

such alone at rest in the Bosom of the Church, because the Matter may be blameable in the *Manner* of doing amongst some : No sure, such as do not only deny the Truth, respecting God and Christ our Lord, but go on in Disputes and Debates wherever they come, to set up a false Faith in the true *Object*, or a false *Object* instead of a true, and teach Men privily so, are to be purged out as old *Leaven*, lest they *Leaven* the whole Church ; and this is to be done without the Breach of the Bounds of Moderation, see 1 Cor. 5. 7.

Section II.

Mr. Allen's Description of the Holy Trinity examined, and a vast Difference between the Orthodox and the Casinites, Unitarians, &c. still remains ; and first of God the Father.

OUR pretended Moderator, in this of his Description of the Trinity, represents the Case of our Believing (at each hand) thereabouts very unfair, and indeed disingeniously ; and besides the real Truth of the Matter, casting, as it were, a dark Mist on that side of Belief the Orthodox are at, and setting a fine *Gloss* or *Paint* on the other side of Belief, that the *Casinites* and other Opposers of the *Trinitarian* Faith are at, painting them out bright and clear, and us of the *Trinitarian*, dark and black.

In page 3, unto the 27th, he gives his unfair Description of the Holy Trinity on both sides, and first of God the Father, how each of the contending Parties believe thereabouts, and ever and anon faining no material *Difference* to be, and from thence draws this Consequence, that *no Breach of Communion ought to be between us at the Lord's Table.*

Now, I shall examin this, and endeavour to prove the contrary; first, he speaks of the most high God, under a threefold manner.

- 1st. *In respect of the Means we are to know him by.*
- 2ly. *What God most high is.*
- 3ly. *Of the Manner of our paying Worship and Adoration to him.* Therefore,

1st. As to the Means we are to know this *Great God* of Heaven and Earth by, tho' some of our Opposits may seemingly agree with us in some Points, yet do we differ much.

1st. Some will have it, that by their *Reason* they do understand and know God and his Word; for, say they, *what is not true in Reason cannot be so by Revelation, that Reason can never assent unto, that appears unreasonable;* see the Works of one *Emes*, a great Socinian, in that Book, entituled, *A short Account of the Proceedings of R. S. Bishop of a Dissenting Congregation, &c.* page 3. and tho' this be not laid down for a Means to know God by in Mr. Allen's Book, yet it's certain one main Hinge of the *Casinites* and others, to wit, this of their *Human Reason*; and because it's not agreeing with that *darkened natural Reason* Man hath had since the Fall of *Adam*, therefore they will not believe Father, Son and Holy Spirit to be one God, tho' it be revealed in God's Word: But according to the aforesaid Author, *what is not true in Reason, cannot be so by Revelation:* So then God's Word, which is a Divine Revelation, they disbelieve, that faith,
These

These three are one, 1 Joh. 5. 7. because they think it not to be true in their dark Reason.

But herein we do vastly disagree, I mean, we of the *Trinitarian* Faith, from the aforefaid *Casnist* and others, that make Reason the main Means to know God by; forasmuch as we believe according to the Scriptures, that Faith sees above *Human Reason*, as *Abraham's* Faith wrought in him, to believe and assent unto that appeared extremely unreasonable, in obeying God's Command, when he went about to offer his Son *Isaac* on *Mount Moriah*, in whom the Promises were, see *Heb. 11. 17.* and also how much against Reason is it for to believe, that God made the World out of nothing in six days; yet, by Faith, we, with the Saints of old, do believe it, *Heb. 11. 3.* being afore revealed, *Gen. 1.* also the *Resurrection* of this Mortal Body, to be raised to Life after consumed to Dust, yea, burned to Ashes, and eat of Wild Beasts; yea, the same Body; how contrary unto Human Reason is it? yet we, by Faith, are bound to believe it, because it's revealed in God's Holy Word.

2ly. Mr. *Allen* lays down, in his Book, as one means to know God by, is the *Imprint of God's Image on the Creature, even the wonderful Power, Wisdom and Skill, which he hath shewed in forming it, &c.* By Creature, I suppose he intends chiefly *Man-kind*.

Reply, Herein we do as vastly disagree from some he calls Brethren, as in any thing; for such is the corrupt Notion of some, that they affirm this Imprint of God's Image on the Creature, is outward in forming of the Body; for tho' his Power and Wisdom be shewn in that, yet not his Image; for God's Image was placed upon the most noble Part of Man, even the Soul, which God made indeed in his own Image, after his own Likeness, in true Holiness and Righteousness of Mind, till Adam sinned, and lost it by his Fall; which said Image it's the Work of the Spirit of God to restore to every

true New-born Soul again in Christ; for God is a Spirit, and nothing but that which is *Spiritual* can truly be said to be his *Image*, for unlawful is it for any Man to form any Shape or Likeness of God, no, not in the Heart and Mind, for his self cannot contradict his own Command, *Deut. 4. 15.* where the Command is given, that they should *take good heed unto themselves* in this Respect, because *they saw no manner of Similitude*, as for God's handy Work on Man outwardly; it's not his *Image*, but his Work or Works of his infinite Power and Wisdom.

2ly. He describes the most high God, what he is, respecting *Essence, Being and Substance*, concerning his *Essential Properties*; first, in the Negative, secondly, in the Affirmative.

In page 9. sect. 2. he saith, that *those things concerning the most High, wherein the contending Persons are agreed, are very plain from Scripture and Reason, ---- and plainly in words at length, declared both in Old and New Testament, as Matters to be owned and believed; and therefore absolutely necessary to Salvation, but the controversial part not so:* Then he seems to sum up thus, *That the great Controversy and Difference concerning God, --- is not Essential, but only Circumstantial, about the Manner or Mode of his Subsisting, and not about the Divine Essence it self, &c.*

Reply, I do affirm, that we are not agreed in those Matters relating to the Great God, about his Essence, Being and Properties; for here he deals deceitfully with his Reader, for some of his Socinian Brethren do conclude the most High to have Passion and Mutableness in him, viz. sometimes to be angry, sometimes to be pleased, yea, sometimes to be afraid and repent, sitting upon a Throne, where a Man may see from his Right Hand to his Left in Heaven, not knowing what is to come, but what is past; and that he hath Intelligence of our Actions here below on Earth, by Intelligence of Angels, see Biddle's Catechism,

Catechism, page 4, 5, 6. and Dr. Owen's Answer to *Biddle*, and the *Racova Catechism*, page 680, 681. again *Mat. Cassin* is of the Opinion, that God is in a *Form or Shape much like to Man*, and in respect of his *Essence*, is *neither Infinite nor Omnipresent*, but is a *limited Being*. This hath been witnessed against him under divers hands in Print, by those who knew his Principles, and detest his Heresy, which I cannot hear; he hath yet absolutely denied or satisfactorily answered; all which is not only contrary to the Orthodox Faith, as we believe, but also contrary to God's Word, both in the *Old and New Testament*; yet indeed will they pretend to *Scripture*, as *Biddle* doth in his *Catechism*; so did *Satan*, when he tempted the Lord of Life. But to return, the Difference is not only *Circumstantial*, as *Mr. A.* saith, about *Mode and Manner* of the Divine Being's *Subsisting*; but *Substantial*, about what he truly and really is, and hath manifested himself to be by his *Word, Works and Spirit*, in all his Divine Properties of *Wisdom, Righteousness and Holiness, Justice, Mercy and Goodness*.

Here we are a long way afunder from those that believe not God's Justice to be such, as that a Divine and infinite Satisfaction was required and given for the Breach of his Holy and Righteous Law, for Man, who had broke it, as *Mr. Emes* and some others will not believe, but say, That a Debt freely forgiven, and yet fully paid, is a Contradiction. Although God hath declared himself to be the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in Goodness and Truth, keeping Mercy for thousands, forgiving Iniquity, Transgression and Sin; and that by no means will clear the Guilty, &c. *Exod. 34. 6, 7.* yet they say this cannot be, that is, indeed after their Human dark Reason; but we believe Jesus Christ did give infinite Satisfaction to God's Divine Justice for our Sin, there being no way, as he was Just, otherwise to clear the Guilty; yet that the great Mercy of God the Father appeared in the Gift of his only Son, to do that great Work
for

for us, without us; for God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, Joh. 3. 16. but neither do the Socinians nor *Mat. Casin* and his Disciples, understand this great Justice, Wisdom and Mercy of God, with all and every of his Essential Properties; for if they did, they would not so stoutly deny the *Desert of Adam's Sin*, to be Death eternal, as it was against the infinite Justice of God, nor would they of *Casin's Faith* think a *created changeable Being*, tho' made glorious, could accomplish the Work of our Salvation and Redemption, as they believe of Christ; nor would they call the *Power and Wisdom of God into Question*, so vilely, as to say it could not be, that Christ could take of our Nature, Flesh and Blood, but must take of our *Defilement and Sin*; and so that to have need of a *Sacrifice for it self*: I say, did they understand all the Divine Properties of God as they should, they would not, nor could not do; all this and much more I might name.

Next *Mr. Allen* comes in the Negative, to describe what he saith we agree in, that God is not, as that he is no *graven Image, nor Device of Man's Hands, nor Man, because they are Mortal, nor Angels, being they are made, and are Messengers*. But I

Reply in short to this, That this he lays down in the Negative; is that which many Heathens will as well agree to as *Mr. Allen*, that the great Supreme Being is not, as he tells us, no *Graven Image, or Mortal Man, or Angel*; for the *Magicians and Heathen Caldeans* concluded, that there was a *God or Gods, whose Dwelling was not with Flesh, that could make known King Nebuchadnezzar's Dream, with the Interpretation, and that none else could do it, see Dan. 2. 11.* tho' they were ready to Worship *Graven Images and Representations*, yet it was not because none of them knew something of a *Divine Being in Heaven*, nor because they all thought there was no other than that Image they worshipped and served.

2ly. As to his Affirmative, what God most high is, he saith,

1st. God is a Spirit or Spiritual Substance, not a created Spirit, as Angels, but an infinite, independent, intire, invisible Essence, the first Cause of, and sovereign Power over all things, incomprehensible, unsearchable in Glory, Power, Strength, Wisdom, Justice, Love, Mercy, &c.

Reply, 1. Altho' we indeed do heartily believe all this Mr. *Allen* lays down here, yet we do differ as to the Sense of these Expressions from he and those I oppose, believe not a Trinity, or three Persons one God: For,

1st. Mind Mr. *Allen* and his *Socinian* and *Cassinitic Brethren*, do exclude the Son and Holy Spirit out of this one most high Essence; for when they speak of the most high God, they intend the Father only, excluding the Son and Holy Spirit, as is noted before; and the Reader may,

2nd. Note, Mr. *Allen* opposes the Father or most high God to the Son and Spirit, when we believe, in respect to Essence and Divine Being, no Opposition is, or no Disagreement is in that one Essence; but these three are one most high God.

3ly. Note, That in his Expressing or describing the Father, whom he calls the *most high God*, or *God most high*; he saith of him, *he is the first Cause of, and sovereign highest Power over all things*; by which he intends the Father to be over the Son and Spirit in sovereign Power and Perfection; for as he and others hold the Son in all degrees to be another thing from the Father, *distinct* and lesser than the Father; therefore, in that Sense, it is he must intend the Father to be the *highest Power over all things*; as over other Creatures, so over the Son; but we *Orthodox* have not so learned yet to agree with them herein, altho' true it is, the Father is
most

most high God over the created Beings, Men or Angels, in any Sense called Gods or Lords, or so deputed, as false Gods and Idols of the Heathens, yet is he not so over the Son and Spirit, respecting their Essence, they being also *most high* with the Father, over all the aforesaid created Beings, deputed Lords or Idols, called God: These *three are one*, which must be understood, according to other Texts of Scripture, one in Essence, one in Power, Sovereignty, Wisdom, Justice and Goodness, Co-equal and Co-eternal, tho' in Office and Person a Distinction is to be made.

2ly. In the Affirmative, he, paraphrasing on the divine Properties and infinite Perfections of God, says, *If he be Independant, then he stays only on himself, and all things stay on him; and if he be Infinite, then he is a single un compounded Essence, only one in Number and Being, ----- and impossible that there should be two infinite Beings; for if one be infinite the other cannot, and is alike impossible, that there should be two most High; for if they are equal, neither of them both can say, that he is the most High, because there is another as high as he; also it argues Imperfection, for if one most High be sufficient, then another is needless, &c.*

Reply, 1st. Take notice, Reader, what manner of a *Trinitarian* we have got, who pretends to be one, yet at the same time labours to disprove, that three can be one; for a Trinity is three, not three Gods, but three Persons, one Essence, Being and Substance, which Mr. *Allen* now labours Might and Main against.

2ly. As to God's Independancy, staying only on himself, is certain; but he would by this insinuate into his Reader, that if God the Father be an Independent God, then he has no need of the Properties of the Son, or the Son's subsisting with the Father in the same Essence. If this be not his Sense, I cannot tell what good it can do his Cause any other way; and indeed it doth but lay his own self open

open to be quite opposite to that he pretends to; for it doth not at all follow, because God is *Independent*, that therefore the Father and Son are not one in Essence: For,

1st. The *Dependency* is in himself, and the Father, Son and Spirit being but one God, they are Independent, as to any created Being; for if it were indeed, as *M. Casin* holds of Christ, that he was a created Being, then there could no *Dependency* be in him, either from the Father or us his Creatures and Children; so that as the Father is God, so is the Son; and the *Dependency* is in one and the same Godhead, Essence and Substance, tho' the Persons are three.

3^{ly}. As to God the Father's being an uncompounded Essence, only one in Number and Being, is true in the right Sense; for,

1st. He is not compounded of two distinct different Beings, that is, different in Nature.

2^{ly}. Neither is he compounded with any thing is imperfect, as all created Beings compared with him are: Neither is there two most Highs; for when we speak of God the Creator, we intend not the Father only, but the Son and Spirit also, who are one in Essence and Being: Indeed we abhor that Notion that the infinite God can be compounded with any glorious Creature whatsoever; but Christ, as God was also Creator, a Person in that Divine Being; so was the Spirit, *Gen. 1. 2.* and *Gen. 1. 26.* And God said, *Let us make Man in our own Image, after our Likeness;* and before you have it expressly said, that *In the Beginning God created the Heavens, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters;* and of the Son it's said, *All things were created by him and for him,* *Col. 1. 16.* then it follows plain, that this *US, Let us make Man, &c.* is Father, Son and Spirit; it's but one in Number and Being, as Substance and Essence; neither is it but

one God, not three Gods: Therefore, Reader, pray mind these three are not in Scripture called Gods, but God; the Reason is, because it's but one infinite divine Essence, Power and Being, not the Father to be most High, and not the Son; not the Father to be Infinite and Creator, and not the Son and Spirit; not for the Father to be without Beginning, and Maker of all things, and the Son to have a Beginning, and that in time too, when they say, God made him: Indeed a *made finite thing* cannot be mixed or compounded with an infinite Creator.

Thus far are we come, and still find the Difference as wide as ever; and his *Description* of the Trinity to be deceitful, as also it's erroneous, for he seems to express himself by many of those Expressions that the Orthodox use, as may be here noted; and also adds something of his own unto it, which, with his way of paraphrasing and turning of things up side down,resents the Matter quite contrary to what we intend, when we use the like Words,

4ly. Thus deals he with the aforementioned Orthodox Writers, whom he quotes over and over again, as Dr. Owen, Mr. J. Wright, Mr. Preston, T. Munk, together with the *Athanasian Creed* and *Nicene Creed*, and the 1st of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, and all to prove, that we all are agreed, as touching God most high, that he is one infinite, incomprehensible, undivided and undividable Substance; and this from page 9. to 16. of his Book, and says, in page 10. col. 2. *Thus far am I come safely, no Body having any thing to contradict or gainsay, --- but on all hands we are agreed about the eternal Essence and divine Properties; and in page 15 says, Thus you see, having summed up the Evidence, as says the Fore-man, so they say all, to wit, that the one true God, respecting his Essence, is an undivided, undividable, entirely one Substance, not subsisting or possible*

sible to be subsisting in parts, or having any parts in him, &c.

I shall yet farther Reply to these Matters, tho' touched at before, page 16.

Reply, 1st. If our Author had been so fair to his Reader, as to have looked over Dr. Owen's Answer to Biddle, as also Biddle's Catechism, together with all the Socinian and Casuist Arguments, and quoted them, wherein they differ from us Orthodox, as he hath piece-mealed our Orthodox Writers, quoting part of them, and interpreting their Sense quite contrary to their own Meaning and Intent: He himself would have shewn the Reader a material Difference still remained.

As to what he quotes, that these Orthodox Men do agree, that God most high is but one true God, respecting his Essence, and undividable and undivided Essence, an entire Substance, not subsisting in parts, &c. is not to be taken in this Sense he would have it, to wit, that God the Father is most high, above the Son and Holy Spirit, respecting the Divine Nature and Essence it self, neither is their Sense to be understood that none in the Holy Trinity is most high, is God over all, is unchangeable from Everlasting to Everlasting; but the Father only, as Mr. Allen would, I think, have it, and I am sure some of those he calls Brethren, that he pleads for Communion withal, would have it.

Neither doth it at all follow, that because they and we do believe God to be one unchangeable and undivided and undividable Being, being most simple, without all Composition; that therefore Christ Jesus, respecting his Divinity, is not God of the very same Essence of the Father, and one with him; nor yet that the Holy Spirit cannot also be of that Divine Essence subsisting in the same Deity, because we and they also do conclude and believe Father, Son and Holy Spirit is but that one God most high, that one Divine Substance which cannot be divided in Being, Power, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness

Goodness and Holiness, tho' distinguished, and their Offices differ: These *three are one*, 1 Joh. 5. 7. and *I and my Father are one*, Joh. 10. 30. cannot be blotted out; and that our *Saviour is not alone*, but *he and the Father that sent him, bears witness of him*, Joh. 8. 16, 18.

sly. Neither is it a Multiplication of God's, to believe, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, yet but one God; nor do we divide the most High into three parts, as they would fain, tho' three distinguished, undivided, divine Persons be the most High, yet still but one Essence, one Being, one Nature, one God, then do they which contradict or disbelieve this Faith of the Orthodox, and say, God the Father is most high, *above* the Son and Holy Trinity; yea, that the Son is a *Creature created* by the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is not most high, but as it were a *Vertue*, yet say the Son is a God, and the Holy Spirit may be called so, as *delegated* under God as a *Messenger*, &c. multiply Gods to themselves, yea, some of them will confess the Power and Inspiration of God dwelt in Christ, or that he was *anointed* therewith, but not that he existed in the Divine Essence it self, equally with the Father, according to their Doctrine; but there must then be parts in him that is most high, and a breaking into, two or three parts, and they cannot get over it, if they own Christ to be God at all, or the Power and Inspiration of God to dwell in him, yet say he is not equal with the Father, so below him.

Now, we believe contrary to this, that tho' the Father be most high, so the Son and Spirit, subsisting in the same Divine Essence, are all three Persons one most high; not that the most high dwelt in Christ, as being anointed with the Holy Spirit, only as God dwells by his Spirit in *Believers*: But a vast difference is here from *that*, that the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father, Joh. 14. 11. in Essence and Being; but it cannot be

be so in a Believer, he dwells only by Faith in the Hearts of his Children, but in Christ *the fulness of the God-head dwelt in him bodily*, yea, all fulness, Col. 1. 19. Col. 2. 9. As he was true God, so of the true Nature of God; *over all God blessed for ever Amen. Rom. 9. 5.*

But how many Gods do these Men make? First, one most high God, and Second *Lesser ones*; over which the Father is most high: Oh, horrible Doctrine, that ever any pretending to Christianity, that God hath given understanding to, should so abuse it, and dishonour him in vindicating so vile a Doctrine, yea must have it Indulged amongst Saints too, in all Churches where it creeps in, or else what an out-cry is there against those that strive to purge it out; as *Renters of Churches to pieces, breakers of Saints Peace, wanters of Love and Charity, and disquieters of poor Souls*; when alas, they are as busie in privately poysoning of Souls with their false Doctrine: First, by laying stumbling-blocks in poor Souls way, saying, *How can Christ be God, seeing there is but one true God? How can Three Persons be one God? How could Christ take of our Nature, and not of our Defilement*; yea, how could he be *one equal with the Father*, when he was *Ignorant of the Day of Judgment*: All this and much more have I heard urged to weak Souls with my own Ears.

3dly. Mr. Allen at the beginning of his Third Section, page 18. States the matter of difference, concerning the manner of paying Worship and Adoration to God the Father, whom he Stiles most High, very *Ambiguous* as well as *Sophistical*, in these words, *viz. Whether it be the declared pleasure of the Almighty, that his Subjects should pay their Adoration to the Matter subsisting, or the Manner of subsisting, or pay it to him, with and under the Conception and Appellation of one Supream Sovereign, single Substance, unseparable in Essence and Divine Properties, subsisting in one Person? or whether it should be paid unto him under the Notion and Appellation of a single*

Essence, subsisting in Three distinct Manners, Modes or Persons? then resolving the Question, saith it's his declared Will that Worship should be paid unto him, under the Appellation, and with the Conception of a single Essence, subsisting in one Divine Person and Spirit.

I Reply, it's enough for us to know what Gods word declares herein, *i. e.* That Father, Son, and Spirit are but one, *these Three are one*, 1 John 5. 7. that is, One in Power, Nature and Being, as is to be proved from many other Scriptures, tho' they have striven to evade the Force of them by Sophistry and Cunning Craftiness.

2. I answer, That it's the declared Will and Pleasure of the Almighty, that we should Honour the Son, even as we Honour the Father, See that Text, John 5. 23. in these words, *That all Men should Honour the Son, even as they Honour the Father*, that the Holy Spirit is to be worshipped as God, is also plain in respect. 1. That the *Seraphims* express Praise and Adoration to the *Thrice Holy God*, Isa. 6. 1, 2, 3. compared with *Acts* 28. 25, 26, 27. where the matter is applied to the Holy Ghost. 2. That the Act of Baptism is to be performed, *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, Matth. 28. 19. is certain, if Christs Commission be true, as it undoubtedly is; which lays us under the obligation to his Worship, in whose Name we are Baptized; therefore it is said that we are *Debtors*, not to the flesh to live after that, Rom. 8. 12. but doubtless to the Spirit which works by his Grace in us if we are his.

3. I answer, That as we believe God is but one Infinite Being, so is it unlawful for Adoration and Worship divine, to be paid to any *Denomitant*, or Called God, not so by *Nature* and *Essence*; but we do believe he that gives divine Worship and Adoration to God, expressing the Father only, and excludes the Son and Spirit in his Thoughts or Words, doth not Answer the pleasure of God, or
God's

God's declared Mind and Will, that all Men should Honour the Son even as they do the Father, from whence it follows, that though there be but one God, not three most Highest; yet that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, so by Nature and Essence; or else they could not be worshipped with one and the same divine Worship, as I have proved, and do affirm they are, for God will not give his Glory to another, nor his Praise to graven Images, or to that which is Created, *Isa.* 42. 8. Compared with *Isa.* 43. 11.

4. I answer, That tho' we may pay our Adoration to God, as a single Essence, differing from all other Beings, excluding all that is not God by Nature, as not being of that single Essence, and so not worthy of that Divine Praise and Worship; yet are we to believe that Three Persons are subsisting in that one Divine single Essence, and not being multiplied into Three distinct Gods, one Greater and two Lesser, for I cannot tell what he means by the words *Three distinct Manners, Modes or Persons*; if he intend not the Son and Spirit to be two distinct Lesser Beings, distinct from the Divine Essence it self, as to Power, Nature, and Eternity, or else that the Father subsists in *Three distinct Manners*; but neither of these do we Orthodox believe, tho' it be a great Mytery, and no finding God out to Perfection; yet shall not we believe what God hath made known of himself? *i. e.* to be one Infinite Being, yet that also in that divine Essence is subsisting Three Persons one God; and indeed here lies Mr. Allens dark Sentences in the words *Single Essence and Inseparable*, if he, or any ask how it can be that there should be One Divine Essence, and yet Three Persons in that one Divine Essence, and this Essence to remain unseparable and single? I answer, That as before is explained, he is single in Essence, Nature, and Quality, as not being Compounded with things of any other Lesser Nature or Being; so also inseparable, as not divided

into Three several Natures; and if they ask further, how One can be Three, and Three One? I ask them, how can Finite Creatures find out the Infinite being to Perfection? but God hath declared this, and we must believe it. 5thly. It is not for us to go to those Niceties, beyond the Word of God, but the Word of God hath in part discovered to us both the *Matter* and *Manner* of God's subsisting, the *Matter* so far, as that God is Holy, Just, and Good; the *Manner*, that we are to Worship him by: In order to which it's declared in part the *Manner* of Existing, as Three Holys, Three that bear witness in Heaven, and that these Three are Father, Son and Spirit, one God Eternal.

Next, I come to take notice of his Reasons, that God is to be Worshipped as one *single Essence, subsisting in one Divine Person, &c.* This he urges from page 19. to the 27. pretending Scripture for: From, 1. *God's discovery of himself to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and Israel in General, as the Object of their Worship, in the singular Number, as I, My, Me, or Mine, and not We or Ours.* 2dly. *How those Patriarchs of Old did conceive of the most High, when they addressed themselves to him,* which saith he appears not to Respect his Subsisting, but his Essence and Essential properties; for that they used such Expressions as were of the singular Number, as Thee, Thy, or Thine, which saith he, shews that they did not directly pay their Respect to distinct Persons, but to one Essence, &c. so far he goes off the Old Testament.

Reply 1. I find that our pretended Trinitarians chiefest design in all this Section about the Worship of the Holy God, is to argue against Divine Worship to be given to the Son as God, equal with the Father, and so against it to be given to the Holy Ghost; for indeed I do not yet see he owns Christ to be God at all, truly so, but in Name and Office only, for page 14. he allows of Duty to be paid

paid to those God *Delegates under him*, and the same that we owe unto God, so far as I can discern by his words, be they Angels or Men, may receive it, and our Duty to pay it them, which he makes as if we were agreed about; but no such thing, we believing no Created Being is to be Honoured and Adored with the same divine Worship, as the Divine Being it self, and Creator of all things is to be.

Reply 2. As to God's discovering himself, as he saith, to those of Old in the *Singular Number*; great reason there is for it, because he is but One, his Essence is but One, his Nature is but One; all Divine Properties are in him, in that one Divine Being; but the Gods of the Heathens, which were either Created Beings, or else Idols, the works of Men's Hands were many, yea, Multitudes.

Reply 3. Tho' God did often discover himself to his Saints, under the appellation of *I, Me, &c.* yet not always but often in *Plural Terms*, as it is discovered in his Holy Word, which Mr. *Allen* would we should as well as himself keep close to, See page 19. of his Book.

First Instance of this, That I take out of the Sacred Word of God, *Gen. 1.* where it is said, *vers. 1.* *In the beginning God Created the Heavens and the Earth, &c.* Where the Learned Assembly of Divines in their Annotations on the said Text, say thus, 'in the Hebrew the word for God is *Elohim*, of the plural Number, which signifieth Strong, Potent Mighty, -- and for Created the Hebrew word is *Bara*, of the Singular Number, whence some Learned and Pious Expositors, have deduced the Doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence, &c. saying also; That tho' for several Reasons which he lays down, some others will not allow the Proof of the Trinity from hence; yet notwithstanding it may be probably conceived to be the meaning of *Moses* to insinuate the Trinity by this Expression of the

Noun and *Verb* in a differing Number; because first he was not ignorant of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

2^{dly}. He well knew God the Father made the World as it is, 1 Cor. 8. 6.

3^{dly}. That God the Son also made the World as it is, Prov. 8. 24. 27, 28. John 1. 3. Eph. 3. 9.

Col. 1. 16. and he expressly nameth the Spirit, or Third Person (*ver. 2.*)

The Second Instance that I give is *Genesis* 1. 26. And God said Let us make Man in our Image, and after our Likeness, &c. Here it is expressly discovered in the *Plural Number* and Phrase by the Word *Us* and *Our*, from which Text the aforesaid Learned Annotator says thus, ' But besides this word of Plurality (*US*) may intimate the Trinity distinctly noted in the first Epistle of John, Chap. 5. 7. in this manner (that is plurally) God speaks of himself Four times in Scripture, as besides this place of this Book Chap. 3. 22. and Chap. 11. 7. and *Isay*. 6. 8. and in divers of them, not by way of deliberation, or advice, --- but so to mind us of the Mytery of the Three Persons in One God-head; and in this place God the Father seemeth to speak, as Communicating by way of Consultation with God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghost, concerning the Creation of Man, &c.

To this I add a Third Instance, *Genesis* 3. 22. And the Lord God said, behold the Man is become as one of us, &c. which the said Annotator Expounds thus, *viz.* (*as one of us*) ' That is one of the Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, &c. which they conclude was spoken Ironically, and indeed so it must be, Man by his Fall becoming more like the Devil than the Holy God himself, For he that commits Sin is of the Devil, 1 John 3. 8. as Adam and Eve did in breaking God's Holy Command, Gen. 3. 6. compared with Rom. 5. 12. but to pass this I come to a Fourth Instance.

Fourth Instance is, *Gen. 11. 7. Go to, Let us go down and there Confound their Language.* (*Let us*) is a Phrase of the Plural Number, and the aforesaid Annotators writ thus on it: 'He speaks as if he took Council of his own Wisdom and Power, *to wit*, with the Son and the Holy Ghost, and indeed I have reason to conceive they do Expound this Right, inasmuch as Christ is said to be the Power of God, and also the Wisdom of God, *I Cor. 1. 24.*

Fifth Instance is from three Texts, as *Gen. 20. 13. and 35. 7. and especially Joshua 24. 19.* which three Texts the aforesaid Annotators Quote, to shew that God is pleased sometimes to be called with a word of the Plural Number, which signifies God's, as in these Texts in the Hebrew word they say it is so; and from that in *Joshua*, where the Text saith, *he is an Holy God, Heb. Elohim, Kedoshim, i. e. Holy Gods himself.* Such discoveries of God to Man, under the Old Dispensation was there, that obliged him to Worship the whole Divine, Holy, and Everlasting Essence that Created all things, the discovery of the Father, Word, or Son, and Holy Spirit, as Creator, Governor, and Preserver of all things, was to that intent Man should pay Adoration to that whole Divine Essence discovered to them, which knowledge of a Trinity was discovered to the Faithful of Old in all Ages, more especially to *Moses.* 'from which Conjunction of the Plural Number with the Singular, some Collect the Trinity in Unity, saith the Assembly of Divines.

6. Instance is, *Isa. 6. 8. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us, &c.* These with many more might be Instanced, shews that God often discovered himself in Old time to Man-kind, in such Words and Phrases, as of the Plural Number.

2dly. And this might serve to answer what he saith about *Adam, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and Israels Conception of, and Addresses to the Holy God,*

40 *Of the Discovery God hath made of himself,*
using alway such Expressions as belong to the Singular
Number, as he saith, &c. page 23.

Reply, But further as to *Moses* (who Penn'd the Heavenly Oracle, which doubtless those before him, had either by Divine Inspiration, or other ways made known to them, being some way or other Revealed to them, as by *Enoch* the Seventh from *Adam*, who *Prophested of the Lord's coming to Judgment with Ten Thousand of his Saints*) could not be ignorant of this Lord Christ, who is appointed to Judge the Quick and Dead at his appearing and Kingdom, *2 Tim. 4. 1.* Neither could *Adam* himself be ignorant hereabout, seeing the promise of Christ (by way of threatning to the Serpent) was made so soon as *Adam* had Sinned, before he was turned out of Paradise, and doubtless was directed afterwards to that Saviour and Lord Christ, that made the Worlds in conjunction with the Father and Spirit; compare *Gen. 1. 1, 2.* with *Heb. 1. 2.* It's also as plain that *Abraham*, who was the Father of the Faithful did see Christ's Day and was glad, *John 8. 56.* this Compared with *Gen. 18. 1.* unto the end, you may find that one of those Three appear'd to *Abraham*, was the Lord, and as the Assembly of Divines, with other Orthodox writers, plainly discover that it was Christ, the Angel, or Messenger of the Covenant, which talked to *Abraham* about the destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, whilst the other Two went toward the said Cities, for Three appear'd first to *Abraham*, and he yet stood before the Lord, *verse 22.* and but two Angels came to *Sodom*; also *Moses* himself is laid to refuse to be called the Son of Pharaoh's Daughter, chusing rather to suffer afflictions with the People of God, then to enjoy the pleasures of Sin for a Season (the Reason is, because he) esteeming the Reproaches of Christ greater Riches than all the Treasure of Egypt, or in Egypt, &c. *Heb. 11. 25, 26.* and that *Israel* in General had Christ the Lord of Life discover'd to them, is also evident. Expositors say at
the

the Bush that Burned first to *Moses*, and so to *Israel*, *Exodus* 3. 2, 4. and the main reason why its thought to be the Angel of the Covenant or Christ, is, First, because this Angel is said to be the Lord, or *Jehovah*, which word *Jehovah* is no where given to Created Angels. Secondly that he is called God; for its said God called unto him out of the midst of the Bush; therefore the blessing of *Moses* upon *Joseph* is expressed; for the Good will of him that dwelt in the Bush, *Deut.* 33. 16. Besides we have Christ's own words for it, being God that spake to *Moses* in the Bush. *Mark* 12. 26. have ye not Read in the Book of *Moses*, how in the Bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of *Abraham*, and the God of *Isaac* and the God of *Jacob*: So that tho' it be said an Angel appeared to *Moses* in the Bush; yet also it must be understood, the Angel of the Covenant, the Word or Son of God, that was God Eternal, Creator of all things, or else it could not be *Jehovah*, and the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, but farther it is plain that the Lord Christ was discovered to *Israel* of Old, not only by Sacrifices and Offerings, which were manifold, and other lively Types; but also when they were in their Conductment out of *Egypt*, by the Hand of *Moses* through the Red Sea, and in the Wilderness, it was the Angel of God's presence, was to go before them, which doubtless was Christ in his Power, if not in Person; because the Apostle plainly tells us that our Fathers speaking of *Israel*, -- were all Baptised unto *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and did all Eat the same Spiritual Meat, and did all Drink the same Spiritual Drink; for they Drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ, *1 Cor.* 10. 2, 3, 4. to pass by *David* and the Prophets, and add no more than the word of himself, *Luke* 24. 44. together with the Apostles words, *Acts* 10. Christ saith that all things must be fulfilled, which are written in the Law of *Moses*, and in the Prophets, and in the *Psalms* concerning ME; the

Apostle

42. *Of the Discovery God hath made of himself.*

Apostle saith thus, *verse 43. 10th of Acts, To him give all the Prophets witness that through his Name, whosoever believes in him shall receive Remission of Sins;* from whence its plain such a large discovery of Christ, as the Lord of Life, and existing with the Father in the Creation of all things, was discovered to all the Fathers of Old and Israel, as did oblige them not to exclude the Son in Worship of the Holy God, as our new *Casimies* and *Socinians* would perswade to; seeing in that dispensation of Old, the Nations were Commanded *to kiss the Son, lest he be Angry, and they perish from off the way,* Psal. 2. 12. But plain it is that the Plural Number is expressed by those of Old, often concerning God, and the Holy and Celestial Creatures, the *Seraphims* do express themselves in their praise to the God of Heaven, in words set forth, a Thrice Holy God, *Crying, Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts,* Isa. 6. 3. But were it so that the Addressees of Man to the Holy God were to be in the *Singular Number*; yet that's no proof that Christ is not Existing in that one divine Essence, and so to be Worshipped equal with the Father, seeing that the Orthodox Faith, according to God's word, obliges us to believe, as is said before, that there is but one most High and Holy God, though Three Persons, subsisting in that one Essence; and therefore though we do Worship God in Expressions of the Singular Number, yet if we by Faith, and agreeable to God's word, do have respect to the whole Essence, then do we Worship that one True Living God in Three Persons aright; but if we Worship God with a singular Expression, where it is no other ways required, including Son and Holy Spirit, we do go by the same Rule of Faith and Practice, to wit, God's Word, who so plentifully in the Old Testament discover'd himself under the appellation of Three *Holys*, and in the Plural word *US*.

Reply 2. Now in the New Testament that enjoyns us, *that all Men should Honor the Son, even as they do*

do the Father, Stephen prays to Christ, and Commits his Spirit into his hands, Acts 7. 59. and they Stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my Spirit: The Disciples pray unto and Worship him, Luke 17. 5. and Luke 24. 52. again 2 Cor. 13, 14. all Three Persons are Named and prayed unto; in Baptism, which obliges us to Worship, all Three Holy and Sacred Names, are Named on us: The Son saith, *I and my Father are one*, John 10. 30. his beloved Disciple saith, *I John 5. 7.* For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One, therefore Mr. Allen's plea for Expressions of the Singular Number, are of no Force, the Oneness of Essence, and distinction of Three Persons discovered so plain, shews how we are to Worship the Holy God, including Son and Spirit, not excluding of them.

Object. Mr. Allen argues the word *US*, was spoken in Heaven, which no Mortal Man ever heard, &c. and that Christ directs his Disciples to pray to the Father saying, *Our Father*, and so the Woman of Samaria, not mentioning any but the Father, see page 20. and 25.

Reply, As to the First thing it's false, to say it was spoken in Heaven, so that no Mortal Man ever heard, &c. because God spake by his Spirit to Moses and the Prophets, and it was discovered to Mortal Men what he panned, besides the speaking of God in former Days, by Angels, Visions and Dreams, was at sundry times and in divers manners, as the Apottle Testifies, Heb. 1. 1.

2dly, As to the second thing, Christ as Man did direct his Disciples and others to pray to, and Worship God, for *God is a Spirit*, and in his Direction to the Woman of Samaria, he tells her that they that Worship him, must Worship in Spirit and in Truth, John 4. 24. therefore he doth not exclude himself as God, because he had that Eternal Spirit of the Eternal Essence, whereby he offered himself without spot to God the Father, Heb. 9. 14. again Christ

again Christ is called the Everlasting Father and Mighty God, *Isa. 9. 6.* besides he saith, that all Men should Honour the Son, even as they Honour the Father, and he that Honours not the Son Honours not the Father, *John 5. 23.* so that Christ would not exclude himself and so contradicts himself, as it must follow, if all *Mr. Allen* says were true.

Section III.

OUR Author Titles his Second Chapter, concerning the Christ of God, in which he divideth his matter into Four Sections.

First, *Of the Person of Christ, who he is,* which he lays down in part of the 27th and part of the 28th page of his Book. First shewing the mistakes of the Jews, Persians, Mahometans or Turks, and the Quakers, &c. Then saith our Brethren, and we all agree, that he, and no other that was Born of Mary, called Jesus of Nazareth, was and is the Christ of God, the Saviour of the World, and why we should cry one against another, or upon one another, that such a one denies the true Christ, and believes in another Christ, I see no Reason, (saith he) since we are all agreed, that that one Person Born of Mary, was and is the true Christ, &c.

Reply. I. As to this Title of his Second Chapter, Stiling it (concerning the Christ of God) I answer, by these words he plainly implies, that our Saviour is not God, but only the Christ of God, or Anointed of God, and by this word Christ it's evident that he speaks or Intends it concerning the whole Person of our Mediator; because in his 2d Section he speaks concerning the Offices of Christ, and