

A REVIEW ¹
OF THE
ANNOTATIONS

OF
HUGO GROTIUS,
In Reference unto the Doctrine of the
Deity, and Satisfaction of CHRIST.

WITH
A Defence of the Charge formerly laid against them.

By JOHN OVVEN D. D.



may 3rd

OXFORD,
Printed by H. HALL, Printer to the UNIVERSITY,
for THOM. ROBINSON. 1656.



A second Consideration of the Annotations
of *Hugo Grotius*.



AVING in my late defence of the doctrine of the Gospel, from the corruptions of the *Socinians*, been occasioned to vindicate the Testimonys given in the Scripture to the Deity of Christ, from their exceptions, and finding that *Hugo Grotius* in his Annotations had (for the most part) done the same things with them, as to that particular, and some other important Articles of the Christian faith, that booke of his being more frequent in the hands of *Students*, then those of the *Socinians*, I thought it incumbent on me, to doe the same worke in reference to those Annotations, which it was my designe to performe towards the writings of *Socinus*, *Smalcus*, and their companions and followers. What I have been enabled to accomplish by that endeavour, with what service to the Gospel hath been performed thereby, is left to the judgment of them who desire to know by *experience*. Of my dealing with *Grotius* I gave a briefe account in my Epistle to the Governours of the University, and that with reference to an Apology made for him, not long before. This hath obtained a new Apology under the name of a second defence of *Hugo Grotius*; with what little advantage either to the repute of *Grotius*, as to the thing in Question, or of the Apologist himselfe, it is judged necessary to give the ensuing account: for which I took the first leisure houre I could obtaine, having things of greater weight, dayly incumbent on me. The only thing of importance by me charged on those Annotations of *Grotius*, was this; that the Texts of Scripture both in the *Old Testament* and *New*, bearing witness to the Deity, and Satisfaction of Christ, are in them wrested to other senses and significations, and the Testimonies given to those grand truths, thereby eluded. Of those of the first kind I excepted one, yet with some doubt, least his expressions therein, ought to be interpreted according to the Analogy of what he had elsewhere delivered: of which afterwards,

Because that which concerns the Satisfaction of Christ will admit of the easiest dispatch, though taking up most roome, I shall in the first place insist thereon. The words of my charge on the Annotations, as to this

this head of the doctrine of the Scripture are these: *The condition of these famous Annotations as to the satisfaction of Christ is the same. Nor one Text in the whole Scripture, wherein Testimony is given to that sacred truth, which is not wrested to another sense, or at least the Doctrine in it, conceal'd and obscured by them.*

This being a matter of fact, and the words containing a crime charged on the Annotations, he that will make a defence of them, must either disprove the Assertion by instances to the contrary, or else granting the matter of fact, evince it to be no crime. That which is objected in matter of fact, *aut negandum est aut defendendum*, says *Quintilianus lib. 5. cap. de refut:* and *extra hac in judiciis ferè nihil est.* In other cases, *Patronus, neget, defendat, transferat, excuset, deprecetur, molliat, minuat, avertat, despiciat, deideat;* but in matters of fact, the two first only have place. *Aristotle* allows more particulars for an Apologist to divert unto, if the matter require it: he may say of what is objected, *ἢ ἀεὶ οὕτω ἔστιν, ἢ ἀεὶ οὕτως ἀβελβερῶν, ἢ οὐ τούτω, ἢ ἀεὶ οὕτω πλείονο, ἢ οὐκ ἀδίκον, ἢ ἕμεγα, ἢ οὐκ ἀίσιον, ἢ οὐκ ἔξον μέγαθ.* (*Rhet. lib. 3. cap. 15.*) all which in a plaine matter of fact may be reduced to the former heads. That any other Apology can or ought to take place in this, or any matter of the same importance will not easily be proved. The present Apologist takes another course. Such ordinary paths are not for him to walke in. He tells us of the excellent booke that *Grotius* wrote *de satisfactione Christi*, and the exposition of sundry places of Scripture, especially of divers verses of *Isa. 53:* given therein; and then adds sundry inducements to perswade us, that he was of the same mind in his Annotations. And this is called a defence of *Grotius*. The Apologist I suppose knowes full well, what Texts of Scripture they are, that are constantly pleaded for the Satisfaction of Christ, by them who doe believe that doctrine. I shall also for once take it for granted, that he might without much difficulty, have obtained a sight of *Grotius* Annotations; to which I shall only add, that probably if he could from them have disproved the Assertion before mentioned, by any considerable instances, he is not so tender of the Prefacers credit, as to have conceal'd it on any such account. But the Severalls of his plea for the Annotations in this particular, I am perswaded are accounted by some, worthy consideration; a breife view of them will suffice.

The signall place of *Is. 53.* he tells us, *he hath heard taken notice of by some;* (I thought it had been probable the Apologist might have taken notice of it himselfe,) as that wherein his Annotations are most suspected; therefore on that he will fasten a while; Who would not now expect

that the Apologist should have entred upon the consideration of those Annotations, and vindicated them from the imputations insinuated: but he knew a better way of procedure, and who shall prescribe to him, what suits his purpose and proposall.

This I say is the instance chosen to be insisted on; and the vindication of the Annotations therein, by the interpretation given in their Author. his booke *de Satisfactione Christi* is propos'd to consideration. That others, if not the Apologist himselfe, may take notice of the emptinesse of such precipitate Apologies, as are ready to be tumbled out, without due digestion, or consideration, I shall not only compare the Annotations and that booke as to the particular place propos'd, and manifest the inconsistency of the one with the other; but also to discover the extreme negligence and confidence, which lye at the bottome of his following attempt, to induce a persuasion, that the judgment of the man of whom we speake, was not alter'd (that is, as to the interpretation of the Scriptures relating to the Satisfaction of Christ) nor is others in his Annotations, then in that booke, I shall compare the one with the other, by sundry other instances, and let the world see how in the most important places contested about, he hath utterly deserted the interpretations given of them by himselfe in his booke *de Satisfactione*, and directly taken up that which he did oppose.

The Apologist binds me in the first place to that of *Is. 53.* which is ushered in by the *1 Pet. 2. 24.*

From *1 Pet. 2. 24.* (saies the Apologist) *Grotius* informes us that Christ so bare our sins, that he freed us from them, so that we are healed by his stripes.

This thus crudely propos'd, *Socinus* himselfe would graunt it, is little more then barely repeating the words; *Grotius* goes farther, and contends that ἀνίτηξαι, the word there used by the Apostle, is to be interpreted, *sulit sursum eundo, portavit*, and tells us that *Socinus* would render this word *abstulit*, and so take away the force of the Argument from this place. To disprove that insinuation, he urges sundry other places in the new Testament, where some words of the same importance are used, and are no way capable of such a signification. And whereas *Socinus* urges to the contrary *Heb. 9. 28.* where he saies ἀνυσσείν αὐαίτιας signifies nothing but *auferre peccata*, *Grotius* disproves that instance, and manifests that in that place also it is to be rendred by *sulit*, and so relates to the death of Christ.

That we may put this instance given us by the Apologist, to vindicate the Annotations from the crime charged on them to an issue, I shall give the

the Reader the words of his *Annotations* on that place: it is as follows:

ὁ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπέστανεν ἕκτι] ἀνθρώπων hic est, abstulit, quod sequentia ostendunt, quomodo idem verbum sumi notavimus, Heb. 9. 28. eodem sensu dicitur ἀμαρτίας. Job. 1. 29. & בָּשָׂא & סָבַל Isa. 53. 4. ubi Græci capiunt vitia nostra ita interfecit, sicut qui cruci affiguntur interfici solent. Simile loquendi genus Col. 2. 14. vide Rom. 6. 6. Gal. 2. 20. 24. est autem hic παρὰ ἡμῶν; non enim proprie Christus cum crucifigeretur, vitia nostra abstulit. Sed causas dedit per quas auferrentur. Nam crux Christi fundamentum est predicationis; predicatio verò poenitentia, poenitentia verò auferit vitia.

How well the *Annotator* abides here by his former interpretation of this place, the *Apologift* may easily discover: 1. There he contends that ἀνθρώπων is as much as *tulit*, or *sursum tulit*: and objects out of *Socius*, that it must be *abstulit*, which quite alters the sense of the Testimony. Here he contends with him, that it must be *abstulit*. 2. There Heb. 9. 28. is of the same importance with this 1 Pet. 2. 24. as there interpreted: here, as here; that is, in a quite contrary sense, altogether inconsistent with the other. 3. For company, סָבַל used Is. 53. is called in to the same signification, which in the booke *de Satisfactione* he contends is never used in that sense, and that most truly. 4. Upon this exposition of the words, he gives the very sense contended for by the *Socinians*; non enim proprie Christus cum crucifigeretur vitia nostra abstulit, sed causas dedit per quas auferrentur: what are these causes; he adds them immediately, Nam crux Christi fundamentum est predicationis, predicatio verò poenitentia, poenitentia verò auferit vitia. He that sees not the whole *Socinian* position wrapped up and proposed in this interpretation, is ignorant of the state of the difference, as to that Head, between them, and Christians. (5) To make it a little more evident, how constant the *Annotator* was to his first principles, which he insisted on in the management of his disputes with *Socius* about the sense of this place, I shall adde the words of *Socius* himselfe, which then he did oppose. Verum animadvertere oportet primum in Græco, verbum, quod interpretes veterunt pertulit, est ἀνθρώπων, quod non pertulit sed abstulit vertendum erat, non secus ac factum fuerit in epistola ad Hebræos cap. 9. 28. ubi idem legendi modus habetur, unde constat ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτίας non perferre peccata, sed peccata tollere, sive auferre, significare. Socin. de Jesu Christi. lat. lib. 2. cap. 6.

What difference there is between the designe of the *Annotator*, and that of *Socius*, what compliance in the quotation of the parallel place of the

the *Hebrewes*, what direct opposition and head is made in the *Annotations* against that booke *de Satisfactione*, and how clearly the cause contended for in the one, is given away in the other; needs no farther to be demonstrated. But if this instance makes not good the *Apologifts* assertion, it may be supposed, that that which follows, which is ushered in by this, will doe it to the purpose; let then that come into consideration.

This is that of Isa. 53. Somewhat of the sense which *Grotius* in his booke *de Satisfactione* contends for, in this place, is given us by the *Apologift*.

The 11th verse of the chapter which he firsts considers (in my booke) page 14: he thus proposes and expounds: justificabit servus meus justus multos & iniquitates ipsorum bajulabit. in Heb. est: רָוַח וְסָבַל וְעוֹכָרִים vox autem וְעוֹכָרִים iniquitatem significat, atq; etiam iniquitatis poenam. 2 Reg. 7. 9. vox autem סָבַל est sustinere, bajulare, quoties autem bajulare ponitur cum nomine peccati aut iniquitatis, id in omni lingua & maxime in Hebraismo significat poenas ferre, with much more to this purpose. The whole designe of the maine dispute in that place, is, from that discourse of the Prophet to prove, that Iesus Christ properly underwent the punishment due to our finnes, and thereby made satisfaction to God for them.

To manifest his constancy to this doctrine, in his *Annotations* he gives such an Exposition of that whole chapter of *Isaiah* 53. as is manifestly, and universally inconsistent with any such designe in the words, as that which he intends to prove from them in his booke *de Satisfactione*. In particular (to give one instance of this assertion) he contends here that סָבַל, is as much as *bajulare*, *portare*, and that joynd with *iniquity* (in all languages, especially in the *Hebrew*) that phrase of *bearing iniquity*, signifies to undergoe the punishment due to it; in his *Annotations* on the place, as also in those on 1 Pet. 2. 24. he tells you the word signifies *auferre*, which with all his strength he had contended against. Not to draw out this particular instance into any greater length, I make bold to tell the *Apologift* (what I suppose he knows not) that there is no one verse of the whole chapter, so interpreted in his *Annotations*, as that the sense given by him, is consistent with, nay is not repugnant to, that the sense given by the same verses he pleads for in his booke *de Satisfactione Christi*. If notwithstanding this information, the *Apologift* be not satisfied, let him if he please consider what I have already animadverted on those *Annotations*, and undertake their vindication. These loose discourses are not at all to the purpose in hand, nor the Question between us which

which is solely; whether *Grotius* in his Annotations have not perverted the sense of those texts of Scripture, which are commonly, and most rightly pleaded as Testimonies given to the Satisfaction of Christ. But as to this particular place of *Isaiah*, the Apologist hath a farther plea, the summe whereof (not to trouble the Reader with the repetition of a discourse so little to the purpose) comes to this head; that *Grotius* in his booke de Satisfactione Christi gives the mysticall sense of the chapter, under which consideration, it belongs to Christ and his sufferings; In his Annotations the literall, which had its immediate completion in *Jeremy*, which was not soe easily discoverable or vulgarly taken notice of. This is the summe of his first observation on this place to acquit the Annotator of the Crime charged upon him. Whether he approve the application of the prophesie to *Jeremiah* or no, I know not. He saies, *Grotius* so conceived. The designe of the discourse seems to give approbation to that conception. How the literall sense of a place should come to be lesse easily discovered then the mysticall, well I know not. Nor shall I speake of the thing it selfe concerning the literall and mysticall sense supposed to be in the same place and words of Scripture, with the application of the distinction to those Propheesies which have a double accomplishment in the Type and thing or person typified, (which yet hath no soundnesse in it) but to keepe to the matter now in hand, I shall make bold for the removall of this engine applyed by the Apologist for the preventing all possible mistake, or controversie about the Annotators after-charge in this matter, to tell him, that the perverting of the first literall sense of the chapter, or giving it a completion in any person whatsoever, in a first, second, or third sense, but the Son of God himselfe, is no lesse then Blasphemy; which the Annotator is no otherwise freed from, but by his conceiving a sense to be in the words, contrary to their literall importance, and utterly exclusive of the concernment of *Jesus Christ* in them. If the Apologist be otherwise minded, I shall not invite him againe to the consideration of what I have already written in the vindication of the whole prophesie from the wretched corrupt interpretation of the Annotator, (not hoping that he will be able to breake through that discouragment he hath from looking into that treatise, by the prospect he hath taken of the whole by the Epistle) but doe expresse my earnest desire, that by an exposition of the severalls of that chapter, and their application to any other (not by loose discourses forraigne to the Question in hand) he would endeavour to evince the contrary; if on second thoughts he find either his judgment, or ability, not ready or competent for such an attempt, I heartily wish he would be carefull hereafter

of ingenerating apprehensions of that nature, in the minds of others, by any such discourses as this.

I cannot but suppose that I am already absolved from a necessity of any farther procedure, as to the justifying my charge against the Annotations, having sufficiently foyled the instance produced by the Apologist for the weakening of it. But yet least any should thinke, that the present issue of this debate, is built upon some unhappinesse of the Apologist in the choice of the particulars insisted on; which might have been prevented, or may yet be removed, by the production of other instances: I shall for their further satisfaction, present them with sundry other, the most important Testimonies given to the Satisfaction of Christ, wherein the Annotator hath openly prevaricated, and doth imbrace and propose those very interpretations, and that very sense, which in his booke, de Satisfactione Christi, he had strenuously opposed.

Page 8. of his booke de Satisfactione, he pleads the satisfaction of Christ, from *Gal. 2. 21.* laying weight on this, that the word, *λογος*, signifies the want of an antecedent cause, on the supposition there made. In his Annotations he deserts this assertion, and takes up the sense of the place given by *Socinus de servator. lib. 2. cap. 24.* His departure into the tents of *Socinus* on *Gal. 3. 13.* is much more pernicious. page 25, 26, 27. urging that place and vindicating it from the exceptions of *Socinus*; he concludes, that the Apostle said Christ was made a Curse, quasi dixerit Christum factum esse vel *ὡς ἐπιμωρατόρον*: hoc est poena à Deo irrogata, & quidem ignominiosissima obnoxium. To make good this, in his Annotations, he thus expounds the words: duplex hic figura; nam & *καταρα* pro *καταρατόρος*, quomodo circumcisio pro circumcisus: & *subauditur* *deus*: nam *Christus* ita cruciatus est, quasi esset *Deus* *καταρατόρος*, quo nihil homini pessimo in hac vita à poena evenire poterat: which is the very interpretation of the words given by *Socinus* which he opposed; and the same that *Crellius* insists upon in his vindication of *Socinus* against him. So uniforme was the judgment of the Annotator, with that of the Author of the booke de Satisfactione Christi.

Pages 32, 33, &c: are spent in the exposition and vindication of *Rom. 3. 25, 26.* that expression *ὡς ἵδμεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ*, manifesting the end of the suffering of Christ, is by him chiefly insisted on. That by *δικαιοσύνη* is there intended that justice of God, whereby he punisheth sin, he contends and proves from the nature of the thing it selfe, and comparing the expression with other paralell texts of Scripture: *Socinus* had interpreted this of the Righteousnesse of Christs fidelity and veracity: *Lib. 2. de Servator. cap. 2.* (ut ostenderet se veracem & fidelem esse.) but

Crellius in his vindication of him places it rather on the goodnesse & liberality of God, which is saith he, the Righteousnesse there intended. To make good his Ground, the *Annator*, thus expounds the meaning of the words: *vocem διευούνης malim hic de bonitate interpretari, quam de fide in promissis praestandis, quia quae sequuntur non ad Iudeos solos pertinent, sed etiam ad Gentes, quibus promissio nulla facta erat.* He rather (he tells you) embraces the interpretation of *Crellius* then of *Socinus*; but for that which himself had contended for, it is quite shut out of doors; as I have elsewhere manifested at large.

The same course he takes with *Rom. 5. 10.* which he insists on pag. 26. and *2. Cor. 5. 18, 19, 20, 21.* concerning which he openly deserts his owne former interpretation, and closes expressly with that which he had opposed, as he doth in reference to all other places, where any mention is made of Reconciliation: The substance of his Annotations on those places, seeming to be taken out of *Socinus*, *Crellius*, and some others of that party.

That signall place of *Heb. 2. 17.* in this kind, deserves particularly to be taken notice of; *Cap. 7 pag. 141.* of his booke de Satisfactione, he pleads the sense of that expression, *ὅτι τὸ ἰλάσασθαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῶ λαοῦ, το βε, ἰλάσασθαι ὁδὸν μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν:* and addes, significat ergo ibi expiationem que fit placando: But *Crellius* defence of *Socinus* had so possessed the mans mind before he came to write his Annotations, that on that place he gives us directly his sense, and almost his words in a full opposition to what he had before asserted: *ἰλάσασθαι ἀμαρτίας, hoc quidem loco, ut ex sequentibus apparet, est auferre peccata, sive purgare à peccato, id est, efficere ne peccetur, vires suppeditando pro modo tentationum.* So the *Annator* on that place; endeavoring farther to prove his Interpretation. From *Rom. 4* last, *Cap. 1. pag. 47.* of his booke de Satisfactione, he clearly proves the Satisfaction of Christ; and evinces that to be the sense of that expression, *traditus propter peccata nostra:* which he thus Comments on in his Annotations: *poterat dicere qui & mortuus est, & resurrexit ut nos à peccatis justificaret, id est, liberaret. Sed amans ambata morti conjunxit peccata, quae sunt mors animi, resurrectioni autem adptionem Iustitiae, quae est animi resuscitatio: mirè nos & à peccatis retrahit & ad Iustitiam ducit; quod videmus Christum mortem non formidasse pro doctrinà suà peccatis contrarià, & ad Iustitiam nos vocanti Testimonio; & à Deo Iustificatum, ut eadem doctrina (summa conciliaretur) Authoritas.* He that sees not, not only that he directly closes in, with what before he had opposed, But also, that he hath here couched the whole Doctrine of the Socinians, about the Mediation of Christ, and our Iustification thereby, is utterly

IGNORANT

ignorant of the state of the Controversie between them, and Christians.

I suppose it will not be thought necessary for me to proceed with the comparison instituted. The severall bookes are in the hands of most Students, and that the case is generally the same in the other places pleaded for the Satisfaction of Christ; they may easily satisfy themselves. Only because the Apologist seems to put some difference between his Annotations on the Revelations, (as having received their lineaments and colours from his owne pencil,) and those on the Epistles which he had not so compleated; as I have already manifested, that in his Annotations on that booke, he hath treacherously tampered with, and corrupted the Testimonies given to the Deity of our blessed Saviour, so shall I give one instance from them also, of his dealing no lesse unworthily with those that concerne his Satisfaction.

Socinus in his second booke against *Covet*, second part, & chap. 17. gives us this account of those words of the holy Ghost, *Rev. 1. 5. who hath loved us, and washed us in his owne blood: Johannes in Apocalyp. cap. 1. v. 5. alia Metaphora seu Translatione, (quae nihil aliud est quam compendiosa quadam comparatio) utens, dixit de Christo & ejus morte, qui dilexiss nos & lavit nos à peccatis in sanguine suo, nam quemadmodum aqua ablununtur sordes corporis, sic sanguine Christi, peccata, quae sordes animi sunt absteruntur. Absteruntur, inquam, quia animus noster ab ipsis mundatur, &c.* This interpretation is opposed and exploded by *Grotius lib. de Satisf. c. 10. p. 208, 209.* the substance of it being, that Christ washed us from our sins by his death, in that he confirmed his doctrine of Repentance & newnesse of life thereby, by which we are turned from our sins; as he manifests in the close of his Discourse, *hoc (apostolus) urgendum est, (saith Socinus) Iesum Christum eà ratione peccata nostra abstulisse, quod effecerit, ut à peccando desistamus.* This Interpretation of *Socinus*, being reinforced by *Crellius*, the place falls againe under the Consideration of *Grotius* in those Annotations on the Revelations; which as the Apologist tells us, received their very lineaments and colours from his owne Pencil. There then he gives us this Account thereof, *καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ υἱοῦ: Sanguine suo, id est, morte toleratà, certos nos reddidit veritatis eorum quae docuerat, quae talia sunt, ut nihil sit aptius ad purgandos à vitiis animos. Humida natura, sub quâ est sanguis, proprium est lavare. Id vero per egregiam ἀλληγορίαν ad animum transferuntur. Dicitur autem Christum suo sanguine nos lavasse, quia & ipse omnia praestitit quae ad id requirebantur & apparet scriptum in plurimis effectum.* I desire the Apologist to tell me what he thinks of this peice thus perfected, with all its lineaments and colours by the pencil of that skillfull man; and what beautifull aspect

he supposeth it to have. Let the Reader, to prevent further Trouble in perusing transcriptions of this kind, consider *Rev.* 13. 8. pag. 114. *Heb.* 9. 25. to the end; which he calls an *illustrious* place in the same page and forward: *I John* 2. 2. pag. 140, *Rom.* 5. 10, 11. page 142, 143. *Eph.* 2. 16. page 148, 149, *Col.* 1. 20, 21, 22. *Tit.* 2. 14. page 156. *Heb.* 9. 14, 15. pag. 157, 158. *Act.* 20. 28. and many others; And compare them with the *Annotations* on those places, and he will be farther enabled to judge of the defence made of the one, by the instance of the other: I shall only desire that he who undertakes to give his judgment of this whole matter, be somewhat acquainted with the state of the difference, about this point of the doctrine of the Gospel, between the *Socinians* and us; that he doe not take *auferre peccata*, to be *ferre peccata*: *nostris causa*, to be *nostra vice*, and *nostro loco*; *causa prosequendi*, to be *prosequendi*; *liberatio à iugo peccati*, to be *redemptio à reatu peccati*: *Subire penas simpliciter*, to be *subire penas nobis debitas*: to be *λύτρον*, and *ἔσχα* in respect of the event, to be so as to the proper nature of the thing; *offerre seipsum in caelo*, to be as much as *offerre seipsum in cruce*, as to the worke it selfe: that so he be not mistaken to thinke that, when the first are granted, that the latter are so also. For a close of the discourse relating to this head, a breife account may be added, why I said not positively, that he had wrested all the places of Scripture giving Testimony to the Satisfaction of Christ, to another sense: but that he had either done so, or else concealed or obscured that sense in them.

Though I might give instances from one or two places in his *Annotations* on the Gospels, giving occasion to this assertion, yet I shall insist only on some taken from the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews*, where is the great and eminent feat of the doctrine of Christs satisfaction. Although in his *Annotations* on that *Epistle*, he doth openly corrupt the most cleare Testimonies given to this Truth, yet there are some passages in them, where in he seems to dissent from the *Socinians*. In his *Annotations* on chap. 5. vers. 5. he hath these words, *Iesu quidem Sacerdotale munus suum aliquo modo erat auspicatus; cum semet patri victimam offerret*. That Christ was a *Preist* when he was on the earth, was wholly denied by *Socinus* both in his booke of *Servatore*, and in his *Epistle* to *Niemoietius*, as I have shewed elsewhere. *Smalcius* seems to be of the same judgment in the *Racovian Catechisme*. *Grotius* saies, *Sacerdotale munus erat aliquo modo auspicatus*; yet herein he goes not beyond *Crellius*, who tells us; *mortem Christum subit duplici ratione, partim quidem ut foederis mediator seu sponsor, partim quidem ut Sacerdos; Deo ipsum oblaturus: de causis mortis Christi* pag. 6. And so *Volkelius* fully to the same purpose. *Partes* (saith he)

muneris Sacerdotis, hac sunt potissimum; mactatio victima, in tabernaculum ad oblationem peragendam, ingressio, & ex eodem egressio: Ac mactatio quidem mortem Christi, violentam sanguinis profusionem continet: de Religio lib. 3. cap. 47. pag. 145. and againe; *Hinc colligitur solam Christi mortem nequaquam illam perfectam absolutamque, ipsius oblationem (de qua in epistola ad Hebraeos agitur) suis esse principium & preparationem quandam ipsius Sacerdotii in caelo demum administrandi exitisse, ibid.* So that nothing is obtained by *Grotius*: his *munus Sacerdotale aliquo modo erat auspicatus*, but what is granted by *Crellius* and *Volkelius*. But in the next words, *cum semet offerret patri victimam*, he seems to leave them: but he seems only so to doe. For *Volkelius* acknowledgeth that he did slay the Sacrifice in his death, though that was not his compleate and perfect oblation, which is also afterwards affirmed by *Grotius*: and *Crellius* expressly affirms the same. Nor doth he seeme to intend a proper expiatory and satisfactory Sacrifice in that expression; for if he had, he would not have been guilty of such an *ἀνωγειν*, as to say, *semet obtulit patri*. Besides, though he do acknowledge elsewhere that this *victima* was *ἔσχα*, & ὅτις ἀμαρτιῶν, yet he sayes in another place (on ver. 3.) *Sequitur Christum quoque obtulisse pro se & ἀμαρτιῶν*; giving thereby such a sense to that expression, as is utterly inconsistent with a proper expiatory Sacrifice for sin. And which is yet worse, on chap. 9. v. 14. he gives us such an account why expiation is ascribed to the blood of Christ, as is a key to his whole interpretation of that epistle: *Sanguini (saith he) purgatio ista tribuitur: quia per sanguinem, id est, mortem Christi, secuta eius excitatione & evellitione, gignitur in nobis fides: quae deinde purgat corda.* And therefore where Christ is said to offer himselfe by the eternal Spirit, he tells us, *Oblatio Christi hic intelligitur illa, quae oblationi legali in adyto facta respondet, ea autem est, non oblatio in altari Cyrcus facta, sed in adyto caelesti*: So that the purgation of sin is an effect of Christs presenting himselfe in heaven only; which how well it agrees with what the *Apostle* sayes chap. 1. v. 3. the Reader will easily judge. And to manifest that this was his constant sense, on those words v. 26. *ἵνα ἀβύρτων ἀμαρτιῶν διὰ τῆς δωτικῆς αὐτοῦ*, he thus comments; *ἵνα ἀβύρτων ἀμαρτιῶν, Ut peccatum in nobis extingatur: sit autem hoc per passionem Christi, quae fidem nobis ingenerat, quae corde purificat.* Christ confirming his doctrine by his death, begets faith in us, which doth the worke. Of the 28th verse of the same chapter I have spoken before. The same he affirms againe, more expressly, on chap. 10. vers. 3. and on ver. 9. and verse 12. he interprets the oblation of Christ, whereby he rooke away sinne, to be the oblation or offering himselfe in heaven, whereby sin is taken away by Sanctification, as also in sundry other

other places, where the expiatory Sacrifice of Christ on earth, and the taking away of the *guilt* of sinne, by *Satisfaction*, is evidently intended. So that notwithstanding the *concession* mentioned: I cannot see the least reason to alter my thoughts of the *Annotations*, as to this business in hand.

Not further to abound in *causâ facili*; in all the differences we have with the *Socinians*, about *Christ's* dying for us, concerning the nature of *Redemption*, *Reconciliation*, *Mediation*, *Sacrifice*, the meaning of all the *phrases* and expressions, which in those things are delivered to us, the *Annnotator* is generally on the *apostate* side throughout his *Annotations*; and the truth is, I know no reason why our *Students* should with so much diligence and charge, labour to get into their hands the books of *Sociinus*, *Crellius*, *Smalcicus*, and the rest of that *Crew*, seeing these *Annotations*, as to the most important heads of Christian Religion, about the *Deity*, *Sacrifice*, *Priesthood*, and *Satisfaction* of Christ, *originall sin*, *free will*, *Iustification* &c, afford them the *Substance* and *Marrow* of what is spoken by them; so that as to these heads, upon the matter, there is nothing peculiar to the *Annnotator*, but the *Secular learning* which in his Interpretations he hath *curiously* and gallantly interweaved. *Plautus* makes sport in his *Ambitrino* with severall Persons, some *real*, some *assumed*, of such likeness one to another, that they could not discern themselves by any outward appearance; which caused various *conjectures* and mistakes between them. The *Poets* fancy rayled not a greater *similitude* between *Mercury* and *Sofia*, being supposed to be different persons, then there is a *dissimilitude* between the *Author* of the booke *de Satisfactione Christi*, and of the *Annotations*, concerning which we have been discourssing, being one and the same. Nor was the contest of those different persons so like on another, so irreconcilable, as are these of this single person, so unlike himselfe in the severall *treatises* mentioned. And I cannot but thinke it strange that the *Apologise* could imagine no surer measure to be taken of *Grotius's* meaning in his *Annotations* then his treatise of the *Satisfaction* of Christ doth afford, there being no two treatises that I know, of any different persons whatever, about one and the same Subject, that are more at variance. Whither now any will be persuaded by the *Apologise* to believe that *Grotius* was constant in his *Annotations* to the *Doctrine* delivered in that other *treatise*, I am not sollicitous.

For the reinforced plea of the *Apologise*, that these *Annotations* were not finished by him, but only *collections* that he might after dispose of, I am not concerned in it; having to deal with that booke of *Annotations*

ons that goes under his name; if they are none of his, it is neither on the one hand, or other, of any concernment unto me. I say not this, as though the *Apologise*, had in the least made good his former plea, by his new Exceptions to my evidence against it, from the *Printers* preface to the *Volume* of *Annotations* on the *Epistles*. He saies I what was the *opus integrum* that was comended to the care of *divina*? and answers himselfe, not that last part or volume of *Annotations*, but *opus integrum*, the whole volume or volumes that contained his *advocata adversaria* on the new *Testament*. For how ill this agrees with the *intention* and words of the *Prefacer*, a slight inspection will suffice to manifest. He tells us, that *Grotius* had himselfe published his *Annotations* on the *Gospels*, five yeares before: that at his departure from *Paris*, he left a great part of this volume (that is this on the *Acts* and *Epistles*) with a friend; that the reason why he left not *opus integrum*, that is, the whole volume with him, was because the residue of it was not so written, as that an *Amannensis* could well understand it. That therefore in his going towards *Sweden*, he wrote that part againe with his own hand, and sent it backe to the same person (that had the former part of the Volume committed to him) from *Hamburgue*. If the *Apologise* read this *Preface*, he ought, as I suppose to have desisted from the plea insisted on: If he did not, he thought assuredly he had much reason to despise them, with whom he had to do: But as I said, herein am I not concerned.

The Consideration of the charge on the *Annotations* relating to their raming with the *Testimonies* given in the *Scripture* to the *Deity* of Christ being an other head of the whole, may now have place.

The Summe of what is to this purpose by me affirmed, is, that in the *Annotations* on the old and new *Testament*, *Grotius* hath left but one place giving *Testimony* clearly to the *Deity* of Christ. To this assertion I added both a limitation, and also an enlargement in severall respects. A limitation that I could not perceive he had spoken of himselfe, clearly on that one place. On supposition that he did so, I granted that perhaps one or two places more, might accordingly be interpreted. That this one place is *Ioh. 1. 1.* I expressly affirmed: that is the one place wherein, as I say, he spake not home to the business. The defence of the *Apologise* in the behalfe of *Grotius* consists of sundry *discourses*. First to disprove that he hath left more then that one of *John* free from the corruption charged; he instances in that one of *Iohn 1. 1.* wherein as he saith, he expressly asserts the *Deity* of Christ: but yet wisely foreseeing, that this instance would not evade the charge, having been expressly excepted, (as to the present enquiry) and reserved to further debate; he adds the places quoted by *Gro-*

ius in the exposition of that place as *Prov.* 8. 21; 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27; *Isa.* 45. 12. & 48. 13. 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. *Col.* 1. 16. from all which he concludes, that the Annotations have left more Testimonies to the Deity of Christ untampered withall and unperverted, then my assertion will allow; reckoning them all up againe Section the 10th. and concluding himselfe a successfull Advocate in this case, or at least under a despaire of ever being so in any, if he acquit not himselfe clearly in this. If his failure herein be evinced, by the course of his late writings himselfe will appeare to be most concerned, I suppose then that on the view of this defence, men must needs suppose that in the Annotations on the places repeated, and mustered a second time by the Apologist, Grotius does give their sense as bearing witness to the Deity of Christ. Others may be pleased to take it for granted without farther consideration: for my part being a little concerned to inquire, I shall take the paines to turne to the places, and give the Reader a briefe account of them.

For *Prov.* 8. his first note on the wisdom there spoken of is: *Hæc de ea sapientia quæ in Lege apparet exponunt Hebræi, & sane ei, si non solt, at præcipuè hæc attributa conveniunt:* Now if the attributes here mentioned, agree either solely or principally to the wisdom that shines in the Law, how they can be the attributes of the person of the eternal Son of God, I see not. He adds no more to that purpose, untill he comes to the 22 ver. the verse of old contested about with the *Arrians*. His words on that are *Græcum Aquile, est, ἡ τὴν σοφίαν, ut & Symmachi & Theodosianus, respōdēt, bene Hebræo קנני, & Caldeæ habet ברה, & 70 ἑκπτος, sensu non malo, si creare sumas pro facere ut apparet: via Dei sunt operationes ipsius; sensum huius loci & sequentium non male exprimas cum Philone de Colo-niis: ὁ λογὸς ὁ ἀριστὸς τῆς Θεοῦ τῶν γένειν εὐκαρῶταν, ἡ καὶ ἀπὸς οὐκ ὀνειρημένους ὁ τῶν ὄλων κυβερνήτης παλαιότερῃ τῇ σύμπαρτα, ἢ ὅτε ἐκοσμοποιάσει χριστιανούς ὄρατω τῆς Θεοῦ τῆς ἀρκαίου τῶν ἀποκριμάτων σύμπαρ.*

On verse 27, he adds *aderam*, id est, ἢ ὡς τὸν Θεόν, ut infra *John Es vang.* 1. 1. What clear and evident Testimony, by this exposition is left in this place to the Deity of Christ I profess myselfe as ignorant, as I was: before I received this Direction by the Apologist: He tells us that קנני is rendred not amisse by the *Chaldee* ברה and the 70 ἑκπτος, though he knew that sense was pleaded by the *Arrians*, and exploded by the ancient Doctors of the Church. To relieve this Concession, he tells us that *create*, may be taken for *facere ut apparet*, though there be no evidence of such a use of the word in the Scripture, nor can he give any instance thereof. The whole interpretation runs on that wisdom that is a property of God, which he manifested in the workes of Creatio:

of the Son of God, the essentiall wisdom of God, subsisting with the father, we have not one words nor doth that Quotation of *Philo* relieve us in this businesse at all. We know in what sense he used the word ὁ λόγος: how far he and the *Platonicks*, with whom in this expression he consented, were from understanding the only begotten Son of God, is known. If this of *Philo* has any aspect towards the opinion of any professing themselves *Christians*, it is towards that of the *Arrians*, which seems to be expressed therein. And this is the place chosen by the Apologist to disprove the assertion of none being left, under the sense given them by the Annotations, bearing cleare Testimony to the Deity of Christ; his comparing אני עמי ibi ego, which the vulgar renders *aderam*, with ἢ ὡς τὸν Θεόν seems rather to cast a Suspicion on his intention in the expression of that place of the Evangelist, then in the least to give Testimony to the Deity of Christ in this. If any one be further desirous to be satisfied, how many cleare unquestionable evidences of the Deity of Christ, are slighted by these Annotations on this Chapter, let him consult my vindication of the place in my late *Vindicia Evangelica*, where he will find something tendred to him to that purpose. What the Apologist intended by adding these two places of *Isaiah*, Chap. 45. 12. and the 48. 13. (when in his Annotations on those places, Grotius not once mentions the Deity of Christ. nor any thing of him, nor hath occasion so to do, nor doth produce them in this place to any such end or purpose; but only to shew that the *Chaldee* paraphrase, doth sundry times, when things are said to be done by God, render it, that they were done by the word of God) as instances to the prejudice of my Assertion; I cannot imagine.

On that of *Peter*, 2 *Epistle*, 3. 5. τὸ πρῶτον Θεὸν λόγος: he adds indeed, *vide que diximus ad initium Evangelii Iohannis:* but neither doth that place intend the naturall Son of God, nor is it so interpreted by Grotius.

To these he adds in the close, *Col.* 1. 16. in the exposition whereof in his Annotations, he expressly *prevaricates*, and goes of to the interpretation insisted on by *Socinus* and his companions, which the Apologist well knew. Without farther search upon what hath been spoken, the Apologist gives in his Verdict concerning the falsnesse of my assertion before mentioned, of the Annotators speaking cleare and home to the Deity of Christ but in one, if in one place of his Annotations: But

1. What one other place hath he produced, whereby the contrary, to what I assert, is evinced? Any man may make Apologies at this rate as fast as he pleases.

2. As to his *not speaking clearly* in that one, notwithstanding the improvement made of his Expressions by the Apologist, I am *still* of the same mind as formerly: For although he ascribes an *Eternity* τῷ λόγῳ, and affirms all things to be made thereby; yet considering how careful he is, of ascribing an ὑπόστασις, τῷ λόγῳ, how many *Platonicke* interpretations of that expression he interweaves in his expositions, how he hath *darkned* the whole counsell of God in that place, about the subsistence of the word, its *omnipotency* and *incarnation*: so clearly asserted by the holy Ghost therein, I see no reason to retract the *assertion* opposed. But yet as to the thing it selfe, about this place I will not contend: only it may not be amisse to observe, that not only the *Arians*, but even *Photinus* himselfe acknowledged that the world was made τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ, that how little is obtained toward the confirmation of the *Deity* of Christ by that concession, may be discerned.

I shall offer also only at present, that ὁ λόγος τῷ Θεῷ, is threefold, λόγος ὑποστατικός, ἐνδιάθετος, and παρασκευατικός. The λόγος ὑποστατικός or ἐνιδιός is Christ, mentioned *John* 1. 1. his *personall* or *eternall* subsistence, with his *omnipotency*, being there asserted. Whether Christ be so called any where else in the New Testament may be *disputed*, *Luk.* 1. v. 2. (compared with the 1 of *Job.* 1. 1.) *2 Pet.* 1. 16. and *Act.* 20. 32. *Heb.* 4. 12. are the most likely to give us that use of the word. Why Christ is so termed, I have shewed elsewhere. That he is called רַבֵּר *Psal.* 33. 6. is to me also evident. כִּלְכֵל is better rendred *πῦμα*, or λέξις, then λόγος. Where that word is used, it denotes not Christ: Though 2 *Sam.* 23. 2. where that word is, is urged by some to that purpose. He is also called רַבֵּר *Hag.* 2. 5. so perhaps in other places. Our present *Quakers* would have that expression of, the word of God, used no where in any other sense: so that destroying that, as they do, in the issue they may freely despise the Scripture, as that which they say is not the word of God, nor any where so called. Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος amongst men is that which *Aristotle* calls πρῶτον λόγον: λόγος ἐν τῷ λαμβανόμενῳ saies *Hesichius* μ. Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος is that which we speake in our hearts, saies *Damas* scen. de *Orthod. fid.* Lib. 1. cap. 18. So *Psalm* 14. אָמַר נַבְלִי כִבְרוֹ. This as spoken in respect of God, is that egress of his power, whereby according to the *eternall* conception of his mind, he worketh any thing. So *Gen.* 1. 3. God said let there be light, and there was light. Of this word of God the *Psalmist* treats, 147. v. 18. he sedeth our רַבֵּר & melteth the Ice, and *Psal.* 143. 8. the same word is used. In both which places the *Septuagint* renders it by ὁ λόγος. This is that which is called *πῦμα τῆς ἀναίματος*, *Heb.* 1. 2. and *Heb.* 11. 3. where the Apostle saies the heavens were made

made *πῦμα*. Θεῷ: which is directly *parallel* to that place of *2 Pet.* 3. 5. where it is expressed τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ: for though *πῦμα* more properly denotes λόγον παρασκευατικόν, yet in these places, it signifies plainly that egress of Gods power for the production and preservation of things, being a *perfitute* of the *eternall* conception of his mind, which is λογος ἐνδιάθετος. Now this *infinite* wise and *eternall* conception of the mind of God, exerting its selfe in power, wherein God is said to speake, (he said let there be light) is that which the *Platonicks*, and *Philo* with them harped on, *never* once dreaming of a *coessentiall* and *hypostaticall* word of God, though the word ἐπίστασις occurre amongst them. This they thought was unto God, as in us, λογος ἐνδιάθετος or ἐπινοητικός. and particularly it is termed by *Philosophy* τῆς διαλογίας ἐνενοούμενος de *Agrio*. That this was his ὁ λόγος is most evident: Hence he tells us ἐδὲν ἂν ἔπρεον ἔπεισι τὸν νοητὸν διναί κόσμον ἢ Θεῷ λόγον ἢ διὰ κατωποιούμενος. ἡ δὲ δὴ ἢ νόησι πάλαι ἐπέσθη τι ἐστίν, ἢ οὐτὶ ἀρχὴν τέλειος κοσμοῦ, ἢ διὰ τὴν νοητὴν πόλιν κίλειεν διανοούμενος. Μασίως δὲ τὸ δόγμα τῆτο, ἐκ ἐμῶν de *Mund. opific.* and a little after: τὸν δὲ ἀόρατον ἐνοητὸν Θεῷ λόγον, εἰκόνα λέγει Θεῷ ἐπίστασις εἰκόνα τὸν νοητὸν φῶς ἐκείνο, δὲ θεῷ λόγου γέγονε εἰκόνα τῷ δημιουργῶντος τὴν γέσθησιν αὐτῷ. ὅ ἐστιν ἐπινοητικός ἀσθηρ. The whole tendency of his discourse is, that the word of God, in his mind, in the creation of the world, was the image of himselfe; and that the *idea* or image of the things to be made, but especially of light. And whereas (if I remember aright, for I cannot now find the place) I have said somewhere, that Christ was λογος ἐνδιάθετος, though therein I have the consent of very many learned *Divines*, and used it meerly in opposition τῷ παρασκευατικῷ; yet I desire to recall it: nor doe I think there is any propriety in that expression of ἐπινοητικός used of Christ, but only in those of *κατωποιούμενος* and *ἐπινοητικός*, which the Scripture (though not in the very termes) will make good. In this second acceptation, τῷ λόγῳ, *Photinus* himselfe granted that the world was made by the word of God. Now if it be thought necessary, that I should give an account of my feare that nothing but ὁ λόγος in this sense decked with many *Platonickall encomiums* was intended in the *Annotations* on *Job.* 1. (though I confesse much from some quotations there used, may be said against it) I shall readily undertake the Task; but at present in this *running* Course, I shall adde no more.

But now, as if all the matter in hand, were fully dispatched, we have this *triumphant* close attending the former discourse, and observations.

If one Text acknowledged to assert Christs eternall Divinity (which one was granted to doe it, though not clearly,) will not suffice to conclude him

him no Socinian) which I said not he was, yea expressly waved the management of any such charge) *If six verses in the Proverbs, two in Isaiah, one in St. Peter, one in St. Paul added to many in the beginning of St. Iohn,* (In his Annotations on all which, he speaks not one word to the purpose) will not yet amount to above one Text; or lastly if that one may be doubted of also, which is by him interpreted to affirm Christ's eternall subsistence with God before the Creation of the world (which he doth not so interpret, as to a personall subsistence) and that the whole world was created by him; I shall despaire of ever being a successfull Advocate for any man; from which Condition I hope some little time will recover the Apologist.

This is the Summe of what is pleaded in cheife, for the defence of the Annotations; wherein what small cause he hath to acquiesce, who hath been put to the labour and trouble of vindicating nere 40 Texts of Scripture in the old Testament, and new, giving expresse Testimony to the Deity of Christ from the Annotators perverse interpretations, let the Reader judge. In the 13th Section of the Apologist's discourse, he adds some other Considerations to confirme his former vindication of the Annotations.

1 He tells us, that he professeth not to Divine, what places of the old Testament, wherein the Deity of Christ is evidently testified unto, are corrupted by the learned man, nor will he upon the discouragement already received make any inquiry into my Treatise.

But what need of Divination? The Apologist cannot but remember at all times, some of the Texts of the old Testament that are pleaded to that purpose; and he hath at least as many encouragements to looke into the Annotations, as discouragements from casting an eye upon that Volume (as he calls it,) wherein they are called to an account. And if he suppose, he can make a just defence for the severall places so wrested, and perverted, without once consulting of them, I know not how by me he might possibly be engaged into such an inquiry. And therefore I shall not name them again, having done somewhat more then name them already.

But he hath two suppletory considerations, that will render any such inquiry or inspection needlesse. Of these the first is

That the word of God being all and every part of it of equal truth, that doctrine which is founded on five places of Divine writ, must by all Christians be acknowledged to be as irrefragably confirmed, as an 100 expresse places would be conceived to confirme it.

Ans. It is confessed, that not only five, but any one expresse Text of

Scripture, is sufficient for the confirmation of any divine truth. But that five places have been produced out of the Annotations by the Apologist for the confirmation of the great truth pleaded about, is but pretended, indeed there is no such thing. The Charge on Grotius was, that he had depraved all but one; if that be no crime, the defence was at hand; if it be, though that one should be acknowledged to be clear to that purpose, here is no defence against that which was charged, but a strife about that which was not. Let the places be consulted, if the assertion prove true, by an induction of instances, the Crime is to be confessed, or else the charge denied to contain a crime: but

Secondly he saies, That this charge upon inquiry will be found in some degree, if not equally, chargeable on the learnedst and most valued of the first Reformers, particularly upon Mr. Calvin himselfe, who hath been as bitterly and unjustly accused and reviled upon this account (witness the booke intitled *Calvino Turcismus*) as ever Erasmus was by Bellarmine and Beza, or as probably Grotius may be.

Though this at the best be but a diversion of the Charge, and no defence, yet not containing that truth which is needfull to countenance it; for the end for which it is proposed; I could not passe it by. It is denied (which in this case untill further prooffe must suffice) that any of the learnedst of the first Reformers, (and particularly Mr. Calvin) are equally chargeable, or in any degree of proportion with Grotius, as to the Crime insisted on. Calvin being the man instanced in, I desire the Apologist to prove that he hath in all his Commentaries on the Scripture corrupted the sense, of any Texts of the old Testament or new, giving expresse Testimony to the Deity of Christ, & commonly pleaded to that end & purpose. Although I deny not, but that he differs from the comon judgment of most, in the interpretation of some few propheticall passages, judged by them to relate to Christ. I know what Genebrard and some others of that faction, raved against him; but it was chiefly from some expressions in his institutions about the Trinity (wherin yet he is acquitted by the most learned of themselves) & not from his explications of Scripture, for which they raised their Clamours. For the booke called *Calvino Turcismus*, written by Reynolds and Giffard, the Apologist has forgotten the designe of it. Calvin is no more concerned in it, then others of the first Reformers; nor is it from any doctrine about the Deity of Christ in particular, but from the whole of the reformed Religion, with the Apostasies of some of that profession, that they compare it with Turcisme. Something indeed, in a chapter or two, they speake about the Trinity, from some expressions of Luther, Melancton, Calvin and others: but

but as to Calvin's expositions of Scripture, they insist not on them. Possibly the Apologist may have seen *Pareus* his *Calvinus Orthodoxus*, in an answer to *Hunnius* his *Calvinus Judaicans*; if not, he may at any time have there an account of this calumny.

Having passed through the Consideration of the two considerable heads of this discourse, in the method called for by the Apologist (having only taken liberty to transpose them, as to first and last) I must profess myself as yet unsatisfied as to the necessity, or suitability, of this kind of defence. The summe of that which I affirmed (which alone gives occasion to the defensive now under consideration) is: that to my observation *Grotius* in his Annotations had not left above one text of Scripture, if one, giving cleare evidence to the Deity of Christ; of his Satisfaction I said in summe the same thing. Had the Apologist been pleased to have produced instances of any evidence for the disproof of my assertion, I should very gladly and readily have acknowledged my mistake and oversight. I am still also in the same resolution, as to the latitude of the expression, though I have already by an induction of particulars, manifested his corrupting and perverting of so many, both in respect of the one head, and of the other, with his expresse compliance with the Socinians in his so doing, as that I cannot have the least thought of letting fall my Charge, which with the limitation expressed (of my owne observation) contains the truth in this matter, and nothing but that which is so.

It was indeed in my thoughts to have done somewhat more in reference to those Annotations, then thus occasionally to have animadverted on their corruption in general; namely to have proceeded in the vindication of the truths of the Gospel from their Captivity under the false glosses put upon them, by the interpretations of places of Scripture wherein they are delivered. But this worke being fallen on an abler hand viz. that of our learned professor of Divinity, my desire is satisfied, and the necessity of my endeavour for that end removed.

There are sundry other particulars insisted on by the Apologist, and a great deale of Rhetoricke is layd out about them; which certainly deserves not the Readers trouble in the perusal of any other debate about them. If they did, it were an easie matter to discover his mistakes in them all along. The foundation of most of them, lies in that, which he affirms Sect. 4. where he saies, that I thus state the jealousies about H.G. as far as it is owned by me, viz. that being in doctrine a Socinian, he yet closed in many things with the Romane interest. To which he replies, that this does not so much as pretend that he was a Papist.

As though I undertake to prove *Grotius* to be a Papist, or did not expressly disowne the management of the Jealousy, stated as above; or that

I did at all owne it, all which are otherwise: yet I shall now say, whether he was in Doctrine a Socinian or no, let his Annotations before insisted on, determine: And whether he closed with the Romane interest or no, besides what hath been observed by others, I desire the Apologist to consider his observation on Rev. 12. v. 5. that booke, (himselfe being judge,) having received his last hand. But my business is not to accuse *Grotius*, or to charge his memory with any thing but his prevarication in his Annotations on the Scripture.

And as I shall not cease to presse the generall Aphorisme (as it is called) that no drunkard &c. nor any person whatever not borne of God or united to Christ the head, by the same Spirit that is in him, and in the sense thereof, perfecting Holinesse in the feare of God, shall ever see his face in glory, so I feare not what conclusion can regularly in reference to any person living or dead, be thence deduced.

It is of the Annotations whereof I have spoken; which I have my liberty to do; and I presume shall still continue, whilst I live in the same thoughts of them: though I should see - a third defence of the learned *Hugo Grotius*.

The Epistles of *Grotius* to *Crellius* mentioned by the Apologist in his first defence of him, giving some light to what hath been insisted on, I thought it not unfit to communicate them to the Reader, as they came to my hand, having not as yet been printed that I know of.

Reverendo summæque eruditionis ac pietatis viro Domini
no Johanni Crellio pastoris Racov.
H. G. S.

Libro tuo quo ad eum quem ego quondam scripseram (Eruditissime *Crelli*) respondi, adeo offensus non fui, ut etiam gratias tunc intra animum meum egerim, nunc & hisce agam literis. Primum, quod non tantum humane, sed & valde officiosè mecum egeris, ita ut quari nihil possim, nisi quod in me predicando, modum interdum excedis, deinde verò, quod multa me docueris, partim utilia, partim jucunda scitu, meque exemplo tuo incitaveris ad penitus expendendum sensus sacrorum librorum. Bene autem in Epistolâ tuâ, quæ mihi longè gratissima advepit, de me judicas, non esse me eorum in numero qui ob sententias salvâ pietate dissidentes alieno à quoquam sim animo: aut boni alicujus amicitiâ repudiem. Equidem in libro * de verâ Religione, quem jam percurri, relecturus & posthac, multa invenio summo cum judicio obser-

*Grotius ad
nos nocentissi-
ma herese-
os aque ef-
renu licen-
the scilam,
iterum, ad
tyrannidite
charybdin
declinavit
fluctuans:
Essen.*

*This booke
of Crellius
lay unan-
swered by
Grotius a-
bove 20
yeres. For
so long he
lived after
the publish-
ing of it. It
is since sub-
ly answered
by Estius
* That is the
body of Soc-
inian Di-
vinity writ
ten by Crell-
ius and
Volkelius.*

vata. Ihud vero sæculo gratulor, repertos homines qui nentiquam in controversiis subtilibus tantum ponunt, quantum in verâ vitæ emendatione, & quotidiano ad Sanctitatem profectu. Utinam & mea scripta aliquid ad hoc studium in animis hominum excitandum inflammandumq; conferre possint: tunc enim non frustra me vixisse hætenus existimem. Liber de *veritate Religionis Christianæ* magis ut nobis esset solatio, quam ut aliis documento scriptus, non video quid post tot aliorum labores utilitatis afferre possit, nisi ipsâ fortè brevitæ e. Siquid tamen in eo est, quod tibi tuique similibus placeat, mihi supra spem euenit. Libris de *jure belli & pacis* mihi præcipuè propositum habui, ut feritatem illam, non Christianis tantum, sed & hominibus indignam, ad bella pro libitu suscipienda, pro libitu gerenda, quam gliscere tot populorum malo quotidie video, quantum in me est, sedarem. Gaudeo ad principum quorundam manus eos libros venisse, qui utinam partem eorum meliorem in suum animum admitterent. Nullus enim mihi ex eo labore suavior fructus contingere possit. Te verò quod attinet, credas, rogo, si quid unquam facere possim tui, aut eorum quos singulariter amas, causâ, experturum te, quantum te tuo merito faciam. Nunc quum aliud possim nihil, Dominum Jesum supplice animo veneror, ut tibi aliisq; pietatem promoventibus propitius adsit.

x. Maii. M. DC. XXVI.
Tui nominis studiosissimus H. G.

TAm pro Epistolâ (vir Clarissime) quam pro transmissio libro, gratias ago maximas. Constitui & legere & relegere diligenter quæcunque à te proficiscuntur, expertus quo cum fructu id antehac fecerim. Eo ipso tempore quo literas tuas accepi, versabar in lectione tuæ interpretationis in Epistolam ad *Galatas*. Quantum judicare possum & scripti occasionem & propositum, & totam seriem dictionis, ut magnâ cum curâ indagasti, ita feliciter admodum es assequutus. Quare Deum precor, ut & tibi & tui similibus, vitam det, & quæ alia ad istiusmodi labores necessaria. Mihi ad iuvandam communem Christianismi causam, utinam tam adessent vires, quàm promptus est animus: quippe me, à primâ ætate, per varia disciplinarum genera jactatum, nulla res magis delectavit, quam rerum sacrarum meditatio. Id in rebus prosperis moderamen, id in adversis solamen sensi. Pacis consilia & amavi semper, & amo nunc quoq; eoque doleo, quum video tam pertinacibus iris committi inter se eos, qui Christi se esse dicunt. Si rectè rem putamus, quantillis de causis---

Januarii. M. DC. XXXII. *Amstelodam.*

FINIS.

Let the
Reader
judge what
Annotations
on that Epi-
stle we are
to expect
from this
man.