

“rejoicing in God, cannot lie. And these adore him as
 “the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* (from whom they
 “proceed) and the *ending*, (to whom they tend,) *who is*,
 “*and who was, and is to come*, (Shaddai) *the ALMIGHTY*.—
 “It is a thought, it is a hope, worth a thousand worlds—
 “*Jesus Christ*, who is all this in himself, is all this for the
 “meanest believer in him. O how should it transport
 “the heart of such a worthless worm, (worthless, indeed,
 “when abstracted from Christ!) that such an Omnipotent
 “and all glorious Lord should stoop so low, as *to the*
 “*dirt of earth*, and to the brink of hell, for the purpose
 “of blessing, fixing, and raising him, and thousands no
 “better than he, to a state, to a crown, to a throne, of
 “**ETERNAL GLORY!**” Christ Jehovah, therefore, is the
 beginning of the creation of God, *for without him was*
not any thing made that was made, (John i. 3,) for *Jehovah*
alone made the heavens and the earth, &c. Neh. ix. 6.

Mr. *John Stevens* quotes as an authority, a learned
 man, a *pre-existerian*, Mr. *Robert Fleming's* opinion, in
 favour of the *human pre-existerian fable*, [S. D. 202,] but
 at the same time he artfully withholds from his young
 rooks, Mr. *Robert Fleming's* interpretation of Rev.
 iii. 14, viz., that Christ is “*the efficient cause of God's*
 “*creation*,” for no one, but a fanatic, would suppose that
 Mr. *Robert Fleming* believed the Lamb had a **GREAT soul**
 without a *body*, [Rhy.] or that Mr. *Robert Fleming*
 believed that Christ, the efficient cause of God's creation,
 was *Behemoth that eateth grass like an ox*. But, before
 I produce the *faithful* testimony of God's servants to the
 true rendering of Rev. iii. 14. I must notice Mr. *John*
Stevens' enmity to the Pre-eternity of Christ recorded in
 John i. 1, and 1 John i. 1, 2, which in common with the
 Socinians, he has long laboured to destroy.

Mr. *Stevens* says, “I am not ignorant that some, even
 “of the household of faith, have boldly asserted, that the
 “doctrine for which I am about to plead is heresy, and
 “that, consequently, the Scriptures no where affirm such
 “a sentiment. But perhaps these, though very confident,
 “will be found to have *censured what they do not under-*
 “*stand*, and in their hurry have *mistaken assertion and*
 “*noise for argument*. That the word of God is full to the

“point I shall now begin to demonstrate.” (S. D. 121.) But was Dr. Gill, and other godly men, who contended for the *pre-eternity* of Christ, so ignorant, or *beside themselves*, as to mistake assertion and noise for argument? And has not Mr. Stevens himself of late admitted, that the word of God is so far from BEING FULL TO THE POINT as regards this, his plain reason creed, that he acknowledges his creed is no matter of faith, because it is not expressly revealed? (E. S. 93.) And as the Scriptures, he now admits, are far from being full to the point, is not Mr. Stevens’ charge against Dr. Gill, and others, as false as it is impudent? The man who could tell such a lie, as to say, that Dr. Gill, and other such godly men, mistook *assertion* and NOISE for argument, is however the same person, who blasphemously perverts every Scripture testimony, which proves the Pre-eternity of the Christ of God.

“The first passage Mr. Stevens quotes to pervert, is, “in the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with GOD, and the WORD was God. The same was in the beginning with God! All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life: and the life was the light of men.” (John i. 1—4,) Having quoted these Scriptures which are full of the Pre-eternity of Christ, the Creator of all things, Mr. Stevens then artfully unites thereto the 14th verse, wherein is set forth Christ’s incarnation, and then, he quotes the friend of the bridegroom, John the Baptist’s testimony of Christ. Mr. Stevens contends that it being said, the Word was made flesh is a proof of the pre-existence of Christ’s human soul without a body! (S. D. 121, 122,) for he says, “The Scripture descriptions of Christ’s coming into the world are always expressed in some corporeal language, such as “body, or flesh, without the least mention of taking a soul,” (S. D. 184,) therefore, he concludes, “there is much reason to suppose that the Son of God had a human soul before.” (S. D. 186.) But this I shall now prove is perfectly ridiculous, and inconsistent with the Divine testimony.

1 They speak *falsely* in saying, that the Scripture descriptions of Christ’s coming into the world is always expressed in some corporeal language, such as *body*, or *flesh*, for in *seventeen* places in Scripture, the seed of

Abraham is mentioned, and *Christ* is declared as taking the *seed* of Abraham; (Heb. ii. 16,) and *Zero*, the Hebrew word for *seed*, and *sperma*, the Greek word for *seed*, never mean any thing else in those *seventeen* Scriptures but *body and soul in union*.^a And further, it is written, “*the children of the promise are counted for the seed.*” Rom. ix. 8.

2. It is an indisputable fact, that the word *flesh* in Scripture doth sometimes signify *living men*, as in Gen. vi. 12, and is expressly used for a *relation in nature*, one who is of the same stock or kindred, (Gen. xxix. 14, xxxvii. 27,) and of the same nature with ourselves, as in Isaiah lviii. 7! And here, it is worthy of notice, that the Holy Spirit testifies in Rom. viii. 3, that God sent forth his *own Son* in the *likeness of sinful flesh*, which words, Mr. *Stevens* must admit, “do evidently include the soul, because he “declares, *the body antecedent to its union with a rational soul, is not the subject of moral obligation, so not formally sinful*; but united with a reasonable soul, it comes under “the law of *the Creator.*” (2 Let. 45.) According to Mr. *Stevens*’ doctrine, the text *sinful flesh* in Rom. viii. 3, must include the *soul*, or it would not be *sinful flesh*; because the body *without the soul* would not be under the law of the Creator: therefore, the human pre-existerians statement is *untrue*, and their *conclusion false*.^b

3. Again. The human pre-existerian *supposition*, for which they say, they have *much reason*, is completely opposed to the word of *faith*: for if the word *body* or *flesh*, when applied to Christ’s coming into this world, *do not include the soul*, then the *flesh*

^a See Ante page 113 & 114, where the *seventeen* Scriptures respecting the *seed* of Abraham are mentioned with Mr. *Stevens*’ admission. that the word *seed* includes the soul.

^b So far is this human pre-existerian supposition from being correct, that it may be as well asserted, that as God is never said to have been manifested in a human soul, but *was only manifested in the flesh*, therefore, God never was manifest *without flesh*: and as it is never said, that *in Christ* dwells all the fulness of the Godhead *souly*, but on the contrary, that *in him* dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead *BODILY*; therefore, it might be said, the *body* or *flesh* of Christ *must* have pre-existed his *soul*. Indeed, as Mr. *Stevens* says, the *soul* is *INVISIBLE*, (S. D. 16.) then, the *body* or *flesh* of Christ, according to Mr. *Stevens*’ *creed*, must have pre-existed, for Christ could not have been *seen* in an *invisible soul* without a *body*.

of Christ must have come from heaven, and his soul must have been made of the Virgin Mary, because, that which was begotten in Mary of the Holy Ghost must have been spirit, for the Scriptures are strictly true, and they testify, that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. John iii. 6.

4. Christ was of *Israel after the flesh*, (Rom. ix. 5.) and in the Old Testament Scripture, he is called the *Redeemer*, and the *Holy One of Israel*, (Isa. xliii. 14,) long before he was *begotten* in the *Virgin of the Spirit*: it must therefore follow, according to Mr. *Stevens'* creed, to wit, "*what Christ was reputed, that Christ must have been, or argument all must be vain,*" (Rhy.) that Christ, before he was born of the Virgin, must have been *of Israel AFTER THE FLESH*, or he could not have been *reputed the Holy One of Israel*, for otherwise, as Mr. *Stevens* says, *argument all must be vain!* And as he could not be *reputed of Israel*, unless he had been *of Israel after the flesh*; so the human soul pre-existerian creed, as well as their arguments, must all be in *vain*, unless Christ's *flesh* pre-existed the birth of his human soul! And as Adam's body was *formed* before he had a *soul*, therefore, Christ's body must have been *formed* before he had a *soul*: and as Christ was not *begotten* in the order of natural generation, therefore, his *soul* must have been *begotten* in the Virgin, because, that which was *begotten* in her, was of the Holy Ghost.

5. In Heb. x. 5. Christ saith, "*Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.*" These words, *a body hast thou prepared*, in the language of prophecy, are spoken ages before Christ's incarnation, and also, as when Christ was coming, he said, *lo, I come to do thy will, O God*: (Heb. x. 7, 9,) *and not, O my God*, as Mr. *Stevens*, *deceived* by the *Septuagint*, has represented Christ's words. (S. D. 189.) For Christ calls the Father, "*My God from his mother's belly.*" (Psalm xxii. 10.) And Mr. *Stevens* is obliged to admit, that Christ's manifestation to Abraham and Jacob was in *a body*, for a human soul without a body *could not eat cakes*: (S. D. 176,) nor a human soul *without a body* wrestle with Jacob, for it has not *human limbs*. (S. D. 176.) This is so *plain*, that unless he is a *fanatic* he must renounce his plain reason creed! And is it not by *the offering of the BODY PREPARED* we are sanctified

by the will of God? [Heb. x. 10.] And as Mr. Stevens contends, the *body prepared* did not include the soul, then, it might be said, that the *body offered* did not include the soul: because the *body offered* is expressly declared to be the *body prepared*.

6. The Word *was made flesh*. [John i. 14.] And Christ's *flesh* is the *bread* which Christ gave for the life of the world. This testimony is important, for the *living bread* Christ declares he is, "*I am the living bread*," [2] which *bread* came down from heaven, "*which came down from heaven*," (3) and this *bread* is Christ's *flesh*, for Christ says, "*and the bread that I will give is MY FLESH, which I will give for the life of the world.*" (John vi. 51.) Here we have Christ's testimony, that he is the *living bread that came down from heaven*, and the *bread* is *his flesh*. Now as Christ's *body* is spoken of, in the language of prophecy, as prepared before Christ came into the world, and as his *flesh* is the *bread* which came down from heaven, it must follow, not according to Mr. Stevens' notion, but according to Mr. *Squirrel's vile tradition*, another human pre-existerian preacher, that Christ's body and flesh pre-existed: and then, Christ's *soul* and not his *flesh* must have been begotten in the Virgin Mary.* And to such a conclusion *all human pre-existerian reasoners* must come, who have a *plain reason creed*, and who do not understand that, to be born of the *Spirit* is to be born from *above*. (E. S. 38.)

7. Christ's human nature was *begotten* in Mary of the Holy Ghost, (Matt. i. 20.) Now that which is *born* of the flesh, is *flesh*, and that which is *born of the Spirit*, is *spirit*. It was therefore impossible for that which was *begotten* in Mary of the Holy Ghost to be *only flesh*. And if the whole of Christ's human nature was not *begotten* in

* It is worthy of observation, that as the *first man, Adam, was formed before his soul*, (Gen. ii. 7,) so the *non-existence* of Christ's human soul previous to his *incarnation* is in perfect accordance with the whole of the divine testimony. Again, the *procession of the Son of God* is mentioned and described as the *living bread which came down from HEAVEN*; and the *procession of the Spirit* is also mentioned and described as *COMING DOWN FROM HEAVEN*: (1 Pet. i. 12.) If, therefore, the pre-existence of a human soul, or body or of a creature nature, were necessary for the ancient appearances; then, there would be the same necessity for the pre-existence of a dove, or of a creature nature, for the manifestation of the Holy Spirit!

Mary of the Holy Ghost, then, that part begotten in Mary of the Spirit *could not be flesh*.

8. Christ is not only called the *Holy One of God, and the Holy One of Israel*, but *his body*, when *in the grave*, is *expressly* called God's *Holy One*. Psalm xvi. 10. Acts ii. 31.—xiii 35. It is therefore *impossible*, according to the Scriptures, that Christ's *soul* could have pre-existed his body.

Then, what must be the awful end of these *human soul pre-existerians*, men, who *lie* against the *truth of so many Scriptures*, to support their enmity and hatred to "the pre-eternity of "the Christ of God." For after Mr. Stevens has quoted, that *the Word was made flesh*, he then boldly attacks the *previous* eternity of the Christ of God, recorded in John i. 1, in the words following, (1) "IF I SAY, THE WORD "WAS GOD, MY LANGUAGE IMPLIES, THE SAME WORD WAS IN "THE BEGINNING, AND BEFORE ALL THINGS; *but, if I say,* "the WORD was in the beginning, though my ASSERTION "DOES BY NO MEANS DENY THE WORD TO HAVE BEEN "ETERNAL, *still it will not certainly prove him eternal.* (2) "The heaven and the earth, we are told, were in the "beginning, but they are not eternal. The devil was "a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the "truth; but the devil is not eternal. He sinneth from "the beginning; but sin is not eternal. The Word "was *with* God in the beginning; but this will not prove "the same Word to have been *with* God *from eternity,* "or *without beginning.* THE SCRIPTURES NEVER USE SUCH "LANGUAGE, that I remember, TO PROVE OR EXPRESS THE "ETERNITY OF THE EVER BLESSED GOD." (S. D. 122. 123.)

In the above statement the Reader should observe, how *cunningly* Mr. Stevens has *disconnected* the *creation* of all things, from the words, *in the beginning!* No doubt he knew, that unless he kept out of sight *the connection* between *the creation of all things*, and the words, *in the beginning*, the Reader would perceive the *subtilty* which precedes *his sophisticated argument*: which *argument* concludes with another human pre-existerian *falsehood*, namely, that the Scriptures never use such language as "*in, or, from the beginning,*" to prove or express the Eternity of the *ever blessed God*: whereas the Scriptures

do use *such* language "*from the beginning,*" to express God's *eternal* choice of his people in the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians. (2 Thess. ii. 13.)

The above argument, it will be observed, commences with *subtile* queries, "*if I say,*" which Mr. *Stevens* afterwards softens with the words, "*my assertion does by no means deny the WORD to have been Eternal,* and then, he instils his poisonous words, to wit, "STILL IT WILL NOT CERTAINLY PROVE HIM ETERNAL:" Mr. *Stevens* well knows by experience, that if the *young rooks* were not deceived by serpentine queries, and sophisticated arguments, they would refuse to eat the *deadly food* he had prepared, and *poisoned* with an *awful lie*, namely, "*that the Scriptures never use such language as, 'in, or, from the beginning,' to prove or express the Eternity of the ever blessed God.*" Indeed, if we are not to understand by the words, "*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,*" that God is *Eternal* and without beginning, what are we to understand? For the Creator in the beginning must be before the beginning of creation, and, therefore, self-existent. But as the plainest method of exposing Mr. *John Stevens'* sophistry is by parallel readings, I shall place his *depraved* argument upon John i. 1—3, in juxta position with the same argument applied to Gen. i. 1, 2, that the Reader may perceive the human pre-existerian enmity to "*the Christ of God*" although concealed under the cloak of smooth words, to wit, "*my assertion does by no means deny the WORD to have been eternal.*"

*The Human Pre-existerian's
depraved argument on John
i. 1—3.*

"If I say the Word was God, my language implies the same Word was in the beginning, and before all things; but if I say, the Word was in the beginning, though my assertion does by no means deny the Word to have been eternal, still it certainly will

*The Human pre-existerian's
argument applied to Gen. i.
1, 2.*

If I say God was the Spirit, my language implies the same God was in the beginning, and before all things; but if I say, God was in the beginning, though my assertion does by do means deny God to have been eternal, still it certainly will not prove

"not prove him eternal. The
 "heaven and the earth, we are
 "told were in the beginning,
 "but they are not eternal. The
 "devil was a murderer from
 "the beginning, and abode not
 "in the truth; but the devil is
 "not eternal. He sinneth from
 "the beginning; but sin is not
 "eternal. The Word was with
 "God in the beginning; but
 "this will not prove the same
 "Word to have been with God
 "from eternity, or without be-
 "ginning. The Scriptures
 "never use such language, that
 "I remember, to prove or ex-
 "press the eternity of the ever
 "blessed God." (S. D. 122,
 123)

him eternal. The heaven and
 the earth, we are told were in
 the beginning, but they are not
 eternal. The devil was a mur-
 derer from the beginning, and
 abode not in the truth; but the
 devil is not eternal. He sinneth
 from the beginning; but sin is
 not eternal. God was
 with the Spirit in the begin-
 ning; but this will not prove
 the same God to have been
 with the Spirit from eternity, or
 without beginning. The Scrip-
 tures never use such language,
 that I remember, to prove or
 express the eternity of the ever
 blessed SPIRIT.

The above reasoning applied to Genesis i. 1, 2, is
 so evident a proof, that freethinkers are reasoners and
 not believers, that I would merely observe, Mr. *Stevens'*
 argument doth extend to make *the heavens and the
 earth in the beginning, and the Word in the beginning, and
 God in the beginning, all co-eval!* But the devil is said
 to have *sinned FROM the beginning*, then, by Mr. *Stevens'*
 argument, the *devil* pre-existed *both the Word and God*;
 for if the devil sinned *from the beginning*, and God, and the
 Word, were only *in the beginning*, then, as the devil *sinned
 FROM THE beginning*, the *devil* according to Mr. *Stevens'*
 reasoning, must have pre-existed the beginning, and have
 pre-existed the WORD, &c. Surely, all such *intellectual* rea-
 soning proves the *carnal mind* to be enmity against God!
 In truth, the words, "In the beginning God created," would
 be quite unintelligible, if we did not thereby understand
 the *previous* eternity of God, or of the Spirit of God,
 which moved upon the face of the waters, or the *previous*
 eternity of the Word of God, who said, let there be light,
 and there was light.

Dr. *Abbadie* in that treatise, which Mr. *Stevens*
 admits to be *masterly*, observes, "It was never said of
 "any man that appeared in the world, 'He was made

“*flesh* ;’ such a way of speaking *being absurd*. Yet, if “we believe our opponents, this is the meaning of ‘*the Word was made flesh*.’ But was it ever said, ‘The King was made flesh.—The Emperor was made flesh? Was it ever said, by the Holy Spirit, such a prophet, or such an apostle, was made flesh? Nor does it avail their (the human pre-existerians) cause to render the text, *He was flesh*. For such a way of speaking is not more proper, and is equally unknown to both human and divine language.” And I may add, it never was said of a *created Angel* or of a *created spirit*, that it was made flesh! It must therefore follow, that the phrase, “*In the beginning*,” mentioned in John i. 1—3, and Genesis i. 1, is evidently used in the same sense as in Psalm cii. and Heb. i. 10. *Thou Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth.* &c., which sets forth the *previous* eternity of the *Christ of God*.

The Holy Spirit testifies that the Word in the beginning *was God*, which certainly implies, that the same Word was not only in the beginning, but *is* before all things; and that the same Word was *eternal*, because the *Word was God*, and *God was eternal*. This testimony the Holy Spirit confirms, in the first Epistle of John, for therein he declares the *Word was that eternal life, which was with the Father*, (1 John i. 2.) The Word was *with* God, and the same Word was eternal life *with* the Father, and not *eternal life* from the Father, for the Word was God, and the Word was eternal life. And as Mr. *John Stevens* says, “*that whatever began to be, however ancient that thing may be, it cannot be eternal*; (S. D. 203,) therefore, he must admit, that as *our Christ*, the Word, was eternal life, *it did not begin to be!*

Again, The Holy Spirit has used the words, “*from the beginning*” to express God’s *eternal* choice of his people: and as in Gen. i. 1, the Holy Spirit has expressly used the words, “*in the beginning*,” to express that God, “*in the beginning*,” who created the heavens and the earth, must have existed *before* the beginning of creation, and was eternal. (Gen. i. 1,) So in John i. 1—3, the Holy Spirit testifies, that God was the Word, by whom all things were made. And as none but God is uncreated, so none but God

could create all things; and as the Word created all things; therefore the Word *in the beginning* was God, and *no creature!*

But in Mr. Stevens' attack upon the pre-eterernity of *the Christ of God*, we perceive he could not leave the words "*in the beginning*," at the commencement of the gospel penned by the evangelist John, to their evident meaning, namely, to *the beginning of creation*, without exercising his carnal reason against the self-existence of the uncreated Word. But to support *Mr. Stevens' human soul LIE*, the Reader will perceive there was a necessity for *Mr. Stevens* to pervert the plain meaning of this Scripture, and to represent the uncreated Word as a complex person in the beginning: and also to deny God's eternal choice of his people in Christ, because, as the human pre-existerian Christ *only* began to be in the beginning, therefore, there was no human pre-existerian Christ previously for God to choose them in. But *Mr. Stevens* infers, because the *devil was a murderer from the beginning*, and not eternal, therefore, the WORD is a complex person from the the beginning, and according to his human pre-existerian argument, and his interpretation of the word *beginning*, the *devil* and the WORD were both in the beginning: but as the devil sinned "*from the beginning*," the devil, according to Mr. Stevens' argument, must have been before the beginning, and must have pre-existed THE WORD! But so far is Mr. Stevens' argument from the truth, that Dr. Doddridge observes, "the order of the words in the original, (Theos ēn o Logos) John i. 1, are such, that some have thought the clause might more exactly be translated, GOD WAS THE WORD." The chief objection against this interpretation is, that in the Greek the article is added to the word God to determine, as it is thought, the nominative case, and in that case it expressly declares, The WORD was God; but if the Greek article be rendered *that*, as it might have been, then the passage may be correctly rendered, "In the beginning was *that* WORD, and *that* Word was with God, and God was *that* Word!"

But Mr. *John Stevens* further states, that the term WORD, and WORD OF GOD, can be no expression of our

Lord's Divinity, (S. D. 128.) What then? Are we to understand, that the *word of God* signifies the *word of man*? or, what are we to understand by the *Father*, the *WORD*, and the *Holy Ghost* being *one*? (1 John v. 7.) One what? if the term *WORD* be no expression of our LORD'S Divinity! Surely, no one but a *fanatic*, or something worse, would tell such a *lie*!^a And, surely, such a *plain reason creed*, which can only be supported by *lies*, must have the *devil* for its father. But, if the term, "*WORD OF GOD*," (1 Kings xii. 22,) does not mean *GOD THE WORD*, then the Socinians may contend that the expression "*the SPIRIT OF GOD*," (Gen. i. 1, 2,) does not mean *GOD THE SPIRIT*, because Mr. *Stevens'* reasoning upon the words "*in the beginning*" may be applied by Socinians, to the *Spirit of God* in Gen. i. 1, 2.

To shew the *depravity* of the human pre-existerians, and the sophistry of their arguments, I shall apply Mr. *John Stevens'* reasoning, whereby he would prove the term *WORD OF GOD*, can be no expression of our LORD'S Divinity, in juxta-position with the same reasoning, why the term *SPIRIT OF GOD* can be no expression of the Holy Spirit's Divinity.

Mr. John Stevens' reason, why the term Word, and Word of God, can be no expression of our Lord's divinity. 1 Kings xii. 22.

"I next inquire why our *Lord is called the Word*, and "*the Word of God*. The term "*itself CAN BE NO EXPRESSION OF HIS DIVINITY*, though the "*person is expressly called*, "*God over all, for ever blessed*.

Mr. John Stevens' reason applied, why the term Spirit of God can be no expression of the Holy Spirit's Divinity. Gen. i. 1, 2.

I next inquire why the *Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God*. The term *itself* can be *no expression of his Divinity*, though the person so named is expressly called *God*. We may, however, here notice, that

^a I would here request the Reader to pause for a moment, and say; whether Mr. *John Stevens* is not conscious, that he was *lying* when he said, "*the term WORD, and WORD OF GOD, can be no expression of Christ's 'divinity.'*" For if he is not conscious that he was *lying*; how came he to make the 7th verse of the 5th chapter of the first Epistle of John, the *third article of faith* to be BELIEVED by *his Church* under *his care*? (A. F. 3.) Did he do so, to make *his young rooks* believe he was no fanatic? or to induce the *silly doves* into a belief, that he was not something worse than *harmless*? If Mr. *Stevens* be not a *fanatic*, he must be regardless of truth; for otherwise, he would not say, and forsay: no man ever did so, except he were a *fanatic*, or something worse!

"We may, however, here notice, that John is speaking of the Divinity of him that is called the *Word*, for he positively declares the *Word was God*. So that we have, first, the *Word in God without beginning*: secondly, the *Word with God in the beginning*: and, thirdly, the *Word from God after the beginning, or in the fulness of time*. The *Word*, considered as a Divine Person in Deity, is eternal and without beginning, and so was God, before he was the pre-existing *Word with God*: and his personal divinity is made the foundation of his mediatorial glory. But when we speak of the *pre-existence* or *antiquity* of the *Word*, we mean to predicate these things of the humanity, as being the first born of every creature; and the beginning of the creation of God. Yet, we attribute these things to his person also, because we believe the *Word* to be God and man in one Christ. And the production of the soul of our Lord, as the first born of Divine power, was the birth of *time*. But how long before our world was formed, revelation does not declare, any more than it tells us, how long Adam stood an innocent man; or why our Saviour did not take flesh of the Virgin, till the world had been standing four thousand years, &c. We are not to deny what is revealed, because we cannot tell why some particulars are not revealed." S. D. 126, 127.

Moses is speaking of the Divinity of him that is called the *Spirit*, for he positively declares the *Spirit God* (Ruach Alehim.) So that we have, first, the *Spirit in God without beginning*: secondly, the *Spirit with God in the beginning*: and thirdly, the *Spirit from God after the beginning, when he moved upon the face of the waters*. The *Spirit*, considered as a Divine Person in Deity, is eternal without beginning, and so was God, before he was the pre-existing *Spirit with God*: and his personal divinity is made the foundation of his *paraclete* glory. But when we speak of the *pre-existence* or *antiquity* of the *Spirit*, we mean to predicate these things of the *dove moving upon the face of the waters from the beginning of the creation of God*, as being the first born of every creature, and the beginning of the creation. Yet, we attribute these things to his person also, because we believe the *Spirit* to be God, and a *dove* in one Holy Ghost. And the production of the *dove* of our Lord, as the first born of Divine power, was the birth of *time*. But how long before our world was formed, revelation does not declare, any more than it tells us, how long Adam stood an innocent man; or why the *Spirit* did not appear in a bodily shape of a *dove*, till the world had been standing four thousand years, &c. We are not to deny what is revealed, because we cannot tell why some particulars are not revealed.

Such is the nature and tendency of Mr. *Stevens'* depraved *arguments*, which the human pre-existerians with all their subtilty produce, in support of their *perversion* of Holy Scripture. Or to use Mr. *John Stevens'* own words, "*Thus to write, is to render the Bible ridiculous; to confound absurdity with mystery, and HOLD OUT ENCOURAGEMENT TO INFIDELS. For what intelligent being can admit the Maker of the universe to be the author of the Bible, if it be supposed to maintain absurdities? It is indeed, fraught with mystery, but it utterly disowns absurdity.*" (C. F. i. 10.) For, nothing can be more *absurd* than the assertion, that the **MAKER** of the universe, the **WORD** was God, and a human soul **WITHOUT A BODY**, like a dead man in the beginning; grieving and repenting like a human soul in purgatory. Yet, this is Mr. *John Stevens'* plain reason creed, who has all the **REASON** in the world. (S. D. 16.)

It is a fact worthy to be recorded, that the first verse of the first Chapter of the Gospel penned by John was by the Holy Spirit made use of to convert one *Francis Junius*, an eminent Scholar from *infidelity*.^a for the words in John i. 1, 2, 3, declare, that without the **WORD** was not *any thing* made, not so much as *one single being*. For there is an emphasis in the original text, which Dr. *Doddridge* observes, *than which nothing can be more literal*. And if Mr. *Stevens* did really believe the Scriptures were strictly true and perfectly consistent, he would not have closed his *vile* comment on the *three* first verses of the first chapter of the Gospel penned by John, in the following words; "*The Scriptures never use such language, that I remember, to prove or express the eternity of the ever blessed God:*" for the Holy Spirit hath used such language, to express the *eternity* of the ever blessed God's election; as it is written, "*God hath FROM THE BEGINNING chosen you, (the Church in God) to salvation,*" 2 Thess. ii. 13. And as God is of *one mind*, so God's election is declared to be *eternal*, "*according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father.*" 1 Pet. i. 2. And as they are chosen **IN CHRIST** from the beginning, *such language is used* by the Holy Spirit to express God's *eternal choice according to his foreknowledge*: and so the "**WORD OF LIFE**," who is de-

^a See Dr. Owen's works. Vol. viii. 299.

clared to be "ETERNAL LIFE" with the Father, is said to be "*from the beginning.*" (1 John i. 1,) and before all time; therefore, the words, "*from the beginning,*" are used to express the eternity of the ever blessed God's election, and also, the eternity of Christ the uncreated Word, in whom they were chosen! And here I take leave to remind the young rooks, that their *old dam*, the *Perverter of I Am*, acknowledges, "a *term*, or a *phrase of words* when used of God may be understood to denote eternity, "which, when referred to a creature, only signifies antiquity." See Note ante, page 35, (1 Let. p. 41.) And therefore, the conclusion, which the understanding of the Perverter of *I Am* came to, was a *delusion*, for he said, "*the only way of understanding the Apostle is, to consider the Word as a complex agent, human and divine.*"

The human pre-existerians assert' "that, *the production of the soul of our Lord as the first born of Divine power, was the birth of time. But how long before our world was formed, revelation does not declare.*" (S. D. 126.) This is another LIE, for our Lord declared to Moses that in six days, *Jehovah made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them is*; and if the *human soul of our Lord* pre-existed, and spake to Moses on the mount, as *Mr. Stevens* says it did, then this *human soul* must have been *one of the all things, which, our Lord then declared, JEHOVAH had made in six days*: (Exod. xx. 11,) because, if the *human soul of our Lord* spake to Moses on the Mount, then, this *human soul* was one of the all things in earth; and if this *human soul* spake to Moses from heaven, then, this *human soul* was one of the all things in heaven, which *JEHOVAH* made in the six days: therefore, *Mr. Stevens'* assertion is FALSE!!!

Satan is a *subtile foe*. He knows all intellectual creatures are under the law of God, and bound to obey the law; and that no creature could *create all things*: and that no creature could *undertake to obey* the law for others, which, as a creature, it must have been bound to *obey* for itself. The enmity, therefore, of the Serpent to the seed of the woman is manifested in Satan's setting up a pre-existent human soul without a body, before all other creatures, a human soul which could not be

the eternal surety of a better covenant, because it was not *eternal* and without beginning! A human soul which was created under the law of its Creator, and bound to obey the law for itself; and, therefore, could not be made under the law for others by taking *a body not subject to moral obligation*. (2 Let. 45.)

But the human pre-existerians have been obliged to invent another *lie* to support their *rage* against *the Christ of God*. For they not only declare their *human soul Christ without a body*, to be the beginning of the creation of God, the **FIRST PRODUCTION OF DIVINE POWER**, and *the birth of Time*, but they say, it pre-existed *for time unknown*: (C. F. i. 3,) whereby they shew their contempt of God's *Holy law*. Some of them profess the law to be their rule of life, but their contempt for God's revealed account of the creation *in six days*, shews the true nature of *their* regard to God's law: for as they do not believe *the LORD created all things in the first six days* of time, it would be absurd to believe they can have any real regard to the *fourth commandment*.

I Am the Alpha and the Omega, the **BEGINNING** and the **ENDING**, *saith the LORD*. Rev. i. 8. But in the human pre-existerian creed, the *human soul* is the *beginning*, and a *nurse child*, the *first born of divine power*, and *the birth of time*.^a (S. D. 141, 120. 126.) Now as Christ is the

^a The Holy Spirit testifies, that *our Christ* is the archē, the *author*, and **THE WAY**, (John xiv. 6,) **THE WAY EVERLASTING**, and therefore **HE IS NOT Behemoth which eateth grass like an ox**, which in Mr. Stevens' revered Bible, the Septuagint, is called (archē) the *beginning of the things formed of God*, and which answers to Mr. Stevens' description of his *human soul Christ*, for he calls him *the first production of divine power*. (C. F. i. 34.) Whereas *our Christ* is the *way everlasting*, he is therefore without *beginning of days!* (Heb. vii. 3.) But Mr. Stevens, when speaking of his Christ as the *beginning*, forms a *syllogism*, by which *syllogism* he proves his Christ to be *Behemoth, the Great Beast, which eateth grass like an ox*, for he declares the *first born of every creature* to mean the *first created creature*: (C. F. i. 30,) which according to Mr. Stevens' revered Bible, the *Septuagint*, and to which he refers as *his authority*, is the *great beast Behemoth*. I shall first quote Mr. Stevens' *syllogism*, and then apply his *syllogism* to *Behemoth*, for his *syllogisms*, in the human pre-existerian religion, are *heavy things to toss out of the way*. Mr. Stevens says, "He, who is the beginning, is the man, Christ Jesus," and then he gives us the following human pre-existerian *syllogism*. "He, who is the beginning, is the beginning of Jehovah's way; but Jesus is the beginning; therefore, Jesus Christ is the beginning of Jehovah's way." (C, F. 31.) Second *Syllogism*. Christ's

ending as well as the *beginning*, it must follow, according to Mr. Stevens' plain reason creed, that as the words, in the *beginning*, signify in Mr. Stevens' creed, the *beginning* of Christ and of his human soul, (S. D. 120, 190,) and the *beginning* of the *Sonship* of Christ, and of the *Paternity* of the Father, and of the name of the Holy Spirit; (Rhy. C. F. i. 47.—ii. 4, 43,) so the word, *ending*, in Mr. Stevens' creed, must signify the *ending* of his Christ, and of his *human soul*, and also the *ending* of the *Sonship* of Christ, and of the *Paternity* of the Father, and of the *name* of the Holy Spirit: indeed Mr. Stevens declares, those *official characters assumed* are hereafter to be *for ever laid aside as no more needful*. (S. D. 252.) So that, there will be no more *Father*, and *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, for as their human soul *Christ* had a *beginning*, so he will have an *ending*.^a But, in all this *vile doctrine*, Mr. Stevens assures us, he has a **PLAIN REASON** for the names *Father and Son*, (S. D. 30,) in his **REASONABLE scriptural display** of his nondescript *Triune God with assumed names*, and of the early existence, or *beginning* of Jesus' human soul; a Christ that, he says, *lost all its ideas and faculties at its first union to a body of flesh*, that was *disappointed*, and was for a season incapable of governing the nation of Israel, and of transacting the affairs of the Church. (S. D. 200. 201.) And this is the *vile doctrine*, for which Mr. John Stevens pleads; and which, he admits, *the household of faith have boldly asserted, is heresy*: (S. D. 121.) and which doctrine, Mr. Stevens has since declared, *is no matter of faith*; (S. J. 93.) but which he, nevertheless, the *human soul without a body*, the *great soul* of the *Lamb*, is the human pre-existerian's notion of the beginning of Jehovah's way; but *Behemoth* the great beast is, in Mr. Stevens' *revised bible*, the beginning of the ways of God; therefore, *Behemoth*, the great beast, is the human pre-existerian's *human soul Christ*. Here, Reader, you have a *sylogistic display* of Mr. Stevens' intellectuality; for his *reason* looks at things *temporal*, a *temporal Christ*; but *faith* looks at things **ETERNAL**, at Christ the **ETERNAL** Rock. Therefore, the human pre-existerian Christ is not *the Christ of God*.

^a Some of Mr. Stevens' disciples may say, that Mr. Stevens is not such a *fanatic* as to believe what he has *written* upon the word *archē*, *beginning*; neither do they; although many have been misled by his *perverse interpretation* thereof! Then why did Mr. Stevens not notice that *our Lord* is the *ending* as well as the *beginning*? And why should Mr. Stevens shew such a disregard to the word *is (esti)* in Col. i. 17, 18. Or, why did Mr. Stevens pervert the *present tense* into the *past*, when applied to Christ? for which he has no example, except in the writings of *infidels*.

less, induces some *silly doves* to believe, *by giving heed to the seductions of men, and the doctrines of devils*. Surely, Mr. *Stevens* must be a *fanatic*, or something worse.

As Mr. *Stevens* admits, that some of the household of faith have boldly asserted, that the doctrine for which he pleads, is heresy, a doctrine, which he admits, is no matter of faith. I shall close this chapter upon this part of his *heresy*, with the opinions of some of the household of faith, upon the meaning of the words *beginning*, and *ending*, when applied to Christ in the Holy Scriptures.

Dr. *Hawker*. "It would seem, that no sooner had the beloved Apostle ended his rapturous expressions, but Jesus instantly said, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending*, saith the Lord. (Rev. i. 8.) *Thrice* in this Chapter, here, and again at the 11th and 17th verses, the Lord Jesus takes to himself these characters of distinction; and, to confirm it yet more finally and fully, in the last chapter of this book of the revelation, as if to leave the impression in full force upon the minds of his people through all ages of his Church, he repeats those names, and puts the whole together; *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last*. Rev. xxii. 13."—"Such being the well known characters *distinguishing Jehovah from all his creatures*; the Apostle, as the Prophets before had been blessed with revelation from the Lord, became the better prepared to receive the message which followed." We find a similarity of expression used by Jehovah, to the prophet Isaiah; "*Who hath wrought and done it; calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord; the FIRST and with the LAST; I am HE!*" (Isa. xli. 4.) So again, (Isa. xliv. 6.) "*Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts: I am the FIRST, and I am the LAST; and beside me there is no God.*" And if these Scriptures be read with an eye to what the same beloved Apostle John saith; (1 John v. 20,) what a beautiful light is thrown thereby on each other! Surely such characters of Godhead need no comment.

Dr. *Guyse's* comment on Rev. i. 8. "To add the greater weight to those things, for the terror of his

“enemies, and the support and comfort of true believers, “he, who is to come in all this majesty and glory, said of “himself, (ver. 11, 17, and chap. xxii. 12, 13.) I am “from eternity to eternity, and also the AUTHOR and FIN- “ISHER* of the works of providence and grace.” And on Rev. iii. 14. “The things contained herein are what “he says, whose name is emphatically the Amen, as he “is the faithful witness, (chap. i. 5,) and is TRUTH itself, “and infallible true in the testimony he bears concern- “ing all things whatsoever, and particularly those which “are contained in the prophecies of this book; and he is “able to perform them, as he is the AUTHOR, Prince, and “Ruler of all the creatures in heaven, and on earth, “that God has made by him.”^b (Heb. i. 2.)

Dr. Doddridge on Rev. i. 8. “I am the Alpha and “Omega, *the beginning and the end*: I was before all “worlds, and shall continue the same, when all the revo- “lutions of this world are over, and the final scenes re- “lating to it shall be concluded. I am the First and the “Last; I am HE, saith the Lord *Jehovah*, who is, and who “was, and who is to come, the *eternal and unchangeable*, “the *Almighty AUTHOR, supporter, and disposer of all “things.*”

And on Rev. iii. 14. “And *to the Angel of the Church “which is in Laodicea, write these things, saith he, who is “the Amen, the faithful and true witness*; attesting these “truths, which are of the utmost importance, having the “most perfect knowledge of them, and with most unerr- “ing exactness; yea, he, who is *the beginning of the cre- “ation of God, BY WHOM IT WAS PRODUCED.*”

Dr. Gill on Col. i. 18. “*Who is the beginning*;^c which

* The Greek word rendered *beginning* in Col. i. 18, and Rev. iii. 14, and also in Rev. i. 18. xxii. 13, is *radically* the same Greek word rendered *author* in Heb. xii. 2,; and the Greek word rendered *ending* in Rev. i. 18, xxii. 14, is *radically* the same Greek word rendered *finisher* in Heb. xii. 2.

^b Mr. Robert Fleming a *Pre-existerian*, renders *archē* of the creation of God, “*The efficient cause of God’s creation.*”

^c Christ is *before all things*, (Col. i. 17,) and Christ is *the beginning* (Col. i. 18,) if these words related to *creature existence*, the Scripture would have been, *who was before all things*, and *who was the beginning*; for we never say of a pre-existent creature, *he is*, but, *he was*, before such a thing.

“denotes the eternity of Christ, who was not only in the beginning, and was set up from everlasting, but *is also the beginning and the end*; and who is indeed without beginning of days, or end of life.”

And on Rev. i. 8. “*The beginning and the ending*; the *Alexandrian* copy, the *Complutensian* edition, the *Syriac* and *Ethiopic* versions, leave out this; which seems to be explanative of the former clause, *Alpha* being the beginning of the Alphabet, and *Omega* the ending of it: and properly belongs to Christ, who knows no beginning, nor will he have any end with respect to time, *being from everlasting to everlasting*; and agrees with him as the FIRST CAUSE of all things, both of the old and new creation, and the last *end* to which they are all referred, being made for his pleasure, honour, and glory.” Rev. iv. 11. “In Rev. xxii. 13. The *Ethiopic* version adds, *the beginning and end of days*, or time. A testimony this, of the Deity, eternity, infinity, and perfection of Christ.”

And on Rev. iii. 14. “*These things saith the Amen*; see Isa. lxxv. 16. The Word *Amen* is the name of a *Divine Person*.”—“*The beginning of the creation of God*; not the first creature that God made, but the *first cause* of the creation; the first parent, producer, and *efficient cause* of every creature; the *Author* of the old creation, who made all things out of nothing in the beginning of time: and of the new creation, &c.” According to Mr. *Hederic*, whom Mr. *Stevens* quotes as a learned and *unquestionable* authority, (S. D. 152,) the Greek word *archē* signifieth *cause* and *origin*, as well as the *beginning*.

The seed of the woman is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel. AS A SIGN, a virgin was to conceive and bear a son, and which she did, for Christ's human nature was BEGOTTEN in the *Virgin Mary* of the Holy Ghost. (Matt. i. 20.) Many will not believe in the seed of the woman, because it is so *unreasonable*: and as *unbelief* is never inactive, what in the *Holy Scriptures* they cannot comprehend, they imagine they have a right to contradict, or to *pervert*, and to *wrest* according to their depraved reason. This was the case when the *sign* was

first revealed: (Isa. vii. 14,) and the *Great Mystery of Godliness* continues to be a stone of stumbling, a rock of offence, a gin, and a snare, (Isa. viii. 13, 14,) as was spoken by the Prophet, and as *Simeon* said, for it is written; *Behold this child is set for the FALL, and rising again of many in Israel, and for a SIGN which shall be spoken against.* (Luke ii. 34.) It is become common among professors, especially the *heady and high minded*, to speak against the *Pre-eternity* of Christ, and against the *seed of the woman begotten* of the Spirit: indeed, such is *their enmity*, they would, if they could, bear down those who contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the Saints, by *vile comparisons*, by *low wit sharpened by human malice*, and by *malignant abuse*.

Some have been so bold as to try the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, and of the *procession* of the Son, and of the Spirit, by the test of *reason*, asking, how could God enter into Covenant with God? and how could God send God? they might as well have asked, how one person in the Godhead could speak what he heard another person in the Godhead declare. (John xvi. 13.) Or, how *only one person in the Godhead could be incarnate*, without dividing the Trinity in Unity? These things, as well as the procession of the Son and of the Spirit, are mysteries revealed, not for the exercise of sophistry, nor for the wit of the knave, but for the comfort and faith of God's *elect*. To the *natural man* they were to seem *foolishness itself*: then, is it any wonder, that they should meet with his opposition? The Christ of God is, therefore, to this hour, a *sign* spoken against, and is for the fall and rising again of many in Israel.

FAITH looks at things *eternal*, but *reason* looks at things *temporal*. The reader, therefore, should *watch*, lest he be beguiled by the *Korahs*, the *Dathans*, and the *Abiram*s, men of reputation amongst the people, who set up a *temporal*, or *began to be Christ*, which their *reason* looks at; and who propose a Tri-une God with *assumed names*, a began to be Father, a began to be Son, and a began to be Holy Ghost, which *their reason comprehends*, in opposition to the *eternal, incomprehensible, and immutable God of TRUTH!* Their writings upon Divine Revelation prove,