

“ must affirm, that he was
 “ always in the *form of a ser-*
 “ vant, in the form of a crea-
 “ ture: and that much more
 “ in heaven, than when upon
 “ earth; much more before
 “ the creation of the world,
 “ than when he conversed with
 “ men. *For with what perfec-*
 “ *tions soever a creature may be*
 “ *endued, it is much more in the*
 “ *form of a servant, when in the*
 “ *immediate presence of God,*
 “ *than when among men.* In-
 “ stead, therefore, of the sacred
 “ writers informing us, that
 “ Christ in his first estate, and
 “ when with his Father, was
 “ God, they should have said,
 “ *that he was then, comparatively*
 “ *nothing.*” (Page 180.) “ Jesus
 “ Christ is equal with God.
 “ *He thought it not robbery to*
 “ *be equal with God,* says an
 “ unerring writer. This equal-
 “ *ity* must include something
 “ greater, and something more

which existed in the form of God
prior to his incarnation, and was
 disrobed and divested of its
 ancient glory, when he took
 on him the *fashion of a man,*
and the form of a servant.

Besides, the *form of God*
 can never be proved to signify
 his divine nature; for there is
 no expression like it in Scrip-
 ture that signifies *proper divi-*
nity. Nor indeed does *morphe*
 properly signify *nature* or *es-*
sence any where in the Bible,
 that I can find, but only *ap-*
pearance, shape, or likeness.
 (S. D. 167, 168.)

Whosoever will read the four
 first chapters of *Genesis with due*
attention, will find a very plain
and easy representation of the
 great God, first creating ALL
 things,^a and afterwards *appear-*
ing to Adam, Eve, and Cain,
 and conversing with them with
 a human voice, and most proba-
 bly in a *human shape too.*^b I am

^a Mr. Stevens, afterwards, *denies* the revealed account of the *creation,*
 recorded in *Genesis,* to be the creation of ALL things. (See P. 1. Let.
 38.) Thus, he says one thing at one time to support his pharisaical lie;
 and the contrary at another time, when he is obliged to *make void* divine
 revelation for the sake of his *tradition.*

^b Whosoever reads the four first chapters of *Genesis* with due atten-
 tion, will find man's *originality* is of the dust, and therefore, the human
 soul pre-existerians are liars. But to *say,* or to *suppose,* God *appeared*
 in *man's own shape,* because his voice was heard by Adam, Eve, and Cain,
 is to suppose the Holy Ghost *did also appear* in *man's own shape,* because
 he testified of Christ, and spake unto Philip, and others, *as with a human*
voice. Thus by *suppositions,* the Scriptures may be made *a nose of wax.*
 Dr. Hawker justly observed to Mr. John Stevens, that on a subject of
 such vast moment, (“The Christ of God”) *all human reasonings unsup-*
ported by divine authority, lose their influence with me.” And so they
 ought with all who *fear God.* The Bible is not a book of *suppositions,*
 but of Truth. When God uttered his *voice,* it is written, *he sent forth his*
Spirit: and as Adam and his wife heard the *voice of the Lord God,* why
 should we *suppose* there was the appearance of a human form, when no
 such appearance is mentioned! Why did not the Father appear in a human
 form, when he spake! (Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5. John xii. 20.) Surely, those

“ Divine, that an unity of con-
 “ sent between Christ and the
 “ Father. Nothing short of
 “ an *unity of essence* can an-
 “ swer the import of the phrase;
 “ for, otherwise, it would con-
 “ tradict that high demand, so
 “ often repeated by Jehovah;
 “ *To whom will ye liken me,
 “ and make me equal, and com-
 “ pare me, that we may be like?*”
 (Page 244.) “ Again: To be
 “ one with God; to be *equal*
 “ with God; to be *God’s own*
 “ *son*; and, to be *God*; are in
 “ the language of inspiration,
 “ phrases of a similar import,
 “ and may be fairly explained
 “ one by another. So, we find,
 “ the Jews understood them.
 “ For, when our Lord said, *I*
 “ *and the Father are one*; they
 “ took up stones to stone him.

“ And when Jesus asked them the reason of their outrageous con-
 “ duct, they answered; *Because that thou, being a man, makest*
 “ *thyself God*. From whence it is evident, that, in their opinion,
 “ to be *one* with the Father, and to be *God*, are the same thing.
 “ In the same exalted point of light they considered the
 “ character, SON OF GOD. For they looked upon him
 “ as appropriating it to himself, in a *proper*, and not in a
 “ *figurative* sense. No, *they would never have made such a stir,*
 “ *nor have laid so heavy a charge against him, if the only cause of*
 “ *complaint had been; THAT HE CALLED HIMSELF THE SON OF*
 “ *GOD by a metaphor, or by adoption*. For they considered them-
 “ selves *the adopted sons of God*; saying, *we have one Father, even*
 “ *God*. They, therefore, must mean something very different

men who are obliged to support their doctrines by *suppositions*, are sport-
 ing themselves with their own deceivings, the wretched effusions of a sensual
 soul, which hath departed from the faith, by giving heed to the seductions of
 men; and the doctrines of devils.

* If *suppositions* are to be received as constituting the *faith* of God’s
elect, there would be as many *creeds* as *suppositions*. And if it may be
supposed that the Son of God *always possessed* the *human form* in the
 upper world; why may it not be *supposed* that the Spirit of God *ALWAYS*
POSSESSED the *dove shape* in the upper world? Here I could multiply *sup-*
positions if it were profitable: but I trust enough has been said to shew the
 folly and wickedness of setting up *suppositions*, by which the world might
 be proved by *materialists* to be eternal.

well assured, that any common
 reader, who begins the Bible
 without prejudices or prepos-
 sessions of any kind, would
 naturally frame this idea under
 the words and expressions of
Moses, the sacred writer.

It is very probable, that
 when God had made man, he
 appeared to him in man’s own
 shape, and thus made it known
 to *Adam*, that he had formed
 him in *his own Image, even as*
to his body; that is, in such form
 as God himself did, and would
 frequently assume, in order to
 converse with man on earth.
 And why may it not be SUP-
 PPOSED that, the Son of God
 ALWAYS POSSESSED the *human*
form in the upper world? S. D.
 173.*

“from this, when they say, *we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the SON OF GOD.* And in another place. they explain themselves; they let us know more fully what they understood by the august character; for when Jesus vindicating his conduct in healing the impotent man on the sabbath day, said; *my Father worketh, and I work: they sought the more to kill him, because he had not only broken the sabbath, but said also, that GOD WAS HIS FATHER, making himself EQUAL WITH GOD.* From which it is manifest, that to be *God’s own son*, and to be *equal with God*, were *the same thing in their account.* And, indeed, the characters *own son*, and *only son*, naturally signify an *equality*, a *sameness of essence.*” (Page 245, 246.) Thus this masterly writer has most clearly proved, he neither worshipped the human pre-existerians’ God, nor believed in the human pre-existerians’ Christ; but that he unfeignedly believed in “the Christ of God,” the *essential son* of the Father in truth and love. Which truth, of *eternal* importance to be believed, is *positively denied*, and rejected, by the *human Pre-existerians, and Antichrist!* And no man would pervert I AM, into *I was a man*; or, pervert the 5th and 6th verses of the 2nd chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, as the *Perverter, and John Allen, and the Arians* have done, unless they were under the dominion of Satan. In this *masterly* Treatise, Dr. Abbadie has also exposed the wickedness of the human pre-existerians’ *Antichristian* attempt to crucify the SON OF GOD *afresh* as an impostor! Indeed, Dr. Abbadie appears throughout the whole of that able treatise to be under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit.

IN THE SECOND PLACE, I shall expose the human pre-existerians’ *sophistry*, by which they have *beguiled* some weak believers *from the simplicity there is in Christ:* (2 Cor. xi. 3,) and for that purpose I shall put the human pre-existerians’ opinion of what they sometimes call the *phrase*, and at other times the *titles*, “Christ Jesus” in juxta-position with their opinion of the word (*morphe*) *form*, which occurs twice in the 6th and 7th verses of the 2nd chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians.*

* It is not said of our Lord Jesus Christ that he was (*morphoumenos*) that is, *formed* in the Image of God: but that he, *existing in the (morphe) form of God, was EQUAL* with God. It is not said of the saints that they are to be in the *morphe of God*, or in the *morphe of the Son of God*, but (*sum-morphous*) *con-formed* to the *Image of the Son*. Then, if to be *sum-morphous* to the image of the Son does not mean to be conformed to the Son, *but only to his Image*; it must follow, that to exist in the *morphe (form)* of God, must mean the *essence of God, and not the Image of God.*

The human pre-existerians' opinion of the names Christ Jesus.

"The phrase Christ Jesus, which the Apostle uses in ver. 5, is never applied in the Scriptures to Abstract Divinity; but always to one who is a complex person, in whom both the divine and human natures are united." (S. D. 166.)

The human pre-existerians' opinion of the word (morphe) form.

"I am well satisfied that, *morphe (form)* has not the signification of essence any where in God's word; but that it properly signifies *form, shape, delineation or appearance.*" (S. D. 164. S. M. ii. 260.) *The nature of God has no form.* (E. S. 37.)

From their opinion of the word *morphe, form*, namely, that it does not signify *essence* or *nature*, but merely *shape, delineation, or appearance*, it is very evident, that if the text in the Epistle to the Philippians be so interpreted, then, the Lord Jesus Christ has neither the nature, nor essence of God, nor has he the nature, or essence of man, but merely the *shape, delineation, or appearance of God, and of man*; because the text would read thus, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: *who being merely in the shape, delineation, or appearance of God*, thought it no robbery to be equal with God: *but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him merely the shape, delineation, or appearance, of a servant, &c.*" Here I would pause a few minutes, and ask the believer, if there ever was an open enemy of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has exceeded this instance of malevolent misrepresentation of the plain meaning of this Sacred text? But, the human pre-existerians are partial to syllogisms: the *Perverter of I AM, with all the reason in the world*, (S. D. 16,) calls them *heavy things to toss out of the way*; and therefore, I shall present his *young rooks* with *three* human pre-existerian syllogisms, formed from their *interpretation* and reudering of the word *morphe* in this text; which they may possibly find too heavy either for their *plain reason*, or for their *much reason* to throw out of the way.

1st Syllogism. *Morphe* has not the signification of *essence* or *nature*; Jesus Christ existed in the *morphe* of God; therefore *Jesus Christ had not the essence or nature of God!!*

2nd Syllogism. *Morphe* has not the signification of essence or nature; Jesus Christ took the *morphe* of a servant; therefore Jesus Christ had not the essence or nature of a servant!!

From these two heavy human pre-existerian syllogisms we have *all the reason in the world to consider*, (S. D. 16,) that their fanciful Christ was neither God, nor man! And as he was neither God, nor man, it is no marvel that he should have *no form*; but only an *appearance*. And as they say, the nature of God has no form, it must therefore follow, according to their interpretation of the word *morphe*, that their Christ *never* had a form: he is therefore a *Christ of man's invention!*

3rd Syllogism. The nature of God *has no form*; Christ was in the *form* of God; therefore Christ had *no form!*

These three *Syllogisms* are very heavy things, and they prove, that Mr. John Stevens with all the reason in the world *considers* (S. D. 16,) *morphe* to mean, that our Lord Jesus Christ had neither the essence, nor nature of God, and neither the essence, nor nature of man, nor any form whatever *

* A spiritual writer observes, "The Greek *Os en morphē Theou uparchon*," which we read, "*Who being in the form of God.*" I conceive must be understood of the essential GODHEAD of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not of any glorious appearance of his before, and under the Mosaic dispensation. And if so, *uparchon*, ought to be rendered *existing, subsisting, living*, (as the sense of the word is in Luke xvi. 23, and vii. 25,) because in Philip ii. 6, it does not imply any derived, but underived existence. *Morphēn doulon*, in the next verse, Philip ii. 7, rendered the *form of a servant*, evidently means the *real* assumption of *human nature*; in which HE who before existed in the *form* of God, and simply *as God*, became the *real* servant of the Father, and not an *imaginary* one; and served in *reality*, and not in *appearance* only. So *Morphē Theou*, which we render, *form of God*, in verse 6, must mean something more than the mere appearance, fashion, similitude, or delineation, without the life or reality of the divine nature. For if the Lord Jesus Christ did not *exist as God*, or *exist of himself*, then it had been the most daring robbery in him to have pretended the *equality with God*, which he evidently claimed as his lawful right. Since, in no respect is Jesus the *Fellow*, or *Equal* of JEHOVAH SABBATH, (i. e. of the FATHER) but as he is essentially, or by nature God; and, being so, *existing in the form of God*, seems to be a correct mode of expressing his *self-existence*. Moreover, if he, "*Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but took upon him the form of a servant,*" did not *actually become a*

The simplicity of this sacred text in the Epistle to the Philippians, has been heretofore set forth, (see ante, page 37, 38, 39,) but I beg leave to observe, that the united subtilty of the serpent, and the depraved reasonings of men, have never been able to prove that, "*the mind of Jesus Christ*" in this text does not mean the *eternal mind of a Divine Person*; because, the most High God has declared by his servants the prophets, that *there is none like him*; for thus it is written; "*To whom then, will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare unto him? To whom, then, will ye liken me, OR SHALL I BE EQUAL, SAITH THE HOLY ONE!*" These questions are unanswerable! Even the human pre-existerians who presumptuously declare, that *the human soul* without a body, *like the dead, is the likeness of God*, nevertheless acknowledge, that the human soul of Christ has no divine perfection seated in it; *and therefore, as his human soul could never be equal with God*, his human soul is, and must be excluded from having any real existence, until Jesus Christ made himself of no reputation; for who was the person

servant, and really serve, for his Church, as the righteous Servant of the Father, (Isa. xlii. 1, and liii. 11,) and finish the work which the Father gave him to do, (John xvii 4,) then Wo worth the day that *Adam* sinned! or that ever any soul of *Adam* was born in his sinful image! for we are all under the righteous curse of the broken law of God; which law (if Christ were not the righteous Servant of the Father) never has been, and never will be obeyed; but its righteous curse must sink the whole human race to endless misery. If, therefore, the term *morphe*, in its application to God, mean only an appearance or shadow, without the reality or substance of the divine nature, (if I may so speak) then the same term must mean the same thing when applied to Christ as a servant; and the evident import of the text in that case is, *who being only in the appearance of God, (but not being really divine) took upon him the appearance only of a servant (but was not really human, neither did he really serve.)* What then becomes of the *Godhead*, or of the *manhood*, or of the *righteousness* of Christ? What are the whole but mere external *appearances*, without any essential qualities! or, shadows without substance! And if such be the *Person* of CHRIST, what, I would ask, is the whole of christianity? What the most glowing description of everlasting happiness? What the most awful representations of eternal misery, with which the Scriptures abound, but a SHADOW! Which, to infer from the Sacred Oracles, were as blasphemous towards God as it would be miserable towards his beloved and redeemed people. But, "*verily he took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took upon him the seed of Abraham.*" Heb. ii. 16. (See a sermon entitled, "*The good news of Christ.*" By W. H. Colyer.)

that was *equal with God*, and *existed in the form of God*? Not a creature; for *infinite*, indeed, is the inequality of the creature when compared with the Creator: and therefore, *Christ Jesus* existing in the divine essence, equal with God the Father and the Spirit, was a Divine person in the abstract, whose eternal mind and will was, to make himself of no reputation *by taking or receiving the essence, or nature of a servant, and be made in the likeness of men!* And as this was the *eternal* mind of Jesus Christ before he took or received what the human pre-existerians only acknowledge to be the *form, shape, delineation, appearance, or likeness of a creature, whether angel or man, for angels and men have forms, and are called servants*, it must follow, that the names Christ Jesus, in this Sacred text, are applied to a Divine person in the abstract.

IN THE THIRD PLACE. I shall make a few observations upon the true interpretation of the word *morphe, form*, in this text.

1st. As the *form* of a servant means the *essence and nature* of a servant, so the *form of God* most plainly and evidently doth mean in this Scripture, the *essence and nature* of God, for God has no other form than his essence and nature. For if the children by adoption would never be *con-formed* (*sum-morphous*) even to the *Image of the Son*, without they partook of the SPIRIT of the Son; how very evident then must the record of Christ existing in the *form of God*, and not merely in the Image of God, mean, that he existed in the divine essence before he took the nature or appearance of a creature. But, if Mr. John Stevens' interpretation be correct, namely, that *morphe*, merely means *shape, delineation, or appearance*; then, Christ never took the essence or nature of a servant, or man, but only the appearance of one, and then, there would be an end to the whole of his *tradition!* Thus, by his much *reason*, he proves the absurdity of his own *plain reason creed*, for he denies the true originality, and even the true substance of Christ's human nature. But what does Mr. Stevens mean, by the human soul being in the form of God? Are we to understand that his God is *like a dead man?* Does he not represent the likeness and

image of his God to be a human soul without a body *like a dead man?* (1 Let. 22, 23.) And if a *dead man* be the *likeness* and *image of his God*, can the human pre-existerians' God be the *living God*? If Mr. Stevens' creed be true, namely, that a *dead man* is the Image of *his God*, then, we may understand what Mr. Stevens means by his interpretation of the word *morphē*, *form*; namely, that Jesus Christ, being the *apparition of a dead man*, wore the *shape, appearance, and delineation* of Mr. John Stevens' Tri-une God! And, therefore, it is not possible, that Mr. Stevens' God can be the *Living God*, neither can Mr. Stevens' Christ be the image of the living and invisible God; for *death* is not the *likeness of life*! But as the human pre-existerians *have all the reason in the world*, I shall prove their *plain reason* creed to be the *offspring* of a depraved reasoner, a *subtile enemy* to "*the Christ of God*," by a *human soul pre-existerian syllogism*: which syllogism reads thus: "*Christ's human soul without a body is the image of the human pre-existerians' God; a human soul without a body is a DEAD MAN; therefore a DEAD MAN is the image of the human pre-existerians' God.*" Now, this well formed syllogism, ought to be highly esteemed by the human pre-existerians, for Mr. Stevens says, a well formed *syllogism* is a heavy thing to toss out of the way!

2nd. Mr. John Stevens says, "*the nature of God has no form!* (E. S. 37.) Then God *has no Image!* And his fanciful notion of the *human soul* of Christ, being the *Great Image of God*, is like his *Behemoth* interpretation of the word *archē*, *beginning*, in Prov. viii. 23. Col. i. 18. and Rev. iii. 14.

3rd. It is very evident, if the nature of the *Living God* has no form, then the *Living God* has no *shape*: and if no *shape*, then the *Living God* can have no such *image* or *likeness*, as the human pre-existerians have made for him! unless, indeed, they mean to affirm, that a *human soul, or human form, which had not the fashion of a man, a nondescript creature*, is the *shape, delineation, appearance, image, and likeness* of their NONDESCRIPT Tri-une God, before he ASSUMED the names *Father, Son, and Spirit*: and which, therefore, may be his *shape* again, when he shall be

once more, (as they *suppose* or believe) a **NONDESCRIFT *Tri-une God***, according to their *plain reason creed*. (S. D. 82, 252.) And as this *depraved creed* is the human pre-existerian doctrine, I desire to be deeply humbled under God's distinguishing grace, that he is pleased to make use of me, as an instrument, to expose by *the word of truth, and by the power of God*, (2 Cor. vi. 7,) the seductions of men, whose *doctrines are of the devil*. (1 Tim. iv. 1.) Surely, the *testimony* of God is from HIM, who cannot lie—from HIM, who cannot be mistaken HIMSELF, and who is too good and gracious, in the remotest degree to *deceive* us, as the human pre-existerians do *blasphemously* represent HIM to have done!

4th. Thus saith the Lord, *righteousness, knowledge and true holiness* are the image of God: then, as the *Divine* perfections are the *Image of God*, then, the *Living God* has an Image: and if God has an Image, then God has a form; and that *form* must be those perfections which are essential to God. Now Jesus Christ being in the form of God was *equal* with God: here the creature is evidently excluded, for *no creature can be equal with God*. And, therefore, the *form* of God doth evidently mean what is *essential* to God, or *equal* to God; and the *form* of a servant doth evidently mean what is essential to a servant, and equal to a servant.

If Mr. *Stevens* has *all the reason in the world*, (S. D. 16,) why does he *abound in contradictions, and absurdities*? sometimes he admits, his Christ to be *God by nature*: (S. D. 72,) at another time he declares, when his Christ appeared to Abraham, he was not the *eternal God*; (C. F. i. 60,) and at another time, when speaking of Christ's incarnation, that it was *an immortal man reserved in the Lord Christ that came out, &c.* (S. J. 19.) who lost all his *vast ideas and extensive faculties* at his first union to a body of flesh, (S. D. 200. 201,) and who either *ignorantly or wilfully* used one tense for another, the *present* for the *past*, *I am* for *I was*. (S. J. 19,) and who was such a *liar* as to declare his sonship to be *incomprehensible!*^a Surely, a stranger might presume, that a man

^a Mr. *Stevens*' "Scriptural Display" "his Verses" his "Celestial Filiation," and his "Early Sonship," (if their contents were true,) would

of the world, like Mr. Stevens, one so well acquainted with the weakness of mankind, (S. D. 208,) was endeavouring to fathom human credulity, or he would not have published the following, amongst other, *vain suppositions*, and *contradictory statements*, which I have placed in juxta-position with each other, as worthy of the Reader's attention!

Mr. Stevens' Supposition.

"It is very probable, that
 "when God had made man, he
 "appeared to him in man's own
 "shape, and thus made it
 "known to Adam, that he had
 "formed him in his own image,
 "even as to his body; that is,
 "in such form as God himself
 "did, and would frequently
 "assume, in order to converse
 "with man on earth. And
 "why may it not be supposed
 "that, the Son of God always
 "possessed the human form in
 "the upper world?" (S.D. 173.)
 "shape and fashion refer to the
 "body." (S. D. 184.) The
 "Great Image of God." (He.
 147.)

Mr. Stevens' Statement.

"The mind here menti-
 "oned could really exist in
 "humanity only. (S. D. 167.)
 "Christ's being in the form of
 "God cannot here necessarily
 "signify his Godhead, he seems
 "to have put off this form of
 "God, 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, which existed in
 "the form of God prior to his
 "incarnation, and was disrobed
 "and divested of its ancient
 "glory when he took on him the
 "fashion of a man." (S. D.
 168.)

The Reader will observe, that in Mr. Stevens' statement we have a *human form* existing for ages, *without the fashion of a man*; and that human form making itself of no reputation, which he calls, divesting itself of its ancient glory *by taking a body, the fashion of a man!* What, therefore, must be Mr. Stevens' opinion of the resurrection of the dead? Are Enoch and Elijah, who have respectively *the fashion of a man*, without reputation? Is the image of the heavenly without reputation in Mr. Stevens' esteem? Again, after the Reader has carefully perused Mr. Stevens' supposition as

prove the Holy Scriptures to be untrue, Christ to be a *liar*, and the Sanhedrim just in crucifying Christ as an impostor, for saying he was the *incomprehensible Son of God!*

well as his *statement*, let him mark the absurdity as well as the contradiction therein set forth: for such is the *food* with which Mr. Stevens feeds his young rooks. (1.) We have God *supposed* to appear in man's *shape* (*body*) to Adam, and we have Adam *formed* in God's *own shape*, as to *his body*! (2.) The *shape* (*body*) he *supposes* Christ *always possessed in the upper world*: therefore, his Christ must have been then, what he calls, without reputation, for if he *always possessed a body*, he must have worn, what he calls, *the fashion of a man*. (3.) But in Mr. Stevens' *statement* we have the human soul only (the *great image of God*. He. 147,) *existing in the form of God*, *putting off*, disrobing, and divesting itself of the form it had, and afterwards taking another body, *the fashion of a man*! Here I ask, if Christ had the *shape* (a *body*) in the upper world, and afterwards took *another body*, did he lay aside his other *body*? and what became of that *first body*? for it is very evident that Christ *rose* from the dead, and ascended, in the *body* he took, which, Mr. Stevens calls, *the fashion of a man*. But if Christ had *not the fashion of a man* before his incarnation, how could he be *actually a man older than Adam*, as Mr. Stevens says, *he was*? (4.) It is very true, that Christ could not put off his Divinity, and the Scriptures never say, he put off the form of God! Then as Christ did not put off his Divinity, and as the human soul of Christ had not *in the upper world* the *fashion of a man*, did he divest himself of his *human form* when he took the *fashion of a man*? What is the difference between the *fashion of a man* and a *human form*? And how could Adam have been made in the image and likeness of Mr. Stevens' image man standing in God, if Mr. Stevens' image man had not the *fashion of a man*? (5) Mr. Stevens *supposes*, that God appeared to Adam in *man's own shape*, and that *fashion and shape* refer to the *body*: and that thus, God made it known to Adam, he had formed him in his *own image, even as to his body*! Then, as Adam had a *body*, the *fashion and shape of a man*, which Mr. Stevens calls God's *own image*, how could Christ's human soul *without a body*, be God's *own image*, as it had not got a *body like Adam's*, which Mr. Stevens calls God's *own image*, namely, the *fashion and*

shape of a man which *Adam* had? (6) After such absurdities, and contradictions, let the Reader observe, how the Holy Scriptures are perverted to destroy the Holy Spirit's testimony of the *Pre-eternity* of Christ Jesus! But, the human pre-existerians say, the *lowliness of mind*. &c. *here mentioned are peculiar to a creature.* (S. D. 167,) and could really exist in humanity only (S. D. 167,) that it refers to the human soul which was disrobed and divested of its ancient glory, when he took on him the fashion of a man! (S. D. 168.) Therefore, their perversion of this text shall be put in juxta-position with the Sacred Scripture, that *their enmity* to the *Pre-eternity* of Jesus Christ, as well as *their enmity* to the seed of the woman may clearly appear.

The Holy Scripture reads.

“Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.” Philip. ii. 5-7.

The human Pre-existerians' perversion.

Let this mind be in you, which was only in the human soul of Christ Jesus, which human soul being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made itself of no reputation, by disrobing and divesting itself of its ancient glory, by taking the fashion of a man.

By the human pre-existerian *perversion*, the Reader will observe, the *human soul* of Christ must have been guilty of *Adam's sin*, by thinking it not robbery to be equal with God!! Thus, by absurdities, contradictions, and perversions, the human pre-existerians do most evidently prove, “*they have all the reason in the world to consider the soul of our Lord as IMMEASURABLY GREAT in its powers and possessions beyond all other created spirits.*” (S. D. 16.) And as the human soul of Christ was IMMEASURABLY *great*, it must, therefore, have been INFINITE, *equal with God!* Here, Reader, we have the human pre-existerians' scriptural display of all their reason, even if the Reader should question their having all the reason in the world! One of them is well known to have much cunning craftiness and *impudence* united, he has acknowledged, although not in the very words, but in *meaning*, that *he fished for gudgeons, (Dagonites), men easily*

cheated; for Mr. *John Stevens* says, and, no doubt, *he speaks from experience*, that it was among such persons, the human pre-existerian preachers found their principal success: he describes them in his *Scriptural Display*, as persons who receive sentiments as young rooks receive food from their Dams. (S. D. 208.) But, probably, he has since recollected, that the *gudgeons*, (*fish*) pre-existed the *rooks*, and, therefore, the human pre-existerians were entitled to the *fishy pre-eminent honour* of pre-existing the *rooks*. Surely, such a *man of reason* may be considered as *laughing at the credulity of his disciples*, or he would not compare them to *rooks*, or to *gudgeons*! But whether he is, or is not, there is a period at hand, when he will know the Scripture saith not in vain, *he that is void of wisdom, despiseth his neighbour*. (Prov. xi. 12.) Therefore, that human pre-existerian must be either a fanatic, or strongly deluded, who can, after the exposure of such absurdities and blasphemies, believe in Mr. *Stevens' dear Lord*, *a began to be Jesus Christ*, who was not the *Eternal God* when he appeared to Abraham, and, therefore, cannot be the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.

IN THE FOURTH PLACE, the Believer's particular attention is requested to another portion of that MASTERLY TREATISE, so admitted to be by Mr. *John Stevens*, which was written by Dr. *Abbadie*^a upon this important text, in the Epistle to the Philippians, because he has most successfully opposed, and exposed, Mr. *John Stevens' sophistry*, and all the cunning craftiness, and depraved reasoning of Christ's enemies, who have unitedly endeavoured from time to time, to pervert or destroy the plain and evident meaning of this Sacred Scripture.

^a This masterly writer, Dr. *Abbadie*, never mentioned the *names of* the enemies of Christ, neither did he refer to their writings by name when he wrote against *their seductions*! He did not consider himself fighting with beasts at Ephesus. But if I am an *unprincipled* writer for following Dr. *Abbadie's* example, how came Mr. *John Stevens* to put such a *masterly* honour upon Dr. *Abbadie*? But, these things are trifling contradictions, when compared with Mr. *Stevens' awful perversions* of Holy Scripture and his *contradictions against God Himself*: the man who has the temerity to compare the Almighty to *assumed characters*, and to give the *lie* direct to Christ himself, may be expected to call his real friends *assassins* like *Joub*, and to compare them to *dogs*, &c.

Dr. Abbadie says: "It is evident, that our Lord's claim of EQUALITY WITH GOD, is here founded by the Apostle, on his *existing in the form of God*; and not on his performing of any works whatever. Nor ought the two terms *uparchon (existing)* and *labon** (*received*), which stand opposed in the passage to be overlooked. It is very observable, that the apostle uses the former, when speaking of *the form of God*; asserting that Jesus *existed* in that Divine form: plainly signifying, that it was not an accidental transient thing, but a property belonging to his glorious person, and therefore permanent. But when he speaks of the *opposite form*, he employs the latter of those expressions, and says, he *received it*: evidently denoting, that it was not essential, but foreign and accidental to him. For he who *receives* a form is not supposed to have had it always; nor is it considered as essential to him." (Page 155.)

IN THE FIFTH PLACE, I shall lay before the Reader Dr. Owen's, Dr. Guyse's, Dr. Hawker's, and Dr. Gill's comment on this Sacred Text, for they are all of Dr. Abbadie's mind, and were all led by the same Spirit into that important truth, which to the Jews is a stumbling block, and to the wise, with all the reason in the world, foolishness.

DR. OWEN. "The Divine Lord of all had absolute dominion over all, he owed no service, he was no creature in the form of God, he owed no obedience for himself, for he was equal with God. When in this state of absolute dominion, he took on him a state or condition of absolute service."

"The consideration of the divine grace and wisdom herein the Apostle proposeth unto us, (Phil. ii. 6—8.) Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Adam being in *the form*, that is, the state and condi-

* Labôn is rendered *took* in our Testaments.

“tion of a servant, did by robbery attempt to make himself equal to God. The Lord Jesus Christ being in the form of God, that is, his essential form of the same nature with him, accounted it not robbery to be equal to him. But being made in the fashion of a man, taking on him our nature, he submitted unto the form or the state, and condition of a servant.”

“Our argument from this place, is not solely from hence, that he is said to be in the form of God; but that he was so in the form of God, as to be equal to him, as is here expressed: not merely that he took upon him the form of a servant, but that he took it upon him, when he was made in the likeness of men, or in the likeness of sinful flesh. (Rom. viii. 3.) If none is, nor can, by the testimony of God himself, be like God, or equal to him, who is not God by nature; then he that is equal to him, is so: but, to whom will ye liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the Holy One? Lift up your eyes on high, and behold, who hath created these things? (Isaiah xl. 25, 26.) None, that hath not created ALL THINGS of nothing, can be equal to him. And to whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like? (Isaiah xlvi. 5.) Between that which is finite and that which is infinite; that which is eternal, and that which is temporal; the creature and the Creator; God by nature, and him, who by nature is not God, it is utterly impossible there should be any equality. God having so often avouched his infinite distance from all creatures, his refusal to give his glory to any of them, his inequality with them all, it must have been the highest robbery, that ever any could be guilty of, for Christ to make himself equal to God, if he were not God. The Apostle’s argument arises from hence, that he was equal to God, before he took on him the form of a servant.”

“He is said to be equal to God, not as he did such and such works, but as, *en morphē Theou uparchōn*, BEING IN THE FORM OF GOD antecedently to any work he wrought.”

“Nor is it said, that Christ was equal to God in respect of the works he did, but absolutely, he thought it not robbery to be equal to God.”

“The Apostle doth not say, he made that *form* of no reputation, or Christ *ekenōse* that form, but Christ being in that form (*ekenōse eautou*) made himself of no reputation, not by any real change of his divine nature, but taking to himself the human, wherein he was of no reputation.”

“The form of a servant is that which he took. Now this was not only in condition a servant, but in reality a man. The form of a servant was that wherein he underwent death, the death of the cross. The very phrase of expression manifests the human nature of Christ to be denoted thereby.”

DR. GUYSE.—“*The form of God* is opposed to the *form of a servant*; and as *the form of a servant*, which Christ is here said to have taken upon him, is meant of his being really a servant in his human nature, with reference to which, it is added, that he was made in *the likeness of men*, the plain meaning of which is, that he was *really man*; so *the form of God*, which he was originally in, must, in all reason mean, that he was, in his prior nature, as *truly and properly God*, as he was in his human nature, man and a servant; and therefore it might well be said, *he thought it not robbery to be equal with God.*”

DR. HAWKER.—“The Apostle begins the relation he hath here set forth of his Divine master, in marking down the *first* and leading feature of all in his essential nature and Godhead. *Who being in the form of God*, and with whom it was not robbery *to be equal with God*. If there were no other portions in the Scriptures which openly and fully declare the essential divinity of Christ, this one most plainly reveals it. This glory of the Godhead of Christ, as the Son of God, is spoken of, *substantially*, and *essentially*, as his nature, his own, underived, equal with God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost, possessing in common with both all divine attributes. Reader! observe this: for it is most blessed.” See ante, pages 39 and 40.

DR. GILL.—“*Who being in the form of God*, this form is to be understood, *not of any shape or figure of him*; for as such is not to be seen, it is not to be sup-

“posed of him; or any accidental form, for there are no
 “accidents in God, whatever is in God, is God; he is
 “nothing but nature and essence, he is (the *to on*) *Je-*
 “*hovah, I Am that I Am*; and so is his Son, *which is, and*
 “*was, and is to come*, the fountain of all created beings:
 “*nor does it intend any outward representation and resem-*
 “*blance of him*, such as in Kings, &c.; NOR DOES IT *design*
 “*the state and condition Christ appeared in here on earth,*
 “*having a power to work miracles, heal diseases, and*
 “*dispossess devils, &c.*: and so might be said to be in the
 “form of God, &c., since this account does not regard
 “Christ as he was on earth in human nature, *but as he*
 “*was antecedent to the assumption of it; or otherwise his*
 “*humility and condescension in becoming man, and so mean*
 “*will not appear*: but this phrase *the form of God, is to be*
 “*understood of the nature and essence of God*, and DESCRIBES
 “CHRIST AS HE WAS FROM ALL ETERNITY; just as the
 “form of a servant, and the fashion of a man in which
 “he was found, means that he was truly and really
 “man; so his being in the form of God intends, that he
 “was really and truly God; that he partook of the
 “same nature with the Father, and *was possessed of the*
 “*same glory*: from whence it appears, that he was in
 “being before his incarnation; that he existed as a
 “distinct person from God his Father, in whose form he
 “was, and that as a divine person, or as truly God,
 “being in the glorious form, nature, and essence of
 “God; and that there is but *one form of God*, or divine
 “nature, and essence, common to the Father, and the
 “Son, and also to the Spirit; so that they are not Three
 “Gods, *but one God: what the form of God is, the hea-*
 “*thens themselves say, cannot be comprehended nor seen,*
 “*and so not to be enquired after; and they use the same*
 “*word the Apostle doth here:** and now Christ being in
 “this glorious form, or having the same divine nature
 “with the Father, with all the infinite and unspeakable
 “glories of it, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*
 “*the Father*; for if he was in the same nature, and
 “essence, he must be equal to him, as he is; for he has

* Laertū præcem ad vit. Philosoph. p. 7.

“ the same perfections, as *Eternity, Omniscience, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, IMMUTABILITY, and self-existence: &c.*”^a

I might multiply *godly* evidences, if necessary, to prove the *Pre-eternity* of JESUS CHRIST, and also, that the *morphe of God* in this Sacred Text doth evidently mean, *equality with God*: but as Dr. *Abbadie's* testimony is admitted to be MASTERLY, I shall decline all further human testimony, but I shall again place the human pre-existerian comment on this text in juxta-position with the text itself, in hope that the human pre-existerians may behold as in a mirror their ignorance and depravity, who say, “ *Jehovah is never represented as a pattern of humanity, therefore he who is so represented must be MAN*: (S. D. 165.) and that *the mind here mentioned could really exist IN HUMANITY ONLY.*” (S. D. 167.) Now as the mind here mentioned, they say, could really exist in *humanity ONLY*, it must follow, that in their creed, *the mind here mentioned could not, and did not, exist in the divine nature, or in a divine person!*

The Sacred Text.

Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men!^b Philip ii.5, 7.

The Human Pre-existerians' Perversion.

Let this mind be in you, which was *only in the human soul of Christ Jesus, whose human soul being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God*: but made *itself* of no reputation, and took upon *it* the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men!

^a The Reader will observe, that Dr. Gill believed in the Christ of God, and not in a began to be Christ of man's invention *under the law*, like the human pre-existerians' Christ, who could never fulfil that law for others, which he was previously *under*, and bound to fulfil for himself.

^b This is an important text, the Reader ought not to overlook the *emphatic* testimony of the Holy Spirit respecting the mind of Christ! First. He speaks of the mind of Christ Jesus *before* Christ had the *form* of a servant, *before* Christ had the *likeness* of men, and *before* he had the *fashion* of a man! Then, if this be true, as it undoubtedly is! Surely, the human pre-existerians are the *boldest blasphemers* that ever professed the Christian faith:—for, according to their testimony, the *mind* of Christ

1st Observation. The Believer will observe, that the human pre-existerians do here represent the *human soul* of Christ as thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, for the *mind here mentioned*, they affirm, *could really exist in humanity ONLY!* Thus, they at one time affirm, no divine perfection was seated in the human nature of Christ, that God could not even give them to him, that Christ as man could not receive them: and at another time they represent it as no robbery for the *human soul* of Christ *to think itself* EQUAL WITH GOD.

2nd. Observation. They represent it as the mind ONLY OF A HUMAN SOUL, *a creature, to do that, for which every knee was to bow to it, and which WAS TO PROCURE IT A NAME ABOVE EVERY NAME!* Then, would it not be *pride, or ambition*, rather than humility, in a creature to have a mind for a name, *which is above every name, and for every knee to bow to it?*

3rd. Observation. If the mind of a human soul ONLY is to be in us; which human soul before it was incarnate, the human pre-existerians say, *repented*, that is, *changed its mind:*^a (S. D. 195,) then, are we to follow the example of such a mutable and uncertain creature? But if this human soul did repent, that is, change its mind, did it not sin? Or, of what did it *repent*, or *change its mind?* Thus, these deluded creatures add injury to insult. *First*, they insult our Lord, as an imposter, as *assuming to be the Son of God*, and thereby, they justify the Jews for crucifying him, because he said God was his own Father, making himself *equal with God*. *Secondly*, they reject our Lord's testimony concerning the incomprehensible modus of his Sonship. *Thirdly*, they deny our Lord the Divine Honour due to his names. And *Fourthly*, they

here mentioned is the *mind of Christ as man only*: and thus, they deny it to be *the divine mind of Christ before he had the form of a servant, or before he had the likeness of men*: they, therefore, in fact, declare the Holy Spirit to be a *liar!*—all of which *sayings and doings* are very *harmless* in their *intellectual opinion!* Reader, be not deceived, for the Lord our God hath *immutably decreed*, that no *lover and maker of a lie* shall enter the Heavenly city!

^a The human pre-existerians' say: "When God is said to grieve, to *repent*, &c.—*if we suppose the divine person of our Lord to be united to the human soul*, and wearing a human form, then these expressions *may be taken in a more literal sense than we imagined.*" (S. D. 195.)

injure him, by assigning to his human soul, a *change of mind*, and a *mind to do that*, which his *Godhead had not*; for, they say, the mind mentioned in Philippians ii. 5. could really exist in humanity only. What blasphemy! But, as Mr. *John Stevens* states, that the way in which Christ Jesus *became poor*, and *made himself of no reputation*, was by *losing* his vast treasures of ideas and his *extensive faculties*, (S. D. 200) namely, his *understanding*, *will*, and *affection*: then, it is very evident, even, if Mr. *Stevens'* statement be true, that the *mind* mentioned in Philippians ii. 5. must be the mind of God the Father, for Christ said, *Lo! I come to do thy will O God!*

4th. *Observation*. How could a *human soul ONLY* have the *mind or thought of humbling* itself for the purpose of accomplishing our eternal salvation and eternal redemption? Was eternal salvation and redemption, and *the way of accomplishing the same*, never in the *mind* of God, or the thought of Christ un'il he had a human soul? Thus, it is seen, that when men, unenlightened by the Holy Spirit, attempt to *unravel the mysteries of the kingdom*, (Mark iv. 11,) or to break the seals of the Book; they only propagate the vain imaginations of their own minds, and darken (if not disgrace) the Sacred Scriptures they venture to explain.

Far otherwise is it with the faithful and truly awakened soul. He has not so learned Christ, for he has heard him, and been taught by him, as well as the saints who dwelt at Ephesus; (Eph. iv. 20, 21,) and he is a *follower (mimetai)* or rather an *imitator of God*, as one of his dear children. (Eph. vi. 1.)

So far was Dr. *Abbadie* from being ignorant of the GOD OF ALL GRACE, *who resisteth the proud*, (James iv. 6. 1 Pet. v. 5,) *for the proud are cursed*, (Psalm cxix. 21,) *and will be burnt as stubble*; (Mal. iv. 1,) that he left upon record in his "MASTERLY Treatise,"^a the following testimony of the *infinite* condescension of His Divine Lord! "To understand, says Dr. *Abbadie*, these words,

^a How frequently do the enemies of THE CHRIST OF GOD dig a pit and fall into it. How little did the Perverter think, he was digging a pit for himself, when he referred to, and admitted Dr. *Abbadie's* treatise on the *Godhead and Sonship of Christ* to be MASTERLY!