whose *Trinitarian creed* he holds in *abhorrence*, maintained the *substance* of his *depraved notions!* C. F. i. 18. But surely, he would not have us believe, that he received his doctrine of *sinless souls and bodies* from the doctor, *as young rooks receive food from their dams*. S. D. 208. That, no doubt, is impossible! And the godly Reader may be assured, the *Perverter* would never have referred his *young rooks* to *Dr. Gill*, the defender of the *essential* truth of that revelation, which Jehovah hath made of himself, but from a *base motive*; for he knows he might have referred to *his dear son*, in the *human pre-existerian creed*, *Mr. Kittson*, one, who has openly denied his faith in the Trinitarians' Jesus Christ!

*neither did their witness agree together.* Mark xiv. 59. It is confidently stated, that many of the human pre-existerians do not believe what they have stated in support of this fable. But if this be true—then what an infamous doctrine must this tradition be, that obliges its promulgators to prostitute their time and talents, in drawing up arguments and statements which they themselves do not believe, and which their *pride* will not allow them afterwards to *dis-avow!* And I now defy them to produce one Scripture in proof, that our bodies are not formally sinful *since the fall.* If our *bodies since the fall be not formally generated sinful,* how came the Holy Ghost to designate all mankind, in the order of natural generation since the fall, to be *sinful flesh?* Rom. viii. 3. Is the Holy Ghost to be repeatedly held up as a liar by these intellectual human soul pre-existerians with impunity? The *Perverter* has the *audacity to affirm* the phrase “sinful flesh” does not include the soul! But that I may not be said to misrepresent him, I will give the Reader the *Perverter’s* own words. He says, by the phrase God sending his own son in the likeness of *sinful flesh, his soul cannot here be meant.*—(S. D. 184.) Again, by “his coming into our world described by taking flesh and blood, body, the fashion of a man, the likeness of *sinful flesh,* &c. there is *much reason* to suppose that the Son of God “had a human soul before.”—(S. D. 186.) Now as Mr. J. Stevens’ *much reason* cannot allow the human soul to be included in the phrase *sinful flesh,* how does it happen with his *much reason,* that he should charge the Holy Ghost with testifying to a lie, by calling our flesh since the fall *sinful flesh,* if it were not *sinful,* or did not include the soul? Therefore, the phrase *sinful flesh* either includes the soul, or it does not. If it does, then the pre-existence of the human soul is a lie: and if it does not, then our bodies since the fall are formally *generated sinful,* and the *Perverter* of I AM is a *liar* and a *blasphemer.*

Again, if the *Perverter’s* statements were true, namely, that our bodies are not the subjects of moral obligation, so not formally sinful; that men do not generate their own kind; that the seed of the woman, the *antithesis* to the

seed of the serpent, denotes, strictly speaking, the *body* of our Lord; that Christ was not the *second* and *last* Adam, but the first Adam; then *avowed* infidels and freethinkers may fairly quote the Perverter's freethinking writings as their authority, for treating the miraculous conception as an absurdity; because the miraculous conception was *unnecessary* and *unnatural*, and as such, a *human pre-existerian absurdity*. Having premised these things, I shall now expose the human pre-existerians' *perversion* of the Holy Scriptures, respecting the image and likeness of Adam, in which he begat children.

1st. The Holy Ghost testifies, that Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son *in his own likeness, and after his own image*; and called his name Seth, Gen. v. 3. But the pre-existerian fabler says, that "Adam begat animal bodies only, not the subject of moral obligation, so not formally sinful;" consequently, his version of this Scripture will read thus, *And sinful Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat an animal body only, not the subject of moral obligation, and so not formally sinful*. But, what was Adam's own likeness and image? Was it a body without a soul? Was it a body without moral obligation? Observe the blasphemy! Are we to accuse the Holy Ghost of *lying*, by saying his record is untrue,—that Adam did not beget a son, but only *part* of a son? and further, that, the Holy Ghost was so *wilfully* false, or ignorant, of Adam's likeness and image as a *fallen creature*, that he made a false entry in the Holy Records? It has been noted by godly men in opposition to *Pelagius*, that the Holy Spirit has taken particular notice, that fallen Adam communicated his *own* image as a sinner to his posterity. Gen. v. 3. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness after his image." Compare this statement, say the godly, with the testimony of the image in which Adam was created. For God said, Let us make man in *our* image, after our likeness—in the image and after the likeness of God. Behold here, say the godly, how the image in which Adam was made, and the image in which his natural offspring are begotten are *opposed*

Man was made in knowledge, upright, righteous, and in true holiness, but sinful Adam begat a sinful son. Hence it is written, "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Psalm li. 5. "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, *speaking lies.*" Psalm lviii. 3. Sinful flesh is not the original formation or essence of man, but sinful flesh is the nature of man since the fall. Man's knowledge and man's wisdom since the fall are so sinfully depraved, that unregenerate "men trust in their own wickedness!" Isaiah xlvii. 10. And the elect, until born of the Spirit, in common with the rest of mankind since the fall, are "*intellectually wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge.*" Jerem. iv. 22. How different was Adam's wisdom and knowledge before the fall! Alas! what will not a hardened sinner say? And what will not a man say, that is wise *above* what is written?

2nd. Was not the creation of the first man, the creation of all mankind in the order of natural or soul generation? Did not every creature, which God created, contain its seed after its kind (*genos*?) Did not even the oak contain all the acorns it would produce in successive generations from age to age, some of which would become trees? The Scripture saith, the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, was after its (*genos*) kind. Gen. i. 12.

The metaphysical fabler may gape and wonder at this, although it is no more marvellous than what he does not understand, but is obliged to acknowledge, namely, *the phenomenon of the silk worm.* But if ever he should become a *Jew inwardly*, (Rom. ii. 29,) he will be convinced that sin is a *positive* thing, the work of the devil, and he will then become a fool that he may be wise, 1 Cor. iii. 18.

But to return, it is written, "And the days of Adam after he had begotten Seth were eight hundred years; and he begat sons and daughters." Gen. v. 4. Now according to the Perverter's doctrine, not one of these sons and daughters were sinful flesh, for he must read this Scripture according to his *plain reason creed*, as follows:

And the days of Adam after he had begotten Seth's body not subject to moral obligation, and so not formally sinful, were eight hundred years, and he begat the bodies only of sons and daughters, not the subjects of moral obligation, so not formally sinful! Again, he must read, according to his doctrine, Gen. xxi. 2, thus: And Sarah conceived and bare Abraham the body of a son in his old age, not the subject of moral obligation, so not formally sinful, at the set time, of which the Lord Christ, who was *not* the Eternal God, had spoken to him.<sup>a</sup> And he also reads, Gen. xxv. 19.—1 Chron. i. 34.—Matt. i. 2.—Acts vii. 8, thus, Abraham begat a part only of Isaac, namely, his body without a soul, which was not the subject of moral obligation, so not formally sinful! 2 Let. 41, 42, 45. Thus this pre-existerian fabler represents the Holy Scriptures as so loosely and carelessly written, by those holy men of old, who were moved by the Holy Ghost, that they are too *incorrect* and *unreasonable* to be believed, and therefore, freethinking intellectual men are wise and prudent in rejecting them.

3rd. I must now recall to the Reader's recollection, that *the Perverter* says, "our bodies previous to their union with a rational soul are not the subjects of moral obligation, being *mere animal*, so not formally sinful;" and further, "that the act of generation does not defile the begotten:"—were the contrary the case, "marriage could not be honourable, and the bed undefiled, as the Holy Ghost has declared." 2 Let. 44

How, then, does it happen, if the act of generation does not defile the begotten, that the *mere animal* in embryo is oft-times infected, or diseased, from the period of its generation? And if there is no defilement in the act of generation, is the fifteenth chapter of Leviticus to be rejected as untrue! Did the Holy Ghost record a falsehood, or make a mistake, when through his conviction, one of the saints of old said, "Behold I

<sup>a</sup> Mr. Stevens, the *avowed* author of "Celestial Filiation" declares, the Lord Christ who appeared unto Abraham, was not the eternal God! See C. F. i. p. 60. This was not his *notion* formerly: but any thing is received from him as food by his young rooks.

“was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me?” Is it a harmless thing, thus to make the God of truth a liar? And how came the Perverter to omit *part of the 4th verse* of the 13th chapter of the Hebrews, and that, the material part, which shews the mind of the Spirit: viz. “but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.”<sup>a</sup> Has he never read, or if he

<sup>a</sup> The *Perverter* of I AM hath repeated in his writings several times, “Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb;”—a part only of the disciples’ reply. And this he did to induce his young rooks to believe, that Christ was speaking of his *human soul* as coming *from* the Father, and going *to* the Father; that Christ was only what he calls “the immortal man, that was reserved in the Lord Christ, that came out,” &c. Whereas, our Lord was speaking of himself as a distinct person in the Godhead, and of his *coming forth or procession in the way of manifestation* from the Father, by taking of the seed of Abraham. And this the disciples clearly understood, for they immediately testified their belief in Jesus as the OMNISCIENT GOD, saying, “Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb;” *now are we sure that thou knowest all things*, &c. This *fact* was plainly pointed out to Mr. J. Stevens previous to his writing “Celestial Filiation, of which he now acknowledges himself to have been the author. And so far from admitting his perversion and *misquotation* of this Holy Scripture, he has actually reiterated part, viz. the *beginning* and the *end* of the reply, carefully omitting the material part, *Christ’s omniscience*; because he knew it destroyed his fable, that lying tradition of the Pharisees, which he has promulgated since the year 1803, namely, the pre-existence of the human soul, with the rest of these abominations. No marvel, that he should fear them, *who try the spirits whether they be of God!*

The Scripture, as it reads in the Holy Record, John xvi. 29, 30.

*His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God.*

The Scripture, as it is *wilfully misquoted* in Celest. Fil. Pt. I. p. 52.

Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb; by this we believe that thou camest forth from God.

The Reader will remember Mr. J. Stevens’ Christ was not in heaven when he spoke to Nicodemus, and he will therefore observe, that the *Perverter* of I AM has *craftily* omitted quoting Christ’s Omniscience. But if Mr. Colyer or Dr. Hawker had omitted for the sake of deception, an essential part of a sentence in the word of God, what would Mr. J. Stevens of Mead’s Court have said of them? The phrase “*Scoundrel*,” would have been too mild a name, for Mr. Stevens to use, after what he has said of others. Let therefore, this pharisaical Perverter be judged out of his own mouth; for he saith, “Whenever any man, professing to be a “Christian,” not to say, a minister of Christ’s gospel, “*makes it evident*



has, does he reject, the 15th chap. of Leviticus, as well as the books of Kings and Chronicles from his *revered* Bible. No doubt, his *much reason* may reject it, as Dr. *Priestly* and *Gilbert Wakefield* may have done, as absurd: for what may he not reject, after twenty two years publishing to the world, his *Scriptural Display* of an *assumed* Father, of an *assumed* Son, and of an *assumed* Holy Spirit, who will hereafter lay aside these assumptions?

Reader, the Holy Spirit has shewn the natural consequences of our fallen state to be such, that the act of generation itself, and every thing connected therewith is unclean, (see Leviticus xv,) that the very desires of nature are corrupt, and the multiplying of our species is in sin: as it is written, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Psalm li. 5.

*Fourthly.* I shall now proceed to notice another part of the *Perverter's* creed, "An animal, he says, generates its own kind; but who does not see that man stands higher in the scale of beings, by reason of *not generating his own kind*; and because he has an immortal nature or spirit immediately from God, which borrows nothing of its being from material things!"—I. Let. 32. If the *Perverter* had not been speaking of mankind in the order of *natural generation*, I should have been spared the necessity of making the following observation.

1st. Do animals generate their life or breath from material things? 2nd. Have not animals their life or breath from God? Is it not written, "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing he is Lord of

*that he can descend to the most vile and detractions insinuations against men of established character, and can wilfully misrepresent their sentiments while they lie in print before his eyes; it is then become manifest, that his censure is no real dishonour, and his commendation a disgrace. Who could credit such a man upon his oath, without the utmost danger of being deceived? where integrity is evidently abandoned, suspicion cannot sleep, nor confidence find repose."* C. E. i. 6. This is Mr. Stevens' own judgment. Then what other sentence can he pass upon himself, for *repeatedly wilfully misrepresenting the testimony of Christ's disciples,*  
WHILE IT LAID IN PRINT BEFORE HIS EYES.

“heaven and earth, &c. and giveth to all life and breath  
 “and all things!!” Acts xvii. 24, 25. Reader, what are we to think of such an *ignorant* or wilfully ignorant character as a human soul Pre-existerian? Are we to be mute, when we find such persons insidiously undermining the Holy Scriptures, yet *pretending to acknowledge* their divine authority? This unregenerate man, no doubt, will consider me his enemy, because I tell him the truth: nevertheless, what I have written, has been in an humble hope that his eyes may be opened to see the truth, and that he may have grace to acknowledge that God is true, and himself to have been a liar! 3rd. Is not the *mule* an animal? Do *mules* generate their own kind? Or, do animals generate a mocker of believer’s baptism, or a blasphemer, or an Arian, a Socinian, a Pharisaical fabler, or a pseudo-Trinitarian; one that professes to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, but declares the revelation Jehovah hath made of himself, the Three that bear record in heaven, to be under *assumed* names, &c. Are such monsters to be found amongst the beasts that perish? 4th. Is an unregenerate man of any denomination, since the fall, to be considered higher in the scale of being, by reason of his generating a *sinner*, who is exceeding sinful, a monster which God never created? Mules are called monsters—but they do not generate their own kind! Yet an unregenerate man, whose carnal mind is enmity against God, generates a monster like himself, an enemy to God, with a heart, part of his body, which the Perverter says is not formally sinful, but which God saith is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked,—with a throat an open sepulchre, with a tongue of deceit, the poison of asps under the lip, a mouth full of cursing and bitterness, &c. and with no fear of God before his eyes. Jer. xvii. 9.—Rom. iii. 13—19. Is, then, the body of a man not the subject of moral obligation? If it be not, *did its sinful soul make its heart deceitful above all things?* Deluded Fabler! Reader, it was before Dr. Hawker received the Perverter’s *second* letter, that the Dr. replied to the Perverter’s *scornful* observation, “Who does not see that man stands higher in the scale “of being,” &c. in the following language.

“Your views of man’s standing higher in the scale  
 “of being than brutes, and *that* by reason of his not  
 “generating entirely his own kind, is assuming a thing  
 “*which you have not supported by any authority.* And the  
 “instance you give, in the history of Abraham, in be-  
 “getting Isaac, that he begat his body only, *I think you*  
 “*will find no small difficulty to prove.* The word of God  
 “appears to intimate more. The Holy Ghost speaking  
 “of the two Adams as the heads of their respective seeds,  
 “saith, ‘The FIRST ADAM was a living soul; the LAST  
 “ADAM was made a quickening spirit,’ 1 Cor. xv. 45.  
 “Who can take upon him to say, what is, and what is  
 “not, communicated by those respective heads to their  
 “respective seeds? In respect to Christ, here called the  
 “last Adam, in his being said to be, a quickening spirit,  
 “we cannot but know, that this is not said in allusion to  
 “the quickening himself, but of his seed. John v. 21.  
 “And as this is said of Christ, by way of explaining what  
 “was said before of the first Adam, his being a living  
 “soul; it would seem to say, that he is not considered as a  
 “single person, but as a public Head; *and so formed to*  
 “*convey that nature to others, which he had personally in*  
 “*himself.* What that nature is, and of its full extent and  
 “meaning, I have no apprehension, much less to ex-  
 “plain.”

“But on the ground you take, that every man hath an  
 “immortal nature, or spirit, immediately from God, which  
 “borrows nothing of its being from material things; it  
 “will follow by an *undeniable* consequence, that if we  
 “have our spirits immediately from God, and borrow  
 “nothing of that being from material things, neither can  
 “we then borrow, or derive any thing *of their corruptions;*  
 “and then original sin in our spiritual part is done away.  
 “If God, in the instance of every human being created,  
 “gives an immortal nature or spirit immediately from  
 “himself, and we derive nothing from our parents but a  
 “mere body; polluted and sinful as that body is, because  
 “generated from such a stock; yet *our immortal part*  
 “*coming from God must be holy.* The Scripture, which in  
 “consequence of original, as well as actual transgression,  
 “declares every son and daughter of Adam to be dead in

“trespasses and sins, considers the soul in this state of  
“spiritual death, (for it is not the body that is here  
“spoken of,) and hence the necessity of the new birth!”

Dr. Hawker truly revered his bible: He was no fabler; He was no *materialist*, for God had given him an understanding to know, that *spirit* could not be obtained by distillation from *grain*, unless the spirit had been in the grain previous to distillation. Dr. Hawker was a spiritual man; in his writings are many excellent notes, supported by Scripture, distinguishing the soul of a man from the spirit of a man, 1 Thess. v. 23, Heb. iv. 12, of which the human pre-existerian pharisaical disciples are wholly ignorant.

So ignorant is the *Perverter of I AM* of the Holy Scriptures, that he states “the traduction of souls cannot  
“be true, because it involves consequences opposed to  
“the Scripture account of generation, and of the holi-  
“ness of Christ as man.” 2 Let. 44.<sup>a</sup> Now if this Fa-  
bler had *revered* his bible, he would have known that the traduction of human souls and bodies was in the order and Scripture account of *natural* generation, and that the holiness of Christ as man was secured by *supernatural* generation; for it was begotten in Mary of the Holy Spirit! And he would also have known, that it was as *supernatural* for a holy incorruptible body *with life*, that no man could take away, to be begotten in Mary, a VIRGIN, as for a virgin to bring forth a begotten soul and body. But, here I cannot avoid quoting the Perverter’s ridiculous reason why he thinks the

“The *Perverter of I AM* contends, that Christ was *not* made in all things like unto his brethren. He reads *begotten* for *made*, as though Parents were the *makers* or *creators* of their children. He argues, that “if Christ was *made* in all things like unto his brethren, then he must “have been *begotten* by man;—that Mary could not have been a virgin “when he was born, that he must have been conceived in sin, and shapen “in iniquity; *these*, he says, *must be admitted for him* TO BE MADE IN “*all things like to his brethren;*” 1 Let. 23.—3 Let. 31. The Reader may wonder, how such a *man of all the reason in the world*, should be so ignorant, as not to know, that the word *made* is not of the same meaning as the word *begotten*: but such is the fact; or else, he ignorantly or wilfully perverts the plain meaning of the Holy Scriptures recorded in Heb. ii. 17. Such disgraceful perversions are, however, the wretched means to which the human pre-existerians are obliged to resort in support of their fable.