

to be explained ; for he was to be known only by divine revelation : “*oudeis,*”^a no man, saith Jesus, *knoweth the Son save the FATHER ! neither knoweth (oude), any man the FATHER save the SON, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.* Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22.

Oudeis, Dr. Hawker observes, doth signify “*no one, neither Angel or man,*” so that our Lord’s testimony is very remarkable: no mere creature knoweth the Son but the Father, that is, the *modus*. It is God only that can know God. For though the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the Godhead are revealed in the Holy Scriptures, as articles of faith, yet no mere creature knoweth how the Son is the Son ! And so in like manner, no mere creature knoweth how the Father is the Father, &c. They are only known as such in their essential nature to and by each other. And when Jesus adds, “*And he to whom the Son reveals the Father ;*” that is, such an *internal* revelation of him as Peter, Paul and others received by faith from God. When the Reader hath duly pondered this unanswerable testimony of Jesus ; let him then consider, if the revelation, both of the Father and of the Son be made, and is made, by Jesus concerning the Father, and by the Father concerning the Son, that no mere creature, but God only can impart this divine knowledge. And in confirmation of this unquestionable truth, according to the order of those words, no man knoweth the Son but the Father, let him observe Christ’s testimony to Peter, for it was not flesh and blood that revealed it to Peter, but my Father said Jesus, who is in heaven. Matt. xvi. 13—17. And Paul’s testimony also, is to the same effect. Gal. i. 11-16. In like manner,

^a There are numerous instances which might be quoted of the Perverter’s *contradictoriness*, saying one thing at one time, and intimating or saying the reverse at another. We have an instance of this kind with regard to the Greek word *oudeis*, which in his Scripture Display, page 229, he renders *none* ; but when rendered *none* by an *anti-human* pre-existential, the Perverter in his Celestial Filiation, i. 57, says, “*is correctly translated no man !*” Thus, to use his own words, “*our extraordinary critic who so well understands his subject is again beaten back, and his armour taken from him.*” As the Perverter’s writings since 1812, do not want for contradictoriness, we may be sure Mr. Colyer’s *kind heart did not pine after them ; or he would have exposed them.* E. S. 3.

let the Reader consult these Scriptures, which equally prove, that the knowledge of the Father is with the Son, and to whom the Lord Jesus reveals him. See John i. 18.—vi. 46.—x. 15.—xiv. 9, 10.

In opposition to this infallible testimony, we find the human pre-existerians amongst others *in battle array*. “The Perverter’s “*Scriptural Display of the Tri-une God, &c.*” has amongst other things, this remarkable *antichristian* feature, viz. the attempt to prove the LORD JESUS CHRIST *to be a LIAR*, by *explaining, in opposition to our Lord’s testimony, the modus of the Father and of the Son*, by the setting up of a human soul as existing without a body, *by the same law, AS THE SOULS OF THE DEAD!* (1 Let. 22, 23.) And so great is the spirit of delusion under which the *Perverter of I AM* labours, that although he knows *Antichrist* to signify *one that is against Christ*, yet he *reasons* himself into the belief, that he is not *against Christ*, when he is trying to overthrow the *veracity* of Christ, by saying, the *utility of the doctrine of pre-existence is evident in aiding us to EXPLAIN the doctrine of the SONSHIP of our exalted LORD, &c.* (C. F. ii. 76.) No doubt the *avowed* infidel may acknowledge the *utility of this pharisaical tradition*, for it is one of the most subtle attacks that was ever made upon the testimony of Christ: but the faithful christian will not be deceived by the Perverter’s *plain reason for the names of Father and Son*; for his plain reason is not of *faith*, and *whatsoever is not of faith is sin*. Rom. xiv. 23. Thus under the *specious* appearance of *plain reason*, he is opposing *the mystery of faith*, (1 Tim. iii. 9,) and *the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ*, (Col. ii. 2,) and explaining away, or rather *destroying the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ*. It is a true saying, “Where mystery begins, the “religion of the man of reason ends.”

Believer! Be not deceived, evil communication corrupts good manners. The Apostle John saw in vision, heaven opened, and behold a white horse, and he that sat upon it was called *Faithful* and TRUE. And in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many

crowns. And he had a NAME WRITTEN THAT (*oudeis*) none KNEW BUT HE HIMSELF. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called "THE WORD OF GOD." Rev. xix. 11—13.^a

This *written* name which *no mere creature* knows, is the stumbling stone, and rock of offence to Antichrist, and to all *human pre-existerians*. But as the Perverter of I Am has very artfully attempted to prove the Lord Jesus Christ *to be a liar*; I shall place our Lord's testimony, to the *written name which none knoweth* but Christ himself, (Rev. xix. 12,) in one column, and the Perverter's *plain reason denial* of the truth thereof in an opposite column, that Antichrist may be seen and known, by his *expressly delineated features*, viz. the *denial of the Father and of the Son*.

Our Lord's testimony concerning his Sonship; that, the modus thereof is incomprehensible.

My Father worketh hitherto, and I work, John v. 17. *I and MY FATHER are one.* John x. 30. *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; BECAUSE I SAID, I AM THE SON OF GOD.* John x. 36. All things are delivered

The human pre-existerians testimony, or plain reason to prove our Christ is a liar.

"We are called as believers in Christ to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *These three names must now be accounted for, if possible, without denying the divinity of either of these persons who wear them.*" S. D. 27. "That

^a Dr. Hawker, in his Poor Man's Commentary, has the following note upon Rev. xix. 12, "I must beg the Reader to regard with me, the very great blessedness of the name spoken of, which no man knew but he himself. Indeed what is here said is enough, one should think, to deter any man, and every man, yea, every angel of light, from speaking on so mysterious a subject decidedly; for if no man knoweth this name of Jesus written, BUT HE HIMSELF, how presumptuous must it be in any to attempt the discovery? Reader! pause for the moment, and before you go further, ask yourself, whether any higher testimony can be desired, in proof of Christ's GODHEAD. If none can know his name, who shall know his person? Who shall declare his generation? Oh! how overwhelming is this testimony to a heart taught of God! Truly, dearest Lord, I behold a blessedness in thy words, used upon another occasion, which bring a peculiar strength of expression, when applied here upon this: no man knoweth the Son, but the FATHER; neither knoweth any man the FATHER, save the SON, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22.

unto me of MY FATHER; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22.^a Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Matt. vii. 21. That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. John v. 23.

“those names were *chosen* with a view to the Sonship of the Lord Jesus, and are founded in his complex person and fulness. That Sonship respects the human nature of our blessed Lord.” S. D. 28. By including the ancient existence of the soul of our Lord, we obtain a plain reason for the names of Father and Son. S. D. 30. The paternity and filiation respect not the divine nature, which is common to the Holy Three; BUT THE HUMAN NATURE of the Son. C. F. i. 48.

If this human pre-existerian statement were true,

^a The Reader will not be displeased with the following notes, taken from the writings of Dr. Gill and others, in support of the truth of Christ's testimony, viz., that the Sonship of Christ is *incomprehensible!*

Dr. Gill.—“No man knoweth the Son but the Father: that is, the transcendent glories and perfections of his nature as the *Son of God.*”

Dr. Guyse.—“None knows who, or what the Son is, and what is the trust committed to him, but the Father.”

Dr. Doddridge.—“These words evidently declare, that there is something *inexplicably mysterious* in the nature and person of Christ.”

Dr. Hawker.—“These are very blessed words of Jesus, (for very blessed they are in my view,) in which the Lord hath said, that the knowledge of the Persons of the Godhead is wholly in themselves.”

The learned Gomer.—“Some particulars are ascribed to the *Father* alone, to the *Son* alone, and to the *Spirit* alone, which are not to be understood in reference to the other persons in the Godhead, but *only in relation to the creatures.* For instance, Matt. xi. 27, “*No one (oudeis, nemo,) knoweth the Son but the Father; that is, he alone knoweth.* But the Son must certainly know his own self, (Rev. xix. 12,) nor can the Spirit be ignorant of him, because he searcheth all things, yea, the (*profunda*) deep things of God. 1 Cor. ii. 10. *Here therefore the creatures are excluded.* Again, Christ says, “Neither knoweth any one the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.” Here surely the Father is not excluded from the knowledge of himself, nor yet the Holy Spirit. Again, “The things of God knoweth (*oudeis*) no one but the Spirit of God.” 1 Cor. ii. 11. And yet, beyond all controversy, neither the Father nor the Son are excluded from that knowledge. But all these propositions, *the knowledge of the Son to the Father alone, the knowledge of the Father to the Son alone, and the knowledge of God to the Spirit alone, are to be understood as excluding the creatures, but not as excluding the knowledge of one divine person from the other two.*

That highly-favoured Servant of the Lord, the late Dr. Hawker, in his excellent answer to the Perverter's first *insulting* letter, says, “Sir, I

then divine revelation would be a cunningly devised fable, and the consequences thereof would be as follows.

1st. If the Sonship or filiation of Christ, respect not the divine nature, but be founded in his human nature, then the Perverter's plain reason proves, that the Holy Ghost is the Father of Christ, and therefore, the human pre-existerian's reasonable Tri-une God consists of *two* divine persons and one human!

2nd. If the human pre-existerian doctrine be true, that the paternity and filiation respect not the divine nature, then between the *Father and Son* there is no real *kindred*, but a *mere* fabulous relationship!

3rd. If the human pre-existerian doctrine be true, then the gift of the Holy Spirit, and his dwelling in the saints, is greater than the gift of the human pre-existerian's immortal man reserved in the Lord Christ that came out, &c., which they call the *Son*, (S. J. 19,) who, they say, was not in heaven, when he was talking to Nicodemus upon earth!

“have never *presumed to look into*, much less enter the hallowed ground “of mystery in relation to the *Modus existendi* of the Divine Persons in “the Godhead. I have no conception of the nature of that relationship “which subsists between the Father and the Son. *I read of it continually in the Scriptures*, and I most cordially accept it, as it is proposed for the object of FAITH. But as the word of God, though plainly “declaring it, hath not explained it, so neither do I.”—“It is the fact,” saith that spiritual man, “and not the *modus existendi*, that the Church “is concerned to know. *Every attempt to investigate this mystery is presumptuous*. From all such unbecoming enquiries I would wish to retire with the most profound humility.” Blessed be God, we have Jehovah's infallible word; we have the testimony of Jesus; and we have the Spirit of Prophecy, with the experience and faith of the saints; that the paternity of the Father, and the filiation of the Son are *incomprehensible*, but nevertheless, apprehended and enjoyed through the Spirit of faith: for the *Father and the Son*, and *the things which God hath prepared for them that love him*, are revealed unto them by his Spirit. 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10. Thus the Father revealed the Son to Peter; and thus revealed his Son in Paul: and thus the Son reveals the Father; and thus the Spirit of God reveals the things of God! Then, what must be the end of the believers in a plain reason creed? A creed so plain, so rational, and intellectual, as must be the duty of all natural men to believe; for what is plain reason must be surely within the natural power of *men of reason*. And no doubt, such is the *Perverter's* real opinion, notwithstanding he has written to the contrary; indeed his doctrine of sinless souls and sinless bodies is an incontrovertible evidence of the fact. Hence it is, that he tries to avoid those godly dissenters, whose minds have been deeply impressed, to try the spirits whether they be of God.

4th. Thus we have in the *Perverter's Scriptural Display*, and in his *Celestial Filiation*, his *plain reason creed*, why Divine Revelation cannot be essentially true, and *all his reason in the world* (S. D. 16,) set up in opposition to Believer's baptism, and "*the Christ of God.*" E. S. 18. Thus the young rooks are fed with a *plain reason Father and Son*, and a reasonable Tri-une God by the human pre-existerian dams. But they who cannot *digest* this vile Jewish tradition are told, it is a very harmless thing, *if compared with other lies, although it be a lie*, (C. F. i. 13.) But the old dams and young rooks will one day know that *all liars are under the law*, (1 Tim. i. 9, 10,) and *will have their portion with unbelievers*. Rev. xxi. 8, 27. xxii. 15.

In addition to the above attack upon the divine veracity, the young rooks are also taught to sing *the Song of the Drunkards*. (Psalm lxxix. 22.) For the human *soul* pre-existerian pharisees, who crucified Christ as a blasphemer, because *he said*, "I AM THE SON OF "God," were the men who sat in the gate, who spake against him, and made him the song of the drunkards; and their disciples, the human pre-existerians now, following their example, have also made him the song of the *drunkards with their delusion*. The Perverter of I AM even composed the song; at a time I must suppose, when he was labouring under a fit of human pre-existerian *monomania*: (E. S. 10,) or he must have studied the most disgraceful mode of rhyming by way of *mockery*: for *he never would have written and published the following doggerel rhymes, unless he had been a fanatic, or a mocker!*—

"The soul was begotten in union with one,
 "In sovereignty named the Son;
 "Which name he received to be truly his own,
 "When human existence began.
 "The Son is Eternal, though not as a son,
 "Because he is one of three:
 "In him as begotten, o'd time first began,
 "Creation's beginning was he.
 "Why one of the Three was called Father by name,
 "Is now, not so hard to conceive;
 "'Tis as he begat the GREAT soul of the Lamb,
 "And adopted his sons to believe."———Rhy.

The Holy Spirit has drawn in such plain lines the true features of Antichrist, the denier of the incomprehensibility of the modus of the Father and of the Son, that I shall make but a few observations upon the *seductions* and *doctrines* contained in the above INFAMOUS verses.

1st. That the verses have all the appearance of the Jewish mockers, and as having been penned by an *unregenerate* man. And in such *characters*, we see the awful state of all men, until quickened by God the *Eternal Spirit*!

2nd. That the Perverter's Tri-une God began to be a Father, and a Son, and a Holy Spirit at the beginning of time, or at the *begetting* and inspiring of a human soul.^a

3rd. That previous to the beginning of time, the Perverter's Tri-une God were Three Non-descripts in Unity.

4th. That the Perverter's began to be Father *adopted* his Sons to believe *at the beginning of time*, and not before.

5th. That if the Perverter's statement be true, then the Lord Jesus Christ is a GREAT LIAR, for saying, "*No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.*"

^a It is also an article in the human pre-existerian creed, that their Jesus Christ began to be a *real* Jesus Christ *only* at the beginning of time, and this the human pre-existerians mean by saying, that their *Christ is older than Adam*. The difference, therefore, between their fanciful Jesus Christ and ours, is as great as the difference between time and eternity! for their fanciful Jesus Christ is one that had a beginning; but our Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever, Heb. iii. 8. To the above wicked invention of a began to be Jesus Christ, a began to be Father and Son, &c., the Reader should take into consideration the fact, that the author of the above despicable *rhymes*, has expressly "*renounced essential paternity, filiation, and the procedure of one person from the other;*" (C. F. i. 63,) That he *has invented* and published a *wilful lie* respecting the *begetting* of Christ's human nature; and that he also declares the *names of Father and Son are assumed*, (S. D. 28,) and *will be hereafter laid aside!* (S. D. 252,) And when the godly Reader has considered the same, let him not overlook the mercy, that *Antichrist* is so fully pictured in the Holy Scriptures, that *the way-faring man though a fool shall not err therein*, Isaiah xxxv. 8.

6th. That the Perverter says his Tri-une God will hereafter lay aside the *assumed* characters of Father, Son, and Spirit, when, *no doubt he means*, they will again be Three Non-descriptors in Unity. (S. D. 252.)

7th. That the Perverter's Three Eternal Testifiers^a began to be testifiers *to the adoption of sons at the beginning of time*.

8th. That the human pre-existerian rooks are baptized by their dams in the name of an assumed and began to be Father, and of an assumed and began to be Son, and of an assumed and began to be Holy Spirit; who will hereafter laid aside those characters as all stage players and swindlers do, when they are no more needful. S. D. 252.

After such an attempt on the part of human pre-existerians to destroy the *truth* of God, and the *essential relationship and nature of the Father* and of the Son; the Reader ought not to be surprized that such awful characters have *invented* and *promulgated* another *infamous FALSEHOOD*,^b to support their attempt to destroy the *true and faithful* testimony of *our LORD!* I shall therefore *faithfully* quote their infamous invention, and at the same time expose its *wickedness* and *falsehood* by the Scriptures of truth, in columns opposite to each other.

The human pre-existerians' infamous invention, to destroy the incomprehensible Sonship of Christ.

They say, "The Scriptures *constantly* attribute *his being* *begotten, as to his humanity*

The Scripture testimony to Jesus Christ being the incomprehensible Son of the Father.

Now the *birth (gennesis)* of Jesus Christ was on this wise: when as his mother

^a The Perverter describes the Word, one of the Testifiers, as the human soul of Christ that began to exist at the beginning of time. S. D. 122, 123.

^b The Reader will find upon a careful examination of the human-pre-existerian tradition, which has been partly exposed, that *it abounds with lies*. And it is so considered by every *godly baptist minister*, who has tried the spirits whether they be of God. And unless the time is at hand when the faithful witnesses be slain by the licentious doctrine, viz, *that a lie is a harmless thing*, although it can only be supported by lies and liars.— I doubt not that the Most High will separate all the baptists who have the like *precious faith* with us, from the human pre-existerian enemies of the everlasting covenant and the eternal suretyship of "the Christ the Son of the living God."

"and Sonship to the person of
"the Father." C. F. i. 31.
That the Sonship respects the
human nature of our blessed
Lord. S. D. 28. That *essential*
paternity, filiation, and proce-
dure of one person from the
other is renounced. C. F. i. 63.^a

Mary was espoused to Jo-
seph before they came to-
gether, *she was found with*
child of the Holy Ghost. Matt.
i. 18. "The Angel of the Lord
"appeared unto him in a
"dream, saying, Joseph, thou
"son of David, fear not to take
"unto thee Mary thy wife;
"for that which is (*gennethen*)
"begotten in her is of the Holy
"Ghost." Matt. i. 20, 18. See
also Luke i. 35.

Thus the human pre-existerians add lies to mockery,
with a degree of hardihood, that was never surpassed by
the *avowed infidel!* And if there be any degree of dif-
ference between the wickedness of an avowed infidel,
and that of a human *pre-existerian*, it is in this, that the
former attempts openly to destroy by violence, what the
latter attempts to do secretly by subtilty. And this is the
Perverter's comparative harmless doctrine! And I am
grieved to know by experience, that this blasphemous
denial of the faithful testimony of God *is countenanced*
as harmless by particular baptists, who contend for the
exclusive right of believers to that solemn ordinance:

^a The Perverter says: "Thus by including the *ancient existence of*
"the soul of our Lord, we obtain a *plain reason* for the names of Father
"and Son, and at the same time maintain a *personal* distinction too evident
"to be readily misunderstood, or fairly denied. For the Son being *human*
"as well as *divine*, he is sufficiently distinguished from the Father who
"is *only divine.*" (S. D. p. 30.) So that there was no Father, or Son in
the Godhead until God begat a *human soul*, and then, there *began to be*
a pre-existerian *father* in the Godhead, who had only one nature, and a
pre-existerian *Son* in the Godhead with two natures; in order to con-
stitute two of the persons in the Godhead Father and Son, *unlike each*
other! What blasphemy! I wish this bold reasoner, or one of the sect,
who give the lie to Christ's testimony, would give us an interpretation of
the *bosom* of the Father in the same *literal* sense as the Perverter gives to
the word *only begotten*; for as he gives us a plain reason for the one he
ought to give us a plain reason for the other; and then, he would be
entitled to some degree of respect. That he ought to do it is unques-
tionable; because John Allen, the Perverter's pre-existerian brother, says,
"THE BOSOM WAS prepared for the object." See note p. 67.

But the human pre-existerians appear to have as great a dislike to
the Father's *bosom*, as they have to the descent of the Holy Spirit in a
bodily shape like a dove. But as they *dwell upon the word begotten in a*
carnal sense, I shall answer one of their subtile arguments upon the word

but which these particular *human pre-existerian* baptists administer in mockery to adult professors! Pray Reader, turn to Matt. vii. 22, 23, Luke x. 17—20. 2 Cor. xi. 14, 15.

If to the *human pre-existerian* lies previously exposed,

begotten with their own reasoning, by applying it to the word *bosom*; that all *their reason in the world* may appear as depraved as it is sinful.

The human pre-existerian argument upon the word *begotten*.

“If our Lord, as a person of the Godhead, be unoriginate, he is not *begotten*: if he be not *begotten*, he is not a Son; for a Son *unbegotten* is a contradiction.” We may with equal propriety speak of an existing effect without any adequate cause. C. F. i. 46.

The human pre-existerian reasoning applied to the word *bosom*

“If the Father, as a person in the Godhead be unoriginate, he has not a *bosom*: if he has not a *bosom*, he is not a Father; for a *Father without a bosom* is a contradiction.” We may with equal propriety speak of an existing effect without any adequate cause.

And therefore, they ought to tell us, of what this *bosom* was prepared, where the *nurse child*, the *Perverter* speaks of, was *nursed* S. D. 141.

But as the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Son, it is evident that there was an essential concurrence of the Father and of the Son in the begetting of Christ's human nature in Mary of the Holy Ghost. And it was this fact which *frustrated the tokens of the liar*, the denier of the Father and of the Son; *it even made the diviner mad*; (1 John ii. 22. Isaiah xlv. 25,) for when the *Perverter* was asked by Dr. *Hawker*, whether; “it was not reasonable to conclude there would be the same concurrence of the Trinity in the production of the soul as the *body*?” The *Perverter* was compelled to admit it to his great annoyance, as appears by the following words: he says, “The doctrine of concurrence in the Trinity must be admitted, or the unity of the Trinity must be denied.” And he then adds, “I never intended to exclude an essential concurrence when I ascribed the act of begetting to the Father.” 2 Let. 27, 28. Here, Reader, you will observe, that instead of *one plain reason* for the names of Father and Son, the *Perverter* now presents us with *much reason* for the names of *Three Fathers* and one Son, for he says, “The Paternity and filiation respect not the divine nature which is common to the Holy Three; BUT THE HUMAN NATURE, as peculiar to the Son!” C. F. 48. And further, this *essential concurrence* made *this diviner mad*; for by his admission, we see it evidently overthrew his *plain reason creed* for the names of *Father and Son*; and by his admission he evidently acknowledged there were *Three Fathers* to the human nature of Christ; to use the *Perverter's* own argument, “the Father is no more the Father of the Son, (the *human pre-existerian's* son) than he is the Father of himself.” C. F. i. 11. And thus his *plain reason* for the names of *Father and Son* appears to be as depraved as his *much reason* for the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ like the souls of *dead men*. Indeed! the *Perverter's* mind was so deranged by *this essential concurrence*, that he admitted, he was then *marching out of his lines*, so as not to understand himself. 2 Let. 28. And he was obliged to have recourse to an *indefensible* subterfuge to conceal his defeat: which *subterfuge* I shall destroy by putting it in one column, and

the godly reader shall take into serious consideration this *last mentioned falsehood*; he will be deeply impressed with the truth of our LORD's solemn testimony concerning the human pre-existerian Jews: "Ye are of your father the Devil," said Jesus unto them, "and the lusts of your fathers ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. John viii. 44.

the Scripture reply thereto in an opposite one, for the benefit of his young rooks, who put their trust in, "thus saith the Perverter," in preference to "thus saith the Lord."

The Perverter's Subterfuge.

"The tendency of your reasoning is to generate confusion, and to confound those personal acts by which a Trinity of personal subsistences has ever been represented to us. Where is the inconsistency of ascribing the act of begetting to THE FATHER ONLY, incarnation to the Son only, and internal sanctification to the Spirit only." 2 Let 28.

To the above statement must be added the human pre-existerian's plain reason, for asserting the Father pre-existed the Son: because the same plain reason may be given for asserting that the Son pre-existed the Holy Spirit, as the SPIRIT of the Son. Gal. iv. 6. And by placing these two plain reasons opposite to each other, the Perverter's antichristian arguments will appear as depraved as his syllogisms.

The human pre-existerian's plain reason for the Father pre-existing the Son.

The Father must be before the Son who is of him as a Son: to deny this, would not be to acknowledge a mystery, but to maintain an absurdity. C. F. i. 47.

Thus Antichrist appears in full dress, and his arguments as blasphemous as his reason is depraved. But if the Perverter previous to his departure should be born of the Spirit, he will then set his seal *unfeignedly* to the testimony, that the Holy Scriptures are strictly true; and then, he will be compelled to follow the godly example of his *despised Biblicus*, (3 Let. 45,) who glorified God by confessing his sin, in that, he had given heed to *Jewish fables!*

The Scripture Reply.

The inconsistency is in mere professors ascribing the act of begetting the human nature of Christ to the Father only, when the Scriptures, which they profess to believe, do expressly ascribe the act of begetting to the Holy Spirit, and not to the Father only. And this act is as clearly ascribed to the Holy Spirit, as incarnation to the Son only, and internal sanctification to the Spirit only.

The human pre-existerian's reasoning applied in proof of their human nature Son pre-existing the Holy Spirit.

The Son must be before the Spirit who is of the Son as a Spirit: to deny this, would not be to acknowledge a mystery, but to maintain an absurdity. Gal. iv. 6.

No marvel, that the Holy Spirit hath blended the *seductions of men* and the *doctrines of devils* as one; for they are united together to *controvert* the great mystery of godliness, viz., God manifest in the flesh, the essential Son of the Father in truth and love; the *Son given*;^a the Son manifested in the human nature *begotten in Mary of the Holy Ghost*. And be it remembered, that the act, viz., the *begetting* of the humanity in Mary of the Holy Ghost, is to every believer of the greatest importance; for it proves the Godhead of the *Son of the Father* in truth and love, to be *co-eval, co-equal, and co-essential*. For if the Father had begotten Christ's humanity, *then the Sonship of Christ would be founded in his human nature!* But as the Holy Ghost did beget Christ's humanity, so Jesus Christ the *Son* is, and must be the Essential Son of the Father in truth and love.

The Holy Spirit hath further declared, that the seductions of men and the doctrines of devils, would succeed by means of some of Satan's ministers appearing as the ministers of righteousness, (2 Cor. xi. 15,) to conceal their enmity to the *one Faith*, (Eph. iv. 5,) the Mystery of Faith, (1 Tim. iii. 9,) and the Faith once delivered unto the saints. (Jude 3.) And what seductions of men can be equal to those of *reason*, under the name of *common sense*; terms most shamefully perverted when used to destroy the mystery of God, (Col. ii. 2,) by reducing Divine Revelation to a mere *theory*, (3 Let. 37,) and which the *Perverter* calls, "*his theory*," under the specious appearance of *having a plain reason for the names of Father and Son*. S. D. 30. There is not a schism or a dissent in matters of faith, but what is generally assumed to be founded in reason and common sense.

^a A godly minister of the Gospel, very lately when at Orpington in Kent, defended the doctrine of Christ's *Sonship* against an attack made upon it by a particular Baptist Minister! After considerable discussion, during which, human reason was opposed to Revelation, the Baptist Minister was completely put to silence by the Godly man's solemn demand, *What Son was given; of whom Isaiah spake?* Thus the deceivers and the deceived mock and scoff: they profess to baptize and to be baptized into the *name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*: but which they do not believe to be *essentially true!*

The believer ought therefore to be on the watch, that whilst he renders to the things of time and sense, that reason and common sense which are their due; that he also renders to the mystery of God, (Col. ii. 2,) that spiritual sense called *faith*, that *one faith*, (Eph. iv. 5,) without which it is impossible to please the God of Truth! Heb. xi. 6.

Again. What seductions of men can be more in correspondence with the doctrines of devils, than those which would persuade us to do, what the devil had the impudence to attempt on Christ himself, viz., whether he was *in truth* the Son of God. Matt. iv. 3, 4.

It was Christ's testimony, as to his *essential Sonship*, for which the human pre-existerian *Jews sought to kill him*; for it is written, "*Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his (idion) proper Father, making himself equal with God!*" John v. 18. Observe Reader, God, his *proper Father*; and *Christ his (idion) proper Son* (Rom. viii. 32,) EQUAL WITH GOD. See also Philip ii. 5, 6. And it was for this, that the Jews amongst other things crucified Christ. And this, therefore, leads me to consider,

Fourthly. That the human pre-existerian *Jews* crucified Christ, because he said, "*I am the Son of God:*" for which act, the human pre-existerian christians do now justify the *Jews*.

1st. Jesus said, "My FATHER worketh hitherto, and I work."—"VERILY, VERILY, I say unto you, the SON can do nothing of Himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for whatsoever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."^a John v. 17, 19. And here I beg the Reader to remark with what indignation the human pre-existerian *Jews* received this testimony of Christ's *Essential Sonship*: that they understood it as such, is as

^a The Holy Scriptures abound with many decisive proofs of the doctrine of the Trinity, for here the Son is said to see and do what the Father doeth, and in the next verse, the Father is said to shew the Son what the Father himself doeth. And in John xvi. 13, the Holy Spirit is said to *hear* what he shall speak, and he would shew us things to come. And in John xiv. 10, what the Son did the Father is said to do! Thus, the indivisibility of the Trinity in Unity is declared.

evident as any one fact recorded in the Bible. “There-
 “fore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because
 “he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also,
 “that God was his *own* or *proper* FATHER, for so it reads
 “in the Greek Testament, MAKING HIMSELF EQUAL WITH
 GOD! John v. 18. Here Jesus solemnly declares his
 Sonship with a *double Verily!* and here the Jews de-
 declare their hatred to him, because he not only said God
 was his *own* Father, but that the Father and the Son
 were CO-EQUAL!!

2nd. It was Christ’s declaration, that he, the Son of
 God was *one with* the Father, as recorded in John x.
 30—39, that the human pre-existerian Jews sought to
 stone him for blasphemy. For stoning was the manner
 of death, which, according to their law, the blasphemer
 was to suffer. Jesus said, “My sheep *hear my voice*,
 “and I know them, and they follow me: and I give
 “unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish,
 “neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand. My
 “Father which gave *them* me, is greater than all; and
 “no one is able to pluck them out of my FATHER’S hand
 “I and my Father are one!” John x. 27—30. The
 Reader will note, that the word *are* is plural to the two
 nouns *I* and FATHER, and that *I* stands the first in the
 order of Christ’s speech, proving his Sonship to be *co-eval*
 and co-essential with the FATHER, and that their rela-
 tionship is *co-equal*.

Here, again, I beg the Reader to remark, with
 what indignation the human pre-existerian Jews re-
 ceived this testimony of Christ’s Essential Sonship, as one
 with the Father, for *then the Jews took up stones again to*
stone him.” John x. 31. Whereupon, “Jesus answered
 “them, Many good works have I shewed you from my
 “Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?”
 John x. 32. The Jews answered him, saying, “For a
 “good work we stone thee not; but for BLASPHEMY;
 “and *because that thou being a man, MAKEST THYSELF*
 “GOD.” John x. 33. The Jews therefore clearly un-
 derstood Christ’s testimony, viz. that he was *the SON OF*
 GOD, *co-equal* and *one with* the Father. Indeed they would
 never have stoned *Christ as a Jew*, for saying he was an

adopted Son, for the human pre-existerian Jews were *high in doctrine*, and believed themselves, and Christ as a Jew, to be *God's first-born*, (Exod. iv. 22.)^a And if Christ had not declared his ESSENTIAL SONSHIP, as one with the Father, they could not, and would not have charged him with blasphemy!

3rd. It was the same blessed declaration of his *essential Sonship*, for which the High Priest rent his clothes, in token that in his judgment, Christ had spoken blasphemy, and for which he was instantly pronounced to be guilty of death. For "*the High Priest asked him, and said unto him, art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed?*" And Jesus said, (*Ego Eimi*) I AM: and ye "shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the High Priest rent his clothes, and saith, what need we any further witnesses, ye have heard the BLASPHEMY: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death." Mark. xiv. 61—64.^b And then they began to spit upon him and to buffet him, as the human pre-existerians have done of late, whenever his *essential Sonship* is *asserted and vindicated*. The Jews understood the meaning of I AM, which allow me to observe, occurs in the *Hebrew Bible*, in Exod. iii. 14, in Prov.

^a The human pre-existerians Pharisees, from their *intellectual* interpretation of Exod. iv. 22, had all the high notions of men, who at the last day will say Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, &c. (Matt. vii. 22.) They considered themselves as having a legal right to all the promises of God!

^b When the "High Priest demanded of Jesus, by a solemn abjuration, to tell him, *whether he were the Christ the Son of God*, (Luke xxii. 70,) or as the equivalent phrase of another Evangelist expresses it, '*Art thou the Christ the Son of the Blessed?*' (Mark xiv. 61.) And on our Lord's declaring that he was, the High Priest rent his clothes, saying he had spoken BLASPHEMY. Would he have pronounced this *blasphemy*, if it had not been considered a title *ex-officio*? Much less would he have declared Jesus deserving of death in consequence of it?—And is it not equally clear that Christ laid down his life in support of the truth of it."—"And if we have authority to draw any inference from any one fact in the world, we may with the fullest safety conclude, from those instances, that our blessed Lord is, in the highest and most complete sense of the word, *The Son of God*. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater, and this is THE WITNESS OF GOD WHICH HE HATH TESTIFIED OF HIS SON! 1 John v. 9." Dr. Hawker.

viii. 30, and in Hosea i. 9. And as they had formerly taken up stones to stone the Son of God on account of it, (John viii. 24, 58, 59,) so they now condemned him to be guilty of death! For the Jews said to Pilate, "*We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the SON OF GOD.*" John xix. 8. When "*Pilate therefore heard that saying he was the more afraid.*" John xix. 8. Here let the Reader ask himself the important question, viz., whether the human pre-existerian Jews were not justified in putting Christ to death as a blasphemer, if Christ was not the Essential Son of God?

What is the human pre-existerian doctrine now? It is true that some of them do not *openly* deny Christ is God. Even the *Arians* do not! And it is also true, that some of them do not deny his divine personality! nevertheless, they deny his *procession*, and *essential* and co-eternal sonship! And if Christ were on earth now, as in the days of his flesh, they would scoff and mock him as the Jews did! And as the Perverter *mocked and sneered* at Dr. Hawker, Mr. Colyer, and other spiritual persons, who contend for that *one* faith, which was *once* delivered unto the Saints, viz., that Jesus Christ is the Son, the Essential Son, the express image of the Father's person,^a and in the *procession of the Son*; because

^a The Greek word *upostaseōs* in Heb. i. 3, has been rendered *person* by that learned body, the translators and numerous revisors of the English established *version* of the New Testament. It is also rendered *person* by Beza in his Latin Testament, to the *annoyance* of *Pseudo-Trinitarians*. I shall now lay before the Reader, the human pre-existerian attempt to pervert this blessed portion of Holy Scripture, with that godly man Dr. Owen's testimony in its favour; that the difference between the opinions of the unregenerate and a regenerate man may be as evident as the sun at noon!

The human pre-existerian perversion of Heb. i. 3.

"*Hypostasis*, is once rendered *person*, in our Testament, where in Heb. i. 3, we read that Christ is the express image of his person, *hypostaseōs*. But here it appears to mean *substance*. The *Latin Vulgate* has *substance*. To the *Colosians*, Paul speaks of

Dr. Owen's testimony to the truth of Heb. i. 3.

"*Hypostasis*, *substance*, *subsistence* *person*. The word is *four* times used in the New Testament. *Thrice* in this epistle; in this place, and chap. iii. 14. and chap. xi. 1, as also, 2 Cor. ix. 4, every where in a different sense; so that the mere use of it

it is *expressly revealed*; and because they do not *merely pretend* to believe *the Scriptures are strictly true, and perfectly consistent.* (S. D. 65.)

“Christ as the *Image* of the in-
“visible God; and to the Hebrews
“he speaks of him as the *character*
“of his substance; *character* an-
“swers to *image*, and *substance* to
“the *invisible God*, and thus these
“passages explain each other. *But*
“the word *PERSON* has no necessary
“insertion in the text, nor does the
“*Image of God in Scripture* mean
“abstractly the *Image of the Fa-*
“*ther's person*, to the exclusion of
“the two. *The Alehim said, Let*
“*us make man in our image!*”

“in one place, will afford *no light*
“unto the meaning of it in another;
“but it must be taken from the
“context and subject treated of.
“The composition of the word
“*ousia* would denote *substantia*,
“but so as to differ from, and to
“add something unto *substance*,
“or *being*: which in the divine
“nature can be nothing but a special
“manner of subsistence. To say
“a man is the express *Image* of
“God the Father, is to depress the
“Glory of God by *anthropomorphism*.
“So that unto God asking the ques-
“tion, *whom will ye compare unto*
“*me, and whom will ye liken me*
“*unto?* we cannot answer of any
“one who is not God by nature, that
“he is the *brightness of his Glory*,
“and express *image of his person.*”

1st Mr. *Screevelius*, and Mr. *Hederic* render *upososis* by *subsistentia*, *substantia*, and *persona*, that is, *subsistence*, *substance*, and *PERSON*. And the Perverter quotes Mr. *Hederic*, as his authority for the true meaning of a Greek word (S. D. 152.) Mr. *Hederic* therefore, who is the Perverter's witness, declares *hypostaseos* to be a Greek word for *PERSON*; and in the approved English Dictionaries, the English word *hypostasis* is also stated to signify *person*, and a *distinct person*. I therefore call upon the Perverter to *prove his assertion*, or to recall his words, viz., that “the word *person* has no necessary insertion in the text” of Heb. i. 3. And if he does not, he may be assured, there is a day coming when God will judge his *anthropomorphism*, and *perversion* of these Holy Scriptures, by “the Christ of God;” and not by the Christ of *man's invention*.

2nd. The Reader will observe that the Perverter charges the Holy Spirit with having merely used the Greek word *charakter* (which Mr. *Toplady* renders, *exact counterpart*) in the place and stead of (*Eikon*) *Image*, as a vain pedant uses one word for another without a difference.

3rd. I admit that the Latin Vulgate has *substance*; but in the Testament printed at *Rheims*, it has this note; “The express *image* and most perfect resemblance of his substance.” And *Beza* in his Latin Testament has *person*. For what is the substance of the *Father*, such expressly is the substance of the *Son*.

4th. The Reader will observe by the context, that the Holy Spirit in Col. i. 15, by the words “*Image of the invisible God*,” does expressly mean the *image of God the FATHER's person*; and therefore the Perverter wrests these Scriptures to support the lying tradition of the Pharisees.

As it is an admitted fact, what one man has done, another man under similar circumstances, state, and condition would do: from such a positive truth I shall form a *human pre-existerian syllogism*, for the benefit of the old dams and their young rooks.

The human pre-existerian Jews crucified "the Christ of God," because they considered him to be a liar and only an *assumed* Son of God; the human pre-existerian christians consider "the Christ of God" to be a liar, and only an *assumed* Son of God; therefore the human pre-existerian christians would crucify the Son of God!^a Now this is a human pre-existerian syllogism, which the Perverter says is a heavy thing to toss out of the way! And let it not be forgotten, that the Holy Spirit hath described their character who crucify the Son of

5th. The Reader will also observe that the Perverter says, "nor does the Image of God," (omitting the word *invisible*) "in Scripture mean the image of the Father's person to the exclusion of the other two." I therefore call upon the Perverter to explain the cause of his omission, so designedly and intentionally done, perverting the *plain* and evident testimony of the Holy Spirit to the *essential Sonship of Christ* in Heb. i. 3.

6th. As the first part of the Perverter's comment on Heb. i. 3, he borrowed from Mr. Parkhurst; I therefore call upon the Perverter to tell the Church of God, from what *freethinking author* he borrowed the latter part of his comment, which I have had printed in *italics*, or whether it was his own invention.

^a Let the Reader duly consider this fact, viz., that the human pre-existerian Jews crucified Christ, because he said, "I am the Son of God!" And when he has so done, let him next enquire, whether human pre-existerian Christians would not do the same, if they had been present and had heard our Lord declare that *heavenly doctrine* recorded in John iii. 12, 13, &c.? Would they not have mocked and rejected the Christ of God as a *Deceiver*? Has not an infallible interpreter informed us, that if the Jews, who had the *types and shadows* of the true religion, had known "The Christ of God," *they would not have crucified the LORD of life and glory*? And would not the human pre-existerian Christians who sit in the *scorner's* chair, who have the *form* of the true religion, also crucify Christ, if they were to hear Christ deliver the *Heavenly doctrine* recorded in John iii. 12, 13. viii. 42. xv. 26. xvi. 30. &c.? Then, surely, we may say, that if the human pre-existerian Christians knew "the Christ of God," they would not crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame as an impostor with an assumed name! And I must add, that the Church of God can never be too thankful for the sacred record of that *heavenly doctrine* in John iii. 12, 13, because it is the stumbling stone to all human pre-existerians, viz., *Murray, Allen, Watts, Stevens, &c.* all of whom have fallen upon it. See Matt. xxi. 44. Luke xx. 18.

God afresh, as *persons who were once enlightened* (not regenerated,) *who have tasted of the heavenly gift*, as Saul and others were partakers of the gift of prophecy, but not of the *heavenly grace*, (1 Sam. x. 10, 11,^a) *so they were made partakers of the Holy Ghost!* &c. And this solemn truth is illustrated by the figure of the earth drinking in the rain; for as the rain falls alike on the earth, both where the pure herbs are, and where the thorns are; so the dew of the Gospel descends upon the *possessor*, and the *mere professor*; and whilst the

^a An old author has truly observed, "When the Creator of all things becomes an *author*, his word must be as *perfect* as his work." For He is the God of Truth—and if the revelation of himself as the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, the names of the Holy Three, which testify to the unity of the divine essence, be not essentially true, then God's word is no better than a *cunningly devised fable*. But woe be to them, that dare so represent it. And if the revelation of the three testifiers, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit be not essentially true, then their three testimonies are not one in unity! But the glory of God's wisdom is declared in the divine revelation of truth, as the glory of God's power is declared in the work of creation! It may be laid down as a certain truth, confirmed by the experience of all the godly, that when divine revelation is received into the mind, it must be by a *faculty*, viz., *faith* which corresponds with, and is the gift of God! When there is no appetite, or a vitiated appetite for divine revelation, then the word of God is not enjoyed. When there is no ear for music, harmonious sounds are not heard with pleasure. To the blind the beams of the Sun give no beauty to the richest prospect. Thus, when God speaks of things which are *above nature*, his word must be received by a *faculty which is above nature*. For spiritual truth to be received, there must be a spiritual faculty. The *invisible and incomprehensible things of God*, viz. the doctrine of the Trinity as revealed by God himself, can only be truly received by Faith. Whereas a doctrine of a trinity has been received by the heathen, who never knew the one true God! There is no doctrine of the Gospel more decided than this, viz., that all men have not faith. The essential truth of the revelation of the God of truth, who can neither lie nor change, nor cease to be what he is, and was, and ever will be, may seem *absurd*, extravagant, and incredible, and be *renounced* by men who write under a form of Godliness, in a pleasant style, and who appear to be very *sensible, prudent and rational* christians. But on what other ground than the holy scriptural distinction between *faith* and *reason*, is it possible to account for a fact which confounded the Jews, when Saul preached Christ to be the Son of God? Acts ix. 20—22. And on what ground was it, that Philip baptized the Eunuch? Let the mockers of believer's baptism seriously consider this important question? Was it on the ground, that the Eunuch believed that Jesus was an assumed or the essential Son of God? Acts viii. 37. Surely, until there is in man, a *spiritual faculty*, which receives the things of God, the Sacred Records will be perverted or rejected. If they are perverted or

possessor believeth with all his heart, lives by faith, and brings forth the fruits of faith, the *mere professor* with head knowledge lives by reason, and brings forth the rank weeds and briars of *suppositions*, and *human notions*, with *intellectual or soul arguments* supported by syllogisms, in opposition to “*Thus saith the Lord*” in the *Holy Scriptures*; Heb. vi. 4—8. Reader, pause over this solemn subject, for you are living in *the age of reason*; it is called the *march of intellect*: and there were such awful characters in the Apostle’s days, who made some of the Lord’s people dull of hearing. Heb. v. 8. And in these days, the *Freethinker* is described as not regarding the *God of our Fathers, nor the desire of women, WHICH WAS THE PROMISED SEED, NOR ANY OTHER GOD*. Observe Reader, he regards not the *DESIRE OF WOMEN, nor any other God*, save one of his own invention, (Daniel xi. 37, 38.) For in this age of reason it is considered as *absurd* to believe, that the Revelation of God is essentially true, or that *coming to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God is coming unto the measure of the stature of the fulness (pleroma) of Christ*. Eph. iv. 13. - And as they *assume or take away the essential Soudship of Christ, so they empty Christ of his fulness!* If the worship of Jehovah under *assumed names* be true worship, then the Athenians were true *worshippers*, for they erected an altar to the *unknown* rejected, we must conclude this *faculty to be wanting*: and when that is the case, the evidence of a miracle will not force its way and change the hardness of a Pharaoh’s heart, although it will confound the Devil. Some theoretical writers have treated of credibility and probability, and the nature, and degrees, and force of evidence, as if they had rules for weighing the revelation of God with mechanical certainty; whereas in fact, the human pre-existerians with all their boasted intellectuality do resist a truth, which the Devils confessed with terror and dismay. Luke iv. 41. The human pre-existerian Jews said, as for this *fellow* we know not whence he is; but the Devils said, “Art thou come to destroy us—we know thee, who thou art, Jesus, the Son of God!” The devils believe and tremble. (James ii. 19.) Balaam was a prophet, (2 Pet. ii. 16,) and in his days spake as Christ Jehovah commanded him, and he said, that (El.) God is not a man, that he should lie, neither the Son of man that he should change his mind. Numb. xxiii. 19. Then, let the human pre-existerians beware, lest the testimony of devils and the testimony of Balaam in the Sacred Records, put them to confusion in the last day for *believing a lie!* For the Hebrew name El is the name of Christ, Isaiah ix. 6. And Balaam declared in his days, that Christ was neither a man that he should lie, nor the Son of man that he should repent.