

demonstrated, namely, that the names Jesus Christ are sometimes in the Holy Scriptures applied to a divine person, or abstract divinity. For instance, "*omnipresence,*" an *attribute or perfection is in God, and is God*: and this divine perfection, the *Perverter* says, is *incommunicable*. That Christ as man cannot receive it, neither can God give it unto him: that it is not even seated in Christ's humanity. To suppose such a thing is to put the author for the instrument he made, and is subjecting him to the work of his own hands. From this statement, then, it is most evident, that the Holy Spirit doth sometimes apply, in the Scriptures, the names JESUS CHRIST to a divine person or abstract divinity; because the names Jesus Christ are applied to *omnipresence or ubiquity, which attribute is God*: for it is written, "*know ye not your ownelves how that JESUS CHRIST IS IN YOU, except ye be reprobates!*"^a (2 Cor. xiii. 5.) Here, therefore, the names Jesus Christ are expressly applied to omnipresence, or God, or *abstract divinity*; for Mr. John Stevens declares, *that no divine perfection is communicable, that, not one divine perfection is seated in Christ's humanity; that Christ as man could not receive it, or use it: that to suppose such a thing is to put Jesus Christ the creator of all things, the author for the instrument he made, and would be subjecting Jesus Christ to the work of his own hands!*

Again. The Holy Spirit testifies, and sometimes applies, in the Holy Scriptures, the names JESUS CHRIST to a divine person or abstract divinity; because the names Jesus Christ are applied to *IMMUTABILITY, which attribute or perfection is God*: for it is written, "*JESUS CHRIST THE SAME yesterday, and to day, and for ever!*" (Heb. xiii. 8.) Hence, therefore, it follows, that the names Jesus Christ are expressly applied to his divine person, or abstract divinity; for immutability, a divine perfection, Mr. John Stevens declares, *is incommunicable; that it is not seated in Christ's humanity; that God could not give it unto him; that Christ as man could not receive it, or use it: that to suppose such a thing, is to put JESUS CHRIST the author for the instrument he made, and would be subjecting him to the work of his own hands.*

^a In Col. iii. 11, omnipresence or ubiquity is applied to the title Christ only: therefore the name Christ is there applied to abstract divinity.

Mr. *John Allen*, one of Mr. *John Stevens*' human pre-existerian *Dams*, positively declares, that IMMUTABILITY, a DIVINE ATTRIBUTE, is applied to the titles "Jesus Christ;" and for the benefit of the *Perverter's young rooks*, I shall transcribe the same. Mr. *John Allen* says, "that all the divine perfections of the deity naturally subsist in Christ." (S. M. i. 271.) And after mentioning several divine perfections, he says, "Likewise IMMUTABILITY IS A DIVINE ATTRIBUTE, which shines forth with luculent beams in Christ, (Heb. xiii 8,) JESUS CHRIST THE SAME YESTERDAY, AND TO DAY, AND FOR EVER." (S. M. i. 272.) Dr. *Guyse* observes, "there is a strong emphasis in this word, the same (*óautos*), for it is a characteristic of the unchangeable permanency of the GREAT JEHOVAH of Israel, the I AM, (Psalm cii. 27,) which is applied to Christ in (Heb. i. 11,) THOU ART THE SAME;" where the Holy Ghost testifies, that THE CHRIST OF GOD *does not wax old.*^a See ante, page 57.

It is worthy of remark, that amongst other proofs of the Redeemer's divinity, the Apostle Paul *certified* to his brethren, that *the Gospel which he preached was not after man, for he neither received it of man, neither was he taught it, BUT BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST.* (Gal. i. 11. 12.)^b If the heart of man could be reached by the written word alone, here is one absolutely unimpeachable, where the names *Jesus Christ* are actually applied to Abstract Divinity; and, which no human

^a Believer, I have made use of the human pre-existerian Allen's admission, and of Mr. John Stevens' mode of demonstration, not under the idea that they would have any weight with you as a believer: but for the benefit of the young rooks, who, with sneers and supercilious airs, talk of the Lord Jesus Christ *being older than Adam*, pretending that they do him honour, whilst they are endeavouring to rob him of the honour due unto his names! In their delusion, we see in part our own deceitful hearts, and the deadly nature and evil of sin: and nothing short of the Almighty power of God can convince them of their wickedness: for our Lord hath declared, that such would not be persuaded of their errors, though one rose from the dead. (Luke xvi. 31.) A solemn truth, the awful effect of man's apostacy from God, confirmed by the Sacred Records; (See John xii. 10 Matt. xxviii. 11,—15.)

^b If this, and other Scriptures of the like import, did not expressly declare the Godhead, or Divine Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, the enemies of "the Christ of God," might have some excuse for their opposition to the Pre-eternity of our Lord.

pre-existerian will deny, who truly believes that *Christ as man had not, and could not use any divine perfection*. The Apostle had been exceedingly zealous of the human pre-existerian traditions of the Jews, to wit, (13, 14 verses,) that their souls were God's *first-born*, that is *born-first, or before the Gentiles*; and that the *human soul of Christ was exalted and chosen out of them!* But when it pleased God, who separated Paul from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, *to reveal his Son IN him*, that he might preach him among the heathen; immediately he conferred not with flesh and blood: (Gal. i. 15, 16,) for he *gave no longer any heed to JEWISH FABLES, or the commandments of men!* (Titus i. 13, 14.)

The Apostle says, the Gospel he preached was not *after man, neither did he receive it of man, BUT BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST*. A most positive testimony, that Jesus Christ is God! For *if he did not receive it of man, and yet received it by the revelation of Jesus Christ*, what can more fully prove, that in this Holy Scripture, the names Jesus Christ are applied to a Divine Person! The man who truly reveres God's Bible, and searches the Scriptures, will find the Godhead of Christ expressly revealed in some Scriptures, and the manhood of Christ expressly revealed in others. For Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the true Melchisedec *without beginning of days or end of life*; who, in the *fulness of time* was sent forth, *made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons*. (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) He is just such a Redeemer as the convinced sinner wants, and exactly such a Saviour as the *chosen ones, the foolish, the weak, and the base* (1 Cor. i. 27, 28,) can require.

There are more Scriptures which may be quoted, in proof of the *pre-eternity* of Jesus Christ, for the elect are therein declared to be *chosen in Christ* according to the *eternal* foreknowledge of God: and God's *eternal* purpose, God purposed *in Christ Jesus our Lord*; therefore Christ and God the Father's foreknowledge, and Christ and God the Father's *eternal* purpose, are evidently *co-eternal*. But the human pre-existerians are universally opposed to the *Pre-eternity* of "the Christ of God." They do not *even* allow Jesus Christ to be the

creator of *all things*, unless he had a human soul or a creature in union with him: which some of them call the *instrument* by which God created *all things!*^a Thus, like all other heretics, they repeatedly *pervert* the Scriptures, which I shall now expose, by placing their *perversion* in juxta position with the Holy Spirit's testimony concerning the creation of all things by Jesus Christ.

The Holy Spirit's testimony. *The Human Pre-existerian's perversion.*

<p>“All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.” John i. 3.</p>	<p>All things, <i>except one creature</i>, were made by him; for without him was <i>one thing made</i>, namely, a <i>human soul</i>.^b</p>
--	--

Thus, *they err not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God!* And the believer will observe, that the Holy Spirit, (knowing men would arise out of the professing Church, and *speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them*), (Acts xx. 30,) hath not only declared that “*all things were made by Jesus Christ, the Word,*” but he repeats the important truth in a still more forcible manner, by adding, “*without him was not any thing made that was made,*” not even the human nature which our Lord took into personal union with himself, if it pre-existed; for it must have been included in the ALL things made by the Word!

It is an important fact, and ought not to be passed over in silence, that these awful characters, human pre-existerians, are described as *holding the truth in unrighteousness*: (Rom. i. 18,) which *unrighteousness* is

^a That awful character, Mr. John Allen says: “It is evident that God always carried on the works of providence and of grace, *by instruments of one kind or other*, and why may he not accomplish creation *work by the instrumentality of the man Jesus*, considered (for he never existed any otherwise) in union with the Godhead?” (S. M. 248.) To this sophistry, there is a plain and decisive answer, for as the *man was a creature instrument*, which the human pre-existerians admit, they ought to tell us what *instrument* was employed by God to create this *man!* This very argument is therefore as absurd as it is wicked, and is opposed to that solemn truth, namely, that Jehovah *made all things*, and stretched forth the heavens ALONE, and spread abroad the earth BY HIMSELF. Isaiah xlv. 24.

^b It is an important truth, that as man's originality is of *the dust*, the human nature of the Lord Jesus Christ could not pre-exist *the dust!* And as our Lord Jesus Christ created all things, so it is equally true, that he was a Divine Person, and pre-existed his manhood, for *the dust* is part of the all things created, and Christ created all things!

described in the words that immediately follow, namely, “because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them, (to wit) for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead: SO THAT THEY ARE WITHOUT EXCUSE: because that when they knew God (in the works of creation) they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise THEY BECAME FOOLS, AND CHANGED THE GLORY OF THE INCORRUPTIBLE GOD into an IMAGE made LIKE to corruptible man, &c. (Rom. i. 19—23.) Who CHANGED THE TRUTH OF GOD INTO A LIE, AND WORSHIPPED AND SERVED THE CREATURE RATHER THAN THE CREATOR, who is blessed for ever. Amen,” (Rom. i. 23,) or, in other words, they do not believe in the *pre-eternity* of Jesus Christ the creator of all things, but they change his glory into an image made like to a corruptible man; they do not consider the Godhead of Christ to be all-sufficient to give him, *as man*, the *pre-eminence* in all things, but *serve the creature rather than the CREATOR*, by the absurdity of their creed, namely, that “the “Christ of God” could not be pre-eminent in all things, unless his humanity or some part thereof pre-existed all other creatures; (S. D. 153.—3 Let. 21,) by which, it doth appear, that they think the *fish (Dagon)*^a were pre-eminent to Adam, &c., *because they were created before him!* Surely, *their* (human pre-existerian) *rock is not as our* (pre-eternity) *rock, even our enemies themselves being judges.* (Deut. xxxii. 31.) For all things were created by Jesus Christ, the Son of God, *who is without beginning of days or end of life:* (Heb. vii 3,) it being an incontrovertible truth, that a creature could never be the creator of all things, because a creature could not be without beginning, or pre-exist the creation of *all* things.

^a *Dagon* is the Hebrew word for *fish*. As the human pre-existerians give to the *fish* a *pre-eminence* over *Adam*, they do in fact sit in judgment upon the wisdom of the Almighty, and condemn the order in which HE created all things. Surely the human pre-existerians may be justly denominated *Dagonites*, on account of their *fishy* or *creature pre-existerian* notion of *pre-eminence*.

The self-existent Jehovah hath *even* confirmed this truth, knowing that men of corrupt minds would arise to draw away disciples after them, for, “thus saith Jehovah *thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am Jehovah THAT MAKETH ALL THINGS; that stretcheth forth the heavens ALONE, and spreadeth abroad the earth by MYSELF; that frustrateth the TOKENS OF THE LIARS, and maketh diviners mad; that turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish.* (Isaiah xlv. 24, 25. See also Isaiah xlv. 18.) ALL THINGS were made *by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made:*” (John i. 2,) upon which, Dr. Dodderidge observes, there is such an emphasis in the original, that he thought it proper to express the same thus, “and *without him was not any thing made, not so much as one single being!*” In truth, would God have been an Almighty Creator, if there had been a creature employed in the work of creation? But God created all things ALONE AND BY HIMSELF, and by HIS SPIRIT *he garnished the heavens.* (Job xxiv. 13.) Dr. Gill observes, “that the words, *by Jesus Christ* in Eph. iii. 9, are left out of the *Alexandrian and Claromontane copies, and that they are left out of the Vulgate, Latin, Syriac, and Ethiopic versions;*” for the Doctor observes, “*God did not create all things by Jesus Christ as an instrument, but as a CO-EFFICIENT CAUSE; for without Christ was not any thing made that was made.*” Neither did God garnish the heavens and create Elihu by the Holy Spirit *as an instrument, but as a CO-EFFICIENT CAUSE,* (Job xxxiii. 4,) *a divine person in the Abstract,* for creation work is not the work of a creature; but the work of God ALONE AND BY HIMSELF. And as God garnished the heavens, and created Elihu by his Spirit *a divine person in the Abstract,* so he created all things by *Jesus Christ* (Eph. iii. 9,) *a divine person in the Abstract;* for “*thus saith Jehovah that created the heavens, GOD HIMSELF that formed the earth and made it, he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I JEHOVAH AND NONE ELSE.*” (Isaiah xlv. 18.)

Having, therefore, *demonstrated* from Mr. Stevens' statement, of the incommunicable nature of the divine attributes, and having also *proved* from the Holy Scrip-

tures, that the names *Jesus Christ* are applied to a divine person, or abstract divinity. And having so done, the first of Mr. Stevens' twenty-four reasonable things are answered! (E. S. 36, 37, 38.) And as this first thing, the foundation of all the rest, is answered by the word of truth, (2 Cor. vi. 7,) the rest of his sophisticated things fall to the ground. But as Mr. Stevens by these twenty four things, avoided answering those plain truths, to which Mr. Colyer earnestly requested his attention, there is, now, no excuse for Mr. Stevens' further evasion, for he must either answer Mr. Colyer's unsophisticated inquiries, or he must be considered in the same state of confusion, as when at *Waltham Abbey*. See ante, page 57 and 58.

But I must proceed to notice, that amongst these twenty four things, plain reason which the human pre-existerians have invented, to support their *pre-existing immortal man standing in God*, there is one so *sophistical*, and so *perfectly ridiculous*, that it would make ELIJAH, who did not sleep the sleep of death, but *was translated*, to be a creator of the world, because Elijah was an IMMORTAL man standing in God, and he was a man in God, in him he lived, and moved, and had his being: and *Elijah will also judge the world and angels*. (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.)

I shall therefore place this pre-existerian absurd question, why the human soul of Christ standing in God could not create the world, in juxta position with the like question, why Elijah could not have created the world.

The human pre-existerian question.

“That although he is able to raise the dead and judge the world, as God and man in one complex person, yet he could not create the world as God-man?” (E. S. 37.)^a

The like question applied to Elijah.

That although Elijah raised the dead (1 Kings xvii. 21. 22.) and will judge the world, (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.) as a man dwelling in God, and God dwelling in him, yet he could not create the world as a man in God and God in him?

^a The above *absurdity*, in common with the rest, is the pre-eminent offspring of Mr. John Stevens' depraved reason. (E. S. 36, 37, 38.) The reader will observe, that because it is written, all things were created by the WORD, therefore, the human pre-existerians corrupt the word of God for the sake of their tradition; and under the pretence of honouring the Lord Jesus Christ, they rob him of the honour

In the above question, we see the depravity of human pre-existerian reason; for if the human pre-existerian *man standing in God* could create the world, because he raised the dead, and will judge the world, it would therefore follow, that Elijah might create the world, for Elijah raised the dead, and will judge the world. By such sophistry we also see, that the same power *works* in the human pre-existerians [Eph. ii. 2,] as in the infidel, who believes *matter* pre-existed *spirit*, because spirit is extracted from matter. But, that the human pre-existerian doctrine may appear to be, what it really is, namely, an attempt to make the God of truth a *liar*, I shall also place their perversion of two Scriptures in juxta-position with the Scriptures themselves.

The Testimony of the Holy Scriptures.

I am Jehovah that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens ALONE; that spreadeth abroad the earth BY MYSELF Isaiah xlv. 24.

Thus saith Jehovah that created the heavens; GOD HIMSELF that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be *inhabited*: I am Jehovah: and *there* is none else. Isaiah xlv. 18.

The human pre-existerians' perversion.

I am Jehovah that maketh all things *by an instrument*; that stretcheth forth the heavens NOT ALONE but with a *human soul*; that spreadeth abroad the earth *not by myself*.

Thus saith Jehovah that created the heavens by an instrument; God not by himself that formed the earth and made it but by a human soul; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited. I am Jehovah: and *there* was *one* else, viz, a human soul without a body.

due unto his names, as the creator of all things. In this attempt, we see the subtilty of the Serpent; and his implacable hatred to the seed of the woman; for the *pride* of Lucifer is opposed to the God of ALL *grace*. The *proud* cannot allow their originality to be of the dust! May the Lord look upon them in mercy, and grant them grace to confess with Abraham, that they are dust and ashes, (Gen. xviii. 27.) So ignorant was Mr. Stockell of man's originality, that he not only contended for the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, but he maintained that all other souls pre-existed in Christ's soul, upon the principle, "*that the head could not exist without a body, because the term is relative and supposes a body.*" He says, *if his Church did not exist, he was a head of nothing.*" S. R. G. 269, 272.

By such depraved acts, namely, *the making void the word of God*, the human pre-existerian pharisees were distinguished! Our Lord, who could make no mistake respecting their character, declared, that *publicans and harlots would go into the kingdom of Heaven before them*. No one can doubt the pharisees professed to *revere the Bible*: if they had not, we might have been at a loss for evidence to prove the *strong delusion*, under which such men did, and must labour, *who profess to revere the Bible, while they are endeavouring to make it void*. But they appear to be so strongly deluded, as to *blaspheme the God of Heaven by making void his word, under the persuasion, that they are not fanatics, and revere God's Bible*. They are so infatuated as to think they do honour to *our LORD, by serving the creature rather than the creator*, although the scripture record of the creation of all things by God *alone*, the human pre-existerians are obliged to pervert, in support of their lying tradition of *the pre-existence of a human soul, like the soul of a dead man*; (S. D. 125.) which they call, the *Great Image of God!* (He. 147.) It is in such *deluded acts*, we see men *blaspheming the God of truth*; for in their writings we have a positive testimony, that they neither *revere God's Bible*, nor truly believe that, "*all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, therefore all is true, the few as well as the many*." "*It is impossible for God to lie, and as he is, such must his communication be. His word, therefore, MUST NOT ONLY*" "*BE STRICTLY TRUE BUT PERFECTLY CONSISTENT.*" (S. D. 55.) For if they did; they would not be guilty of such abominations; and I therefore call upon the *Perverter of I Am*, if he has a claim to honesty or integrity as a man, to tell the church of God, why he did not in his Scriptural Display set forth the numerous passages of Holy Writ, which he either considered to be *defective*; or that he rejected as *a lie!*

The Reader will *not overlook* the *profligate, and sophisticated* expedients resorted to by all such deluded creatures, who make void the word of God by their traditions! They would conceal their enmity to Christ Jehovah. (Luke ii. 11,) by subtilty and sophistry! And with insulting mockery, they tell us, they honour Christ

by setting him up as a *man in God, like unto a dead man without a body.* (S. D. 125.) Surely such conduct is an undeniable proof, they are either *fanatics*, or something worse!

Mr. John Stevens has either wittingly or unwittingly charged Mr. Colyer, who is one of the witnesses for "the Christ of God," with having written against *his (Stevens') Lord!* This is an unquestionable truth, for our Lord Jesus Christ, "the Christ of God," is not that Antichristian *Jesus, who changed his mind and lost his faculties*, as Mr. John Stevens represents his *dear Lord* to have done, when *he was made flesh.* (S. D. 200.) That the reader may have some correct idea of the human existerians' Christ of man's invention, I shall quote part of the human pre-existerians' *subtile* comment on the 5th, 6th, and 7th verses, of the 2nd chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, and place the same in juxta-position with the application thereof to our Lord Jesus Christ, that their *secret*, and *malignant hatred* to "the Christ of God," may be seen *in the human pre-existerians' own mirror*: because in Christ dwelleth all the *fulness of the Godhead bodily*: and it pleased the Father that *in Him should ALL FULNESS dwell*, the *fulness of grace and truth*, &c. Col. ii. 9.—i. 19.—John i. 14.

The human pre-existerians' comment on Philip. ii. 5, 6, 7, that the form of God does not mean what is essential to God.

"If God can make himself of no reputation, he can make himself so, no doubt, in the esteem of his creatures. But then can he be worthy of the highest adoration at the same time?" C. F. ii. 36. "Who can love and adore an essential God of no reputation? And what can be more incredible, than the assertion that the essential God the Almighty God, emptied himself? If he emptied himself, what remained to him after-

The human pre-existerians' comment applied to our Lord Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.

If Jesus Christ can make himself of no reputation, he can make himself so, no doubt, in the esteem of his creatures. But then can he be worthy of the highest adoration at the same time?

Who can love and adore Jesus Christ the Lord of Glory, of no reputation? And what can be more incredible, than the assertion that the immutable Jesus Christ, in whom all fulness dwells, emptied himself? If he emptied himself, what remain-

“wards? Is not an emptied God
 “a changed God? Or is his
 “fulness such, that he can be
 “the same without it as with
 “it? But we are told how he
 “emptied himself, namely, by
 “taking upon him the *stature*,
 “the *form* of a servant. Still
 “it is difficult to conceive, how
 “his taking upon him any form
 “which he had not before,
 “should empty him of what
 “was essential to his being.”
 C. F. ii. 36.

We cannot believe in a
mutable God, nor understand
 how the essential God can be
 subject to emptiness. *This*
Divinity is to us, horrible in the
extreme. C. F. ii. 36. 37.

ed to him afterwards? Is not
 an emptied Jesus Christ, a
 changed Jesus Christ? Or is his
 fuiness such, that he can be the
 same without it as with it?
 But we are told how he emp-
 tied himself, namely, by taking
 upon him the *stature*, the form
 of a servant. Still it is diffi-
 cult to conceive, how his taking
 upon him any form which he
 had not before, should empty
 him of what was essential to
 him, who was equal with God!

We cannot believe in a
mutable Jesus Christ, nor un-
 derstand how the fulness of
 God can be subject to empti-
 ness. *This Divinity is to us,*
horrible in the extreme.

Thus, the human pre-existerians reject “the Christ of God!” Hereafter I shall shew, the human pre-existerians *do not* believe, that when the Word was made flesh *he became what he was not before, without CEASING TO REMAIN WHAT HE WAS BEFORE:* because they say, when he was made flesh, he *lost all his faculties, i. e. his will, his understanding and his love, by the overwhelming impressions of infant animal nature:* [S. D. 200, 201,] for such is the Christ they have invented, and set up in opposition to “The CHRIST OF GOD.” [Luke ix. 20.]

If the Holy Spirit had not explained the meaning of the words, “*he made himself of no reputation,*” an apology might be made for Mr. John Stevens’ vile comment: but if Mr. Stevens’ *much reason* led him to make such a vile comment upon those words, although clearly explained by the words which follow, namely, “*and took upon him the form of a servant, &c.,*” how came Mr. Stevens’ *much reason* to make the God of truth *of no reputation for truth,* by his *plain reason creed of assumed names?* For the benefit of Mr. John Steven’s young rooks, I shall apply his before mentioned carnal comment, in juxta-position with his plain reason creed of an *assumed Father, &c.;* because his *carnal arguments* completely destroy his *carnal* creed: and

unless he abandons his arguments, he must acknowledge his enmity to God's truth is fully proved by his own arguments.

The human Pre-existerians' comment on Philip ii. 5, 6, 7, &c.

“If God can make himself of no reputation, he can make himself so, no doubt, in the esteem of his creatures. But then can he be worthy of the highest adoration at the same time? Who can adore an essential God of no reputation? And what can be more incredible than the assertion that the essential God, the Almighty God *emptied* himself? Is not an emptied God, a changed God?” (C. F. ii. 36.)
 “Or is his fulness such, that he can be the same *without it* as *with it*?” (C.F. ii. 36.)

“But we are told how he emptied himself, namely, by taking upon him the *stature*, the *form* of a servant. Still it is difficult to conceive, how his taking upon him any form which he had not before, should empty him of what was essential to his being.” (C. F. ii. 36.)

“We cannot believe in a *mutable God*, nor understand how the essential God can be subject to emptiness. *This Divinity is to us, horrible in the extreme!*” (C.F. ii. 36, 37.)

The human Pre-existerians' comment applied to their plain reason creed.

If God can make himself an *impostor*, he can make himself so, no doubt, in the esteem of his creatures, by *assuming names, and hereafter laying them aside*, as *stage players* do. But then can he be worthy of the highest adoration at the same time? Who can love an essential God of no reputation for truth? And what can be more incredible than the assertion that the essential God, the Almighty God emptied himself of truth, by assuming *false and non-essential* names. Is not a God with non-essential names, taken up and afterwards laid aside, a mutable God? Or is his truth such, that he can be the same *without it* as *with it*?

But we are told how he emptied himself of truth, namely, by taking assumed names, like *upokrites*, and impostors. Still it is difficult to conceive how the God of truth could be such an *impostor*, as to take upon him non-essential names, by which his creatures might be deceived, unless he emptied himself of *truth*, which is essential to his being.

We cannot believe in a mutable God, nor understand how the essential God can either lie or deceive. *This Divinity is to us, horrible in the extreme.*

The Reader will observe, how justly Mr. John Stevens' *carnal* arguments may be applied to his *plain reason Tri-une God*. Carnal arguments are very properly used when applied to carnal creeds; but *spiritual truths* are the proper arguments to be applied to *spiritual things*. But as it is my duty to expose Mr. John Stevens' *cunning craftiness*, and his *Pelagian principles*, I am compelled to observe, that, by his *carnal comment* upon the Holy Scriptures, it may be fairly questioned, whether his *much reason* does not *secretly* condemn as unjust, the doctrine of God's *special election*, and *particular redemption*: and for that purpose I shall also place in juxtaposition his before-mentioned *carnal* comment, with the application thereof to God's eternal and unconditional election, that the *Perverter's secret* Pelagian principles may be made *more and more* manifest by *his* carnal arguments, because such depraved reasons are the strong holds of the *Pelagian heretics*, and perfectly accord *with his denial of his guilt of Adam's sin*, and *with his plain reason creed of the birth of sinless souls*, and *sinless bodies*, and *with his doctrine of an unbegotten son having no analogy with any thing found in grace*, &c.^a

^a The Reader will remember, that Mr. John Stevens *did not believe, in his heart, what he wrote in answer to Mr. Andrew Fuller's book!* Mr. Andrew Fuller (in common with Dr. Watts,) believed it to be the duty of sinners to believe in Christ; and what he sincerely believed, he published. But Mr. *John Stevens*, who believes we are bound to believe the Sacred Record, nevertheless wrote against Mr. *Fuller's doctrine*: and therefore, what he published against Mr. Fuller's book, *plain reason says*, (S. D. 30,) he did not sincerely believe, because, so far, was *his much reason*, (S. D. 186,) from *approving* of what he wrote against *the duty of sinners to believe in Christ*, that he, *with all the reason in the world*, (S. D. 16,) printed and published that, "*a man can know nothing of supernatural truth, beyond the testimony of the Scriptures: WHAT IS PLAINLY DECLARED IN THESE SACRED RECORDS, WE ARE BOUND TO EXAMINE WITH REVERENCE, AND BELIEVE WITH ASSURANCE.*" (S. D. iii.) Therefore, it may be fairly questioned, whether Mr. *Stevens* believed a word of what he wrote against Mr. Fuller; or in charity, whether he had any *real opinion* upon the subject; because *depraved reason* is so indelibly stamped upon the whole of Mr. *John Stevens'* writings, that neither his *subtlety*, nor his *sophistry*, have been able to conceal, even under a profession of Christianity, his hatred to the Sonship of Christ, or his justification of the Sanhedrim, in causing Christ to be put to death as a *blasphemer*, because he said *God was his own Father, making himself equal with God*. And I may add, as Mr. *Stevens'* writings under the term of *plain reason*, do

The human Pre-existerians' comment on Philip ii. . 5, 6, 7, in support of their heresy.

“If God can make himself of no reputation, he can make himself so, no doubt, in the esteem of his creatures. But then, can he be worthy of the highest adoration at the same time?” C. F. ii. 36.

“Who can love and adore an essential God of no reputation? And what can be more incredible, than the assertion that the essential God, the Almighty God, emptied himself? If he emptied himself, what remained to him afterwards? Is not an emptied God, a changed God? Or is his fulness such, that he can be the same without it as with it? But we are told how he emptied himself, namely, by taking upon him the stature, the form of a servant!” C. F. ii. 36.

“We cannot believe in a mutable God, nor understand how the essential God can be subject to emptiness. This Divinity is to us, horrible in the extreme.” C. F. ii. 36, 37.

In such horrid, pelagian, and infidel reasoning upon divine revelation, we see in part the dreadful enmity of the carnal mind against God! Reader, it is a mirror in which we see ourselves, if we have been convinced of sin by God the Holy Ghost! But, it is not improbable, that some of Mr. *John Stevens'* disciples may say, that Mr. *Stevens* doth neither preach, nor believe in the *Pe-*

strongly intimate, if they do not openly avow, that the revelation which God hath made of himself, is the act of (*upokrites*) *stage players*, or *impostors*, it may with much reason be questioned, whether he does not secretly consider the whole of divine revelation to be a *stage trick!*

The human Pre-existerians' comment applied in support of the Pelagian heresy.

If God can make himself of no reputation by *partiality*, he can make himself so, no doubt, in the esteem of his creatures. But then, can he be worthy of the highest adoration at the same time?

Who can love and adore a God of no reputation for equity? And what can be more incredible, than the assertion that the just God, the God of equity, emptied himself of his *impartiality*? If he emptied himself, what remained to him afterwards? Is not a partial God, an unjust God? Or is his *impartiality* such, that he can be just without equity as with it? But we are told how he emptied himself of *equity*, namely, by special election and particular redemption, &c.

We cannot believe in a *partial* God, nor understand how the impartial God can be subject to partiality. This Divinity is to us, horrible in the extreme!

lagian doctrine! But then, I would ask, how came Mr. John Stevens to use such *Pelagian arguments*, if he did not approve of them? Do they mean to charge Mr. Stevens with the guilt of such abandoned conduct, as that of asserting for truth, an argument he knew to be *false*? If they do not, how came Mr. Stevens, when he used the above *Pelagian* argument, to subscribe himself a *lover of his creed*? If they cannot answer this question, Mr. Stevens will do it for them; because, he has already declared, that the human pre-existerian disciples receive all the absurdities which the zealous advocates of the doctrine promulgate, *as young rooks receive food from their dams!* (S. D. 208.)

As it is very evident, the human pre-existerians' Christ is not "*the Christ of God*," (Luke ix. 20,) let not the Reader omit to pray for these deluded creatures; for all of them may not be under that *strong delusion*, from which there is no recovery! (2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.) A Baptist Minister *has been pulled out of the fire*, [Jude 23,] who had been *beguiled from the simplicity that is in Christ, by the subtilty of the human pre-existerians who preach another Jesus*; [2 Cor. xi. 3, 4,] one that was not in heaven when talking to Nicodemus on earth. It is but a few months since, when this Baptist Minister humbly, faithfully, and openly, confessed his sin in giving heed to these fblers; and he glorified God in the presence and hearing of his congregation! And if Mr. John Stevens be not past recovery, and if he should be deeply convinced of the *awful lies and perversions*, [wittingly or unwittingly] *which he has committed*; we may be sure he will not fail to confess his sin, and also to glorify God: because after long experience he well knows, that the *young rooks, who received his seductions as food from their dam, will all follow his example*. And he also knows, that *they only received them upon his credit*; for he acknowledges *his creed to be no matter of faith, because not expressly revealed*. [S. J. 93.] Surely, he never would have promulgated such a tradition, had he known the Scriptures, and the power of God, *for our faith is not to stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God*. And if an Apostle would not use the *wisdom of words* (human learning) lest *the cross*

*of Christ should be made of none effect: (1 Cor. i. 17,) and if he came not with excellency of speech or wisdom, (1 Cor. ii. 1,) (sensual illustrations), with the words which man's wisdom teacheth (1 Cor. ii. 13,) (reasons, and syllogisms,) or with enticing words of man's wisdom, (carnal arguments) [1 Cor. ii. 4,] that their faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, BUT IN THE POWER OF GOD, [1 Cor. ii. 5,] how dare any man, who names the name of Christ, to seduce his hearers by the wisdom of words, excellency of speech, enticing words, or with the words which man's wisdom teacheth, to induce them to receive upon his credit, what he admits to be no matter of faith, because not expressly revealed! (S. J. 93.)^a Is it not written, *cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm?* And is not this curse part of God's immutable decrees? Reader, be not deceived, for the God of Israel is as true to his threatenings, as he is to his promises!*

But to return. We not only find the names Jesus Christ, in the Holy Scriptures, repeatedly applied to his Godhead, but *expressly* so before he came in the flesh, when he existed in that *form which is essential to his equality with God the Father and the Spirit!* This truth in common with others, has *only*, as *always*, been attacked in various ways by the enemies of "the Christ of God." They appear to have some strange ideas of a God *prouder* than the Devil: for in their opinion it is *degradation* in our God, the GOD OF ALL GRACE, to *humble himself!* (3 Let. 44.) They say, "*Jehovah is never set forth as a pattern of humility, therefore he, who is so represented, must be man.*" [S. D. 165.] "That they never find the divine nature or Godhead propounded to us as an example of self-denial, or humility, in all the Bible; therefore, they say, it must be the inferior na-

^a It is worthy of observation, that so far from the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ *without a body*, having any foundation in what is revealed, that the whole tenour of Holy Scripture is directly opposed to it. Would any believer assert, the image of the LIVING GOD to be a *human soul without a body, like a dead man!* But as this *wicked* Pharisaical tradition has been cordially received of late by many, professing to be christians, it is equally worthy of observation, that as this human pre-existerian doctrine is a *lie*, so the Devil must be the father of it, because of the many *lies*, which have been invented, & promulgated by the children of disobedience for its support!

“ture, *i. e.* *Christ's human soul in its condescension.*”^a (S. M. ii. 260.) Surely, if these men had known “*The Christ of God,*” they would have known that Christ’s humiliation, even after he was found in fashion as a man, was the act of God manifest in the flesh; for our God is infinite in humility: or had they known the Scriptures and the power of God, they would have had an *internal*, as well as an *external* evidence, that God the Holy Spirit doth humble himself to dwell in the vile bodies of the regenerate, and they would also have known the truth of the following Scriptures, 1 Sam. ii. 1—9.—Psalm cxiii. 4, 8.—cxlvii. 9.—Matt. vi. 26.—1 Cor. vi. 19.—2 Cor. vi. 16.—Eph. iv. 31, 32.—Eph. v. 1, 2! But their attack upon the humility of the God of all grace was to prepare their way for wresting the following Scripture from its plain and evident meaning, namely, “*Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who BEING in the Form (morphe) of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form (morphe) of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself, &c.* (Philip. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8.)”^b In this Scripture we

^a Christ was despised and rejected by the professing Jews, as he is now by many professing Christians, who know not JEHOVAH OF GLORY. And as he was JEHOVAH OF GLORY whom the princes of this world knew not, (1 Cor. ii. 7, 8.) it is very evident, that by taking the nature of a servant, the likeness of men, the likeness of sinful flesh, *he made himself of no reputation:* and therefore, he was despised and rejected by human pre-existerian Jews then, who despised the Holy Spirit’s testimony of man’s originality, as he is rejected by the human pre-existerians now.

^b A modern writer correctly observes upon this text: “it is very important to remark, that the way by which our Lord Jesus Christ, as God, made himself of no reputation, was by taking the form of a servant in a low degree of abasement, namely, *the likeness of sinful flesh:* whereas Adam was made in the likeness of God. And after our Lord was found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, &c. As the Creator he made himself of no reputation by taking the form of a creature; the likeness of sinful flesh, and after he had taken the form of a creature he humbled himself still further; for he submitted to the vilest indignity, *even the death of the cross.*” The Pre-exist-Arians are more candid than their brethren, the human pre-existerians, for they allow the pre-existence of Jesus Christ in this text to be that of a Divine Person, although they do not allow him to be equal to God the Father! But the text saith, EQUAL WITH GOD! another modern writer *justly* observes

have the names *Christ Jesus* applied to a divine person existing (*uparchon*) in the form of God, and *equal with God*, who made himself of no reputation by *receiving (labon)* the form of a servant. But as Mr. John Stevens refers his young rooks to a most excellent book written, by *James Abbadie, D. D.*, which he admits to be a *masterly* treatise: I shall put Dr. Abbadie's most excellent version of this portion of Holy Scripture, in juxta-position with the human pre-existerians' perversion thereof; because Dr. Abbadie's excellent version constitutes a part of that very book, which Mr. John Stevens recommends in the following strong terms: "Read a *MASTERLY treatise on the Divinity of Christ by James Abbadie, D. D.*" [C. F. ii. 32,] and as Dr. Abbadie's version is *masterly*, I hope *Mr. John Stevens*, and his *young rooks*, will benefit by it, and not fail to acknowledge, how *they have been beguiled by the subtilty of the serpent, from the simplicity there is in Christ, to believe in another Jesus!* 2 Cor. xi. 3. 4.

Dr. Abbadie's MASTERLY ver-
sion of Philip ii. 5, 6, 7.

The human Pre-existerians' per-
version of Philip ii. 5, 6, 7.

"Paul reveres that voice
"from heaven which demands,
"To whom will ye liken me?"

"The phrase, *Christ Jesus*,
"which the Apostle uses in
"verse 5, is, I believe, never

upon this text,—“We could never see how it could be humility in any
“creature to accept the office of *mediator* between God and man! Surely
“the mediatorial office is of the Highest Dignity. The *nobleman* who
“would become a servant and be treated as a slave, knowing that in con-
“sequence thereof he should be exalted and be made a *king*, does not
“afford us any example of Christ's *pure devoted love* by such an act of hu-
“mility.” But the love of Christ passeth knowledge, he, who made
himself of no reputation for us, could not be exalted beyond his equality
with God the Father and the Spirit: but as his taking the nature of
man was *his own* act, and the mean whereby he made himself of no re-
putation, and afterwards humbled himself even to the death of the cross;
SO THAT NATURE, whose originality is of the dust, WAS THE MEAN WHEREBY
HE, who humbled himself, was also exalted as God manifest in the flesh,
the Redeemer of Israel! And his manifest Glory is great in the Salvation
of his people, honour and majesty has been put upon him; for he has
a name given him, which is above every name, namely, GOD MANIFEST IN
the flesh, (1 Tim. iii. 16,) of the seed of Israel after the flesh; yet OVER ALL
GOD BLESSED FOR EVER. AMEN. (Rom. ix. 5.) In whom dwelleth ALL
THE FULLNESS OF THE GODHEAD (*somatikos*) corporeally. Col. ii. 9.

“*To whom will ye make me*
 “*equal?* yet he boldly asserts,
 “*Jesus thought it no robbery to*
 “*be EQUAL WITH GOD.* Again:
 “The Apostle could not but
 “*know the ground, or, if you*
 “*will, the pretence, on which*
 “CHRIST WAS CONDEMNED BY
 “THE JEWS; that is, because
 “he asserted his *likeness* to
 “God, and EQUALITY WITH
 “HIM. This was a prodigious
 “offence to men who had heard
 “God say, by his prophets;
 “*To whom will ye liken me and*
 “*make me equal?* Paul does
 “what he can to convert the
 “Jews to the Christian faith;
 “yet he never attempts to
 “justify the religion of Jesus,
 “from the charge of equalling
 “a creature with the Creator;
 “though, on the principles of
 “our opponents, it was highly
 “necessary for him so to have
 “done, for the salvation of men,
 “and the Glory of God. Nay,
 “so far was he from endea-
 “vouring to acquit the cause
 “of his master from such a
 “charge, that he roundly as-
 “serts, *Jesus thought it no rob-*
 “*bery to be EQUAL WITH GOD;*
 “which is the very thing for
 “which the Jews were so of-
 “fended with Christ, and on
 “*account of which they consi-*
 “*dered him as deserving judg-*
 “*ment of death.* But can it be
 “supposed that he who rent
 “his garments when he was
 “taken for *Mercury*, who was
 “a subordinate god among the

“applied, in the Scriptures, to
 “abstract divinity; but always
 “to one who is a complex per-
 “son, in whom both the divine
 “and human natures are united.
 “*Christ Jesus*, expressly means,
 “*the anointed Saviour*, and there-
 “fore, must ever imply a nature
 “that could be anointed: for
 “I have already shown, in
 “Prov. viii. 23, that a divine
 “person, abstractly taken,
 “could not be anointed. He
 “could neither receive gifts
 “nor grace, without a nature
 “suited to hold them, and to
 “be as a head of created and
 “communicated things. Nor
 “could the ‘*lowliness of mind,*’
 “the *humility* and *self-denial*
 “here mentioned, be fairly
 “SUPPOSED of one, who was
 “personally all divine. If it
 “would be *absurd* to predicate
 “bodily acts of mere spirit,^a it
 “must be still more absurd, to
 “predicate creature acts and
 “dependencies of a subsistence,
 “so infinitely above every thing
 “of the kind. *And surely, hu-*
 “*mility and self-denial are dis-*
 “*positions peculiar to a creature*
 “*existence.* Yet, if this be
 “allowed, it must follow that,
 “*Christ Jesus*, who was in the
 “*form of God*, was *really man*,
 “before he took the form of a
 “servant, and was made in the
 “likeness of men!!

“It should be observed
 “that, the mind which was in
 “*Christ Jesus was peculiar to*
 “*him, and was not in the Father,*

^a What Mr. Stevens calls *absurdity* is part of his creed, for he speaks of the human soul of Christ (*without a body*) eating with Abraham, &c., or else he must believe that Christ had *two human bodies!* (S. D. 176.) But where does he find *anointed* in Prov. viii. 23?

"heathens; can it, I say, be
 "supposed, that this very man
 "should equal a mere creature
 "with THE INFINITE GOD?"
 (Page 66. 67.) "Can it be
 "said, without impiety, of the
 "most excellent creature, *He*
 "exists in the form of God, and
 "thinks it not robbery to be
 "equal with God? Though the
 "LOGOS, in his pre-existent
 "state, possessed a Divine
 "glory, in comparison with us;
 "can we, on the ARIAN HY-
 "POTHESIS, attribute a Divine
 "glory to him, when con-
 "sidered as being *with God*?
 "What, must he bear the name
 "of that incomprehensible
 "Being, who is infinitely more
 "exalted above him, than the
 "most excellent creature is
 "above the meanest insect, or
 "the smallest atom!—Instead,
 "therefore, of saying, HE WAS
 "IN THE FORM OF GOD, be-
 "fore he humbled himself; we

"nor the Holy Spirit; nor are
 "HUMILITY AND SELF-DENIAL
 "EVER SPOKEN OF THEM, and
 "pointed out for our IMITA-
 "TION.—When these thoughts
 "are duly weighed, they must
 "demonstrate the necessity of
 "admitting, that *Christ Jesus*
 "here means a person who WAS
 "ACTUALLY MAN, as well as
 "truly God; BECAUSE THE
 "MIND HERE MENTIONED
 "COULD REALLY EXIST IN HU-
 "MANITY ONLY" (S. D. 166, 167)
 "Christ's being in the form of
 "God cannot here necessarily
 "signify his Godhead, because it
 "is represented as inconsistent
 "with the state of his humili-
 "ation; for he seems to have
 "PUT OFF *this form of God,*^b
 "and put on the opposite form
 "of a servant, when he became
 "incarnate." But it is plain he
 could not put off his divinity
 when he took flesh, therefore,
 it must refer to his human soul,

^a Observe Reader, that this deluded writer represents the *mind* of Christ as not being the mind of the Father and of the Spirit: but was not the humility of Christ the *mind* and will of the Father and of the Spirit? If the *mind* of Christ Jesus before he took the form of a servant was not the mind of the Father and of the Spirit, then the Three Testifiers could not be of *one mind*. But, if such a sentiment be the opinion of *freethinkers*, it is not the opinion of God's regenerated children; for our Lord declared "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doth, these also doeth the Son likewise: (John v. 19,) "AND THE FATHER, THAT DWELLETH IN ME, HE DOETH THE WORKS." (John xiv. 10.) And these truths are believed by God's regenerated children, for they have the Spirit of Christ, and therefore know the mind of Christ. The mind of Christ Jesus here mentioned, before he took the form of a Servant, was unquestionably the perfect mind of the Father and of the Spirit, because the proud are cursed. If God was not the God of humility, the proud would not be cursed.

^b It is never said, that Christ Jesus *put off* the form of God by taking the form of a servant. He never ceased to be what he was by taking *that form* which he had not; for our Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. But as the human pre-existerian Jesus Christ put off the form of God, it is very evident their Christ is not the Christ of God.