

and Immaculate Thing, who knew no sin, *should have HIS BRAIN CONFOUNDED BY DISEASE?*

2nd. Is the *brain* the *soul*? Or what is the brain composed of, where the traces and images of arts and sciences are impressed? Where, in the Scriptures, do the human pre-existerians find any authority for their statement, *that the images of arts and sciences are impressed upon the brain?*

3rd. The human pre-existerians say, "*the soul rules the body as its own, and disposes of it according to its will.*" (S. D. 103.) If this be true, how did it happen that Christ's human soul did not rule his body? From this part of the human pre-existerian creed it appears, that they believe either the *brain* is the *soul*; or that the *brain* governs the *soul*; for they say, *the soul rules the body at its will*: (S. D. 103,) then, how was it that Christ's *infantine body overwhelmed his soul, and deprived him of all its riches?* This, Reader, is a part of Mr. Stevens' *Scriptural DISPLAY of all the reason in the world*, (S. D. 16,) and of *his plain reason*, (S. D. 30,) and *much reason to suppose!* (S. D. 186.) Which *reason*, Mr. John Stevens says, is **PROFESSEDLY GROUNDED ON THE WORD OF GOD!** (E. S. 17.) And every *Socinian*, as Dr. *Abbadie* observes, will say *the same!*

4th. Was not John the Baptist, who was **FULL OF THE HOLY GHOST** *from his mother's womb*, superior to the human pre-existerians' Christ, during the period, they say, he was without the *Spirit's* influence, and had lost his *vast treasures of ideas and extensive faculties?* Do not the human pre-existerians prove by their *plain reason creed*, that *John* had the pre-eminence of *their* Christ, as *John* was anointed in the womb: whereas, *their* Christ was deprived of his *anointing* in the womb, by the withdrawment of the Holy Spirit's influence? and as they represent their *Christ*, for nearly *thirty years*, without the Holy Spirit's influence, do *they* not *thereby admit*, that *their Lord* for that period was **DISANOINTED**, for Mr. John Stevens affirms that *Christ* only signifies *anointed?* Here, then, we have his testimony in proof, that *his Lord* is not *the Christ of God*; for *our* Lord Christ never was without his *unction*; but Mr. Stevens declares *his*

Christ was, *disanointed* for about thirty years, even from his first union to a body of flesh, until the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him in his baptism! For, as the Holy Spirit had withdrawn his influences from Mr. Stevens' Christ until that period, which Mr. Stevens asserts, *then his Christ for that period was without the anointing*, or in other words, *he was for that period a disanointed man Jesus!* Mr. Stevens has therefore not only proved his ignorance of "*the Christ of God,*" and that he could not find the phrase "*the Christ of God,*" in the Holy Scriptures, (E. S. 32,) but he has even given us full proof of his enmity to the Pre-eternity of the Christ of God.^a

After such a *display* of human pre-existerian *blasphemy*, I shall suppress my feelings, by laying before the Reader, what Mr. John Stevens has published respecting the sin of blasphemy; *for out of his own mouth let the Perverter of I AM be judged.* "*Verily, I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith so ever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: because they said, he hath an unclean spirit.*" (Mark iii. 28. 30. S. D. 230.) Now, has not Mr. John Stevens charged the Holy Spirit with begetting the *flesh* of Christ to overwhelm and divest this Glorious Being of all its *riches* and extensive faculties? Has he not charged the Holy Spirit with the *withdrawment of his influences*, so that Christ lost his *pre-existent understanding, will, and affec-*

^a According to the human pre-existerian doctrine, *their* Jesus Christ was *disanointed at his first union to a body of flesh*, and John the Baptist was anointed *from his mother's womb!* Therefore John the Baptist, *a man sent from God* (John i. 6,) *a man in God*, (Acts xvii. 28,) *a man who had God in Him* (Luke i. 16,) whose body was the Temple of the Holy Ghost, (1 Cor. vi. 19,) was undoubtedly pre-eminent to *the* human pre-existerian *man* Jesus until he was baptized by John in Jordan, for John was anointed with that *anointing which abideth*; but their human pre-existent man Jesus was without the *Spirit's* influence, and therefore, before his union to a body of flesh, he must have been, according to *their* creed, only a partaker *for a season* of the Spirit of prophecy, such as *Balaam, Saul, and Caiphas*, had, *when they prophesied!* Here, again, I cannot but rejoice, that *our* Christ is not the human pre-existerian's Christ; for *our* Christ is Pre-eternal, Immutable, the *Quickening Spirit, Head of the Church of God*, but their Christ is *temporal, and mutable, a human soul head, disanointed* for nearly 30 years.

tion, that there was even the absence of every perfection, which Mr. John Stevens declares to be sin. (2 Let. 45.) Therefore, according to Mr. John Stevens' plain reason creed, either the *flesh of Christ was sinful*, or the *weakness of an infant's body was stronger than Christ*, and made his *soul sinful!* Then, has not Mr. Stevens charged the Holy Spirit, *by withdrawing his influences, with unchristianing Christ?* and with enabling the *flesh of Christ to deprive this glorious being of all its perfections?* For the *flesh of Christ had no power of its own, and, therefore, could not, without the power of God, deprive his soul of a single idea or faculty.* Now, Reader, attend to Mr. John Stevens' opinion respecting the *sin of blasphemy*; he says, "*no part of Scripture so emphatically expresses the extent of forgiving favour, as where we are told of unpardonable sin. Thus, where sovereignty determined to place a mark, to which its favour should not be extended, there also is given the fullest declaration of saving grace toward guilty offenders.*" To blaspheme, is "*to speak with impious irreverence concerning God himself, or what stands in some peculiar relation to him.*"—"A man is guilty of blasphemy, when he speaks of God, or his attributes injuriously; when he ascribes such qualities to him, as do not belong to him, or robs him of those which do. The law sentences blasphemers to death." (Lev. xxiv. 12. 16. 2 Kings xix. 3. 7. S. D. 230.) Let the *Perverter of I AM* therefore judge himself, in *limiting Jehovah's foresight, God's election to time, God's mind, God's Covenant, and in perverting God's true revelation of himself, and of blaspheming the Holy Spirit, and of unchristianing Christ, and making him a liar, and an impostor, &c., that he be not condemned with the world.*

For the sake of Dr. *Watts*, it now becomes my duty to notice the *use*, or rather the *abuse*, which Mr. John Stevens has made of the Doctor's reputation: and also, to press upon the Reader's attention *certain facts*, by which the depravity of the human heart in matters of religion, will evidently appear.

To support this absurd fable, which Mr. John Stevens has the impudence to say, "*we may rest assured of*

“*the truth of it, from the word of inspiration!*” but which, *if true, we may rest assured*, he would not have had recourse to such falsehoods and inventions, nor to the *human authority* of Dr. Watts *for its support*, because the Doctor was not only opposed to Mr. Stevens in several *important points*, but the Doctor was a man, who was labouring under derangement or delusion: nevertheless, Mr. John Stevens says, Dr. Watts adds, “*I can declare solemnly, that after my best searches into the word of God, I can see no-thing unscriptural, absurd, or dangerous in such a representation; and I am well assured it gives the highest honour to our blessed Redeemer for this surprising instance of his obedience to his Father, and condescending love to mankind.*” (S. D. 202.) It is *lamentably true*, that Dr. Watts did, *after a severe illness*, and when labouring more or less under MENTAL DELUSION, write as Mr. John Stevens says he did! And can any man want stronger evidence of the derangement and delusion the Doctor laboured under, than the *gross absurdities*, to speak in the mildest terms of such notions, which Mr. John Stevens has *set forth*? Can any one but a *fanatic*, or something worse, suppose it possible that Dr. Watts, the penman of the *Trinitarian Doxologies*, could be *sane* when he wrote, or professed to believe in, such gross absurdities, and blasphemies about the Head of the Church *losing his faculties*, and of being *disappointed* for about thirty years, *being without the Holy Spirit's influence*? It is not improbable, that the Doctor wrote and published such ridiculous ideas, during the period he was so *deluded* as to believe himself to be a *tea pot*, &c. But Mr. John Stevens has not given us a hint of the Doctor's infirmities! He knew, if he had, *his food for his young rooks*, as he calls them, would have been so indigestible, that they might have refused receiving it from their Dam, (S. D. 208.) But, as Mr. John Stevens, to force his ridiculous inventions upon the credulity of mankind, has made use of the name of Dr. Watts, I may surely be permitted to ask him a few questions, which, if he should decline answering plainly and faithfully; the Reader will be competent to do it for him.

1st. As Mr. John Stevens professes to believe in

THREE distinct persons in Deity, why did he refer to Dr. Watts as his authority, when he knew the Doctor laboured under such a *delusion*, as to declare there were NOT THREE equal Divine Persons in the God-head, but one; THAT THE FATHER ONLY IS THE TRUE GOD—the Son and the Spirit being really but two divine faculties, virtues, or powers?

2nd. As Mr John Stevens professes to believe in the *immortality* of all human souls, why did he refer to Dr. Watts as his authority, when the Doctor laboured under such a delusion as to believe, that the *souls* of the children who die in their infancy, the offspring of ungodly parents, are annihilated?

3rd. As Mr. John Stevens wrote against the duty of all men to believe in Christ, why did he refer to Dr. Watts as his authority, when the Doctor always professed it to be the duty of all men to believe?

4th. As Mr. John Stevens believes all infant souls and bodies are produced *sinless*, and yet declines to baptize infants; why did he refer to Dr. Watts as his authority, when he knew the Doctor was a *pedo-baptist*, and was surely justified in baptising infants, *if their souls and bodies are produced sinless?*^a for sinless souls are exempt from *unbelief!*

^aThe *orthodox baptists* do not believe that infants are born in the order of natural generation with *sinless souls, and sinless bodies*. Nor do they believe that the *human nature* of our Lord Jesus Christ was *created imperfect, or by piece meal!* “We believe, says, Dr. Gill, that the Lord Jesus Christ, “being set up from everlasting as the mediator of the new covenant, and he “having engaged to be the surety of his people, did, in the fulness of time, “really assume human nature, and *not before, neither in whole nor in “part; his human soul being a creature existed not from eternity, but “was created and formed in his body by him that forms the spirit of man “within him, when that was conceived in the womb of the virgin, &c.”* The words printed in *italics* were inserted by Dr. Gill in his declaration of faith, since it was first drawn up; and the following was especially introduced in consequence of the *human soul pre-existerian heresy, a vile tradition, which saps the FOUNDATION of Divine Revelation!!* “We believe,” says Doctor Gill, “that God created the first man, Adam, after his own “Image, and in his likeness; an upright, holy, and innocent creature, “capable of serving and glorifying him; but, he sinning, ALL HIS POSTERITY SINNED IN HIM, and came short of the glory of God, the guilt “of his sin is imputed, AND A CORRUPT NATURE DERIVED, TO ALL HIS “OFFSPRING, DESCENDING FROM HIM BY ORDINARY AND NATURAL GENERATION: THAT THEY ARE BY THEIR FIRST BIRTH CARNAL AND UN- “CLEAN, AVERSE TO ALL THAT IS GOOD, *incapable of doing any, AND*

5th. Why did Mr. John Stevens refer to such parts of Dr. Watts' writings, as his authority, which *writings in part* are received by *Socinians* and *Arians* in support of their awful heresies?

6th. Did not Mr. John Stevens make use of Dr. Watts' name as his authority, under the impression that the Doctor was scarcely known among the Baptists for his *anti-trinitarian* writings, although he was very generally known and highly esteemed for his Psalms and Hymns? the Original Edition of which, was published previous to the Doctor's derangement?

7th. Did not Mr. *John Stevens* make use of Doctor *Watts'* name, to protect himself from *the sharp rebukes*, which he so justly deserves for his lies, absurdities, and blasphemics?

8th. Has not Mr. John Stevens declared that his opinion respecting the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, which he calls *a man*, was not *contrary to any precept of the law, or institution of the divine will?* (1 Let. 17,) and is not that *declaration a wilful lie*, it being in direct opposition to Jehovah's testimony, that *God ALONE created all things!* Gen. i. 1. Nehem. ix. 6. Isaiah xlv. 24, xlv. 18; and also to Jehovah's testimony in Exod. xx. 10, 11, where we find recorded, that every thing in *heaven and earth, &c.* was created in six days; and also, in opposition to Gen. ii. 7. and iii. 19, where the most High declares man's originality to be of the dust? See also Gen. xviii. 27, Job iv. 19. xxxiii. 6, Psalm ciii. 13, 14.

9th. Lastly, has not Mr. John Stevens received his tradition from men, as, he says, a young rook receives food from her dam? (S. D. 208.)

I shall abstain from making any *severe* observation upon Mr. *John Stevens'* vulgar abuse, or the insolent

“PRONE TO EVERY SIN; and are also by nature children of wrath, and
 “under a sentence of condemnation, and so are subject not only to a cor-
 “poreal death, and involved in a moral one, commonly called spiritual,
 “BUT ARE ALSO LIABLE TO AN ETERNAL DEATH, AS CONSIDERED IN THE
 “FIRST ADAM, FALLEN AND SINNERS; from all which there is no deliver-
 “ance, BUT BY CHRIST THE SECOND ADAM!” Dr. Gill was taught of
 God, he knew sin to be *deicide*, that an *infinite satisfaction* for
deicide was made by the GREAT GOD OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST; and
 he also believed in the *Pre-eternity* of the *Christ of God*

manner in which he treated Mr. Colyer, but I may say, that no true believer in the Doctrine of the Trinity would insult Mr. Colyer for his faithfulness, in exposing the *anti-trinitarian* writings of Dr. Watts! On the contrary, he would rather rejoice at Mr. *Colyer's faithfulness*, because, as *Dr. Watts was high in reputation*, his deluded writings are the more *dangerous*: and therefore, that God should raise up a man, who had the integrity and courage to be faithful, in dealing *justly* with such a man's deluded writings, is, and must be, a just cause for *thanksgiving!* And if Mr. John Stevens had been a *true* believer in the doctrine of the Trinity, he would have dealt as *faithfully* with the *anti-trinitarian* writings of Dr. *Watts*, as he did with the *anti-trinitarian* writings of Mr. *Elliott*. And I am bound to believe, that if Mr. *Elliott* had been held in as much repute as Dr. *Watts*, that Mr. *John Stevens* would not have written against Mr. *Elliott*: on the contrary, he would have said of Mr. *Elliott* as of Dr. *Watts*, that he was *a man of far superior talents to himself, and whose piety was above all suspicion!*

Amongst other awful *perversions* of Holy Scripture, of which the human pre-existerians are guilty, from their opposition to the *Pre-eternity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, there is one which they *wrest* to their own destruction in Micah v. 2, *the goings forth of Christ from of old*, FROM EVERLASTING, the Hebrew is rendered by some as in the margin of our Bibles, FROM THE DAYS OF ETERNITY. From this Scripture, amongst others, Dr. *Goodwin* has faithfully contended for the *Pre-eternity of Christ*, and observes, that *Jehovah's day is eternity*, he therefore reads, *my day* (Jehovah's day) *Eternity*. This faithful testimony on the part of Dr. *Goodwin*, is very offensive to Mr. *John Stevens*: in truth, Mr. *Stevens* is so opposed to the *Pre-eternity of the Christ of God*, that he boldly affirms, "*Eternity is never called a day.*" (C. F. ii. 32.) Now, had Mr. *John Stevens* known "*the Christ of God,*" he would never have uttered such a *falsehood*, for in the Heavenly Jerusalem it is all day, and *no night*, for *the path of the just, as the shining light, shineth more and more unto the PERFECT DAY!* (Prov. iv. 18.) Ignorance, therefore, of the Christ of God is strongly marked in all Mr. *Stevens'*

writings, he even *wrests the days of eternity* in Micah v. 2. into *days of unknown time*, (C. F. ii. 33,) to induce his disciples to believe in his Christ of *man's invention*; a *false Christ*, which he, as well as the worshippers of Dagon, acknowledge to be *their Lord!*^a

There are more profligate falsehoods in the human pre-existerian creed, which, in dependence upon the Lord, I hope *faithfully* to expose in the ensuing chapter; but before I conclude this, allow me to say a few words, out of respect and regard to Dr. *Watts*, under whose *cloak* Mr. *John Stevens* has endeavoured to conceal *his enmity* to, or his *ignorance* of, "the Christ of "God."

When Doctor *Watts* had little more than entered his 38th year, a violent fever almost broke him down. And from the effects thereof, it is admitted, he never totally recovered! He was at times the subject of most extraordinary delusions, such as, that he was *a tea pot*, a *glass*, that he was *too large* to pass out of the room in which he was sitting, &c! As the mind of a person so diseased is never altogether free from delusion, or *its effects*, we cannot be surprized that the Doctor's writings should have such strong marks and signs of an *excursive curiosity*, or, as the late learned Dr. *Dyer* observed, "that he should *con-* "found the idea of *space* with that of *empty space*, and not "consider that though *space* might be without matter, yet "matter being extended, could not be without *space*." Such was the Doctor's state of mind, that an assistant in the ministry was provided for him: and if any additional evidence be required in proof of the Doctor's delusions, the believer has only to refer to those *absurd* opinions, which Mr. *John Stevens* has extracted from the

^a As the Israelites said, the golden calf was *their God* which brought them up out of the land of Egypt, (Exod. xxxii. 4,) so the human pre-existerians acknowledge their Christ of man's invention to be *their Lord*. But *a began to be Jesus Christ*, is not the Lord of Hosts! The human pre-existerians may cut themselves, as *Baal's priests* did: for the prophets of Baal did not mean to worship an *idol*, neither do human pre-existerians mean to worship an idol; but such sincerity will not make the human pre-existerian Christ, "THE CHRIST OF GOD." (Luke ix. 20.) And should they die, as they live, without the *true knowledge of the Christ of God*, they will awfully prove the truth of what our Lord said to the Jews, *where I Am ye cannot come!* John vii. 34, 36.

Doctor's writings, in support of his *pharisaical* creed: for they are so *grossly ridiculous*, and have such evident marks of derangement, that it would be an insult to the memory of Dr. Watts, if any *sane person*, professing a regard for his memory, could suppose it possible, that such **BLASPHEMOUS ABSURDITIES** could have been the *religious* productions of Dr. *Watts*, when of *sound mind, memory, or understanding*.

That excellent and faithful writer, Mr. *Toplady*, when speaking of Dr. Watts, observes, "Gladly would I throw, if possible, an everlasting veil over this valuable person's occasional deviations from the simplicity of the Gospel, relatively to the personality and divinity of the Son, and of the Spirit of God. But justice compels me to acknowledge, that he did not always preserve an uniform consistency with himself, nor with the Scriptures of Truth, so far as concerns that grand and fundamental article of the christian faith. The *inclusiveness* (to call it by the tenderest name we can) of his too wanton tamperings with the doctrine of the Trinity, has been largely and irrefragably demonstrated, by more hands than one. Amongst others, by the learned *Dr. Abraham Taylor*, in a masterly tract, entitled, the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity vindicated, in opposition to Mr. Watts' scheme of one divine person, and two divine powers. The great Mr. *John Hurrion*, one of the most evangelical men, and ablest reasoners, that have added lustre to the present century, *has likewise totally demolished Dr. Watts' fanciful and dangerous surmises*, in his (i. e. in Mr. Hurrion's) set of admirable discourses, entitled, the Scripture Doctrine of the proper Divinity, real personality, &c. of the Holy Spirit, stated and defended."^a

"I am happy in believing, that the grace and faithfulness of the Holy Ghost did not permit our author to die under the **DELUSIONS** of so horrible and pernicious an heresy." And who will not add, Amen? The *Socinians* may refuse, because they, *as well as Mr. John Stevens*, take every advantage of the Doctor's *delusions*, to favour

^a Mr. John Hurrion also published a set of admirable discourses on the importance of having a *true knowledge of Jesus Christ!*

their own freethinking principles: but every benevolent christian will say, Amen: although, he will not fail to deal justly, by faithfully censuring the *fanciful* and *delusive* writings of the pious and amiable Dr. Watts!

The Pharisees were human soul pre-existerians, they also believed in the transmigration of the soul; and that the soul without the body constituted the man. By this *leaven* they made void the word of God, for their *traditions* denied man's originality: and from such traditions, the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead. Our Lord said to his disciples, "*Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.*" (Matt. xvi. 6.) Afterwards, he enquired of his disciples, "*Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?*" The Disciples replied, "*some say, (thou art a pre-existent man in God, to wit,) that thou art John the Baptist: some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.*" (Matt. xvi. 13, 14,) for they were *men in God*: and many of the Pharisees believed, *he was a man come from God, and that God was with him.* (See John iii. 2.) Our Lord, having received from his disciples the *opinions of men* respecting his person, immediately demanded, "*But whom say ye that I am?*" This is the important question! and equally important is the answer! for our Lord declares, *human reason (flesh and blood)* could not reveal his *pre-eternity*, but it was expressly revealed to *Peter* by God the Father! For Peter replied, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,*" which reply was from *Divine revelation*, the revelation of God the Father: (Matt. xvi. 15—17,) and that *revelation* was opposed to the *human pre-existerian leaven* of the Pharisees and the *leaven* of the Sadducees; for their *leaven doctrine* was *human reason*, which our Lord calls *flesh and blood*, and which *flesh and blood* cannot *inherit the kingdom of heaven*: (Compare Matt. xvi. 17, with 1 Cor xv. 50,) but the testimony of Peter was the *word of faith revealed to him by the operation of God*. As the human pre-existerian tradition of the Pharisees is so *decidedly* opposed to divine revelation, its blasphemous nature will be *plainly* seen by Mr. *John Stevens'* confession being put in juxta-position with *Peter's* confession and our *Lord's* testimony.

Peter's confession, &c.

“*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* And Jesus answered and said unto him, “*Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto THEE, BUT MY FATHER WHICH IS IN HEAVEN.*” (Matt. xvi. 16, 17.)

Mr. Stevens' confession.

Thou art an immortal man reserved in the anciently constituted Lord Christ, which came out of thy secret glory into fleshly visibility, and when you came, you was to be called Immanuel and the Son of God, (S. J. 19,) an assumed name, (S. D. 28,) for my much reason supposes, (S. D. 186,) you are a pre-existent man older than Abraham! (S. J. 20.)

Peter believed in the Christ of God, *the pre-eternal quickening Spirit-Head of the spiritual Church, the Eternal Rock on which the spiritual Church is built, whereas the human pre-existerians substitute a began to be human soul head, and thereby, they make void the word of God! These very Pharisees believed they were the Lord's elect, and pure in doctrine, but our Lord declared, they were hypocrites, and that, when they made a proselyte, they made him twofold more the child of hell than themselves!* After such a solemn declaration, can we wonder that such a *spiritual* man as Dr. Hawker, who by *divine revelation* believed in the *pre-eternity of Jesus Christ*, should *shudder*, when he thought of the final state of those *high minded professors, the human pre-existerians*; (2 Tim. iii. 4, 5,) or can we avoid feeling for a man, who is so deluded, as to set up a *began to be human soul head of the Church* in opposition to the *Eternal quickening spirit head*, and having so done, *mocks Dr. Hawker*, because he called this vile tradition, *awful error—dangerous delusion—daring heresy—presumptuous notion—preposterous ground—nothing can be more awful! I shudder while I think!* (1 Let. 15) Surely, if Mr. Stevens had been taught of God, *he would not sit in the seat of the scornful!*

Reader, As God hath put *enmity* between the *seed of the serpent* and the *seed of the woman*, we ought to expect to see that *enmity manifested in a serpentine way*, namely, in that *subtilty*, which is *peculiar to*, and the *distinguishing mark of, the Serpent!* Satan is a subtle foe.

And do we not see in the human pre-existerian doctrine, the subtle *enmity* of the serpent towards the seed of the woman, in other words, the enmity of the *Dragon which stood before the woman, for to devour her man-child as soon as it was born?* (Rev. xii. 4.) Do not the human pre-existerians *subtily* profess to be *christians* and to honour Christ, and to acknowledge his Godhead, whilst the sum and substance of *their doctrine* is to destroy "the *Pre-eter-nity of the Christ of God,*" and to *devour the seed of the woman BORN OF THE SPIRIT*, by representing that which was *begotten in Mary* to be *merely matter?* (1 Let. 26.) Is not the human pre-existerian doctrine an attempt to destroy the *seed of the woman*, the great promise revealed, the same day that Adam transgressed? a promise, that the seed of the woman should be the *first born MALE, HOLY, that OPENED THE WOMB, (which womb had never been opened before,)* (Psalm lxxxix. 27. Luke ii. 7, 22.) Surely, every attempt of these *professors of believers' baptism*, to give an *actual creature pre-existence* to that *man child*, which is the *seed of the woman, her first-born MALE, HOLY, that opened the womb*, since *her child was caught up unto God and to his throne*, (Rev. xii. 5,) *is the act of the serpent, who is now CASTING OUT OF HIS MOUTH WATER AS A FLOOD AFTER THE WOMAN, (the Church of God) that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood!* (Rev. xii. 15.) But thanks be to God, the earth, (mere professors) and not the woman, opens her mouth and swallows up the flood, which the Dragon casts out of his mouth! (Rev. xii. 16.) Reader, we are building for *eternity*, and there are many subtle foes to obstruct our progress. But if our foundation be "*the Christ of God,*" the *essential Son of God, "the Rock,*" upon which the Church is built, then the promise is, *we shall never be ashamed, nor confounded, world without end.* Reader, art thou thus engaged? Is the Pre-eternal Christ of God, the quickening Spirit head of the Church of God your foundation? If thou art building *wood, hay, and stubble upon this foundation*, thou shalt *be saved as by fire*, but your *wood, hay, and stubble will be burnt up.* But if thou art building precious stones upon a *Temporal Christ, a human soul head*, your foundation is *sand*, and the whole of your building,

although of precious stones, will all give way; and great will be the fall thereof; for no other foundation will stand, than that which from eternity is laid, namely, *Jah* the self-existent Saviour, the Christ of God; who is able to anoint, the unction one, and the verily eternally fore-ordained anointed, **GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH!**

Never, perhaps, since the reformation, hath there been a more *deadly* blow aimed at the *Pre-eternity* of Christ, and also at the *seed of the woman*, **BEGOTTEN of the Holy Ghost**, than the human pre-existerian attack upon the *Great Mystery of Godliness!* But the sequel will prove, that the blow will fall wholly upon the *serpent* and his *seed*. Reader, depend upon it, such has heretofore been the end of all the stratagems of Satan in his designs upon Christ and his Church. It is not enough to say his designs shall do no harm; we ought to say more than this, because the denial of the *Pre-eternity* of our Lord Jesus Christ is an *heresy*, that they which are approved may be made manifest, (1 Cor. xi. 19,) for the many anti-christs, the deniers of the *Divine Paternity* and *Sonship* are expressly declared as *making manifest that they are not of us*; (1 John ii. 18, 19, 22, 23,) so that the human pre-existerian heresy is evidently amongst *the all things that work TOGETHER for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose*.

Before I conclude, allow me the further indulgence to observe, that I freely forgive Mr. *John Stevens*, for all his *vile comparisons* and *personal abuse*. I have no desire to render railing for railing, or to strive as potsherds strive with potsherds about earthly things. But it would have been sinful in me, as one of the Lord's witnesses, to have passed by Mr. *Stevens' vile perversions* of Holy Scripture without making just animadversions upon his conduct; or to have overlooked *his awful blasphemies* without reprobating such *acts of wickedness*. As a faithful servant, "I am to say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die; for God hath *immutably decreed*, that no lover and *maker of a lie* shall enter the heavenly city!" It be-

* Mr. *John Stevens* has not *plainly* made his human pre-existerian creed part of the articles of his Church, although he *impudently* declares, "there is no one text in the Bible WHICH SO MUCH AS SEEMS TO THWART

hoved me to use great plainness of speech, in obedience to the Lord's command, "*Shew my people their iniquity.*" The human pre-existerians, or potsherds may strive with potsherds: they may mock and scoff at rebuke: *the smiting of the righteous* may not be esteemed a kindness by Mr. Stevens, although it was by the Psalmist: (E. S. 39, 40.) (Psalm cxli. 5,)^a but woe unto him and his disciples, if they *continue to strive with their Maker.*

And now, by way of conclusion, let me remind the Believer, that in the awful blasphemies which have "*the plain sense of those Scriptures that have been produced!*" (3 Let. 55.) If Mr. Stevens really *believed* what he has asserted, if he had no *secret misgivings* that he *perverted the meaning of those Scriptures he has produced*, we may boldly affirm, that, as Mr. John Stevens has so much contempt for Dr. Gill and others, he would have made his human pre-existerian creed a *plain* leading article in his church! As the learned Robert Fleming, Romaine, the Rev. Mr. J. Watts. Wilkinson, Dr. Gill and others, are held by Mr. Stevens in so much contempt, as to be compared by him to *drowning men catching at straws*, because they interpret *prototokos pasēs ktiseos* to his confusion, as well as to the confusion of the Socinians, Arians, and Sabellians, we may be certain, that in a *man* so *arrogantly impudent*, nothing short of *secret misgivings* have prevented Mr. John Stevens from introducing the human *soul* pre-existerian tradition *plainly* into the articles of his *baptist church*; because Dr. Gill introduced into the Church of God under his pastoral care, *two articles of faith in direct opposition to the human pre-existerian creed!* But, as Mr. Stevens asserts, that *no one text in the Bible even seems to thwart his plain reason creed*, surely, we may conclude, he knew he was asserting a *falsehood*, or he would not ADMIT HIS CREED TO BE NO MATTER OF FAITH. (S. J. 93.) And as he also admits, it is not expressly revealed, and therefore, *no matter of faith*, how came he to say, "*if he erred in this point, he erred willingly, nor would he, while he breathed, suffer this error to be wrested by main force from him?*" (3 Let. 55.) Surely, the force of truth he never knew, or he would not have used such *vain words!*

^a The Psalmist says, "*Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness: and let him reprove me; it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head!*" But Mr. John Stevens is of a very different opinion to the Psalmist. He is so in love with his *lies*, that if any one speaks against his *sin*, he has no idea it can be from any regard to his person. So little do unregenerate men know the heart or the feelings of a regenerated child of God. And this is evident from Mr. John Stevens' reply to Mr. Colyer's affectionate address, and mild reproofs. It seems, by Mr. Stevens' own confession, that he lives in a *rookery!* (S. D. 208,) and it is very evident, he is both a stranger to reproof, and to the pure language of a *dove*, or of an Israelite without guile. For Mr. Colyer never compared Mr. Stevens to a *dog*, or to a *venomous spider*, or to an *ass*, or to a *perjured person*, or to an *assassin*, &c. &c., on the contrary, he reproofed him as a *brother*, for his abusive language, whilst he entreated him to away with his sensual creed, as it was unsupported by "*thus saith the Lord.*" But this

been exposed, we see the natural blindness of our own minds, the utter apostasy of our own hearts, and the furious opposition of our depraved reason to the truth of divine revelation? *Satan*, the enemy of mankind, is as well pleased with human pre-existerian preachers as he is with stage-players, for he knows by experience that *no lie* is of the truth: and our Lord testified, that the human

gentle smiting was no kindness in Mr. *Stevens*' account, instead of receiving Mr. *Colyer*'s reproof as an excellent oil, he replied in a malignant and bitter spirit: and if his words speak the *dictates* of his heart, the Reader cannot fail to know what passed within Mr. *Stevens*' breast, whilst he wrote as follows: "*It is impossible for me now to be deceived by your pretended friendship,*" on 108th page. *There you address me,* "Beware, I would say, with the kindest feelings of christian affection, and of christian friendship united,—even to you, dear Sir, as well as to your pre-existerian friends, &c., kindest feelings—christian affection—christian faithfulness! Lord what is man! Did ever Jesuit exceed this since the birth of popery? It reminds me of the conduct of Joab towards Abner—The same Joab said to Amasa, art thou in health, MY BROTHER? And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand to kiss him, but Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand: so he smote him therewith, and he died. But you have aroused my attention to your Sword, Sir, therefore your kindest feelings—and your christian affection—with your christian faithfulness; can only put me the more on my guard." (E. S. 39, 40.) Thus, this inhabitant of the rookery, after having challenged Mr. *Colyer* to the controversy, finding himself fainting under the force of truth, charges Mr. *Colyer* with acting like an assassin, and the worst of hypocrites! In this letter, after several false as well as scandalous assertions, he proposes twenty four things for attention, which any humble taught child of God may answer. The first is the title Jesus Christ, in which he shews his enmity to the Pre-eternity of the Christ of God: this, with several others are completely answered in this chapter; and others have been previously answered, see ante, pages 25, 26, 30—34, 40, 42, 93, 98, 99, 216, 221, 239, 240, 255, 259, 261, 275, 278. And therefore, I embrace this opportunity to challenge Mr. John Stevens, to put his twenty four things into the form of his plain reason creed, that he may appear unmasked! (1 Tim. iv. 1.) But in so doing, he will make the human pre-existerian preachers appear worse than Joab; for Joab, although an assassin, was not accessory to the damnation of his fellow creatures: but the human pre-existerian preachers, those men seducers, who appear like ministers of righteousness, are accessory to the damnation of their fellow creatures: for they, under the profession of religion, make void the word of God by their traditions, although, it is immutably decreed, that no lover or maker of a lie shall enter into the heavenly city. Then, as they, in the mirror of God's word, appear more depraved in their conduct than Joab, let them not forget, that it is Mr. *Stevens*' writings which portrayed their character; and that, my object in exposing the human pre-existerian lies, is to rescue some of my deluded fellow creatures from destruction, and himself, if possible! Neverthe-

pre-existerians pharisees were *liars*, and of their father the devil! The very means, therefore, which God's Bible describes concerning our deliverance from *sin*, and the wrath to come, could not have been *thought of* but by *uncreated* wisdom, nor have been proposed but by *infinite* love, *nor have been undertaken and accomplished but by omnipotent power!* The conquest of such and so many enemies, with whom "the Christ of God" had to do, and the obtainment of *eternal* redemption, as well as the *eternal* salvation of so great a number of sinners, whose originality is of the dust, could not have been even the *undertaking* of a human soul *with* or *without a body*;^a and the very nature and *eternity* of salvation, together with the effectual application thereof to so numerous a company of believers, proclaim its accomplisher infinite and eternal! The righteousness of Christ, which Christ brought in, is an *everlasting* righteousness, (Dan. ix. 24,) it is truly the *righteousness of God*, and it

less, he may still account me his enemy for telling him the truth; for the human pre-existerian pharisees so considered "the Christ of God;" but faithful are the wounds of a friend! In truth, they are his deadly enemies, who know better, yet encourage him in his wickedness! A man with the *leprosy* in the *forehead* is utterly unclean; *his plague is in his head.* (Levit. xiii. 42, 43, 44.) The *leprosy* rose up in the *forehead* of *Uzziah* when he *invaded* the Priest's office, to which he was not *ordained*, or *anointed* by God. (2 Chron. xxvii.) No marvel, that Mr. *John Stevens* should reject the Books of Kings and Chronicles from *his Bible*, where spiritual *verities* are veiled under historical facts, the Holy Ghost thereby signifying, that the man who *invades* the priest's office, his *depraved reason*, like the *leprosy* in the *forehead*, will be manifested in his *wresting the Scriptures*, perverting I AM into *I was*; *everlasting* into *hidden time*; *sin* into a *negative thing*; a QUICKENING SPIRIT into a *human soul without a body, like a dead man*; the *Eternal Head* of the Church of God into a *temporal head*; *Amen* into a *NURSE CHILD*; &c. &c.! And if such men continue lepers with the *leprosy in the forehead* to the day of their death, we see in them, the Scriptures verified, that *many workers of iniquities* will say, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in *thy name? And in thy name have cast out devils? And in thy name done many wonderful works?*" And our Lord will profess unto them that he never knew *such workers of iniquity*: (Matt. vii. 22, 23,) it being *immutably decreed*, that *no lover and maker of a lie* (dying so) *shall ever enter the heavenly city, where it will be ALL DAY!* for there shall be no night there.

^a All creatures being *under* the law of their *Creator*, it would have been impossible for Christ's *human soul with, or without, a body*, if a pre-existent creature, for as such it would have been *under the law*, to have *undertaken* to fulfil and satisfy the law of God for others, for *myriads* of mankind.

is so called in God's Bible. (Rom. i. 17.—iii. 22.—x. 3. 2 Cor. v. 21.—Philip iii. 9. 2 Pet. i. 1.) And the *blood* of Christ is truly called God's own blood:^a (Acts xx. 28.) How

^a God's own or proper blood, (Acts xx. 28,) *Athanasius* observes, that the burning bush was a type of Christ incarnate. (Exod. iii. 2.) The *fire* signified the *Divine Person*, and the *bush* signified the *human nature*. The bush was united to the fire, yet the bush was not changed into fire, although the bush was all on fire. So the human nature of Christ was united to his Divine Person, yet the human nature was not changed into Divine, although the human nature was united to his Divine Person. As fire fills all parts of the iron that is red hot, so the Divine Person of Christ filled all and every part of his human nature! There was no part of Christ's human nature, not a *drop of his blood*, where the Divine Person of Christ was not; for such was the *hypostatical* union of Christ's Divine Person with his human nature, that the *blood* of Christ is truly called God's own blood, the *hypostatical* union being inseparable! As the righteousness of Christ is therefore truly and always declared to be the *righteousness of God*, so the blood of Christ is truly called *the blood of God*. Dr. *Gill* observes, the words, "*Yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted,*" are by some rendered, "*and we reckoned him the stricken, SMITTEN GOD, and humbled;*" which version of the words *proved the conversion of several Jews* in Africa, as *Andradius* and others relate; by which they perceived the passage is to be understood not of a mere man, but of God made man, and of his humiliation and sufferings in human nature. (See Dr. *Gill* on Isaiah liii. 4.) The dying thief testified his faith in Christ Jehovah, by *praying* to him and *acknowledging* him to be Jehovah: (Luke xxiii. 24.) and this act of faith he did by the Holy Ghost; for no man can truly say, that Jesus is Jehovah, but by the Holy Ghost. (1 Cor. xii. 3.) As the *soul* of a man after death exists without the body, therefore, human blood is no more *essential* to the existence of the soul, than blood is *essential* to God. But the *blood* of Christ was *essential* to the union and existence of the essential God and perfect man in one person, and it is, therefore, truly called God's own blood, the proper blood of *God manifest in the flesh!* An eternal line of separation is, therefore, for ever drawn between the Christ of man's invention, a human soul head of the Church, and "*the Christ of God,*" (Luke ix. 20,) the *quickening spirit* head of the spiritual Church of God! Feed the church of God, which he (God) hath purchased with his own blood; which word, *own*, is of an infinite and eternal importance to us! Mr. *John Stevens* declares or speaks of it as a *temporal covenant*, and therefore of the *blood*, he says, "It was blood shed that atoned; (1) *human blood essentially considered*, (2) *but relatively the blood of God*. This, he says, was efficacious blood, and had its efficacy from its being the blood of his person, (3) *but it never could have become the blood of his person had it not been ordained to be so, by the sovereign will of God.*" (3 Let. 16.) Now (1) The blood of John the Baptist was *human blood essentially considered*, (2) *but relatively the blood of God*, for John was *relatively* a child of God. The reader will here observe the importance of the word, *own*, God's own blood, for John's blood was not efficacious blood, although it was the blood of his person, neither would it have become the blood of his person, (soul and body) had it not been ordained

very full of comfort, then, must the precious names *Jesus Christ* be to every humble believer. The very name *Jesus* assures us, he is *Jehovah the Saviour* and *able to save EVEN to the uttermost*; and that he, the *eternal* and *immutable* one engaged to save, and will save his people from their sins! *And him that cometh unto him he will in no wise cast out.* And how precious must the name, "*Christ*," be to every humble believer! The sacred names "*Christ Jehovah*" (Luke ii. 11,) assure us, *HE IS able to anoint us with that KINGLY and PRIESTLY unction which abideth*; (1 John ii. 27. Rev. i. 6,) and the holy name, "*the Christ of God*:" (Luke ix. 20,) testifies *HE IS the unction one of God, EQUAL WITH GOD*: and his name "*the Lord's Christ*," (Luke ii. 26,) is as an ointment poured forth, for *HE IS to be so, by the sovereign will of God!* And, therefore, I hope the reader will not overlook the Holy Spirit's testimony to "*the Christ of God*," (Luke ix. 20.) *God's own Son*, and to the blood of his person by personal union, (Rom. viii. 32,) and not merely by *ordination*, but *God's own blood*, (Acts xx. 28,) not merely covenant blood, like the blood shed under the Old Testament dispensation, but the blood of the *everlasting* covenant of the *everlasting* God! (Heb. xiii. 20.) Not the blood of a pre-existent human soul, but the *sacrificial blood* of the *everlasting* covenant, for some of Christ's blood flowed from his *body*, (*God's Holy One*,) after the soul had left the body, when the Godhead continued in hypostatical union with the body: (John xix. 34,) but *which fact, Mr. Stevens denies!* (S. D. 181.) Indeed, he has so much contempt for Christ's *body, God's Holy One*, (Psalm xvi. Acts ii.) that it genders in him too mean thoughts of our Divine Lord, to believe an infinite person in *Deity* was *immediately* in union *with a body of flesh*, for in his opinion, it was *mediately* so, through an intervenient principle of intellectual kind: and therefore, as his divine Lord was not in union *with the body in the grave*, the hypostatical union with the body was dissolved, because his human soul Christ, the *medium* of union was then separated from the body; and *therefore*, Mr. John Stevens says, *it is very indecorous to speak of an infinite Person in Deity, being united to a body, without any intervenient principle of intellectual kind!* (S. D. 181.) But *our God was manifest in the flesh, he that descended (in the body) into the lower parts of the earth, (THE GRAVE)* was not a human soul, but *IS THE SAME THAT ASCENDED in the body.* (Eph. iv. 9.) Did the human soul of Christ descend into the grave, called the lower parts of the earth? Let human soul pre-existerians reply to this question; but let them not forget, that *the resurrection body of the Saint is the image of the heavenly!* No marvel, therefore, that our Almighty Lord gave such offence to the human soul pre-existerian Jews, when he declared his *flesh* to be meat indeed, and his *blood* to be drink indeed—that the *living bread which came down from heaven* was his *flesh!* (John vi. 50—56.) This was a *hard saying* to human soul pre-existerians, some of whom were his *disciples* for a season, but they thereupon *went back, and walked no more with him.* John vi. 66.

the *eternal verily fore-ordained, anointed* “to preach the GOSPEL to the poor; sent to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord,” &c. (Luke iv. 18, 19. Isaiah lxi. 1, 2.) The internal evidences of these divine truths make the name of *Christ* precious to them that believe! And the divine names, “JESUS CHRIST,” give to the heart of a believer, a demonstration of the Godhead of Christ, which neither the malevolence of *devils*, nor the sophistry of *all the reasoners in the world*, can destroy! And as Jesus Christ, JAHOSHUA the UNCTION ONE, the *eternal verily foreordained anointed, is come in the FLESH*, (1 John iv. 2, 3,) and we are members of his *body*, and of his *flesh*, and of his *bones*; and also partakers of HIS SPIRIT; what a blessedness is revealed to us in this truth, that what *he is*, *he ever was in covenant*, and *ever will be*, to all his people. He is omniscient, and knows all,—He is omnipotent, and can do all, yea, he loves all his people with an *eternal and immutable* love. He is Jehovah our righteousness, He so loved us, that because we were partakers of flesh and blood, he also HIMSELF took part of the same, and destroyed death, and him that had the power of death, that is the devil. In further proof of *his love*, it is written, *in that (the flesh) he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted*; (Heb. ii. 18,) and that *he is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, for he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin*. (Heb. iv. 15.) He so loved us, that he gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savour. (Eph. v. 2.) He gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God, and our Father. (Gal. i. 4.) As Jehovah, he was able to accomplish every purpose of his grace; to give pre-eminence to the human nature he took: to crown it with perpetual conquest; and to bring in by his infinite merit an everlasting righteousness, for the justification of his people! As Mr. *John Stevens* acknowledges his ignorance of Mr. *Colyer's* writings upon the subject of Christ's *satisfaction*, (E. S. 11,) I recommend Mr. *Stevens* to read Mr. *Colyer's* excellent sermon,

"THE GOOD NEWS OF CHRIST," wherein Mr. *Colyer* has set forth the perfection of Christ's righteousness, the full satisfaction which Christ made to God as the *Holy law-giver*, and as the *righteous judge*. And I would earnestly entreat Mr. *Stevens* to read the same *without delay*, because Mr. *Stevens*, with his notion of *negative sin*, has no just apprehension of the *evil* of sin, or just apprehension of that satisfaction due to God's justice for the sins of his people, and of that *everlasting* righteousness which God's law demands, for the innumerable company of the redeemed! But *as Mr. Stevens may be* (to use his own words) *too obstinate to read*, the Believer will allow me to observe, that our Lord, one of the THREE that bear Record in Heaven, said, "It becometh us to FULFIL all righteousness, (Matt. iii. 15.) think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to FULFIL: for verily I say unto you, until heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. (Matt. v. 17, 18.) It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." (Luke xvi. 17.) These are important truths, for if the righteousness of Christ was not the righteousness of God, it would not be commensurate to the demand of God's holy law, which requireth full, and perfect, satisfaction, and obedience, on behalf of that company which no man can number out of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, which John saw in vision stand before the Throne, and before the Lamb. Every act therefore that Jesus did in obedience to the law, was the act of God the Son in the flesh. And in the Holy Scriptures, it is always called the righteousness of God! Here, again, I must observe, that it is written, *Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his (idiou) own blood.* (Acts xx. 28.) And this *proper* blood is called God's *own*; for the blood of Jesus Christ is the blood of God manifest in the flesh. The life of Christ in the flesh testifies to his Godhead and manhood in the unity of his person, *God and man*. In the Holy Scriptures we find it recorded, that in his human nature he suffered, being tempted; and afterwards the devils acknowledged his Godhead; they even requested he would suffer them to go into the herd of swine! Whilst talking