

the words, *the likeness of sinful flesh*, the *human nature* in which God sent forth his son? If Mr. *Stevens* is so opposed to the *Holy Spirit's* testimony of *man's originality*, why does not Mr. *Stevens* acknowledge *his disbelief* in the resurrection of the *body* as well as the *Swendenborgians*? Neither he, nor they, *receive* the testimony of the Holy Ghost, namely, that the resurrection **BODY** of a Saint *is the Image of the heavenly!* But Mr. *Stevens* rejects the Holy Spirit's testimony of the Image of the heavenly, therefore, we ought not to be surprized, that he should either ignorantly or wilfully contradict or pervert the *Scripture*, by declaring, that "*Christ's right as the first-born was not to arise out of the conformity of his brethren to his Image!*" (C. F. i. 34.) If Mr. *Stevens*, by the use of the word *right*, did not mean, that the *title*, first-born, constituted the *pre-eminence* of Christ, (C. F. i. 35,) his statement might be admitted: but as he means by the word *right*, that the *title*, first-born, constitutes the *pre-eminence* of Christ; we must deny it; because, it is *expressly* declared in the *believer's revered Bible* that, God's elect are *predestinated to be conformed to the Image of his Son*, for the very purpose, namely, THAT HE (Christ) MIGHT BE THE FIRST-BORN among many brethren. [Rom. viii. 29.]

12. Mr. *Stevens* says, "Christ could not be King of Kings, before there were any Kings to reign over." (C. F. i. 39.) This is *another lie!* But the *Perverter of I Am* may have such a *creed* concerning his *began to be Jesus Christ*: and if he has, we have no such depraved notion respecting the *Holy One of Israel*: for our CHRIST was the God of Israel, and the *Holy One of Israel*, before Israel was created. Our Christ is the *same* yesterday before all time, the *same* to-day throughout the whole of time, and the *same* for ever, when time shall be no longer. Heb. i. 10—12.—xiii. 8.

13. There is one important truth which must now be noticed, namely, that Mr. *Stevens' fanciful* Christ was not, neither was it possible for him to be, the Christ of God, the *first-born among many brethren*, because, Mr. *Stevens* admits, *his Christ*, his *literal born-first*, was *like Reuben unstable as water*; for when born of Mary, he had neither *excellency of dignity*, nor *excellency of strength*:

he says, "*it lost all its vast treasures of ideas, and its extensive faculties, at its first union to a body of flesh,*" (S. D. 200,) that it was *disappointed by*, to use his own words, *the withdrawal of the Spirit's influence*: (S. D. 201,) and, therefore, Mr. Stevens' *DISAPPOINTED man Christ* was then vastly inferior in dignity and in strength to John the Baptist, who was FULL OF THE HOLY GHOST from his mother's womb! I hope the Reader will not overlook this part of *the human pre-existerian creed*, for a man must be *strongly deluded*, who believes in such a *lie*.^a

Beloved, saith John, *believe not every spirit*, but try the spirits whether they are of God: *because many* (not a few) *false prophets* are gone out into the world. In trying, therefore, the human pre-existerian prophets we have found them to be *liars!* and *false prophets* in holy Scripture language are called *forgers of lies*.^b They acknowledge themselves to be *lovers of their creed*—a creed of lies!—In their writings we may perceive their natural consciences accusing them: and by their arguments we may perceive, whilst endeavouring to deceive their fellow creatures, they are excusing themselves. Such in part is the *positive* evil of sin, that one *deceived* or *deluded* sinner would, if he could, *delude others to their damnation*: he endeavours to *deceive* others whilst *sporting himself with his own deceivings*. In that solemn discourse

^a The Persians have a mediator, whom they call Mithras. The Roman Catholics as well as the heathens have many mediators. The Sabellians have a mediator! The Arians have a mediator! And the human soul pre-existerians have a mediator. But such mediators are the inventions of men: not one of them is the *Eternal Mediator, Surety, and Testator*, of the everlasting covenant. The Persians acknowledge the *Godhead* of their Mithras. And the Arians and human soul pre-existerians acknowledge the *Godhead* of their *began to be* Jesus Christ: but *their Christ* is not our Lord Jesus Christ; for our Lord is the *true Melchisedec without beginning of days*, (Heb. vii. 3,) *the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever*: (Heb. xiii. 8.) The Christ of God *waxeth not old*, but the human soul pre-existerians' Christ *groweth old*. (Heb. i. 10—12. Psalm cii. 25—27.)

^b When our Lord was reviled, he reviled not again, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps. But when the testimony from God was perverted by the testimony of men, our Lord called them *liars*, and said, they were of their father the devil: for *sin is exceeding sinful*, and, therefore, cannot be expressed in words too plain, to shew forth the *damnable* consequences of loving and making a *lie*. The stoical *antinomians* may be offended at such *plainness of speech*, who cry peace, peace, when there is no peace; but there can be no *peace* or *alliance* between *truth* and *error*.

which our Lord had with the Jews, when he said, “*if ye believe not THAT I AM, ye shall die in your sins,*” he said, “*ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth: BECAUSE THERE IS NO TRUTH IN HIM, WHEN HESPEAKETH A LIE, HE SPEAKETH OF HIS OWN; FOR HE IS A LIAR, AND THE FATHER OF IT.* (John viii. 24, 44.) Reader, observe, our Lord declares the devil to be the *father of lies*, and that those Jews, who did not believe him to be I AM, were the children of the devil: Yet, the *piety* of those Jews was considered to be above suspicion, they were considered to be God’s *first-born*, literally *born first*. It becomes us, therefore, to remember, that Christ *declares*, he receives not *testimony from man*, but *from God*. (John v. 34.) For, if the *testimony of man* be not the testimony from God, *it is a lie*: and a *lie* is damnable, for the devil is the father of it: and such a *lie* is the human soul pre-existerian doctrine. Indeed, Mr. *Stevens admits his creed IS NOT REVEALED*, in other words, that *it is not the testimony from God*, but a testimony *from man*! But whilst I am thus exposing the human pre-existerian lies, be it remembered, that my object is not to *damn* poor deluded *intellectual*^a creatures, but to save them *with fear*: and by telling them the truth *to pull them out of the fire*. (Jude 17—23.)

I might multiply evidences, if it were necessary, in proof, that the human pre-existerians are either *fanatics*, or something worse: but ample evidence has been produced in proof, that the *leaven* of the human pre-existerians is the *leaven of hypocrisy*! And if the *human pre-existerians* did not mix some truth with *their lies*, no one would swallow *their deadly leaven*. But the Reader shall have further *evidence*,^b how the word *prōtotokos*, is *per-*

^a The Greek word rendered *sensual* in James iii. 15, and in the 19th verse of *Jude*, is literally *soul*, a word used by Mr. Stevens to convey his notion of *our Christ*, whom he nicknames, “*God man intellectual*,” (C. F. i. 4,) “*in whom*, he says, *was contained a fulness of rational and intellectual*, or *SOUL LIGHT*: (He. 142,) but which in Scripture is declared to be, that *wisdom which descendeth NOT from above*! Therefore, in Mr. *Stevens’ Christ* was contained the *fulness* of that *soul wisdom* which descendeth *not from above*! But our Christ is the *wisdom of God*, a *quickenning spirit*!

^b Whilst Mr. *Stevens pretends* to give the *fullest evidence*, how the word *prōtotokos* is applied by the inspired writers, he *craftily* withholds

verted by the human pre-existerians, and how it is applied by the inspired writers!

SECONDLY. That Our Lord Jesus Christ is not *every* creature's *first-born*! Therefore, if the word *prōtotokos* in Colosians i. 15, be read with the accent upon the second syllable; *pasēs ktiseōs* in this scripture, cannot mean *every creature* in an *unlimited* sense.

1. The Greek word *prōtotokos* with the accent upon the second syllable, Mr. *Stevens* admits, is rendered *first born* or *first-begotten*. (S. D. 151.) And as the words *every creature* include *Adam* and *Eve*, it would therefore unquestionably follow, that unless Christ be the *first-born* or *first-begotten of Adam and Eve*, he cannot be *literally* the *first-born of every creature*. Surely, no human pre-existerian will deny, that the words *every creature* include *Adam* and *Eve*; or that *Cain* was *literally* the *first-born of mankind*; therefore, as Christ is not the first-born of *Adam* and *Eve*, Christ cannot be *literally* the *first-born*, or *first-begotten of every creature*.^a

2. The Greek words, *prōtotokos pasēs ktiseōs* cannot be literally rendered either *the first created of God*, or the *first-born of God*, for *pasēs ktiseōs* never mean *God*! Mr. *Stevens*, therefore, justly asserts, that "the *first-born* means "one among many who are born;" accordingly, he says, "we read of the *first-born of Pharaoh*; as a man and as "a monarch." (C. F. i. 22.) By which he admits, as plain as words can express, that the *first-born* of *Pharaoh* was of the nature of *Pharaoh*, and born after *Pharaoh*: therefore, if Christ be *literally* the first-born of every creature, he must have the nature of every creature, and be born after every kind of creature! But was Christ the first-born of angels, &c.? or had Christ the nature of *fish*, or of *beasts*, or of *insects*? or the *flesh* of fish, or of birds? the fact, that the *female first born*, was neither *the chief-born*, nor a type of Christ.

^a If Mr. *Stevens* had declared the true literal and spiritual import of the *first-born son*, was *chief born*, instead of *born first*, he would have been supported by all the godly: for they never questioned Christ's personal pre-eminence, namely, that he is verily, *the chief born of every creature*! But Mr. *Stevens*' ignorance of the *image of the heavenly*, as well as his fear of being known to be a *preacher of another gospel: which is not another gospel*, may have hardened his heart, and he may be insensible to the awful denunciations pronounced upon all the preachers of a counterfeit gospel. Galatians i. 6-9.

Surely, no one, but a *fanatic*, will venture to say, that Christ had *the nature of every creature*: then, as Christ had not the nature of every creature; therefore Christ is not literally *every creature's first-born*, or *the first-born of every creature*.

3. Although Christ is not literally, *every creature's first-born*, yet he is the *seed of the woman*, the *first-born of Mary a Virgin*. Mr. Stevens says, "Of Mary, it is said, she brought forth her *first-born* son: and called his name Jesus. Here (he says) the word (*first-born*) must mean "the *first brought forth from the same parents*." (Matt. i. 25.—Luke ii. 7.) From this *plain* and *simple* argument it is evident, that the first-born of Mary a Virgin, means Mary's first-born, which did not pre-exist *Mary*. This fact may be proved by a human pre-existerian syllogism. "The mother pre-exists her offspring; Christ's human nature is the offspring of Mary; therefore, Mary pre-existed Christ's human nature." And this *plain* and *simple* argument also proves, if Christ be the first-born of every creature, that, Christ's creature nature could not pre-exist every creature: this *truth* may be established by *three* human pre-existerian syllogisms. "The first-born of a creature is the offspring of a creature; Christ is the first-born of *Mary* a creature; therefore, Christ is the offspring of a creature." (2) The *first-born* of a creature has a creature pre-existent for its parent; Christ is the first-born of a creature; therefore, a creature parent pre-existed Christ as the first-born of a creature." (3.) The first-born of a creature is literally *the offspring of a creature*; Christ is *literally* the first-born of every creature; therefore Christ is *the offspring of every creature*." Now, these human pre-existerian syllogisms, Mr. Stevens declares, are *heavy things to toss out of the way*: and, therefore, the words *first-born of every creature*, cannot be *literally* understood and applied to *our Christ*; because *our Christ is not the offspring of every creature*.

4. *The first-born of every creature*, LITERALLY UNDERSTOOD, must be *of the creatures*; Mr. Stevens says, *he must be a creature*: (E. S. 36,) that is to say, he must be a creature with the nature of every creature to be the *first-born*

of every creature. But if the *first-born of a creature must be a creature*, it is impossible that all created things could be created by such a creature. This is evident to all persons who are not *fanatics*, or *Atheists*. But as *by faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the (rēmati) word of God*, and not by the word of a human soul, or by a creature, so *the things which are seen were not made of pre-existent matter, or made by a creature.* (Heb. xi. i. 3.) And it is expressly revealed in Col. i. 15, 16, that *by the prōtotokos of every creature all things were created*; Christ, therefore, cannot be *literally understood to be a pre-existent creature who created all things*; but the UNCREATED WORD of God, who spake, and it was done; because no *pre-existent creature, or a creature of a creature, can be the Creator of all things.*

5. As the *context* declares the *prōtotokos* of every creature to be the Creator of all things; then, Christ could not be a creature pre-existing *all things*, because *all things include the whole creation of God*, of which Christ's human nature *forms* a part.

6. *Prōtotokos* was originally written without an accent; for the accents, it is universally admitted, have been added to the Original Text since the days of the Apostles; and therefore, we have a right, and indeed we ought to remove, the accent from the *second* syllable upon this word whenever it appears from the context, that the accent has been mis-placed: for instance, in Col. i. 15, 16, the accent upon the *second* syllable of the word *prōtotokos*, makes a creature, born of a creature, to be the Creator of all things, which is perfectly ridiculous. And as the accent upon the *second* syllable of the word *prōtotokos* in Col. i. 15, gives a *Sabellian*, and an *Arian* interpretation to the text, and makes the *Bible strictly untrue*, as well as *inconsistent with the context*; we are surely justified by *revelation*, and by the *context*, to remove the accent to the *third* syllable. But for so doing, Dr. *John Gill* and *others* are denominated *quibblers* by Mr. *Stevens*: he even compares them to *drowning men taking hold of a straw!* In such vile comparisons we have the evidence of that *secret enmity*, which all human pre-existerians have to the *true disciples of Immanuel*. Thus the *enmity of Mr.*

Stevens shews itself, when he is opposed in his wicked attempt to destroy, or pervert, the genuine meaning of those Scriptures, which testify of the Previous Eternity of Christ.

THIRDLY. If the word *prōtotokos* be read in Col. i. 15, 16, with the accent upon the *third* syllable, then the description of Christ, the Creator of all things, in this Scripture is strictly true and perfectly consistent.

1. Mr. *Stevens* admits, that the original text will not allow the translation to be, *the first-born before all the creation.* (S. D. 150.) This is a just observation: for as the context declares, that the *prōtotokos* of every creature is the *Creator* of every creature, it must follow, that the person spoken of is *without beginning*; and the true Melchisedec is *without beginning of days.* (Heb. vii. 3.)

2. *Prōtotokos pasēs ktiseōs* cannot be rendered the *first-born of God*, because, in that case, *freethinkers* might say, that the Holy Spirit made a mistake and used *pasēs ktiseōs* for *Theou!*

3. It is universally admitted, that the *accents* have been added to the Original Text since the Apostles' days, and that the word *prōtotokos* stands in the original records *without the accent upon the second syllable*, an important fact, noticed by Dr. *Gill*, and others! Then, it is perfectly consistent with the true sense of the Scripture in this place, that *prōtotokos* be translated the *first producer*, because the conjunctive particle *for*, which follows the words "*every creature*," declares the person spoken of to be the first parent or producer of *all things created*, &c. Indeed, Mr. *Robert Fleming*, a *learned pre-existerian*, a man of integrity and literary reputation, renders it, *the first creator or producer of every creature.* And thus rendered, the text *is not only strictly true, but it is perfectly consistent with the context*, which proves the *Sabellian* and *Arian* doctrine to be as *false* as it is *absurd!* No marvel, that Mr. *Stevens* should be greatly *alarmed* at the removal of the *accent!* But, why did he withhold the fact, that the *accents* have been added to the original text since the Apostles' days? He knew the propriety of moving the accent was not to be disputed! And, if he could not, as he does not honestly and fairly meet

the *word of truth*, why did he cast *contempt* upon God's faithful witnesses, whose names *he craftily suppressed*? Did he omit to mention their worthy names from *ignorance of their integrity*, or lest the godly reputation of such *faithful* witnesses should rebut his *vile* charge of *quibblers*? a charge as *false*, as it *despicable*!

4th. Mr. *Stevens* asks, "Why are we to believe that "*prōtotokos*, in verse 15, signifies the *first parent* of the "whole creation, when, in the 18th verse, it is allowed "to mean so very different an idea, as that of being "*brought forth*?"^a (S. D. 152.)

In reply to this question, I cannot pass over Mr. *Stevens*' suppression of the fact, that Mr. *Robert Fleming* did not allow *prōtotokos* in the 15th verse, to have so very different an idea as that in the 18th verse. But why did Mr. *Stevens* suppress this fact? Was it not, because he knew Mr. *Robert Fleming's* character and testimony would destroy his *subtilty*? But if *prōtotokos* in the 15th verse, is not to have a different sense, *if needs be*, to the meaning of the same word in the 18th verse, why should Mr. *Stevens* make *pasēs ktiseōs* in verse 15, to signify *the whole creation*, when in the 23rd verse it is allowed to mean only *mankind*? Is it not an undeniable truth, that *pasēs ktiseōs* do sometimes signify *meats to eat*, (1 Tim. iv. 4,) and at another time, *mankind*, (Mark xvi. 15.) and at another time, *every creature*, (Col. i. 15,) according to the *context*: then, why should not *prōtotokos*, as well as *pasēs ktiseos*, vary in its signification *according to the context*?^b This is so *reasonable*, that Mr *Stevens*, with all the reason in the world, dare not venture to deny it. Therefore, as in the 15th verse *pasēs ktiseōs* do signify *all things*

^a Why did Mr. *Stevens* put this question to his Readers? Does Mr. *Stevens* believe in transubstantiation? And, why did he not ask? *Why are we to believe that soma (body) in Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, Luke xxii. 19, should not mean the real body, that the bread was the real body, when soma is allowed to mean the real body in all other Scriptures?*

^b In my former work, entitled *Immanuel*, I considered the words, *pasēs ktiseōs* in Col. i. 15, to mean *mankind*: which induced me to consider the word *prōtotokos* to be correctly rendered *first-born*, as a *title of Christ's* personal pre-eminence. As I only wrote for truth, so for the sake of truth, I do not hesitate to acknowledge the mistake I made, and I am equally willing to acknowledge any other, if I have written any thing inconsistent with the *word of faith*!

created according to the context, so *prōtotokos* doth signify the *first parent* or *producer* according to the context! And this was the *faith* of an ancient christian writer, namely, *Isidor*, who observed, that *our Lord Jesus Christ* is in the 15th verse set forth, the *first parent* or *bringer forth of every creature into being*! And *Isidor* also observes, the word is used by *HOMER* to signify the *first parent* and *first creator*! As *prōtotokos* was so used by *Homer*, then it ought to be so used in *this Holy Scripture* is beyond a doubt; because, the Holy Spirit immediately proves our Lord to be the *first parent* or *producer* of every creature by testifying, *for by him were all things created*: which can never be said of a creature, and which none but a *fanatic*, or an *Arian* or a *Sabellian* ever controverted! Indeed, *Dr. Gill* observes, the accent being placed upon the *third* syllable makes the *Apostle's* reasoning, in the following verses, appear with much more beauty, strength, and force: he is, says the *Apostle*, the *first parent* of every creature, *for by him were all things created, &c.*! A *Mr. Pierce* is mentioned by a *learned* writer in the middle of the last century, as observing, “that *prōtotokos* sometimes signifies *the dam* “*that produces its first birth*, and then the sense would be, *he* “*who, as it were, at the first birth, by the exertion of his cre-* “*ating power, brought forth all things!*”

I could multiply evidences in proof, that the accent ought to be in *this instance* on the *third* syllable of *prōtotokos*, but I shall only add one more. *Dr. Guyse* states, “if the accent of the word *prōtotokos* be “placed on the last syllable but one, instead of the last “but two, it signifies not *passively*, the *first-begotten*, but “*actively* the *first-begetter*, or *Former* of all things, and in “proof of *Christ's* being so, he observes, it is added in the “next words, *for by him were all things created*; and “verse 17, it is said, not that *he was made*, but that *HE* “*is before all things.*”^a

^a *Mr. Parkhurst* has justly noticed in his *Hebrew Lexicon*, the *Holy Spirit's* testimony to the *previous eternity* of the *Christ of God*: he says, “The *Apostle Paul*, after asserting that *all things, that are in heaven, and “that are in earth, visible, and invisible, were created by and for Christ,* “adds, and *HE IS* (*AUTOS ESTI*, not *en was*) *before all things, and by him* “*all things have subsisted, and still subsist.*” (*Heb. Lex.* 157.) And it is again testified, of *Christ*, *HE IS THE HEAD, &c.*! (*Col. i.* 18.) This

5. In opposition to the faithful testimony of these *men of God*, Mr. *Stevens* says, (1) "The *quibble* about "the moving of the accent, is too much like trifling to "merit any serious regard. (2) A man in the threaten- "ing deep, may catch at, and even take hold of a straw, "that may be floating on the surface, and nevertheless be "drowned with the straw in his hand." (S. D. 151.) Now, in answer to these observations, as *ignorant* as they are *impudent*; I call upon Mr. *Stevens* to prove, what authority any man had, or has, to put the accent *in this instance* upon the *second syllable*, the original Scripture being without it? And if Mr. *Stevens* does not prove such authority, the charge of *quibbler* will fall upon the head of the HARDENED *Perverter of I AM!* Surely, I may ask, are not *Isidor*, Dr. *Gill*, Dr. *Guyse*, and others, justified by the context in moving the accent? And have they not as much right to put, or move the accent to the *third* syllable as the Sabellians, or Arians, or as any other person, had to put it on the second? Are *Isidor*, Dr. *Gill*, and *others*, more like *drowning men catching at straws* than the Sabellians and Arians? But, Mr. *Stevens'* observation about moving the accent, may have been

Divine testimony to the *previous eternity* of Christ, is so offensive to Mr. *Stevens*, that he endeavours to turn this comment upon the Holy Spirit's record, that Christ is, not *he was*, before all things, *into ridicule*. If the words Mr. *Stevens* perverted, had been my *unwarranted* invention, there would have been some excuse for Mr. *Stevens'* malevolence, but *his hatred* to Christ's servants is from *his ignorance of the Christ of God!* Mr. *Stevens* asks, "What can I mean by emphatically denying that Christ was "before all things." (C. F. i. 39.) Did I deny that Christ is before all things? Mr. *Stevens* knew I did not: but the leading feature of Mr. *Stevens'* writings is to prove that Christ is *not* before all things, he declares, Christ was not *our* Lord before he had a *human soul!* He also asks, "Can it be that I mean to keep the poor pre-existerians in ignorance, that I "write so obscurely for their benefit?" (C. F. i. 39.) Presuming Mr. *Stevens* is not *wilfully ignorant* of the *emphatic* words, "Christ is before all things," that HE is the *head*, &c., which he calls obscurely written, although the Divine Testimony; and presuming *from ignorance* he left out the *is, before all things*, in the title of his reply, "*Early Sonship*;" I beg to inform *him and his young rooks*, that when a Christian speaks of a *pre-existent* or antediluvian *creature*, he uses the words *he was* before such a thing, or such a man; but when he speaks of the *pre-existence of the Christ of God*, he uses the words, HE IS *before all things*, because *the Christ of God* is not *a began to be Jesus Christ!* But if Mr. *Stevens* be *wilfully ignorant*, the *searcher of all hearts* will repay him for *his malice!*

from ignorance, for he calls the moving of the accent, a quibble; but his vile comparison, likening *Isidor, Dr. Gill, Dr. Guyse, and others*, to *drowning men catching at straws*, is *profligately impudent*: and recoils with vengeance upon himself.^a

The *learned Dr. Gill* received the *love* of the truth, he is distinguished by his incomparable defence of the cause of God and truth, therefore, the vile traducer of such a man may boast of having *all the reason in the world*, but such reasoners, denominated *freethinking christians*, have always endeavoured to destroy the *previous eternity of the Christ of God*. And let it not be forgotten, that in Mr. *Stevens'* vile attempt to set up a *began to be Jesus Christ*, he represents Christ as being *disappointed*, and as *born twice!* And let it not be forgotten, that he not only represents Christ as having a *second birth*, but at that second birth he was *degenerated!* Such absurdities are *fanatical*: it may be inferred from his *sophistical* reasoning upon the words *only-begotten* and *first-born*, that, if it would *not* have *frustrated* his pur-

^a As Mr. *John Stevens* is the *Perverter of I AM*, it is no marvel, that he should *libel* the servants of the Most High God. He calls *Dr. Gill, Guyse*, and others, *quibblers*: he says, *Dr. Hawker's* sentences are *fraught with darkness and FALSEHOOD*, in other words, *wilful lies*. He suspects Mr. *Evans* of John Street Chapel, had *no real belief of our Lord's self-existence*. If Mr. *Stevens* had said *his Lord*, instead of *our Lord*, he would have been correct; for Mr. *Stevens'* false Christ is *not the HOLY ONE of Israel*. He also compares Mr. *Colyer* to an *assassin*. And he *misrepresented* the testimony of that excellent Minister of Jesus Christ, the late Mr. *John Rees* of Crown Street Chapel, because he believed in the *essential* Sonship of Christ. Indeed, the *previous eternity* of Christ is so offensive to Mr. *John Stevens*, that he *scoffs* at the eminent servants of Christ, who speak of *our Lord* as revealed in *God's word!* (2 Let. 33, 34.) Their united *testimony* is the testimony *from God*, concerning the *verily foreordained Christ of God*, who is *without beginning of days*, whom *Isaiah* saw in the Vision of Prophecy, and whom *John* saw worshipped by the living creatures, who rest not day and night, saying, *Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God Almighty who was to come in the flesh*, who is come, and who is to come a second time without sin unto salvation (Rev. iv. 8.—Heb. ix. 28.—Isaiah vi. 1—3. . . John xii. 40, 41.) They also believed, that Christ was God our Redeemer, the Holy One of God, and the *Holy one of ISRAEL from everlasting*; that he was eternally *foreseen* by God the Father and the Spirit, as of Israel *after the flesh*; and as such, is called the *Holy One of Israel* in the book of the prophets; and as such he was rejoicing in the *habitable part of his EARTH*, (Prov. viii. 31,) before that *chief or highest part of the world was made*, (Prov. viii. 26,) namely, *his human nature which was made of a woman*.

pose he would have declared, *Cain the first born of Adam and Eve to be the only true type of Christ!* (See. C. F. i. 42.) Indeed, what may not a *Perverter* say, who cannot see in God's Bible, the *natural* or *soul first-born*, born *first*, was the *first-born of the wicked one?* (1 John iii. 12,) or what may not *such a witness* say, who *at one time* declares the word *first-born* means *one born first, and brought forth before any other*, and *at another time* asserts that, *Isaac* was the *first-begotten, first-born, only-begotten, and only-one?* (C. F. i. 43.) Did he not know *Ishmael* was *born first*, yea, years before *Isaac*? And if *Cain* was, as he says, *when born*, *Adam's only one, his only-begotten, and first-begotten*, (C. F. i. 42,) how can he deny that *Ishmael* was, when born, *Abraham's only-one, his only-begotten, and first-begotten?* Surely the man, who writes to destroy the testimony of *Christ* to his *incomprehensible* sonship, justifies the *Sanhedrim* for *crucifying Christ*; and *crucifies the son of God afresh*, and *puts him to an open shame*.

FOURTHLY. That our Lord *Jesus Christ* is the *archē prōtotokos* of and from the dead. Col i. 18. Rev. i. 5.

1. Mr. *Stevens* says, "*the first-born from the dead*" must mean one who had been numbered with the dead, "and who had risen before them."^a (C. F. i. 23.) If this be the true meaning of *prōtotokos* in Col. i. 18, then it must follow, that the Scriptures cannot be true, or else

(Gal. iv. 4.) Therefore, Dr. *Hawker* justly observes in his reply to Mr. *Stevens*; "These things in relation to the *personal glory* of *Christ*, in his *pre-existent state*, set up as *God-man* mediator FROM EVERLASTING, are scattered more or less over all my writings; and in a more especial manner "in my *Poor Man's Commentary on the Bible!* The observations I have "particularly made on this subject on the 8th chapter of the *Proverbs* in "the *Old Testament*, and on the *first* chapter of the epistle to the *Colossians* "in the *New*, I would refer to in proof." The Reader will observe how faithfully Dr. *Hawker* bears testimony to the previous eternity of *the Christ* of God, the *Holy One of God*, the *Redeemer* and *Holy One of Israel*, whose name is *from everlasting*; and who is the *way everlasting*. (Psalm cxxxix. 24.)

^a I request the Reader's particular attention to Mr. *Stevens'* *subtile* expression, "*one who had been numbered with the dead*," by which he intimates, that *those* who had been *previously* raised from the dead by our Lord, or before his incarnation, had not been *numbered with the dead*. But if this be his meaning, it is only another proof of the *human pre-existential lie*, for *Lazarus* was actually *numbered with the dead*, and rose before *Christ* died.

Mr. *Stevens* makes them void by his tradition ; because, *Christ* was not the *first* that rose from the dead, for *Lazarus* had been *actually numbered* with the dead, and had risen before *Christ* died. And it might be affirmed, that the *son* of the *widow* of *Zarephath*, and *not Christ*, was the first born from the dead, because he was numbered with the dead, and was the *first* who rose before them, although not by his *own* power.^a He was the *first* raised from death ! But, if Mr. *Stevens* should say, the *widow's son* was not numbered with the dead, *because he had not been buried*, then, *Lazarus* plainly answers to Mr. *Stevens'* interpretation of the words, *first-born from the dead*, because he “*had been numbered with the dead, and had risen before them.*” But, if the accent be put upon the *third* syllable of the word *prōtotokos*, then, *Christ* has the pre-eminence, for *archē prōtotokos*, Mr. *Robert Fleming* the learned pre-existerian^b says, signifies, “the efficient or “prince, who is the first raiser of the dead!” which is saying, that *Christ* is the *first producer* of the dead, and from the dead. Mr. *Stevens* cannot object to render the word *prōtotokos* in Col i. 18, as in the 15th verse ; because Mr. *Robert Fleming* the learned pre-existerian, a man highly respected for *his integrity*, renders *prōtotokos* in the 15th, as in the 18th verse, namely, with the accent upon the *third syllable*. Then, “by what fair rules of explaining “the Scriptures, Mr. *Stevens* may repeat, *can it be that “the word prōtotokos, in the 15th verse, must have a “widely different sense from what it has in the 18th verse, “and that, while it is used of the same person, and in the same “sentence ? Besides, it is evident, that it has this very “meaning throughout the whole of the copious citation made, “for he is the first producer of every creature, and the first*

^a Mr. *Stevens* is so delighted with his *first-born*, LITERALLY *born first*, as *Cain* was, that he opposes the *literal* interpretation of the word *prōtos*, *chief*; and he is obliged to support his *traditional lie*, by saying, “*Christ* rose “*first according to his own order*,” which words, *rose first*, if understood *literally* would be untrue, because *Christ* did not rise before his beloved *Lazarus*, and therefore, the word *prōtos* must be understood to mean what it may be correctly rendered, namely, *chief*. But how came Mr. *Stevens* to give the *pre-eminence* to *Enoch* and *Elijah* ? he admits they were *first* in heaven in glorified bodies *before Christ* ! Therefore, according to Mr. *Stevens'* plain reason *creed*, his *Christ* could not be *literally* the *first* !

^b Dr. *Watts* acknowledges Mr. *Robert Fleming* to be a learned writer.

“*producer of all from the dead: for the son of the widow of Zarephath, &c., were raised by Christ’s power.*”

2. The *first-born from the dead* can never mean Mr. Stevens’ false Christ, because his *first-born Christ* was an *immortal nondescript*, to wit, a *human soul which had not a body*, such a man as is not to be found throughout the Holy Scriptures; for *dead men have bodies*. But, according to Mr. Stevens’ creed, his Christ *never descended into the lower parts of the earth*; he says, “*he was excarnate, when he left the cross.*” (C. F. i. 4.) And therefore Mr. Stevens’ own *creed* makes it evident, that his *first-born human soul Christ without a body*, or his *began to be Jesus Christ*, was a *nondescript*, for he was *originally like one in the state of the dead* and in *purgatory*, except that *he never had a body, and who, after he was born of Mary, was excarnate when he left the cross, and was again in the very image*, (S. D. 16,) which Mr. Stevens has set up, namely, a *human soul without a body*, as before he became incarnate; and therefore, he was never *numbered with the dead*. Thus Mr. Stevens encourages infidels to ridicule the word of faith.

3. Mr. Stevens observes, “The Hebrew word for *first-born*, is also rendered *first-fruits*. So Christ the *first-born of every creature*, is the *first-born from the dead, the first-fruits of them that slept.*” Whereupon he adds, “Here then the argument of our opposer fails, for the *first-fruits* were not *only the best of the fruits*; *but they were ripe first, and gathered and presented first*; *which answers to our Lord’s being brought into existence first, and to his being with God first, as the first-born of every creature.*” (C. F. i. 36.) Reader, do not pass away from this statement without enquiring, whether it was from ignorance, or from *loving a lie* that, Mr. Stevens should declare the *first-fruits* were not *only the best of the fruits, but ripe first*? For, were the *best fruits always ripe first*? Is it not a *revealed fact*, that the *fruits of the trees were for the three first years declared to be uncircumcised*? That the *fruits for the first three years were so far from being in God’s esteem the best of the fruits, that they were like Mr. Stevens’ image man, (a soul without a body) uncircumcised!* Here then, the argument of Mr. Stevens fails, for the *first-fruits to be presented first were not ripe*

first, for the best fruits WERE NOT RIPE until after the uncircumcised fruits, which answers, according to Mr. Stevens' manner of proof, to our Lord's being brought into human existence last, after all the natural offspring of men were uncircumcised in Adam, and to his being with God pre-eminent, as the last Adam and chief-born of every creature!^a Again, in proof of Mr. Stevens' ignorance of, or of his disregard to *God's Bible*, the *first-fruits* of the land to be offered to the Lord were *green ears of corn*: and as they were *green and not ripe*, they were to be *dried by the fire*, &c. (Lev. ii. 14.) But does Mr. Stevens revere God's Bible? If he does, he ought to prove from the Holy Scriptures, that God made a man without a body, or he ought to acknowledge his *lies* to be of Satan's invention. But can a man, *unless a fanatic*, pretend to *revere* God's Bible, and be ignorant of the phrase "the Christ of God?" or be ignorant that, Jehovah had delivered a *law* to Israel, declaring the fruits of the trees were for the first, second, and third years *uncircumcised*? See Leviticus xix. 23, 24, or, would he declare "*sin to be a negative thing beyond a doubt?*" or could he be ignorant that the sons of God *by adoption*, are *unbegotten* sons until born of the Spirit; and that Levi was an *unbegotten* son in the loins of Abraham, when Melchisedec met him? (C. F. i. 10. 46.)

4. Mr. Stevens says, "Christ is not called the first-fruits of them that slept, because he raises the dead; but because he *first rose* according to his own order, as the head *before* its mystical body. 1 Cor. xv. 20—23. This, he adds, is so very evident that, it becomes grievous to witness any attempt in a christian minister to conceal, or controvert the evidence: *the plain assertions of Holy Writ are against him, NOR CAN THE INSTANCES WHICH HE MENTIONS, be so explained as to contradict the open testimony of JOHN and PAUL, who both maintain that Christ is the beginning, THE FIRST BROUGHT FORTH*

^a Dr. Owen observes on the title *first-born*, as applied to Christ, that it is not the thing itself, but the *Dignity* and *Privilege* that attended it are designed in this *appellation*. If he is *the first-born of every creature*, he adds, this is no more, but he that hath power and authority over all the creatures of God. That, as Christ was to be *MADE the first born*, so we understand he is the *APPOINTED heir* of all things, *not as succeeding his Father*, but as *possessor*, &c., by grant.

“FROM THE DEAD.” (C. F. i. 36.) But where, Reader, did *John* and *Paul* declare that Christ was literally *the first brought forth* from the dead, *before Lazarus*, or before the widow’s son of Zarephath, &c.? Why did not Mr. *Stevens* repeat the INSTANCES *by name*, which he says I had MENTIONED, in proof that Christ was the *chief-born*, although not the *first* raised from the dead? Surely he knew if he did *repeat* them, that the *silly doves* would not feel it grievous to witness a christian minister proving the Scriptures to be strictly true, and perfectly consistent: for in every respect they are opposed to Mr. *Stevens’ vile* tradition; although the *young rooks* would swallow the *leaven* of this Pharisee.^a

Again. Where did JOHN and Paul maintain that Christ was the first brought forth from the dead? Did they put the *accent* upon the *second* syllable of *prōtoto-kos*? Are we to believe they were so ignorant of God’s *Bible*, or of Christ raising the dead, as to maintain the human pre-existerian *lie*, namely, that our Lord rose *first*, and before the widow’s son of Zarephath, &c. or before *Lazarus*, or the widow’s son of Nain, or Jarius’ daugh-

^a *The Pharisees mix leaven with their bread:* at one time Mr. *Stevens* says; “*A creed* means things to be *believed*, not things to be *comprehended* in their own *nature*, and *manner* of being and *acting*.” (1 Let. 17,) but *when* he speaks of the *procession* of the Son, which he *thinks* implies *local motion*, he *craftily* leaves out the *testimony* of his *Omniscience!* But when he speaks of the *procession* of the Spirit, he calls it a *pretence*, although the *procession* of the Spirit, “is not a thing to be *comprehended* in its *own nature*, and *manner* of being and *acting*.” I shall therefore apply his reasoning against the *procession* of Christ to the *procession* of the Holy Spirit.

* Mr. *Stevens’ reasoning* against the *procession* of the Son of God.

“Who would suppose *any believer* of the *Holy Scriptures* could question, whether our Lord had been a *man with God* before he taught on earth: if prejudice and pre-conception had not already, with marked *contumacy*, attested the lamentable fact? (C. F. i. 57.)

Mr. *Stevens’ reasoning* applied to the *procession* of the Holy Spirit.

Who would suppose *any believer* of the *Scriptures* could question, whether the Holy Spirit had been a *Dove with God*, before he descended and lighted on Jesus in Jordan; if prejudice and pre-conception had not already, with marked *contumacy*, attested the lamentable fact?

And I may ask, who would suppose even a *mere* professor of believer’s baptism would *dare* to omit the *testimony* of *Christ’s Omniscience*, for the sake of supporting a *lie*, namely, that Christ was actually a man pre-existing without man’s originality.

ter? But why did Mr. *Stevens* misquote the Scriptures? Where do the Scriptures read, that Christ *first rose* (LITERALLY) according to his own order? It is written, “every man in his own order,” (*aparchē Christos*) the first fruits (*plural*) Christ! May not *aparchē Christos* refer to the resurrection of those saints, whose bodies came out of their graves after Christ’s resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many? (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.)

Os estin archē prōtotokos ek tōn nekron in Col. i. 18, is rendered by the learned Mr. *Robert Fleming*, to whom Mr. *Stevens* refers as an authority, “the prince, the first raiser of the dead.” Mr. *Robert Fleming* never charged the Apostles, *John* and *Paul*, with saying Christ rose from the dead before *Lazarus*, and others. Neither did he pervert their testimony to make the Bible ridiculous. Neither did he presume to represent the miracles of Christ, in raising the dead, a fiction, by maintaining that Christ is LITERALLY the first brought forth from the dead. Therefore, Mr. *Stevens*’ grief at what he calls an “attempt in a christian minister to conceal or controvert the evidence, the plain assertions of Holy Writ,” is rather his grief that the plain assertions of Holy Writ respecting our Lord’s raising the daughter of *Jarius*, the widow’s son of *Nain*, and *Lazarus* who was numbered with the dead, are so incontrovertible, that he was not able with all his subtilty to support his perversion of the Scriptures, or the misplaced accent upon *prōtotokos*, upon which he and all the *Arians* and *Sabellians* depend, to maintain their absurd and false tradition. He must, therefore, either deny those plain assertions of Holy Writ, or he must admit that he has been awfully deceived.^a

^a Mr. *Stevens* says, “First-born means one born first, and for Christ to be the First-born in Jehovah’s eternal purpose, can mean no less than that he was decreed to be born, or enter into being first, and while no other creature existed;” (C. F. i. 34,) and, therefore, Mr. *Stevens* must admit, if first-born from the dead means one “FIRST brought forth from the dead.” (C. F. i. 36,) “who had been numbered with them, and who had risen before them;” (C. F. i. 23,) then, the Widow’s son of *Zarephath* must be the first-born from the dead in Jehovah’s eternal purpose; “for an eternal purpose can never fail of an efficient and exact accomplishment. The acts of God’s eternal will govern and determine those of his Almighty power. He does nothing without purposing to do it. nor purposeth any thing which he does not perform. And his purpose in-

Some learned men, to whom Mr. *Stevens* refers, consider “*charaktēr tēs upostaseōs autou,*” in Heb. i. 3, to answer “*os estin eikōn tou theou,*” *Charaktēr*, they say, answers to *image*, and *upostaseōs* (person) to *the invisible God*, and thus these two passages, they say, explain each other: if this be true, why may not *os estin archē prōtotokos ek tōn nekrōn* in Col. i. 18, answer *Ego Eimi ē anastasis kai ē zōe*, in John xi. 24,? may they not say, that, *Who* is answers to *I AM*, *beginning to life*, and *first-born from the dead to the Resurrection*? *Archē*, which is rendered *beginning*, signifies the *first cause*, the *origin*, the *author*, &c., and *prōtotokos ek tōn nekrōn* signify the *chief*, or *first producer* or *raiser from the dead*! But without determining the propriety or impropriety thereof, it may be observed, that *os estin archē* is a blessed testimony of the pre-eternity of Christ, *for he is the first cause*, the *archē*, the *author* of the whole creation, and of the resurrection, against whose *previous eternity*, (to use Mr. *Stevens*’ words, when speaking of me,) the human pre-existerians “*pour forth the streams of their before unfested malevolence.*” (C. F. i. 65.)

Our blessed Lord said to the Jews, *destroy this temple* (his body,) *and in three days I will raise it up.* (John ii. 16—22.) It is therefore certain, that he did not talk *nonsense*, (C. F. i. 36,) when he declared his own eternal being to *Martha before he died, rose, and revived*, saying, *Ego Eimi ē anastasis kai ē zōe*: (John xi. 24,) for, to the confusion of Mr. *Stevens*, our Lord Jesus Christ *is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.* Dr. *Hawker*’s sermon upon this text is most excellent, he first speaks of Christ as *I AM*; and secondly, of Christ the resurrection and the life: but in so doing, according to *wise Mr. Stevens*, “*he evidently makes Christ speak nonsense.*” (C. F. i. 36.) And therefore, the Holy Spirit’s testimony of Christ in

“*volves all the circumstances of time, place, and instruments, connected in the execution of his wise decrees.*” (C. F. i. 35.) Now, *as the Scriptures are strictly true, and perfectly consistent*; Mr. *Stevens*’ argument proves, *he either does not believe that, first-born means one born first, or before any other creature existed, or one that was numbered with the dead, and who had risen before them; or else, he only acknowledged the Scriptures were strictly true, and perfectly consistent, for the purpose of deception!*

Col. i. 18, namely, who is *archē prōtotokos* from the dead, must also in wise Mr. Stevens' opinion be nonsense, unless Christ rose first, and before Lazarus from the dead.

Dr. Hawker observes, "*I Am*—the Lord saith: by which is expressed his everlasting being, his eternity, and sameness of nature and essence, possessing in himself at one and the same time, (call that time by whatsoever name you may,) *past, present, and future*. As if the Lord had said, *I am* what I am now; and *I am*, what I have always been; and *I am*, what I shall always be; *yesterday*, before all worlds; to-day, during the whole time, state of all worlds; and *for ever*, when there are no worlds, &c." In the *second* branch of his discourse, the Doctor observes, "Martha had a notion in common with others at that time of what was supposed, but not openly revealed, of a resurrection: but not the most distant idea how this resurrection was to be accomplished; much less that the Lord Jesus was himself the SOLE CAUSE of that glorious event, and indeed himself the resurrection:" as if the Doctor had said, *Christ is archē, prōtotokos ek tōn nekrōn*, the author and chief producer or raiser from the dead. The Doctor further observes, "*Christ is not only the cause of the resurrection and the life; but he is himself both*. All is in himself, as well as by himself. It is not enough to say, that by the great and incommunicable salvation which he wrought, he hath done all this for his people; but that he is himself the whole to his people. He is himself the resurrection and the life. His people were considered virtually all in him, and represented by him, when he did what he did, and suffered what he suffered for their salvation." (See Doctor Hawker's Sermon, entitled, "Jesus the Resurrection and the Life.") But such is Mr. John Stevens' malevolence at our Lord Jesus Christ being so highly esteemed, that he saith, *This makes Christ speak nonsense!* That such should be Mr. Stevens' opinion is no marvel, for to the Greeks it is foolishness; but "*the foolishness of God is wiser than men!*" (1 Cor. i. 23—25.) Mr. Stevens also states, "that Christ was not then asserting his own eternal being; but his authority and ability to raise the dead bodies of his Saints by virtue of his own resur-

“rection, as the *first fruits of them that slept*” (C. F. i. 36, 37.) Here again, Mr. *Stevens* mixes error with truth, for Christ did not *only* assert his authority and ability to raise the *dead bodies of the saints* by virtue of his own resurrection; but also his power to raise the *dead bodies of the NON-ELECT*. And if Christ did not assert *his own eternal being*, how came Christ to say, “*I am the life?*” What life? Surely that **ETERNAL LIFE** which was *with the Father!* For the Christ of God *waveth not old!* Surely it is impossible for words more plainly to express that, Christ *himself is both the resurrection and the life?* But we ought not to wonder at Mr. *Stevens’* *perversion of this text*, because, he sets up a *began to be Jesus Christ* in opposition to *the Christ of God*. Neither ought we to be surprised, that he should be *enraged* at its being stated, that our Lord asserted his own eternal being, as well as his authority and ability to raise the dead, or that he should presumptuously declare no *sedate christian* could approve of *such unhallowed treatment of the Scriptures, &c.* (C. F. i. 37.) For what may not a man say, who sets up a *began to be human soul Christ* in opposition to *the Christ of God a quickening spirit?* But is it *unhallowed* treatment of the Holy Scriptures to believe, that Christ is the *efficient cause of the RESURRECTION of the dead bodies of the NON-ELECT?* If Mr. *Stevens* be not a *fanatic*, he must be something worse, or he would not have closed his *unhallowed* observations with charging our Lord, as following the example of the *sinful Jews*, by saying one thing when he meant another. Neither would Mr. *Stevens* have endeavoured to conceal his *vile* charge against *our Lord*, by saying, “*Some men seem to imagine that, WHENEVER our blessed Lord and Saviour used the phrase I Am, he must be understood to mean by it the same as in Exod. iii. 14.*” Whereupon, he adds, “*See this notion opposed in a pamphlet on ‘The sinlessness of Jesus,’ p. 19, 20.*”^a (C. F. i. 37.)

^aThe Reader will observe, Mr. *Stevens* entitles his pamphlet “*The Sinlessness of Jesus,*” but in that very pamphlet, he charges Christ with using one tense for another, as the deceitful Jews did. But who are those *some men*, who seem to imagine that, *whenever* our blessed Lord and Saviour used the phrase *I am*, he must be understood to