

A Second
D E F E N C E

Of the Learned

HUGO GROTIUS,

OR

A vindication of the Digression concerning him, from some fresh
E X C E P T I O N S.

By *H. Hammond*, D. D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. Fletcher*, for *Richard Royston* at the
Angel in Ivy lane, 1655.

A DEFENCE OF THE

Learned

HUGO GROTIUS.

1. **W**Hat hath newly been suggested, in an *Epistle Dedicatorie to the Oxford-heads*, by way of *Reply to my Digression about the Learned Hugo Grotius*, will receive punctual answer within the compasse of very few leaves. But for the Readers thrift and ease, I shall first set down the words, wherein the suggestion is delivered.

2. From thence, whence in the thoughts of some, I am most likely to suffer, as to my own Resolves, I am most secure. It is in meddling with Grotius his Annotations, and calling into question what hath been delivered by such a Giant in all kinds of literature. Since my ingagement in this business, and when I had well-nigh finished the vindication of the Texts of Scripture commonly pleaded, for the Demonstration of the Deity of Christ, from the exceptions put into their Testimonies, by the Racovian Catechisme, I had the sight of Dr. H's Apologie for him, in his vindication of his dissertations about Episcopacy, from my occasional Animadversions, published in the Preface of my Book of the Perseverance of the Saints. Of that whole Treatise I shall elsewhere give an account. My Defensative as to my dealing with Grotius his Annotations, is suited to what the Doctor pleads in his behalfe, which occasions this mention thereof.

This very Pious, Learned, Judicious man (he tells us) hath fallen under some harsh censures of late, especially upon the account of Socinianisme, and Popery. That is, not as though he

would reconcile those extremes, but being in Doctrinals a Socinian, he yet closed in many things with the Romane interest: as I no way doubt, but Thousands of the same persuasions with the Socinians, as to the person and offices of Christ, do live in the outward Communion of that Church (as they call it) to this day; of which supposal I am not without considerable grounds; and eminent instances for its confirmation. This (I say) is their charge upon him. For his being a Socinian (he tells us) Three things are made use of to beget a jealousy in the minds of men of his inclinations that way. 1. Some parcells of a Letter of his to Credlius. 2. Some Relations of what passed from him at his Death. 3. Some passages in his Annotations. It is this last alone wherein I am concerned. And what I have to speake to them, I desire may be measured and weighed by what I do promise. It is not that I do entertaine in my self any hard thoughts, or that I would beget in others any evill surmises of the Eternal condition of that man, that I speak what I do. What am I, that I should judge another mans servant? He is fallen to his own Master. I am very slow to judge of mens Acceptation with God, by the Apprehension of their understandings. This onely I know, that be men of what Religion soever, that is professed in the world, if they are Drunkards, Proud, Boasters, &c. Hypocrites, haters of good men, persecutors and revilers of them, yea if they be not regenerate and born of God, united to the head Christ Jesus, by the same spirit that is in him, they shall never see God.

But for the passages in his Annotations, the substance of the Doctors plea is, that the passages intimated are in his posthuma, that he intended not to publish them, that they might be of things he observed, but thought farrther to consider: and an instance is given in that of Col. 1. 16. which he interprets, contrarie to what he urged it for, Joh. 1. 1, 2, 3. But granting what is affirmed as to matter of fact, about his Collections, (though the Preface to the last part of his Annotations will not allow it to be true) I must needs abide in my dissatisfaction to these Annotations, and of my resolves in these thoughts give the Doctor this account. Of the Socinian Religion there are two main Parts; the first is Photinianisme, the latter Pelagianisme. The first concerning the person, the other the Grace of Christ. Let us take

an

an eminent instance out of either of these heads: Out of the first, Jam vero sciendum est, multo their denying Christ to be God by Nature. Out of the latter, quidem citius, their denyall of his satisfaction, quam nunc decum temporis

For the first, I must needs tell the Apologist, that of all the Texts of the New Testament and Old, whereby the Deity of Christ is usually confirmed, and where it is evidently testified unto, He hath not left any more then one (that I have observed) if one, speaking any thing clearly to that purpose. I say, if one, factum sit, per for that he speaks not home to the business in hand on Joh. 1. I shall elsewhere give an account: perhaps some one or two more may be interpreted according to the Analogie of that. I speake not of his Annotations on the Epistles, but on the whole Bible throughout, wherein his expositions given, do for the most part fall in with those of the Socinians, and oftentimes consist in the very words of Socinus and Smalcus, and alwaies do the same things with them, as to any notice of the Deity of Christ in them. So that I marvell the Learned Doctor should fix upon one particular instance, as though that one place alone were corrupted by him, when there is not one (or but one) that is not wrested, perverted, and corrupted to the same purpose. For the full conviction of the truth hereof, I refer the Reader to the ensuing considerations of his interpretations of the places themselves. The condition of these famous Annotations, as to the satisfaction of Christ, is the same; not one Text of the whole Scripture, wherein Testimonie is given to that sacred truth, which is not wrested to another sense, or at least the Doctrine in it, concealed, and obscured by them. I do not speak this with the least intention to cast upon him the reproach of a Socinian: I judge not his Person his Books are published to be considered and judged. Erasmus I know made way for him in most of his Expositions about the Deity of Christ but what repute he hath thereby obtained among all that honor the Eternal Godhead of the son of God, let Bellarmine on the one hand, and Beza on the other, evince. And as I will by no means maintain or urge against Grotius any of the miscarriages in Religion, which the Answerer of my Animadversions undertakes to vindicate him from; Nor do I desire to fight with the Dust and Ashes of men; yet what I have said, is, if not necessary to return to the Apologist, yet of tendency, I hope, to the satisfaction of others, who may inquire after the

A 3

reason

reason of my calling the Annotations of the learned man to an Account in this Discourse, shall any one take liberty to pluck down the Pillars of our Faith, and weaken the grounds of our assurance, concerning the person and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall we not have the boldness to call him to an account for so sacrilegious an attempt? with those then, who love the Lord Christ in sincerity, I expect no blame or reproach for what I have indeavour'd in this kind; yea that my good will shall find acceptance with them, especially if it shall occasion any of greater leisure and abilities farther, and professedly to remark more of the Corruptions of those Annotations, I have good ground of expectation. The truth is, notwithstanding their pompous shew and appearance (few of his Quotations, which was the manner of the man, being at all to his purpose) It will be found no difficult matter to discuss his Assertions, and Diss-

* Grotius in lib. 5. de veritat. Relig. in notis R. Sel. pate his Conjectures.

Aben Ezra & Onkelos adducit, sed alienis oculis hic vidit, aut aliena fide retulit (forte authoribus illis aut non intellectis, aut propter occupationes non inspectis) aut animositatis & auctoritatis sue in citandis authoribus, & referendis dictis aut factis, ut ipsi hoc usui veniebat, nimum in scriptis Theologicis indulerit. Veti: disput: de Advocat: Mess.

For his being a Papist, I have not much to say; let his Epistles (published by his Friends) written to Dionysius Petavius the Jesuite, be perused, and you will see the character which of himself he gives: As also what in sundry writings he ascribes to the Pope.

Reverende Domine, sepe tibi molestus esse cogor, sumpsi hanc ultimam operam, mea antea dicta & famam quoque à ministris allatam tuendi, in co Scripto squid est, aut Catholicis sententiis dissentiens, aut ceteroqui à veritate alienum, de co ab te vivo Eruditissimo &c. cujus judicium plurimi facio moveri percipio. Epist: Groti: ad Dionys: Petav: Epist: 204.

3. The first thing that I am here to clear, is the meaning of plain words. I said that Grotius was sometimes calumniated, as a Socinian, sometimes as a Papist, and as if he had learnt to reconcile contradictories, or the most distant extremes, sometimes as both of them together. And here I am told that the harsh censures under which he hath fallen, are not as though he would

reconcile

reconcile those extremes — And sure I never said, or intimated they were, but that the Socinian and Popish doctrines were so contradictory one to the other (the one affirming, the other expressly denying the Eternal Divinity and satisfaction of Christ, and many the like) that it was impossible for the same man to be both Socinian and Papist, without being a greater artificer then yet ever was in the world, one that had learnt to reconcile contradictories &c. i. e. (if I must farther construe plain words) to believe together things most incompatible, and impossible to be believed together by the same person, the affirmations and the negations of the same Enunciations, that Christ was, and was not Eternal God, made, and made not satisfaction for our sins; For this work of wonder, above what either nature or divine power can extend to, is necessarily required to the verifying of that part of the calumnie.

4. The 2^d is, his stating the jealousy, as far as it is own'd by him, viz. that H. Grotius being in Doctrinals a Socinian, he yet closed in many things with the Romane interest; where the Distinction being made between Doctrinals and interest, it is visible, 1. That this doth not so much as pretend that he was a Papist, for it is the doctrines onely (such is that of the Popes Supremacie, &c.) which can give any man that denomination, and for closing in many things with the Romane interests, the Anabaptists and other such Sektaries, the most distant from Poperie, may and oft are as guilty of that, as any. 2. There is no colour for this suggestion, as far as Grotius's writings give us to judge (and farther then those I have no perspective to examine his heart) For the fomenters of the divisions in Christendome, being the only persons whom he profess to oppose, the irreconciliables, and qui aeterna cupiunt esse dissidia, tis consequent, that the Pacificatorie interest was the onely one espoused by him, and pursued most affectionately; and I could never yet discern by any pregnant indication, that this is the Romane Interest.

5. The 3^d is, his manner of proving his thus stated suggestion. 1. By his bare affirmation, without the least tender of proof for the truth of it; 2. by his confident undoubted assurance, that thousands of the same persuasions with the Socinians, as to the

the person and offices of Christ, do to this day live in the outward communion of the Church of Rome. Whereas, 1. This could have no force to infer the conclusion, as it concerned Grotius, who never lived a day, or died in the communion of the Church of Rome, nor is by his most unkind adversaries affirmed to have done so, but is known to have profest his willingness to communicate with the church of England; and 2. tis not imaginable how any one Doctrinal Socinian, should after his having espoused those Doctrines, if his practices be consonant to his persuasions, live in outward Communion with the Church of Rome, if by living in the outward Communion, be meant either joyning in the offices, or receiving the Sacrament with them, when (beside many other obstacles in the way, the Athanasian Creed, and the like) the very * receiving the Eucharist kneeling, is by Socinus defined to be Idolatrical, and most strictly required by the Papists from every Communicant.

Fourthly, when he hath premised his profession that he would not beget in others any evil surmises of the eternal condition of that man (who is (blessed be God) out of the reach of such darts) with a [what am I, that I should judge another mans servant?] and yet addes in the next words [He is fallen to his own master,] I cannot but think these words to far contrary to his profession, as may be apt to beget evil surmises in others. The foregoing words are evidently taken from Rom. 14. 4. and judging there, and here, is used in the sense of condemning, which is, at the best, surmising of the eternal condition, and [falling to his own Master] is in like manner taken from the same verse, and so marks by the *Italick* letter, and [falling] there evidently signifying that Lot, to which the precedent [judging] determines it, and to which the subsequent [standing] is opposite, what can this regularly infer, but that he which is fallen to his master, is fallen under condemnation? But if by [fallen] he meant no more then death, as I yet hope, and desire the reader in charity to believe he did, I heartily wish, he would hereafter be more carefull in using of Scripture style in a sense so distant from the known importance of it in Scripture, without any character to discriminate it; and withall, that when he speaks of so nice a point, as is the eternal salvation of one that is dead, he will not deliver his

* Sedendo vel
stando potest ec-
clesiarii, Genicu-
lari est Idolola-
tricum. Socini:
dens: & fin:
can: Dum:
p. 115:

his mind in such general Aphorismes, as those (which the jealousy or malice of any man may interpret, to the inferring the most sanguinary conclusion) that the men of what religion soever, if they are Drunkards, Proud, &c. shall never see God. For though I have all reasons to believe that this Learned man was regenerate and born of God, and united to the head Jesus Christ by the same Spirit that is in him, and withall, neither lived, nor dyed, in any one or more of those wasting guilts (I heartily wish all men living were as guiltlesse as he) yet who knows what surmises may be infused into those, that are willing to believe ill or have no grounds of knowledge to pronounce any thing that is good, of him, when they find such Aphorismes as these (comprehending so many sorts of sinners, which shall never see God) made use of to conclude a discourse, which purposely treated of that person, and cannot discern with what proprietic, they could be directed to that place, if they did not relate to him.

7. Fifthly when he saith, that the Preface to the last part of Grotius's Annotations will not allow that to be true, which I said of his Posthuma, viz. that they had not been formed by him, or fitted for the publick, &c. I answer, that that Preface of the Publisher, if it be supposed to have set down the whole truth, hath yet nothing contrarie to what I said. It saith the *Opus integrum* was by the Author committed and earnestly commended to the faithfull care of *ô Dèu*. But what was the *Opus integrum*? not that last part or volume of Annotations thus completed, and so made *Integrum* intire by his own hand (though for as much as concerned the *Apocalypse* I think it had received from his own pencil, by occasion of the contests he met with about his tract *De Antichristo*, the very lineaments and colors, wherein it appears) but *Opus integrum*, the whole volume, or volumes which contained all his *diversorum adversaria* on the New Testament, which it seems were thus committed to a friends hands, or else they had never come to ours. And this is perfectly consonant to what I said, and (I suppose) exemplified, and evidenced concerning those Annotations.

8. Sixtly when he saith, that H. Grotius hath not left any more then one text of the New and Old Testament whereby the

Deity of Christ is usually confirmed and where it is evidently testified to] I refer him briefly to one place in his *Annotations* on S. John's Gospel, which alone will be able to discover, what weight there is in this affirmation. There having by way of Preface observed, that S. John did more expressly, than any other of the Evangelists and more early in the very first words of his writing, set down the divine nature of Christ, ipso initio Dei nomen ei assignandum — existimans, in the very beginning of his Gospel assigning him the name of God, accordingly, in his explanation of the first verse, he makes the [ἐν ἀρχῇ ὡς In the beginning was] an expression of Christ's eternity, applying to it the place in the Proverbs concerning wisdom c. 8. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old, I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was, when there was no depths I was brought forth, when there were no fountains abounding with water, before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth, while as yet he had not made the earth nor the field, nor the highest part of the dust of the world, when he prepared the heavens, I was there — (and in his notes on the Old Testament, Prov. 8. 27. he expressly refers to this, Joh. 1. 1. and by so doing manifestly defines that eternal wisdom to be Christ) and on this occasion he brings the most express affirmations of the ancients Iustine and Athenagoras, the former affirming Christ's preexistence before the word προϋπῆρχε πρὸ τῶ ἀίδιου, and p. 851. οὐδὲν ὄντα πρὸ αἰώνων, he was God before the worlds; the latter his eternity, and that from the beginning God being an eternal mind ἔχεν αἰὼν ἐν αἰὼνι ἢ λόγον αἰδίου λογὸς αἰν. Then out of the old Testament from the Chaldee Paraphrast he brings several places where God is interpreted by God and his word, making and founding the heavens and earth, Isa. 45. 12. and 48. 13. and according and consenting thereto, 2 Pet. 3. 5. which again are so many more evidences set down by him, of Christ's eternal deity, and then on v. 3. to testify that all things were created by this eternal word, he appeals to the place, which before I produced from him, Col. 1. 16. by him were all things created —

9. This I hope without farther search, may suffice to prove, that he hath left more than one text of the Old and New Testament speaking home

home and clearly to this purpose; For what can be more clear and home, then this, that Christ was God before the world was (whereas Socinians make the beginning Joh. 1. 1. to be the beginning of the Gospel) and that by him the whole world was created.

10. In a word, If one text acknowledged to assert Christ's eternal divinity, will not suffice to conclude him no Socinian in that point, who was not so Atheistical, as to doubt of the truth and authority of that one place, and so cannot be doubted to believe, what from one place (if there had been no more) he did believe; 2 If six verses in the Proverbs, two in Isaiah, one in S. Peter, one in S. Paul, added to many in the beginning of S. John, 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 eternally subsistent with God, before the creation of the world, and that the whole world was created by him, I shall despair of ever being a successful Advocate for any man.
11. And then how, still, he that affirmed positively that he hath not left more than one, and presently adds his doubting of this one [not more than one, if one] and after [not one, or but one,] can first enlarge the catalogue, that [perhaps some one or two more may be interpreted according to the analogie of that one] and then presently contract it again, that [his Expositions alwaies do the same things with Socinus and Smalcus:] who it is certain do not permit that one to be understood of Christ's eternal divinity, and yet at length profess, that he speaks not with the least intention to cast on him the reproach of a Socinian, or to urge against him any of those miscarriages in Religion, which the Answerer of his Animadversions undertakes to vindicate him from (and Socinianism was, one of them) acknowledging that Erasmus made way for him in most of his Expositions about the Deity of Christ, (which is to make him an Erasmusian, rather than a Socinian) and after that still adhere, that his attempt is sacrilegious, even to pluck down the pillars of our Faith — concerning the person and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, how, I say, he can reconcile, all these contrary appearances, I have not the skill, and therefore shall not have the curiosity to divine, or conjecture.
12. Severely when he marvels the Doctor should fix upon one particular

particular instance, as though that one place only were corrupted by him] I answer that he misinterprets my words, and misrepresents my designe and aime in producing that particular instance; It was not to give example what place of Scriptures those notes had corrupted, or misinterpreted, but to evidence that those Annotations, under his name, agreed not with his sense, of which as this was one eminent and pertinent instance, interpreting this place, Col. 1. 16. after his death, to the Socinians mind, which in his lifetime he had interpreted expressly against it, and as one instance thus explicate, is as concluding to this matter, as many more could be, so elsewhere I have added many instances more to the same purpose, which I shall not here collect unseasonably.

13. What places in the *Old Testament*, wherein the Deity of Christ is evidently testified, as corrupted, wrested or perverted by this learned man, H. Gr. I professe not to divine, nor shall, it seems, come to the full conviction of the truth thereof without reading over this, whole (which is a great) volume where their confutation lyes scattered, and is not, as I discern, put together in any part of the work, save only in the title page, and to this larger travail my prospect doth not invite me, having already by what I have recited from Grocius's notes on Joh. 1. compared with this Authors suggestions, a competent *ſcētis*, what I am to expect from any farther inquiry.

In lieu hereof, I shall only aduce these two *Suppletory* considerations. 1. That the word of God, being all, and every part of it equally of undoubted truth, that doctrine, which is founded expressly on five places of divine writ, must by all Christians be acknowledged to be as *irrefragably* confirmed, as a hundred expresse places would be conceived to confirme it. 2. That this charge of disarming the Church of her defences against the adversaries of the faith, by diverting those places of Scripture, which have formerly been used to assert the great mysteries of Salvation, to other and inferior ends, though it be a very popular one, and that which is most apt to divolve an odium on him, which shall be represented guilty of it, and may therefore probably be chosen, as the field of declamation against Grocius, by any that can gladly expatiate on that subject, yet will it upon inquiry be

found

found in some degree, if not equally, chargeable on the learnedst and most valued of the Reformers, particularly upon Mr. Calvin himself, who hath been as bitterly and unjustly accused, and reviled, on this account, (witness the book entitled *Calvino-Turcismus*) as ever Erasmus was by Bellarmine or Beza, or as probably Grocius can be.

14. 8th. For the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, and the interpretation of those Scriptures, that belong to it, I cannot imagine any surer measure can be taken of Grocius's sense, then by that perspicuous and judicious treatise which he hath written purposely on that subject, against Socinus himself, and which I believe will be found a surer Antidote against that poison, among considering men, then hath been mixed by any other the most skillful hand, since that controversy hath been agitated in this last age, more especially the places of Scripture are by him there vindicated from the perversions of Socinus, and a great cumulus of texts brought forth to testify to the doctrine of Satisfaction, which I shall not recite, that I may leave on the Reader an engagement to survey the book, and commit the judgement to his own eyes.

15. Onely because I have heard the signal place Isa. 53. taken notice of by some, as that wherein his Annotations are most suspected, I shall there fasten a while. From 1 Per. 2. 24. having inserted that Christ so bare our sins, that he freed us from the punishment of them, and so that we are healed by his stripes, he at length urges as parallel to this, Isa. 53. 11. my righteous servant shall justify many, and shall bear their iniquities. *In* iniquity saith he, signifying the punishment of iniquity 2 Kin. 7. 9. and *וְנָס* to bear, the bearing of punishment, and thence concluding, *Deserit ergo hic diciur Christus laturus penas eorum qui iustificantur*, It is therefore here distinctly said, that Christ shall bear the punishments of those who are justified, and according to this specimen he gives the mystical sense of that whole chapter (and refutes the Socinian arts of evading it) and at last from v. 12. concludes the punishments which Christ indured for our sins to be the foundation and merit of his dividing the spoils, and interceding, *decere enim ut is qui peccata multorum tulerit, jus habeat pro iis intercedendi*, for it was fit that he that bare the sins of many, should have the right of interceding for them; and much

B 3

more

more to the same purpose, defining positively against all the adversaries *ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς*, that *Peccata ferre patiendo, atque ita ut inde liberentur alii, aliud indicare non potest quam pœna aliene susceptionem*, to bear sins by suffering, and so that others may be freed by that means, cannot signify any thing else, but the undergoing of other mens punishment, annexing *Isa. 53. 6. The Lord hath laid on him, the iniquity of us all* — and refusing all the evasions, that were there interposed by Socinus.

16. And when to this, and the * many pages more which are there From p. 12. to subjoined for the vindicating that one chapter, and the several p. 18. expresse testimonies therein, I shall add two things more for preventing all possible mistake or jealousy of his after-change in this matter, I shall have no motive farther to enlarge this consideration.

17. First, the Annotations of that Learned man on the Old Testament, published a little before his death, are very brief, and especially respect the first and literal interpretation; As in the Prophets, where there is one immediate completion of each Prophecy among the Jewes of or near that time, wherein it was written, another more remote and ultimate concerning Christ, or the times of the Gospel (this might be exemplified in several instances, applied by the New Testament to Christ, having had before a literal completion [Out of Egypt have I called my sonne] and many the like) there generally his care is, to set down most distinctly the first, or literal sense, as that is terminated in the immediate completion (and this, I suppose, because it was most neglected by other interpreters, who were more copious in rendering the mystical notation) And accordingly on *Isa. 53.* conceiving the Jewes usage of the Prophet *Jeremie*, and Gods regard to him, to be literally predicted there, he interprets every verse of that chapter to that sense (which was not so easily discoverable, or vulgarly taken notice of) omitting to enlarge on that other, more sublime completion in Christ, which the New Testament had so clearly exprest, all Commentators enlarged on, and himself in the tract de Satisfaction. so evidently set down, and vindicated, that all that was needfull to be added, was easily said by him by way of introduction to that whole chapter, in these few words, *Ha nota in Jeremiam quidem con-*

grunt prius, sed potius, sublimiusque, sepe & magis et læv in Christum. These characters agree indeed first to *Jeremie*, but to Christ more principally and eminently, and oftentimes more according to the very letter or diction.

18. The 2^d thing that I have to adde for the clearing of his constancie, or no change in these doctrines, will be such, as I think will leave no place of Jealousie, his own expresse words protesting his opinion, when he was accused of changing it. This he hath publicly done in his Discussion (written a little before, and not published till after his death) p. 17. by setting down the occasion and author of that defamation, and for the removing of it, referring the reader to what he had in many places of his Annotations on the Gospels written concerning the eternity of the Word, the blood of Christ given for our redemption &c. And this I have before my eyes at this time, more clearly testified under his own hand in a letter of his written to a friend of his of this nation, who then held a correspondence with him, in these words, *Poteris autem, vir optime, omnibus, qui nos norunt, affirmare, me de iis qua contra Socini admiratores defendi, non modo nihil discere, sed & illorum aliquos meâ operâ adductos ad meliorem sententiam. Quo magis gratias tibi habeo de edito nostro libro de Satisfactione Christi, In quo argumento illos à proprietate verborum tam multorum in sacris literis, & à manifestissimo antiquitatis consensu, positionibus quibusdam inanibus abstractos non dubito. Giving him authority to assure all that know him, not onely that he hath no whit departed from what he had maintained against the Socinians, but also that some of them had by his endeavour been reduced from the Socinian errors, charging them with the vanity of their positions, and departure both from the Propriety of many words in the Scriptures, and from the most manifest consent of antiquity, and expressing himself very well pleased that his Book de satisfactione was reprinted at Oxford. And all this long after the publication of Crellius's Book against him, which is the thing supposed to have wrought the change in him. Upon these plain words I shall adde no Descants, but leave them that have entertained contrarie surmises, to consider them:*

19. 9^{thly}. For the character given of this Person, with whose dust and

and as he yet desires not to fight, viz. that few of his quotations are at all to his purpose; and the grounds of that character, the words of Voetius disputing against him, and affirming that it was customary with him to indulge too much to his own authority in citing authors or relating speeches or facts. I shall say but this, 1. That these two things are different, to miscite, which was the thing Voetius spake of, and not to cite to the purpose; A false citation is one thing, an impertinent or unseasonable citation, or such as is not at all to his purpose, is another, and so this citation from Voetius is guilty of the infirmity it accuseth, is not to his purpose that cited it. 2^{dly}. That adversaries testimonies of the faults of those, whom they find it usefull to asperse, are not valid testimonies, nor competent to asseverate (or justifie) ill characters on any, and that Voetius was such, is known to many, and, I doubt not, to him that cited him. 3^{dly}. That whosoever shall be willing to profit by that mans writings, will find that as he writes with great consent, so is he observable to bring the most pertinent testimonies of any man, and seldome to omit any, which the most diligent observer shall take notice of. And if in so large a field he be found sometimes to have mistaken, or miscited a testimonie, there are so many innocent ways to such kind of errors, that untill it appear that his were not such, they cannot with reason asseverate an ill character on him; and 4^{thly}. That if this character were true, it yet infers not the point in hand, that he was either Socinian or Papist, those two Sects having not the inclosure, or Monopoly from all other Sects, of writing or quoting what is not to their present purpose.

20. Lastly, for the little which he hath to say to prove him a Papist, and 1. For his Epistles written to Dionysius Petavius a Jesuite, and in them the words set in the margin, I answer, 1. That it being willingly acknowledged that he wrote five very short Epistles to Dionysius Petavius, which are put together in the two last leaves of his Epistles ad Gallos, there is this obvious account to be given of it, which will no way reflect ill upon him.

21. Petavius was both a very learned, and a very moderate Papist, fit to be joyned with Jac. Sirmundus, a Jesuite also, yet both these of such abilities and affections to the good of learning, of
such

such diligence in the search and study of antiquity, and withall of so much temper above what is generally expected from that Society in other kingdoms, that it can be no prejudice to him who so earnestly desired, and laboured to advance the peace of the universal Church, to have a particular respect unto, and acquaintance with one of these, and as his living so long in Paris, where Petavius was an eminent person, makes it no miracle, that he should be thus acquainted with him, so his Pacificatory design could not but render it profitable and desirable, he must have been an unskilfull manager, if intending to reconcile distant interests, he did not acquaint himself with the utmost of both their pretensions; And what means was more commodious to that end, then this, of receiving advertisements from Petavius.

22. The words of Grotius himself, when he was by Rivet accused for commending Jesuites, are here worth reciting, *Jesuitas non omnes laudavit Grotius, sed quorum & mores & eruditio laudem mererentur. Eorum vero qui in Gallia sunt, pro talibus habet, quales eos Reges Gallie volunt existimari, i. e. pro bonis civibus, & quid magis necessarium est pacem Ecclesiasticam restituere cupienti, quam eruditorum audire consilia, eorum maxime quibus & præsens Ecclesia status & antiquior historia percognita sunt. He commends onely those Jesuites whose manners and learning deserve praise, the French Jesuites, whom he takes to be such as the Kings of France account of them, i. e. good Subjects to their Prince — And what can be more necessary to one that desires to restore the peace of the Church, then to hear the advices of those especially who have the perfectest knowledge of the present state of the Church, and of ancient historie. And to the same purpose again, p. 91. affirming that he had great reasons to believe that some of that Society, Petavius no doubt, were seriously willing as well as able to contribute very much toward the peace of the Church.*

23. 2^{dly}, For the words here cited from his Epistle, that if there were anything in that answer to Rivet, which agreed not with Catholike doctrine, or were otherwise distant from truth, or (which he adds in that place, but is here left out) minus idoneum ad pacem, less fit for Peace, he desired to be admonished

by *Petavius*.] The result is no more then what all his controversy with *Rivet* professes, that he was one, that desired the returne of all Catholike truth and peace into the Christian world (and he must renounce his part in *Christ's Legacie* [peace I leave with you] that is not in this particular affected like him) And then what wonder he should desire to be admonished by a sober learned man of the *Romish Communion*, if he wrote any thing which was not ordinable to that end?

24. The same *designe*, and way of pursuing it, will be yet more visible in the 200th *Epistle*, where he hath these words to the same *Petavius*, *Liceat mihi tuâ ope addere, demere, corrigere que opus erit ad verum pacemque promovendam*, Give me leave by your helpe to adde, to take away, to mend what is needfull toward truth and the advancing of peace, viz. such an advancement of peace, as was perfectly consistent with truth.

25. The 2^d and last suggestion in this matter is taken from what *Grotius* hath said in sundry writings concerning the Pope] to which I have already spoken somewhat in the answer to the animadversions, as far as concerned that passage in his *Discussio*, which I discerned to be most accused of inclination to the Popes interest. As for the *Papal power*, whatsoever passage can be brought from him, must sure be interpreted by analogie with those rules, which he premiseth in his *Discussio*, requiring that it may be confined and limited *sec. Canonibus*, according to the ancient Canonical rights allowed the Pope by the Councils, and so as the authority of Scripture, the rights of the Catholike Church, of Councils, of Patriarchs of the East, of Primates, and Metropolitans, and other Bishops be preserved intire, as also all the just rights of all Christian Princes in their own Dominions. See *Discuss. Riv. Apol.* p. 18, 19, 20. And against this, or on this head, here being no one place produced, to support this indefinite charge, I cannot reply by *Divination*, and so have thus briefly discharged my present undertaking.

26. What is briefly toucht on with reflexion on my self in the end of that Dedication, of the softness and gentleness of the leaves of my Answer to his *Animadversions*, of the illness of my

my cause, wherein I am engaged against him, and the illness of my Principles in managing a good cause, in the *Treatise of Schisme* and *some others* (which he hath not pleased to name) I am no way qualified to judge of, till his severer sheets instruct me, by discovering the infirmities of my cause, and till by his managery of a dispute with a *Romanist*, he shall approve his Principles to be such as will hold out against all gainstayers. At the present having no more to adde, I willingly take leave of him.

The End.

ERRATA.

Pag.	Line.	Read.
2	14	premise
3		the marginal note belongs to p. 2, l. 32.
	7	absolvig
4	4	Sol:
	9	Voet:
6	7	2
	26	left
8	25	world
	25	trav