

“to THIS word, it is because there is no light in them.” (Isa. viii. 20.) And as Mr. *Stevens* does not speak according to the Oracles of God, it is because there is no light in him.

Again, Mr. *Stevens* says, “Concerning *time*, it may “be here observed, that the beginning of this creation “is *our measure of time, definitely considered*; but it does “not follow that *it is the beginning of time itself*.” (P. 1st. Let. 38, 39.) This is another *lie*, for it is not *our* measurement of time, for there *was no sun* until the *fourth* day; therefore it is God’s *measurement* of the *first, second, and third* day, and the denial of this truth is another part of the human pre-existerian *creed*.

Again, Mr. *Stevens* says, “We hear of the end of the “world, as well as the beginning of it, and so far we in “common language attach the idea of the end of time; “but *in a strict sense of speaking*, no creature can be “*eternal, so that there will be time continued in the duration “of the creature after this world is ended. Then why not “before it was first formed?*” (S. D. 203.) This is another human pre-existerian *lie*, which he would conceal under a serpentine question, and to which statement I reply, that according to Mr. *Stevens*’ argument, if no creature can be *eternal*, then there can be no duration of time *without end!* But is the God of truth a liar, who promised us *eternal life*; a life *without beginning*, and without end? And is not Christ *that life*? *Time* never can be *eternity*, for *time* is not without beginning, neither is *time* without end: but *eternity* is without beginning, and without end: and therefore *our* Christ is not a began to be Christ of *man’s invention!* But what *holy* authority is there, for *his* saying, there will be *time* after this world is ended! Hath not God *who cannot lie* promised his elect, *eternal life before the world began?* (Titus. i. 2.) Is the God of truth *a liar?* Is not *our* Christ that *eternal life*, which was *with* the Father before all time, yea, *before the day was!* (1 John i. 2.—Isa. xliii. 11—13.) And, in confirmation of the solemn truth, that time shall end, the *Angel*, which John saw stand upon the sea, and upon the earth, lifted up his hand to heaven, and **SWORE** *by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven and the things (the Angels) that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the*

sea, and the things which are therein, *that there should be TIME NO LONGER.* (Rev. x. 5, 6.—1 John v. 11.) And as John heard this Angel swear by Him *that liveth* to what is true and certain, then the human pre-existerians must be *liars* and *blasphemers*, for they charge the ANGEL OF GOD with being a **PERJURED PERSON!** Remember, Reader, it is written, to the **LAW**, and to the **TESTIMONY**, for as Mr. *Stevens* speaks not according to God's word, but according to *philosophy*, and *vain deceit*, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ, (Col. ii. 8,) it is because there is no light in him: and he is evidently a liar, for he makes void the word of God by his wicked tradition.^a No marvel, that such awful characters, who

^a Mr. *John Stevens* has unwittingly, like all *freethinkers*, given us the outline of his own character as a *beguiler*, in perfect accordance with the description given of *men seducers* in the Scriptures of truth, viz. *intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind:* (Col. ii. 18,) for, "*secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those which are REVEALED belong unto us, and to our children for ever.*" (Deut. xxix. 29.) If the supposition of other systems pre-existing the creation mentioned in God's Bible be allowable; what licentious freethinking principle may not be equally admissible, provided it be thought reasonable? Is not the supposition of other systems, the attempt of a vain man that would be wise above what is written? Is the *Zend* or *Ancoran* to be added to God's word? Are any of the traditions of the Elders, because they may be thought reasonable to be allowed. Did not the Pharisees make void the word of God by their suppositions? Did they not suppose there was a place or world called *Goph*, created before the creation mentioned by Moses, wherein, they said, the souls of all the children of Israel dwelt, and another *Goph*, where, they said, the souls of the Gentiles created after the children of Israel were kept? Indeed, if such suppositions be allowed, shall we not add to God's Bible *something worse than the apocryphal writings?* Is Christ and Belial to be thus united? Or is the word of God to be received, subject to human pre-existerian suppositions? Surely no one, who *knows experimentally that the word of God is true*, would allow of any such insinuating suppositions; for what reasonable fables, such as, the *supposition of the inhabitants of the moon*, &c., may not be added, if Mr. *Stevens' sensual and devilish suppositions* be admitted? But, woe, an awful woe is the portion of them, who dare so to add to God's word! See Deut. iv. 2.—Prov. xii. 31, 32.—Rev. xxii. 18. Here I cannot pass over in silence, Mr. *John Stevens' serpentine, or forked subtlety*; for in him we see a man at one time *wilfully* perverting the *word of God*; and at another time telling his *young rooks*, to "*turn to the Scriptures, have done with all creeds that are not there expressed*"—and then talking of the *pre-existence* of other systems as not **UNREASONABLE**, although not mentioned in God's Bible. Is it not evident, that if he had ever turned to the Scriptures, (God's Bible) *the word of faith*, in sincerity and godly sim-

reject the testimony of the Holy Spirit to the *pre-eternity* of "the Christ of God," or that the *Perverter of I Am*, should pervert the word *created* into *formed out of*, and wrest the word *possessed* into *created*, see C. F. i. 31.—ii. 27, and distort *Amen* into a *nurse child*, wrest "archē," the *beginning* of the creation into a *human soul grieving and repenting*, as it were in *purgatory*, (S. D. 195,) after the traditions of the Church of Rome, or that he should wrest the sacred testimony in John i. 1, and I John i. 2, to his own *confusion!*

Having exposed this part of the human pre-existerian heresy, I shall now notice the perversion of the Sacred testimony recorded in Prov. viii. 30, and Rev. iii. 14, which no honest man, who had any *real* knowledge of the original tongues, or was a *baptized believer*, ever perverted!

Our translators have rendered the record in Prov. viii. 30, 31, "Then I was by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the HABITABLE PART OF HIS EARTH; and my delights were with the sons of Adam." The Reader will permit me to observe, that it is very evident the Translators of the English Bible intended to give us a correct translation of the Original Scriptures, according to the Hebrew *idiom*, by the words printed in *Italic* letters, to wit, "as" and "with him," not *by* him, but *with* him, *co-eternal*: for the Hebrew word, "Amun," or "Amen," which they have rendered "one brought up," they have never been so ridiculous as to render in the Sacred Scriptures by the phrase, *nurse child*, although they have considered, the word, *Amen*, to signify the *trust reposed in a person*, who had the care of a child. Indeed the Hebrew word EHJAH, to which the *vau* is pre-fixed, and with which this Scripture begins,

plicity, he would have apologized for having imposed upon the *credulity* of his hearers a plain *reason* creed, which gives the *lie* direct to our Lord Jesus Christ? Or would he not long since have acknowledged the *lies* he has either ignorantly or wilfully *promulgated*; or would he have declared the *fourth* commandment in the law to be an *absurdity*, if not a *lie*, as God, according to Mr. *Stevens'* creed, must have created many things before the creation revealed to Moses; and as time, he says, began long before, it could not have been the *seventh* day, according to his creed, when God ceased from all his works, (Exod. xx. 10, 11.—Heb. iv. 4, 10.)

to wit, "*then I was,*" is the same Hebrew word rendered I AM, in Exod. iii. 14, and I WILL BE, in Hosea i. 9, so that the text doth evidently set forth God the *Father's eternal* delight in Christ and in *his people*; and also, that Christ is I AM, that *eternal life with the Father*, (1 John i. 2,) his *co-eternal* Son, (John v. 18,) for we have here *expressly* set forth Christ's *foreknowledge* of his *incarnation*, as *rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth*, and of his *delight* in his people, the sons of Adam, *when as yet there was none of them*. (Psalm cxxxix. 16.) But as the *pre-eternity of our Christ*, the quickening Spirit Head of the Church, is hateful to the human pre-existerian preachers, so they pervert all those Scriptures, which destroy their tradition, and cause *their craft to be set at nought*. (Acts xix. 27,) Mr. Stevens, therefore, observes, "*Wisdom says, I was by him, as one brought up with him*. The original word rendered *brought up* is "*Amen*; its root denotes *steadiness, stability, constancy*: "*Parkhurst*. It is frequently translated *Amen* in our "*Bible*. (Deut. xxvii. 15. Numb. v. 22.) May it be "*thought that, Rev. iii. 14, has any reference to this passage? These things saith the AMEN, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God*. Thus "*spoke the Lord Jesus to the Laodicean Church; and the words of Wisdom are, Jehovah acquired, and possessed me, the beginning of his way, when he appointed the foundations of the earth, I was by him, the Amen, (so is the Hebrew), and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him*. It is very evident, that the "*words in the Revelation are a striking explanation of the Hebrew word used in the speech of Wisdom; and we know that Christ is the wisdom of God. Wisdom, in the Old Testament, says Jehovah possessed me, the beginning of his way: the particle in is not in the Hebrew Text.*"^a The Word, in the New Testament

^a It is a remarkable fact, that if the particle *in* be omitted because it is not in the Hebrew Text, so ought the particle *of*, for *of* is not in the Hebrew Text. Then, *Wisdom says, Jehovah possessed me the beginning, his way, for Christ is the way, (John xiv. 5,) and Christ is the beginning.* [Col. i. 18.] For the Scriptures are *perfectly* consistent, because Christ is not *Behemoth* that eateth grass like an ox. But the *pre-eternity* of Christ is here set forth, for *Wisdom adds, I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.* [Prov. viii. 23.] Which words are in

“ says, I am the *beginning of the creation of God*. I was
 “ by Jehovah, the *Amen*, says *Wisdom*; I am the *Amen*,
 “ says Jesus Christ,”—“ The word *Amen*, is used to de-
 “ note a *nurse*, and a *NURSE CHILD*, intimating the *care*
 “ and *constancy* of a *nurse*, and the *charge* or *trust* that
 “ devolves upon her.” (S. D. 141.)

It is very true that the word *Amen*, denotes *trust*,
 &c., and as such, is sometimes used to denote a *nurse* or
 guardian, in whom *trust* and *confidence* is reposed, for
 Christ is the *everlasting Father* of all his *seed*, (Isa. ix. 6,) and is a *nursing Father* to his Church, for he carries the
little ones in his bosom. (Isa. xl. 11,) but no one, except a
fanatic, would repose trust and confidence in a *nurse child*.

God the Father trusted in *our* LORD Jesus Christ, but
 he never reposed trust and confidence in *a began to be* Christ
of man's invention, for the *human pre-existerians' Christ* is
 only a *temporal Christ*, and as such, he is not trust worthy!
 But, what sort of a *nurse child* is a *human soul* without a
 body? Does Mr. *Stevens* mean to say, that Christ was a
nurse child? and that God the Father had a *human bosom*,
 (John i. 18,) and suckled this human soul nurse child? Or,
 that God the Father put his trust and confidence in a *hu-
 man nurse child*? Or was this human soul a *woman*, a
female, for is not *Wisdom called she*? and are we not to call
 her, *our sister*? (Prov. vii. 4.) And is it not written, “*Cursed*
 “ *is the man that trusteth in man!*” Surely, Mr. *Stevens*
 would never encourage *infidels*, as he has done for thirty
 years, if he had ever been out of love with himself, as
 Mr. *Colyer* and all true christians are, for *self* is a *monster*
 in religion. And if Mr. *Stevens* should ever be out of

perfect harmony with the revelation of God the Father's *eternal* election,
 [to wit] elect according to the [eternal] foreknowledge of God the
 Father, [1 Pet. i. 2,] chosen *from the beginning*, [2 Thess. ii. 13,]
before the foundation of the earth. [Eph. i. 4.] *Search the Scrip-
 tures*, saith *Wisdom*, *for in them ye think ye have ETERNAL LIFE: and
 they are they which testify of me*, [John v. 39,] for the *Scriptures* testify
 that Christ is that *ETERNAL LIFE with the Father*, [1 John i. 2.] And as
 Mr. *Stevens* admits, *no creature can be eternal*, [S. D. 203.] every
 attempt, therefore, on the part of Mr. *Stevens* to destroy the pre-
eternity of Christ, is an evident proof of Mr. *Stevens'* ignorance of, and
 his *enmity* to the “*Christ of God*,” a *phrase*, he says, he has not
 found in his Bible, a solemn proof of his ignorance of *the Christ of God*,
 and of the contents of God's Bible. (E. S. 18.)

love with himself, we may be sure *nothing* will *restrain* Mr. Stevens from following the recommendation he gave Mr. Colyer, namely, to *hate himself*, because he has promulgated such *falsehoods*, and has given so much encouragement to *infidels*. And as soon as he begins to *hate himself*, so soon will he be known as a disciple of that CHRIST, (Luke xiv. 26,) whose *pre-eternity* he has, in common with all infidels, been labouring to destroy!

But the human pre-existerian doctrine is not only full of enmity to *the Christ of God*, but, strictly speaking, it not only makes the *Bible ridiculous*, but it is an artful attempt to represent the SONSHIP of Christ as a LUDICROUS LIE. For *Wisdom* was *reputed* our Sister, and *what Christ was reputed that*, Mr. Stevens says, *Christ must have been!* (Rhy.) Then how could *Wisdom, our sister*, be the human soul of Christ, which Mr. Stevens says, constitutes the *Sonship* of Christ? And how could the *human soul* of Christ be reputed *our sister*, which Mr. Stevens says, his *reputed Christ must have been, or argument all must be vain*, (Rhy.) unless that *human soul* was the *Daughter of God*, instead of being the *Son of God*? Surely, if Mr. Stevens has *all the reason in the world to consider* the human soul of his reputed Christ to be *our sister*, he must also have *much reason to suppose* his *reputed Christ* was a *daughter, generated*, as Mr. Stevens says, *by the union of a reasonable soul to a divine person*.

Our Lord expressly declared his *Sonship* to be incomprehensible to, or by, creatures; and further, that *they* could only *believe in his SONSHIP* by *divine revelation*: the Reader will therefore allow me to draw his attention to Mr. Stevens' attempt to prove *the Christ of God* to be a *liar*, in what Mr. Stevens calls a *plain reason*, for the names of *Father* and *Son*, (S. D. 30,) namely, that the *human soul of Christ* constituted *one* of the persons in the Godhead, the *son of God*; "a son then *generated*, as he says, *by the union of a reasonable soul to a Divine Person*;" (S. D. 28, 29, 125. C. F. i. 47. ii. 4. 43,) for, Mr. Stevens, in common with all human pre-existerians, endeavours to prove the *Christ of God* to be a *liar*, by his *impudent* attempt to make Christ's sonship *comprehensible* to creatures, and by his *infidel declaration*, that Christ's sonship is not *Divine*,

or of the same nature with the Father! (Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22, John v. 18, John xix. 7.) And as all the human pre-existerians endeavour to prove Christ *to be a liar*, so for that purpose it will be observed, Mr. *Stevens* wrests the word *possessed* in Prov. viii. 22, into *acquired*, representing Jehovah as *acquiring* wisdom *as creatures do*; and then, he perverts *everlasting* into *time*, and metamorphoses a *sister* into a *brother*, and *turns* a *she* into a *he*, &c. whereby he proves, that he does *not* believe God's word *to be strictly true*, and *perfectly consistent* (S. D. 65.) with his *vile* tradition, or that, "*what is plainly declared in the Sacred Records, he was bound to believe with assurance!*" (S. D. iii.) And in so doing, he not only encourages the *infidel*, but he gives us a true picture of a *depraved* man, who is so deluded as to *reason* upon Holy *mysteries*, vainly attempting the destruction of the *mystery of faith*, under the idea of establishing a *plain reason creed*.

But as Mr. *Stevens* insists, that *Wisdom* is a human pre-existerian *man* Christ, which he says, *Christ must have been, or argument all must be vain*; (Rhy.) must he not also admit, that as *Wisdom* is called our *sister*, and is described by the feminine pronoun *she*, that the human pre-existerian Christ must have been a *woman*, for *what Christ was reputed, that, Mr. Stevens* says, *Christ must have been*, and he knows that *Wisdom* is called our *sister*, and *understanding* our *kinswoman*, (Prov. vii. 4,) and is *plainly* designated by the *feminine* pronoun *she*! Then how can *Wisdom*, our *sister* plainly declared, be *the soul of a man*; or a *man*? Mr. *Stevens* says, *the Scriptures are strictly true, and perfectly consistent*: but if he believed they were so, he would not have *wrested Wisdom*, our *sister*, into a *man*, or the *soul of a man*. Again, how could a human soul *without a body*, if a female, constitute one of the persons in the Godhead, a Son, as Mr. *Stevens* says, the *human soul of his Christ did*? And if the names Father and Son are *adopted* names, do not the saints *wait for their adoption, the redemption of the body*? (Rom. viii. 23.) Then how could a *soul* without a *body* constitute Christ an *adopted Son*? Or does Mr. *Stevens* mean to assert, that his fanciful *first born*, which he calls *the beginning of the creation of God*, and the first born of every creature, was in the first in-

stance our *sister*, a *she*? Or that *Wisdom* was the *soul* of a *female*? Or that a *female soul* was the *beginning of the creation of God*? If Mr. *Stevens* does not, then he must either acknowledge *his creed* to be a *lie*, or he must deny that the Scriptures are strictly true and perfectly consistent with his tradition. Or does he mean to say, that *his invented Christ* having a *female soul* in union with his divine person made him *our sister*? and that afterwards, *his invented Christ* by having a *human body* of the *male kind* became *our brother*? Indeed, he must either admit his *human soul Christ without a body* was *our sister*, and the *daughter of God*, and not the *Son of God*, or he must acknowledge that he does not believe the Scriptures are *strictly true* with *his tradition*, because he says,

“What Christ was reputed, that Christ must have been,
“OF ARGUMENT ALL MUST BE VAIN.”——*Rhy.*

And as *Wisdom* was reputed our *sister*, that *Christ* must have been; and when he took a *body*, he became our *brother*; or Mr. *Stevens* must acknowledge *his argument all is in vain*, for in *God's estimation pure truth must be seen, or who dare to trust him again.*—(*Rhy.*) Therefore, so long as Mr. *Stevens* has regard to his tradition of a *beginning to be Jesus Christ*, a pre-existent *human soul* without a body, a *nurse child*, which he calls *the beginning of the creation of God*, we must understand he has all the reason in the world to consider his pre-existent human soul was a *she*, a *female soul*, and therefore, *our REPUTED sister*, or his *argument all must be vain*: and then, it must follow according to Mr. *Stevens' much reason*, (*S. D. 186*,) that after *his Christ* had continued our *sister* for thousands of years, during which period *his Christ* was a *female soul*, *his Christ* then took a *human body* of the *male kind*, by which means *his Christ* became *God's son*, and our *brother*, or else, Mr. John *Stevens* must admit, *all the human pre-existerian argument must be vain*. Thus, in Mr. *Stevens' plain reason creed*, he has a *plain reason Christ*, who was first our *elder sister* and *God's daughter*, and afterwards became our *younger brother* and *God's son*, or else his *creed*, as well as his *argument*, must be *vain*, for Mr. *Stevens* declares, that the *paternity* and *filiation* respect not the *divine nature*, BUT THE HU-

MAN NATURE OF CHRIST, (C. F. i. 48,) and therefore, the human pre-existerian *plain reason* doctrine must be, to be consistent with its *creed* and *argument*, that Christ's *soul* made him God's *reputed* and *adopted daughter*, and the *body* which Christ afterwards *took of the Virgin*, made him God's *reputed* and *adopted Son*.^a But as this is only a *small part* of Mr. *Stevens*' *display of all the reason in the world*, what a solemn proof we have here, that his wisdom which descendeth not from above, is *carnal*, *mental*, and *devilish*. (James iii. 15.) Surely, if Mr. *Stevens* be not a *fanatic*, he must acknowledge, that he is something worse, for he says, "*While such zealous advocates for the hu-*
"*man soul pre-existerian sentiments display their un-*
"*guided zeal, together with their unarranged ideas on*
"*the subject they so eagerly wish to propagate, it of course*
"*falls out that THEIR PRINCIPAL SUCCESS IS FOUND AMONG*
"*THOSE, who receive sentiments as young rooks receive food*
"*from their dams:*" and he refers us to *Deut. xxii. 6, 7.* (S. D. 208.) in proof, that all such characters are like *young rooks*: therefore, if he be not like a *young rook*, he must be something worse.

Mr. *Stevens* well knows, that our translators rendered, when necessary, the same *Hebrew words* in a very different sense when applied to *Jehovah*, to that when applied to a creature. (1 Let. 41.) Our *translators* believed in the true God, and they testified *Jehovah* *POSSESSED wisdom*, and did not *acquire* wisdom as creatures do! They were faithful men, and were not of the opinion of the Deists, to wit, that God *acquired* wisdom; they therefore rendered the *Hebrew word kanaanü* in *Prov. viii. 22*, *possessed me*, for *Jehovah* always possessed *wisdom*: but Mr. *Stevens*, in this instance, amongst others, is of

^a Mr. *Stevens* sometimes says, the names *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit* are *assumed*, (S. D. 28,) at another time he calls them *names adopted*. (C. F. i. 44.) But if they be *adopted* names, and if the *paternity* and *filiation* do not respect the divine nature, but the *human nature of Christ*; (C. F. i. 48,) how can these names be *relative* and *personal*, as he admits they are, (C. F. i. 44,) unless he also admits, that the Holy Ghost is the Father of Christ as the *begetter* of Christ's humanity? for if the *paternity* and *filiation* *only* respects the human nature of Christ, in that case, the Holy Ghost must be the Father of Christ, which Mr. *Stevens* is bound to admit as a *matter of faith*, because the *begetting* of the human nature of Christ by the Holy Ghost (*Matt. i. 20*,) is *expressly revealed*. (S. J. 93.)

the *infidel* opinion, that Jehovah *acquired* wisdom, and he has *written, printed, and published*, almost *five octavo pages* upon the subject, (S. D. 134—138,) whereby he *proves*, that he does not believe in “*the Christ of God*,” but in a *Christ of MAN’S INVENTION*, a began to be Christ, a *human soul head* of the Church.* And although, he says, *the Scriptures are true, and perfectly consistent*, [S. D. 65,] yet he did not believe in any one portion of them as regards *the Pre-eternity* of the *Christ of God*, the *Quickening Spirit Head* of the spiritual Church of God, or in other words, he did not believe in *our LORD Jesus Christ*, for at one time, he says, *his Christ is God*; but when he appeared to Abraham, he says, he was *not* the eternal God; and when he came in the flesh, he says, he was an *immortal* man reserved in the *anciently constituted* Lord Christ that came out, &c.; and although he *sometimes* admits, that *the same words are of a very different sense when applied to Jehovah, and when applied to a creature*, yet, he nevertheless comes forward like a *fanatic*, or something worse, when *his craft is in danger*, to prove that *Jehovah ACQUIRED wisdom!* And this is another portion of the *food* with which he feeds his *young rooks!* (S. D. 208.)

Having given us his testimony, that Jehovah *acquired wisdom*, we ought not to be surprized that he should *wrest Amun, or Amen, into a nurse child!* But such spots are not the *spots* of God’s children, (Deut. xxxii. 5,) for no man, who had any real regard to the Three which bear record in Heaven, ever so *mocked* or *insulted* the AMEN, *the faithful and true witness!* [Rev. iii. 14.] As Mr. *Cruden’s Concordance* is in general use, and easily referred to, the Reader will find, Mr. *Cruden* says, “*Amen* signifies, in Hebrew, TRUE, FAITHFUL, CERTAIN. It is made use of likewise to affirm any thing, and was an affirmation used often by our Saviour, which is rendered in our translation, *verily, verily; Amen, Amen, I say unto you.* [John iii. 3. 5.] All the promises of

* Mr. *Stevens* has since found in the *Septuagint*, his *revered Bible*, that they have *perverted kanaanü* into *bera*, and as they rendered *kanaanü* *created* instead of *possessed* or *acquired*, he now adopts their *perversion*, which no one, but the *Perverter* of I AM would do. (C. F. i. 31.)

“God are Amen in Christ, that is, *certain*, and *firm*.
 “[2 Cor i. 20.] Christ himself, the faithful prophet
 “and teacher of his church, is called the *Amen*. [Rev.
 “iii. 14.] In Isaiah lxxv. 16, *shall bless himself by the*
 “*God of truth, and swear by the God of truth*, which in
 “the Hebrew, is the GOD AMEN. And it is used in the
 “end of prayer, in testimony of an earnest wish, desire, or
 “assurance to be heard; *Amen, so be it, so shall it be*.
 “The word *Amen* is used in *many* languages.”

That spiritual man, *Mr. John Brown*, late minister of the gospel at Haddington, and professor of divinity under the associate Synod, whose *godliness* is beyond all suspicion, has given a like faithful testimony to the signification of the word *Amen* in his dictionary of the Holy Bible! But as the word *Amen* occurs in John viii. 58, that holy record of *our Lord's* testimony, which *Mr. Stevens* so shamefully perverts, by intimating that *our Lord*, like the sinful Jews, either ignorantly or wilfully used one tense for another, to wit, I AM, for *I was*; that text so wilfully *perverted*, a standing memorial of *Mr. Stevens' love* to his Lord, and of his *hatred* to *our Lord* reads, as *Mr. Stevens* perverts it, “*Jesus said unto them nurse child, nurse child, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I was, that is, a man, or a nurse child,*” for *Mr. Stevens* says, *our Lord* thereby intimated he was *a man older than Abraham*: and he even laments that great and good men have presumed to venture the proof of (*our Lord's*) *his personal divinity, on so inconclusive a foundation*. (S. J. 20.) But surely, *Mr. Stevens* will never find any one, but a *Sociinian*, or an *Arian*, &c. that will lament with him, that *Dr. Abbadie* did so presume! And how came *Mr. Stevens*, the *Perverter of I AM*, to acknowledge *Dr. Abbadie's* Treatise to be MASTERLY? (C. F. ii. 32.) So far was *Dr. Abbadie* from being of *Mr. Stevens' profligate* opinion, that *Dr. Abbadie* observes, “When they,” (the *pre-existerians*,) “tell me for instance, That Christ was before the prophets, and before Abraham in excellence and dignity, MY JUDGMENT CANNOT ACQUIESCE IN IT. For the word of inspiration assures me repeatedly, that the LORD Redeemer IS THE FIRST AND THE LAST. Here the distinction is of no avail, but rather tends to embarrass them. For he is the FIRST, in

“that respect in which he ought to be the LAST: for they will not say he is the last in dignity. It cannot, therefore, be a priority of excellence that is here meant.—And how comes HE to be represented to us, as “WITHOUT BEGINNING OF DAYS?” It is therefore certain, that Dr. *Abbadie*, as well as Mr. *Romaine* and all true Christians, believed in the *Pre-eternity of the Christ of God*, which the *human pre-existerians in general do not*, and, therefore, Mr. *Stevens* will not find any one, but the serpent and its seed to lament with him, that great and good men *did not die in their sins*, because they believed Christ to be, I AM! (John viii. 24.) But the day is coming, when all, whether *fanatics* or not, who depart this life denying the *Pre-eternity of “the Christ of God,”* will wofully find, that our Lord was no *Impostor*, and did not use one tense for another, when HE said unto the Jews, “if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins.” (John viii. 24.)

The Reader will also observe Mr. *Stevens*' hatred to the *Pre-eternity of the Christ of God*, by his wresting the Hebrew word for *everlasting* in Prov. viii. 23, into *hidden time*. And, as usual with all men of his *reasonable* complexion, he adopts that sense of the Hebrew word, in which it is used in reference to creatures, instead of that sense in which it is used to express the *eternal* foreknowledge or *election* of God. (S.D. 146—148,) But whilst we see such enmity to the *Pre-eternity of the Christ of God*, in those who are *from beneath, and are of this world*, (John viii. 23. E. S. 38,) what a relief it is to the child of God *born from above*, (John iii. 37,) *who is not of this world*, (John xvii. 16,) to find in Dr. *Hawker*, a faithful witness to the *Pre-eternity of Christ*. In a *Village Sermon*, entitled, *Jesus THE ETERNAL LIFE of his people*,^a the Doctor truly observes, “*Wisdom* is described in the *Book of Proverbs* as standing in the top of high places, by the way, at the gates, and at the entry of the city, and calling upon his people to attend to him, promising them that love him, to fill their treasures, and to give

^a This was one of the last works penned by Dr. *Hawker*, to use his own words, “the result of a more ripened judgment.”—“I see enough,” said the Doctor, “to lament in the imperfections of many of those writings of mine gone before, and more especially in my earlier productions, and which I pray the Lord to pardon.” Vol. vii. 220.

“ them durable riches and righteousness. And then he
 “ adds, *the Lord POSSESSED ME in the beginning of his way,*
 “ *before his works of old: I was set up from EVERLASTING,*
 “ *from the beginning, or ever the earth was.—Then I was*
 “ *by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his*
 “ *delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the*
 “ *habitable part of the EARTH, and my delights were with*
 “ *the SONS OF MEN.*” (Prov. viii. 1—21.) Observe in these
 “ words how Christ first states THE ETERNITY OF HIS NA-
 “ TURE; and observe also how he speaks of Jehovah in
 “ his Trinity of Persons possessing him as mediator, in
 “ the beginning of his ways, *as set up the Glorious Head*
 “ *of his Church from EVERLASTING.* Then having spoken
 “ of himself as one brought up with the Lord Jehovah,
 “ and the delight of Jehovah in his covenant Headship
 “ and character, he then takes in the Church as in the
 “ same view, and expresseth his delight in the SONS OF
 “ MEN. Nor merely habitable earth, as distinguished
 “ from the water, for this prospect of Christ he had be-
 “ fore said was, *or ever the earth was, when there were no*
 “ *depths, when there were no fountains abounding with*
 “ *water; whilst as yet he had not made the earth, nor the*
 “ *fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.* But
 “ his allusion of *rejoicing in the HABITABLE PART OF HIS*
 “ *EARTH,* was that *habitable part in which the LORD him-*
 “ *self would TABERNACLE,* when he as the WORD was made
 “ FLESH and DWELT among us: and his delights were FOR
 “ EVER with his people. And what a beautiful and unan-
 “ swerable testimony the whole forms, that the glorious
 “ HEAD of his Church, and his members, have been in the
 “ unceasing contemplation of Jehovah, Father, Son, and
 “ Holy Ghost, FOR EVER; to whose INFINITE and compre-
 “ hensive mind, inhabiting ETERNITY, past, present, and
 “ future, FORM BUT ONE OBJECT.” Let the humble believer
 compare this blessed testimony of a highly favoured Ser-
 vant of the Lord, with the *deluded* human pre-existerian’s
 notions of a God who, as one of them says, *lived a parte*

*The text in Prov. viii. 30, reads thus, “ Yea, (EIJAH) I AM with
 “ Him, Amen: and I AM daily his delight, rejoicing always before him,
 “ &c.: which Mr. Stevens perverts by reading, “ Then I was by him, a
 “ nurse child,” &c.

ante, AN ETERNITY before *he had any thoughts or conceptions, or acts WITHIN HIMSELF relating unto Christ and the Church*, and the believer must conclude, that a human pre-existerian must be either *a fanatic, or something worse*.

Dr. *Davenant* observes, that the Hebrew word, *Gnolam*, which interpreters sometimes render *eternal*, sometimes *everlasting*, and sometimes *an age*, denotes *perpetuity* either *absolute*, or for a *period*; i. e. limited according to the nature of the thing. But it always denotes an *absolute* eternity, when it is predicated of God, or of his eternal will, choice, or purpose, &c. In Prov. viii. 23, it is *truly* and generally admitted by all godly men, that Christ is spoken of as the *Mediator* and *Redeemer* set up from *everlasting!*^a For with God the Father there are no *after* thoughts; he is not a creature; his purpose is eternal, he is of *one mind*, and his *eternal purpose he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord*. (Eph. iii. 11.) And had Christ not been that *Eternal life* with the Father, God the Father's *eternal purpose* could not have been *purposed* in Christ.

^aAs Mr. *Stevens* refers to Mr. *Parkhurst*, for the meaning of an Hebrew word, and then *falsely* applies it, I may be permitted to observe, that Mr. *Parkhurst* is of the same opinion as that spiritual man, Mr. *Ambrose Searle*, as regards the Hebrew word, *El*, to wit, that it signifies, *to interpose, intervene, mediate, come, or be between, for protection, prevention, &c.* If this be the true signification of the Hebrew word, *El*, then Christ is the *Eternal Mediator*; for he is expressly so revealed in Psalm xc. 1st and 2nd verses, where it is written, “(Adonai) Lord thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hast formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art El.” And Mr. *Stevens* admits these words are an ascription of *Eternity* to God. (P. 1st Let. 41.) And if the Reader will compare this Scripture with the 23rd, 24th, 25th, and 26th verses of the 8th chapter of Proverbs, he will perceive that *Wisdom*, who says, I was set up from *everlasting, before the mountains were settled, &c.*, is the same person, who in this Psalm is spoken of, as *before the mountains were brought forth, &c.*, even from *everlasting to everlasting thou art El!* Balaam also testified under the power of the Spirit of God, that in his (*Balaam's*) days, *EL* was not a man that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent, (Numb. xxiii. 19,) that is, *change his mind, &c.*, but which the human pre-existerians say, *their Christ did before he was incarnate*. (S.D. 195.) And although *Adam* never was the *son of man*, yet Mr. *Stevens* would *perversely* call him the *son of man*, because the human pre-existerian lie can only be supported by the assertion that the term *son of man*, and *man*, are terms equivalent.” (E. S. 24.) But does *Adam*, and the *Son of Adam*, mean one and the same person? Certainly not! And yet, it is by such *absurdities*, that Mr. *Stevens* supports his tradition, and therefore, we must conclude Mr. *Stevens* is either a *fanatic*, or something worse.

But *our* Christ was that *Eternal life* with the Father : and God the Father's eternal purpose was purposed in Christ Jesus *our* Lord!

2. But, the human pre-existerians worship a God who is not Eternally and Immutably the same: for they only acknowledge a *began to be* God THE FATHER from the time, they say, he begat the *great soul* of the Lamb, (*Rhy.*) and they only believe in a God the *Son*, which received *that name as his own*, when, they say, *human existence began*, (*Rhy.*) and therefore we ought not to be surprized, that they should pervert *everlasting* in Prov. viii. 23, into *hidden time*, or that they should read *anointed* for *set up*, (S. D. 143, 144,) in order to make a *began to be* Jesus Christ! But our translators have never rendered *nasacethi*, *anointed*, in any one Scripture: indeed, they knew better, for as the *drink offerings poured forth* under the law set forth the *shedding of Christ's blood*, so they knew that Christ was in Jehovah's eternal foreknowledge of vision, and according to the Hebrew Text in Prov. viii. 23, the Lamb slain *from the foundation of the world*, (Rev. xiii. 8,) for we are not redeemed with corruptible things, as with silver and gold, but with the *precious blood* of Christ, as of a *Lamb without blemish and without spot*; WHO VERILY WAS FORE-ORDAINED *before the foundation of the world!* (1 Pet. i. 19, 20.) Here, allow me to observe, that if Mr. *John Stevens* shall at any time before his decease, believe in the Pre-ternity of *the Christ of God*, the quickening Spirit Head of the Spiritual Church of God, he will be obliged to glorify God by confessing his awful *perversions of Holy Scripture*: for he will then *hate* himself, and acknowledge there is *no sin in the confession of sin*, although unto us belong shame and confusion of face for our sins! And the Reader may be assured, if Mr. Stevens had been a godly man, he never would have set such an example to *infidels*, of perverting the Holy Scriptures, or of making the *Bible ridiculous*, by setting up *his depraved reason* in opposition to *divine revelation*, the *word of faith*. Rom. x. 8. It is therefore our duty to *try the spirits whether they be of God*: (1 John iv. 1,) and in so doing, the Reader will find the human pre-existerians are not of God, but *false prophets, forgers of lies*, *who bend their tongues like their bow for lies*: they

“are not valiant for the truth upon the earth; *for they proceed from evil to evil, AND THEY KNOW NOT ME, SAITH THE LORD!*” (Jerem. ix. 3.)

But before I proceed further, the Reader will allow me to say, there is but *one true* CHRIST OF GOD, although there are many *false* Christs! Indeed, there are several human pre-existerian *Christs* of various *shapes, conditions, and ages*, but not one of them is God the Father’s co-eternal Christ, that *ETERNAL LIFE* which was *with the Father*.

Upon the *one true Christ of God* the foundation, some of the *children of God* have built gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble: but fire will try every man’s work of what sort it is; and if any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, *but HE HIMSELF SHALL BE SAVED*; yet so as by fire, because the foundation he built upon was and is *Eternal*.

Upon a *false* Christ, a *temporal* foundation, the *non-elect* may build gold, silver, precious stones, as well as wood, hay, and stubble: but, because they received not *the love of the truth*, God will send them a *strong delusion*, that they might believe a *lie, their election*, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, &c., (2 Thess. ii. 10, 11,) namely, the *Pre-eternity of the Christ of God*.

The Holy Spirit testifies of one true Christ of God, and his testimony is true and not *forked* or *contradictory*. But when a *false* witness testifies of a *false* Christ, his testimony is *forked* or *contradictory*. At one time, he will tell you, that *there is no one text in the Bible, which seems to thwart his testimony of his Christ*, (3 Let. 55.) And at another time, he will tell you, that what he says of *his* Christ is *NOT A MATTER OF FAITH, because it is not expressly revealed*. (S. J. 93.) Mr. Stevens well knew, that *Romaine, Toplady, Gill, and others*, never believed in *his fanciful* Christ: but lest *their faithful* testimony should be the means of *his false* Christ being discovered, he has been obliged to acknowledge, that his *plain reason* creed is not expressly revealed! I hope the Reader will keep this in remembrance, for in such contradictions we may see the *craft* and *subtilty* of the *Old Serpent* and *its seed*: as well as the human pre-existerian’s attempt to set up

a *temporal* foundation, a *began to be Jesus Christ*, in opposition to *the Christ of God!* That highly favoured servant of Christ, the late Dr. Hawker, was so fully impressed of the importance of "*thus saith the Lord*" in matters of faith, that he declared an **INVINCIBLE** objection, and such it *truly* is, to the belief of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ, "was the silence of the Holy Ghost upon the subject." (Vol. ix. 449.) Indeed, it would be a most tremendous *stumbling stone* to the *faith of God's elect*, if the Holy Spirit had in any one instance so far contradicted his own infallible testimony, as even to intimate that *man's* originality was not of the dust: and this truth is very important, because the enemies of *the Christ of God*, in hope they should thereby *beguile* their fellow creatures to believe *their lies*, have admitted that, "*all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, therefore ALL IS TRUE; the FEW as well as the MANY.—It is impossible for God to lie. He is truth itself, and as he is, such must his communications be. His word, therefore, must not only be strictly true, BUT PERFECTLY CONSISTENT.*" (S. D. 65.) And therefore, if Mr. John Stevens has any regard to his *fellow creatures*, he must admit, that the Scriptures being perfectly consistent as to man's originality, his testimony concerning the real existence of Jesus' human soul without a body, or the early existence of his *man Jesus*, a soul without a body, is a *lie* of Satan's invention; because it is perfectly inconsistent, and opposed to the Holy Spirit's *faithful* testimony of the true originality of man, recorded in God's Bible. Dr. Hawker, therefore, very faithfully opposed the human pre-existerian *fable*, by justly observing, that "*The one great and INVINCIBLE objection to the belief of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ, IS THE SILENCE OF THE HOLY GHOST UPON THE SUBJECT.* A doctrine so important, and so intimately connected with the welfare of the Church, if true, might have been expected to be found in every part of Scripture. If on the presumption that Christ's possessing an human soul from before the foundation of the world, had been with a view to his glory, would not the Holy Ghost in this case, whose office is to glorify Jesus, by taking of the things of Jesus, and shewing to his people, have delighted in bringing the whole Church ac-

“quainted with it.” The human pre-existerians cannot reply to this just observation, they, therefore, not only charge the Holy Ghost with giving us an imperfect testimony concerning “the Christ of God,” but they represent him as giving us a false testimony concerning the *originality of man!*^a

But here, I must observe, that the Holy Spirit is not silent respecting the *non-existence* of the human soul, or human nature of Christ, because he has given us an express revelation of the time of the *birth of Jesus Christ, the Son of man, the son of David, and the son of Abraham!* (Matt. i. 1, 18, 20.—Luke i. & ii.) But, as Mr. *Stevens has all the reason in the world*, he must know that Christ could not be *actually a man*, before he was the *son of man*: he is therefore obliged to seek support for his *lying* tradition in the *Oriental idiom*, that the *son of man*, and *man* are *equivalent terms*, as if the *Oriental idiom* meant *the same person*. (E. S. 24.) But why does he not prove, that the term *son of Adam* can be applied to *Adam*, although it may be applied to all his sons in the order of natural generation? And as he makes the term *son of man*, when applied to Christ, to be the same as *man*, in order to prove *his* Christ was a *pre-existent man* before he was the *son of man*, I call upon him to prove, that the term *son of David*, when applied to Christ, is the same as *David*, and that the term *son of Abraham*, when applied to Christ, is the same as *Abraham*? And unless he does, he must be considered as a *fanatic*, for maintaining the *silly* notion, that the *son of man* was *actually a man* before he was the *son of man*, an *absurdity*, which no one but

^a It is written, “*if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God,*” (1 Pet. iv. 11.) and the Lord’s people will do well to attend thereto; for many have been ensnared to use certain expressions, *nick-names*, invented by the Devil, whereby the Devil and his ministers, under the pretence of honouring our Lord Jesus Christ, would *rob OUR FATHER* of his honour, and *OUR MAKER* of *his fear*, *DESPISING HIS NAME*: (Mal. i. 6,) the Reader, therefore, should beware of them who speak not in the language the Holy Ghost teacheth, but in the Ashdod tongue, such as, “*Image man*” (He. 146.) *mysterious man in God*—*God’s master-piece*, &c. (He. 139,) for they are so deluded as to think they are doing God service, when, in truth, they are representing the Holy Spirit as having given us an *imperfect* testimony of Christ, and as having omitted to give that *honour* to Christ, they pretend to do by *their unhallowed* names.

a *fanatic* would allow! Whilst, therefore, I admit, that the terms *son of man*, and *man*, are *equivalent*, as expressing a sameness of nature, I deny they are, therefore, in *every* respect, of the same import. But, it is more than probable, that some of Mr. *John Stevens'* disciples may say, that Mr. *Stevens* doth neither preach, nor believe, such a *ridiculous far-fetched notion as the Oriental idiom to mean the same person*, because in his articles of *faith* he hath *expressly set forth*, that it was by the *incarnation of the Word*, the *Son of God became the Son of man!* For “*the Word who was with God was God, AND WAS MADE* “*FLESH; SO THAT the Son of God was MANIFESTED BY BE-* “*COMING THE SON OF MAN!*” (A. F. 6.) And therefore, as Mr. *Stevens* believes, that the *WORD by being made flesh became the Son of man*, it is quite certain, he does not approve of the *Oriental idiom*. But if this be true, then it is equally certain, Mr. *Stevens* must be either a *fanatic*, or something worse: because no man, *who loves the truth*, would use an argument which *he knew to be FALSE*, in opposition to the truth, unless he were *deranged*,

That the Holy Scripture is perfectly consistent in its record concerning Christ, is unquestionably true, for Christ is not *Behemoth*, the *beginning* (archē) *of the ways of God*, but Christ is I AM, (Ego Eimi) the way itself, and Christ is (*esti*) the *Beginning* in the true sense thereof, for he is also the *Ending*. (Rev. i. 8.) And if the particles *in*, and *of*, be omitted in Proverbs viii. 22, as those *particles* are not in the Hebrew Text,—then, Christ is not that great beast which eateth grass like an ox, the (*Rashith*) *beginning of the ways of God*; but Christ is the *beginning* and the *ending of the creation*, the author and finisher of *the creation*, &c. (Rev. iii. 14.) But these truths are shamefully adulterated by some men, and *subtily* perverted by others; for all the human pre-existerians oppose the Pre-eternity of Christ, that *ETERNAL LIFE* which was *with the FATHER*, the *WORD with GOD*, recorded in John i. 1, and I John i. 1, 2. *Eternal life* is without beginning of days or end of life, and was *with*, not from, *the Father!* In accordance with this important truth, we have the spiritual testimony of that gracious man, Mr. *Ambrose Serle*, who observes, “the

"Apostle excellently defines the name *Shaddai*, *All-suffi-*
 "cient and *Almighty*, to the idolatrous, though learned,
 "Athenians; and points him out as *that UNKNOWN GOD*,
 "who had delivered them from the horrors of a raging
 "pestilence, and whom they had successfully, yet igno-
 "rantly worshipped. God, said he, *that made the world*
 "*and all things therein, seeing that he is LORD of heaven*
 "*and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;*
 "*neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he*
 "NEEDED ANY THING, SEEING HE GIVETH TO ALL, *life, and*
 "*breath, and all things;—for in him we live, and move, and*
 "*have our being.* (Acts xvii. 23, &c.) To this beauti-
 "ful and incomparable description, we may add, what he
 "tells the Colossians, that he (*i. e. Christ*) *is before all*
 "*things, and that by him all things consist; that he is the*
 "*head of the Church, by whom it is fitly joined, and sup-*
 "*plied in every joint, the BEGINNING (the first cause of*
 "*all;)* and that *in or over all he hath the pre-eminence:*
 "[Col. i. 17, 18,] from which he teaches us, in another
 "place, to draw this inference; that seeing we ourselves
 "are not sufficient for the least good thing, and that such
 "an infinite fulness of grace and power is in God, we
 "should rest our whole sufficiency upon him. This tes-
 "timony alone is adequate to prove that the blessed
 "*Jesus* is the Omnipotent *Shaddai*, who filleth all in all.
 "As his self-sufficiency is that, whereby he has enough
 "in himself to denominate him completely blessed, as a
 "God of infinite perfection; so, his all-sufficiency is that,
 "whereby he is able to communicate as much blessed-
 "ness to his creatures, as he is pleased to make them ca-
 "pable of receiving, and therefore, he is able, not only
 "to supply all their wants, but to do exceeding abun-
 "dantly above all they ask or think. (Eph. iv. 16.) And
 "if we turn our eyes beyond the grave, and survey the
 "wonderful delineation, which *St. John* exhibits of what
 "no mortal eye, but his own, beheld upon earth, we
 "shall see, that the armies of heaven, and all the blessed
 "of God, triumph in our *Immanuel* as their *Shaddai*, and
 "ascribe to him the glory and dominion for ever and
 "ever. As the witnesses upon earth, when led by God,
 "could not be deceived; surely the witnesses in heaven,