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1826.
A REVIEW

OF THE

ANNOTATIONS OF HUGO GROTIIUS,

IN REFERENCE UNTO

THE DOCTRINE OF THE DEITY AND SATISFACTION OF CHRIST:

WITH

A DEFENCE OF THE CHARGE FORMERLY LAID AGAINST THEM.
A SECOND CONSIDERATION
OF THE
ANNOTATIONS OF HUGO GROTIIUS.

HAVING in my late defence of the doctrine of the gospel, from the corruptions of the Socinians, been occasioned to vindicate the testimonies 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 book of his being more frequent in the hands of students, than those of the Socinians, I thought it incumbent on me, to do the same work in reference to those Annotations, which it was my design to perform towards the writings of Socinus, Smalcius, and their companions and followers. What I have been enabled to accomplish by that endeavours, with what service to the gospel hath been performed thereby, is left to the judgment of them who desire αληθειαν ἐν αγάπῃ. Of my dealing with Grotius I gave a brief account in my epistle to the governors 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 himself, it is judged necessary to give the ensuing account: for which I took the first leisure hour I could obtain, having things of greater weight, daily 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, lest his expres-
sions therein, ought to be interpreted according to the analogy of what he had elsewhere delivered: of which afterward.

Because that which concerns the satisfaction of Christ will admit of the easiest despatch, though taking up most room, I shall in the first place insist thereon. The words of my charge on the Annotations, as to 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. Not 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, concealed 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 Quintilian: lib. 5: cap. de Refut. and 'extra hæc in judiciis fere nihil est.' In other cases, 'patronus, neget, defendat, transferat, excuset, deprecetur, molliat, minuat, avertat, despiciat, derideat;' 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, ή ως ουκ ἐστιν, ή, ως ου βλασφημον, ή ου τοιτυ, ή ως ου τηλυκοτο, ή ουκ ἄδικον, ή ου ἡμερια, ή ουκ αἰσχρον, ή ουκ ζηκου μέγαθος. (Rhet. lib. iii. cap. 15.) all which in a plain 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 walk in. He tells us of the excellent book that Grotius wrote 'de Satisfactione Christi,' and the exposition of sundry places of Scripture, especially of divers verses of Isa. liii. given therein; and then adds sundry inducements to persuade us, that he was of the same mind in his Annotations. And this is called a defence of Grotius. The apologist, I suppose, knows full well, what texts of Scripture they are, that are constantly pleaded for the satisfaction of Christ, by them who do believe that doctrine. I shall also for once take it for granted, that he might with-
OF HUGO GROTIN.

out much difficulty, have obtained a sight of Grotius’s An-
notations; to which I shall only add, that probably if he
could from them have disproved the assertion before-men-
tioned, by any considerable instances, he is not so tender
of the prefacers credit, as to have concealed it on any such
account. But the several of his plea for the Annotations
in this particular, I am persuaded are accounted by some,
worthy consideration; a brief view of them will suffice.

The signal place of Isa. liii. 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 himself), as that
wherein his Annotations are most suspected; therefore on
that he will fasten awhile. Who would not now expect that
the apologist should have entered 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 proposal?

This, I say, is the instance chosen to be insisted on; and
the vindication of the Annotations therein, by the inter-
pretation given in their author’s book ‘de Satisfactione Christi’
is proposed to consideration. That others, if not the apo-
logist himself, may take notice of the emptiness of such pre-
cipitate apologies, as are ready to be tumbled out, without
due digestion or consideration, I shall not only compare the
Annotations and that book as to the particular place pro-
posed, and manifest the inconsistency of the one with the
other; but also to discover the extreme negligence and confi-
dence, which lie at the bottom of his following attempt, to in-
duce a persuasion, that the judgment of the man of whom we
speak, was not altered (that is, as to the interpretation of the
Scriptures relating to the satisfaction of Christ), nor is others
[different] in his Annotations, than in that book; I shall com-
pare 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 himself in his book ‘de Satisfactione,’ and directly
taken up that which he did oppose.

The apologist binds me in the first place to that of Isa.
liii. which is ushered in by the 1 Pet. ii. 24.

From 1 Pet. ii. 24. (says the apologist) Grotius informs
us, 'that Christ so bare our sins, that he freed us from them, so that we are healed by his stripes.'

This, thus crudely proposed, Socinus himself would grant it, is little more than barely repeating the words; Grotius goes farther, and contends that ἀνήνεγκεν the word there used by the apostle, is to be interpreted, 'tulit 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. ix. 28. where he says ἀνήνεγκιον ἀμαρτίας signifies nothing but 'auferre peccata,' Grotius disproves that instance, and manifests that in that place also it is to be rendered by 'tulit,' 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 thereader the words of his Annotations on that place: it is as follows:

'Oc τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν, &c.] ἀνήνεγκεν 'hic est, abstulit, quod sequentia ostendunt, quomodo idem verbum sumi notavimus,' Heb. ix. 28. 'eodem sensu' ἀπεκ ἁμαρτίαν, John ii. 29. et ἄριστον ἰδανησ. Iii. 4. 'ubi Graeci 'φρεν' vitia nostra ita interfecit, sicut qui cruci affiguntur interi solent. Simile loquendi genus, Col. ii. 14. vide Rom. vi. 6. Gal. ii. 20. 24. 'est autem hic μετὰνήσει; non enim proprie Christus cum crucifiigetur, vitia nostra abstulit. Sed causas dedit per quas auferrentur. Nam crux Christi fundamentum est predicationis; predicatio vero poenitentiae, poenitentia vero austerit vitia.'

How well the annotator abides here by his former interpretation of this place, the apologist may easily discover: 1. There he contends that ἀνήνεγκε is as much as 'tulit,' or 'sursum tulit;' and objects out of Socinus, 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. ix. 28. is of the same importance with this I Pet. ii. 24. as there interpreted: here, as here; that is in a quite contrary sense, altogether inconsistent with the
other. 3. For company intent used Isa. liii. is called into the same signification, which in the book 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 vita nostra abstulit, sed causas dedit per quas auferrentur.' what are these causes; he adds them immediately, 'Nam crux Christi fundamentum est prædicationis, prædicatio vero pœnitentiae, pœnitentia vero auertit vitia.' He that sees not the whole Socinian poison 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 Socinus about the sense of this place, I shall add the words of Socinus himself, which then he did oppose. 'Verum animadvertere oportet primum in Graeco, verbum, quod interpretes rererunt pertulit, est ἀνευμένως, quod non pertulit sed abstulit vertendum erat, non secus ac factum fuerit in epistola ad Hebræos, cap. ix. 28. ubi idem legendi modus habetur, unde constat ἀνευμένως ἀμαρίας non perferre peccata, sed peccata tollere, sive auferre, significare.' Socin. de Jes. Christ. Serv. lib. 2. cap. 6.

What difference there is between the design of the annotator, and that of Socinus, what compliance in the quotation of the parallel place of the Hebrews, what direct opposition and head is made in the Annotations against that book 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 apologist's assertion, it may be supposed that that which follows, which is ushered in by this, will do it to the purpose; let then that come into consideration.

This is that of Isa. liii. Somewhat of the sense which Grotius in his book de Satisfactione contends for in this place, is given us by the apologist.

The eleventh verse of the chapter which he first considers (in my book)p. 14, he thus proposes and expounds: 'justificabit servus meus justus multos et iniquitates ipsorum habitabit, in Heb. est: οὐ hùn vox autem ἱν iniqu
tatem significat, atque etiam iniquitatis pænam, 2 Reg. vii. 9.
vox autem הָדָד est sustinere, bajulare, quoties autem baju-
lare ponitur cum nomine peccati aut iniquitatis, id in omni
lingua et maxime in Hebraismo significat pænas ferre," with
much more to this purpose. The whole design of the main
dispute in that place, is, from that discourse of the prophet
to prove, that Jesus Christ "properly underwent the punish-
ment due to our sins, and thereby made satisfaction to God
for them."

To manifest his constancy to this doctrine, in his Anno-
tations he gives such an exposition of that whole chapter of
Isa. liii. as is manifestly and universally inconsistent with
any such design in the words, as that which he intends to
prove from them in his book "de Satisfactione." In particu-
lar (to give one instance of this assertion) he contends
here that הָדָד, is as much as 'bajulare, portare,' and that
joined with 'iniquity' (in all languages, especially in the He-
brew), that phrase of 'bearing iniquity,' signifies to undergo
the punishment due to it; in his Annotations on the place,
as also in those on 1 Pet. ii. 24. he tells you the word signi-
fies 'aufferre,' 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 apologist (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 which from the same verses he pleads for in his
book 'de Satisfactione Christi.' If notwithstanding this in-
formation, the apologist be not satisfied, let him if he please
consider what I have already animadverted on those Anno-
tations, and undertake their vindication. These loose dis-
courses are not at all to the purpose in hand, nor the ques-
tion between us, which is solely, whether Grotius in his An-
notations have not perverted the sense of those texts of
Scripture, which are commonly and most righteously pleaded
as testimonies given to the satisfaction of Christ. But as
to this particular place of Isaiah, the apologist hath a farther
plea, the sum whereof (not to trouble the reader with the re-
petition of a discourse so little to the purpose) comes to this
head; that Grotius in his book 'de Satisfactione Christi,'
gives the mystical sense of the chapter, under which consi-
deration, it belongs to Christ and his sufferings; in his
Annotations the literal, which had its immediate completion
in Jeremiah, which was not so easily discoverable or vulgarly
taken notice of. This is the sum of his first observation on
this place, to acquit the annotator of the crime charged upon
him. Whether he approve the application of the prophecy
to Jeremiah or no, I know not. He says, Grotius so con-
ceived. The design of the discourse seems to give approba-
tion to that conception. How the literal sense of a place
should come to be less easily discovered than the mystical,
well I know not. Nor shall I speak of the thing itself con-
cerning the literal and mystical sense supposed to be in the
same place and words of Scripture, with the application of
the distinction to those prophecies which have a double ac-
complishment in the type and thing or person typified (which
yet hath no soundness in it), but to keep to the matter now
in hand, I shall make bold for the removal of this engine
applied by the apologist, for the preventing all possible mis-
take, or controversy about the annotator's after-charge in
this matter, to tell him, that the perverting of the first lite-
ral 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 himself, is no less than blasphemy; which the
annotator is no otherwise freed from, but by his conceiving
a sense to be in the words, contrary to their literal impor-
tance, and utterly exclusive of the concernment of Jesus
Christ in them. If the apologist be otherwise minded, I
shall not invite him again to the consideration of what I have
already written in the vindication of the whole prophecy
from the wretched corrupt interpretation of the annotator
(not hoping that he will be able to break through that dis-
couragement he hath from looking into that treatise, by the
prospect he hath taken of the whole by the epistle), but do
express my earnest desire, that by an exposition of the se-
veral of that chapter, and their application to any other
(nor by loose discourses foreign 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
careful hereafter of ingenerating apprehensions of that na-
ture 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 foiled the instance produced by the apologist for the weakening of it. But yet lest any should think, that the present issue of this debate, is built upon some unhappiness 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 farther satisfaction, present them with sundry other, the most important testimonies given to the satisfaction of Christ, wherein the annotator hath openly prevaricated, and doth embrace and propose those very interpretations, and that very sense, which in his book, 'de Satisfactione Christi,' he had strenuously opposed.

Page 8. of his book 'de Satisfactione,' he pleads the satisfaction of Christ, from Gal. ii. 21. laying weight on this, that the word δωρεάν, 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 Servatore,' lib. 2. cap. 24. His departure into the tents of Socinus on Gal. iii. 13. is much more pernicious, p. 25—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 τῷ Θεῷ ἐπικαράωτω: hoc est poenae a Deo irrogatae, et quidem ignominiosissimae obnoxium.' To make good this, in his Annotations, he thus expounds the words; 'duplex hic figura; nam et καράω pro καράωτος, quomodo circumcisio pro circumcisis: et subauditur ὥς: nam Christus ita cruciatus est, quasi esset Deo καράωτος, quo nihil homini pessimo in hac vita pejus 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 uniform was the judgment of the annotator, with that of the author of the book 'de Satisfactione Christi.'

Pages 32, 33, &c. are spent in the exposition and vindication of Rom. iii. 25, 26. that expression εἰς εἰδεξεν τὴς δικαιοσύνης 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 itself, and comparing the expression with other parallel texts of Scripture; Socinus had interpreted this of the righteousness of Christ’s fidelity and veracity, lib. 2. ‘de Servatore,’ cap. 2. (ut ostenderet se veracem et fidelem esse); but Crellius in his vindication of him, places it rather on the goodness and liberality of God; which is, saith he, the righteousness there intended. To make good his ground, the annotator thus expounds the meaning of the words; ‘vocem ἰδιαονύνης malim hic de bonitate interpretari, quam de fide in promissis præstandis, quia quæ sequuntur non ad Judæos solos pertinent, sed etiam ad gentes, quibus promissio nulla facta erat.’ He rather (he tells you) embraces the interpretation of Crellius than 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. v. 10. which he insists on p. 26. and 2 Cor. v. 18—21. concerning which he openly deserts his own 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 signal place of Heb. ii. 17. in this kind, deserves particularly to be taken notice of; cap. 7. p. 141. of his book ‘de Satisfactione,’ he pleads the sense of that expression, εἰς τὸ Ἰάκεσσια τᾶς ἁμαρτιὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, to be Ἰάκεσσια Θεὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτίων: and adds, ‘significat ergo ibi expiationem quæ fit placando.’ But Crellius’s defence of Socinus had so possessed the man’s 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: Ἰάκεσσια ἁμαρτιὰς, ‘hoc quidem loco, ut ex sequentibus appareat, est auferre peccata, sive purgare a peccato, id est, efficere ne peccetur, vires suppeditando pro modo tentationum.’ So the annotator on that place; endeavouring farther to prove his interpretation. From Rom. iv. last, cap. i. p. 47. of his book ‘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 et mortuus est, et resurrexit ut nos a peccatis justificaret, id est, liberaret. Sed amans divitiera morti conjunxit peccata, quae sunt mors animi, resurrectioni autem adeptionem justitiae, quae est animi resuscitatio: mire nos et a peccatis retransit et ad justitiam ducit: quod videmus Christum mortem non formidasse pro doctrina sua peccatis contraria, et ad justitiam nos vocanti testimonio; et a Deo suscitatum, ut eidem doctrinæ 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 justification thereby, is utterly ignorant of the state of the controversy between them and Christians.

I suppose it will not be thought necessary for me to proceed with the comparison instituted. The several books 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 own pencil), and those on the Epistles which he had not so completed; as I have already manifested, that in his Annotations on that book, 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 less unworthily with those that concern his satisfaction.

Socinus in his second book against Covet, second part, and chap. 17. gives us this account of those words of the Holy Ghost, Rev. i. 5. 'who hath loved us, and washed us in his own blood: Johannes in Apocalyp. chap. i. 5. alia metaphoræ seu translatione (quæ nihil aliud est quam compendiosa quædam comparatio), utens, dixit de Christo et ejus morte, qui dilexit nos et lavit nos a peccatis in sanguine suo, nam quemadmodum aqua abluitur sordes corporis, sic sanguis Christi, peccata, quæ sordes animi sunt absterguntur. Absterguntur, inquam, quia animus noster ab ipsis mundatur;' &c. This interpretation is opposed and exploded by Grotius, lib. 'de Satis.' c. 10. pp. 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 and newness of life thereby, by which we are turned from our sins; as he manifests in the close of his discourse: 'hoc sæpius urgendum est,' saith Socinus, 'Jesum Christum, ea ratione peccata nostra abstulisse, quod effecerit, ut a pec- cando desistamus.' This interpretation of Socinus, being reinforced by Crellius, the place falls again under the consideration of Grotius, in those Annotations on the Revelations; which as the apologist tell us, received their very lineaments and colours from his own pencil. There then he gives us this account thereof, καὶ λοφοσκευῃ ἡμᾶς ἅπερ τῶν ἐμπροέντων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῶν· 'Sanguine suo, id est, morte tolerata, certos nos reddidit veritatis eorum quae docuerat, quae talia sunt, ut nihil sit aptius ad purgandos a vitii animos. Humidae naturae, sub qua est sanguis, proprium est lavare. Id vero per egregiam ἀληθερολογαν ad animum transfertur. Dicitur autem Christus suo sanguine nos lavisse; quia et ipse omnia praestitit quae ad id requirebantur et apparat secutum in plurimis effectum.' I desire the apologist to tell me what he thinks of this piece thus perfected, with all its lineaments and colours, by the pencil of that skilful man; and what beautiful aspect he supposeth it to have. Let the reader, to prevent farther trouble in perusing transcriptions of this kind, consider Rev. xiii. 8. p. 114. Heb. ix. 25. to the end; which he calls an illustrious place in the same page and forward; 1 John ii. 2. p. 140. Rom. v. 10, 11. p. 142, 143. Eph. ii. 16. p. 148, 149. Col. i. 20—22. Tit. 14. p. 156. Heb. ix. 14, 15. p. 157, 158. Acts xx. 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 do not take 'auferre peccata,' to be 'ferre peccata;' 'nostri causa,' to be 'nostra vice;' and 'nostro loco:' causa προγομνη, to be προπορακτημ; 'liber ratio a jugo peccati,' to be 'redemptio a reatu peccati:' 'su bire poenas simplicitur,' to be 'subire poenas nobis debitas: to be λύτρον, and θεμ 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 work itself; that so he be not mistaken to think that, when the first are granted, that the latter are so also. For a close of the discourse relating to this head, a brief 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 seat of the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction. Although in his Annotations on that Epistle, he doth openly corrupt the most clear testimonies given to this truth, yet there are some passages in them, wherein he seems to dissent from the Socinians. In his Annotations on chap. v. 5. he hath these words; 'Jesus quidem sacerdotale munus suum aliquo modo erat auspicious; cum semet patri victimam offerret.' That Christ was a priest when he was on the earth, was wholly denied by Socinus, both in his book 'de Servatore,' and in his Epistle to Niemojevius, as I have shewed elsewhere. Smalcius seems to be of the same judgment in the Racovian catechism. Grotius says, 'Sacerdotale munus erat aliquo modo auspicious;' yet herein he goes not beyond Crellius, who tells us: 'mortem Christus subiit duplici ratione, partim quidem ut fæderis mediator seu sponsor, partim quidem ut sacerdos, Deo ipsum oblatus: de Causis mortis Christi,' p. 6. And so Volkelsius, fully to the same purpose; 'Partes' saith he, 'muneris sacerdotis, haec sunt potissimum; mactatio victimae, in tabernaculum ad oblationem peragendam, ingressio, et ex eodem egressio: Ac mactatio quidem mortem Christi, violentam sanguinis profusionem continet:' De Relig. lib. 3. cap. 47. p. 145. and again: 'Hinc colligitur solam Christi mortem nequaquam illum perfectam absolutamque ipsius oblationem (de qua in Epistola ad Hebræos agitur) fuisse, sed principium et preparationem quandam ipsius sacerdotii in caelo demum administrandi extitisse,' ibid. So that nothing is obtained by Grotius's 'munus sacerdotale aliquo modo erat auspicious,' 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 do. For Volkelius acknowledgeth that he did slay the sacrifice in his death, though that was not his complete and perfect oblation, which is also afterward affirmed by Grotius; and Crellius expressly affirms the same. Nor doth he seem to intend a proper, expiatory, and satisfactory sacrifice in that expression; for if he had, he would not have been guilty of such an ἀνευρολογία, as to say, ' semet obtulit patri.' Besides, though he do acknowledge elsewhere, that this 'victimam' was θυσία, and ὑπήρ ἀμαρτίων, yet he says in another place, (on ver. 3.) 'Sequitur Christum quoque obtulisse pro se ὑπήρ ἀμαρτίων' 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. ix. 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, 'purga-tio ista tribuitur: quia per sanguinem, id est, mortem Christi, secuta ejus excitacione et evectione, gignitur in nobis fides, qua deinde purgat corda.' And therefore, where Christ is said to offer himself by the eternal Spirit, he tells us, 'Obla-tio Christi hic intelligitur illa, que obligationi legali in adyto factæ respondet, ea autem est, non oblatio in altari crucis facta, sed in adyto caelesti.' So that the purgation of sin is an effect of Christ's presenting himself in heaven only; which how well it agrees with what the apostle says, chap. i. 3. the reader will easily judge. And to manifest that this was his constant sense, on those words, ver. 26. εἷς ἀμαρτίας, διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτῶν, he thus comments: εἷς ἀμαρτίας ' Ut peccatum in nobis extinguatur; fit autem hoc per passionem Christi, quæ fidem nobis ingenerat, quæ corda purificat.' Christ confirming his doctrine by his death, begets faith in us, which doth the work. Of the 28th verse of the same chapter, I have spoken before. The same he affirms again, more expressly, on chap. x. 3. and verses 9. 12. he interprets the oblation of Christ, whereby he took away sin, to be the oblation or offering himself in heaven, whereby sin is taken away by sanctification, as also in sundry other places, where the expiatory sacrifice of Christ
on earth, and the taking away of the guilt of sin 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 farther to abound in causa 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 annotator 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 Socinus, Crellius, Smalcius, 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, original sin, free will, justification, &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 annotator, but the secular learning which in his interpretations he hath curiously and gallantly interwove. Plautus makes sport in his Amphitruo with several persons, some real, some assumed, of such likeness one to another, that they could not discern themselves by any outward appearance; which caused various contests and mistakes between them. The Poet's fancy raised not a greater similitude between Mercury and Sosia, being supposed to be different persons, than there is a dissimilitude between the author of the book 'de Satisfactione Christi,' and of the Annotations, concerning which we have been discoursing, being one and the same. Nor was the contest of those different persons so like one another, so irreconcilable, as are these of this single person, so unlike himself in the several treatises mentioned. And I cannot but think it strange, that the apologist could imagine no surer measure to be taken of Grotius's meaning in his Annotations than 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. Whether now any will be persuaded by the apologist to believe, that Grotius was constant
in his Annotations to the doctrine delivered in that other treatise, I am not solicitous.

For the reinforced plea of the apologist, 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 book of Annotations 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 apologist had in the least made good his former plea, by his new exceptions to my evidence against it, from the printer’s preface to the volume of Annotations on the Epistles. He says, ‘what was the opus integrum that was commended to to the care of α ἑπίσκοπος? and answers himself, ‘not that last part or volume of Annotations, but opus integrum, the whole volume or volumes that contained his 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 himself published his Annotations on the Gospels, five years 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 amanuensis could well understand it. That therefore in his going towards Sweden, he wrote that part again with his own hand, and sent it back to the same person (that had the former part of the volume committed to him) from Hamburg. If the apologist 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 tampering with the testimonies given in the Scripture to the Deity of Christ, being another head of the whole, may now have place.

The sum 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 several respects. A limitation that
I could not perceive he had spoken of himself, 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 John i. 1. I expressly affirmed; that is the one place wherein, as I say, he spake not home to the business. The defence of the apologist in the behalf of Grotius, consists of sundry discourses. First, to disprove that he hath left more than that one of John free from the corruption charged; he instances in that one of John i. 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 inquiry), and reserved to farther debate; he adds the places quoted by Grotius in the exposition of that place; as Prov. viii. 21—27. Isa. xliv. 12. xlviii. 13. 2 Pet. iii. 5. Col. i. 16. from all which he concludes, that the Annotations have left more testimonies to the Deity of Christ untampered withal and unperverted, than my assertion will allow; reckoning them all up again, section the 10th, and concluding himself a successful advocate in this case, or at least under a despair of ever being so in any, if he acquit not himself clearly in this. If his failure herein be evinced by the course of his late writings, himself will appear 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 pains to turn to the places, and give the reader a brief account of them.

For Prov. viii. his first note on the wisdom there spoken of is; ‘Hæc de ea sapientia quæ in lege apparat exponunt Hæbræi, et sane ei, si non soli, at praecipue 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, until he comes to the 22d verse, the verse of old contested about with the Arians. His words on that are: ‘Græcum Aquilæ, est, ἵκτισαρό με, ut et Symmachi et Theo-
dosionis, respondetque, bene Ἰαβρασιν, et Chaldæus habet Ἠρ, et LXX. ἐκτισε, sensu non malo, si creare sumas pro facere ut appareat: viae Dei sunt operationes ipsius; sensum hujus loci et sequentium non male expressam cum Phileone de Coloniiis; τὸ λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν γένεων ἐλιφωτῶν, οὐ καθάπερ οίκος ἐνελημένος ὁ τῶν δύσων γνισειτης πεδαλιον χεῖ τὰ σύμ-
παντα, καὶ ὁτε ἐκσισμοπλάσαιο χρησάμενος ὁργάνω τούτω πρὸς τὴν ἀναπαθιον τῶν ἀποτελούμενων σύστασιν.

On verse 27, he adds 'aderam, id est, ἢν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ut infra John Evangel. i. 1.' What clear and evident testimony by this exposition is left in this place to the Deity of Christ, I profess myself as ignorant as I was before I received this direction by the apologist. He tells us, that ἦν is rendered not amiss by the Chaldee Ἠρ, and the LXX. ἐκτισε, though he knew that sense was pleaded by the Arians, and exploded by the ancient doctors of the church. To relieve this concession, he tells us that 'creare,' may be taken for 'facere ut appareat,' though there be no evidence of such a use of the word in 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 works of creation: of the Son of God, the essential wisdom of God, subsisting with the Father, we have not one word: nor doth that quotation out of Philo relieve us in this business at all. We know in what sense he used the word ὁ λόγος; how far he and the Platonics, 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 Arians, 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 clear testimony to the Deity of Christ; his comparing ἢν ὡς ibi ego, which the Vulgar renders 'aderam,' with ἢν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, seems rather to cast a suspicion on his intention in the expression of that place of the Evangelist, than in the least to give testimony to the Deity of Christ in this. If any one be farther desirous to be satisfied, how many clear 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 'Vindiciae Evangelicae,' where he will find something tendered to him to that purpose. What the apologist intended by adding these two places of Isaiah, chap. xlv. 12. and the xlviii. 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 iii. 5. τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, he adds indeed, 'vide quae diximus ad initium Evangelii Jo- hannis:' but neither doth that place intend the natural Son of God, nor is it so interpreted by Grotius.

To these he adds in the close; Col. i. 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 falseness of my assertion before-mentioned, of the annotator's speaking clear 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 Platonic interpretations of that expression he interweaves in his expositions, how he hath darkened the whole counsel 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 itself, about this place I will not contend: only it may not be amiss to observe, that not only the Arians, but even Photinus himself acknowledged that
the world was made τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ, that how little is obtained towards the confirmation of the Deity of Christ by that concession, may be discerned.

I shall offer also only at present, that ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, is threefold, λόγος ὑποστατικός, ἐνδιάκτητος, and προφορικός. The λόγος ὑποστατικός or σωσίώθης is Christ, mentioned John i. 1. his personal or eternal subsistence, with his omnipotency, being there asserted. Whether Christ be so called any where else in the New Testament may be disputed: Luke i. 2. (compared with 1 John i. 1.) 2 Pet. i. 16. Acts xx. 32. Heb. iv. 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 ὁ λόγος Psal. xxxiii. 6. is to me also evident. γὰρ is better rendered ῥῆμα, or λέξις, than λόγος. Where that word is used, it denotes not Christ: though 2 Sam. xxiii. 2. where that word is, is urged by some to that purpose. He is also called ὁ λόγος Hag. ii. 5. so perhaps in other places. Our present Quakers would have that expression of the word of God, used nowhere 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. Δόγματι ἐνδιάκτητος amongst men, is that which Aristotle calls, τὸν ὑστο λόγον τοῦ λόγος ἐν νῷ λαμπανόμενος, says Hesychius. Δόγματι ἐνδιάκτητος is that which we speak in our hearts, says Dama scorn. de Orthod. Fid. lib. 1. cap. 18. So Psal. xiv. 1. לָבֶנ לַמֵּן. This as spoken in respect of God, is that egress of his power, whereby according to the eternal conception of his mind, he worketh any thing. So Gen. i. 2. 'God said, Let there be light, and there was light.' Of this word of God the Psalmist treats, cxlvi. ver. 18. 'he sendeth out νῆρα and melteth the ice,' and Psal. cxlviii. 8. the same word is used. In both which places the Septuagint renders it by ὁ λόγος. This is that which is called ῥῆμα τῆς δυνάμεως, Heb. i. 3. xi. 3. where the apostle says, the heavens were made ῥηματί Θεοῦ, which is directly parallel to that place of 2 Pet. iii. 5. where it is expressed τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγῳ: for though ῥῆμα more properly denotes λόγον προφορικὸν, yet in these places, it signifies plainly that egress of God’s power for the production and preservation of things, being a pursuit of the eternal conception of his mind, which is λόγος ἐνδιάκτητος.
Now this infinite, wise, and eternal conception of the mind of God, exising itself in power, wherein God is said to speak, 'he said, Let there be light,' is that which the Platonics, and Philo with them, harped on, never once dreaming of a co-essential and hypostatical word of God, though the word ἀπόστασις occur amongst them. This they thought was unto God, as in us, λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or ὁ ἔσω, πρὸς νοῦν and particularly it is termed by Philo, φωνῇ τῆς διανοιας ἀποστάσεως de Agric. That this was his ὁ λόγος is most evident. Hence he tells us, οὐδεὶς ἐὰν ἔτερον ἐποιηθῇ εἶναι κόσμον ἡ θεοῦ λόγον ἡ διανοια μοιούνοις. οὔτε γὰρ ὡς πόλεις ἔτερον τι ἐστὶν, ἢ τὸ ἀρχιεκτόνος λογισμὸς; ἡ δὴ νοητὴ πόλις τιτδεὶ διανοιμένην. Μωσέως γὰρ τὸ δόγμα τούτο, ὡς ὕπον de Mund. Opifce. and a little after, τὸν ἄφθοδον καὶ νοητὸν Ἑλέον λόγον, εἰκὼν λόγιος θεοῦ καὶ ταύτης εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ φῶς ἔκειν, ὁ Ἑλεον λόγον γέγονεν εἰκὼν τοῦ διερμηνευτός τήν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ et ipsis ὑποκρανίων ἄστηρ. 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 himself; 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 λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, though therein I have the consent of very many learned divines, and used it merely in opposition τῷ προφορικῷ; yet I desire to recall it: nor do I think there is any propriety in that expression of λόγον used of Christ, but only in those of ὑποστάτους and οὐσιώδης, which the Scripture (though not in the very terms) will make good. In this second accetptation, τοῦ λόγου, Photinus himself 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 fear that nothing but ὁ λόγος in this sense, decked with many platonical encomiums, was intended in the Annotations on John i. (though I confess 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 add no more.

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

'If one text acknowledged to assert Christ’s eternal divi-
nity' (which one was granted to do it, though not clearly), 'will not suffice to conclude 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. John' (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 eternal subsistence with God before the creation of the world' (which he doth not so interpret, as to a personal subsistence), 'and that the whole world was created by him; I shall despair of ever being a successful advocate for any man;' from which condition I hope some little time will recover the apologist.

This is the sum of what is pleaded in chief, 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 near forty texts of Scripture, in the Old Testament and New, giving express testimony to the Deity of Christ from the annotator's perverse interpretations, let the reader judge. In the 13th section of the apologist's discourse, he adds some other considerations to confirm 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 look 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 several 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 than name them already.

But he hath two suppletory considerations, that will
render any such inquiry or inspection needless. 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 a hundred express places would
be conceived to confirm it.'

Ans. It is confessed, that not only five, but any one ex-
press 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 acknowl-
dged 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 says, 'That this charge upon inquiry will be
found in some degree, if not equally, chargeable on the lean-
edest and most valuable of the first reformers, particularly
upon Mr. Calvin himself, who hath been as bitterly and un-
justly accused and reviled upon this account (witness the
book intitled 'Calvinio 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 need-
ful to countenance it, for the end for which it is proposed;
I could not pass it by. It is denied (which in this case until
farther proof must suffice) that any of the learnedest 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 instance
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 express testimony
to the Deity of Christ, and commonly pleaded to that end
and purpose. Although I deny not, but that he differs from
the common judgment of most, in the interpretation of some few prophetic 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 (wherein yet he is acquitted by the most learned of themselves) and not from his expositions of Scripture, for which they raised their clamours. For the book called 'Calvino Turcismus,' written by Reynolds and Giffard, the apologist has forgotten the design of it. Calvin is no more concerned in it, than 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 apostacies of some of that profession, that they compare it with Turcism. Something indeed, in a chapter or two, they speak about the Trinity, from some expressions of Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and others: but as to Calvin's expositions of Scripture, they insist not on them. Possibly the apologist may have seen Pareus's 'Calvinus Orthodoxus,' in answer to Hunnius's 'Calvinus Judaizans;' 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 suitableness, of this kind of defence. The sum 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 clear evidence to the Deity of Christ; of his satisfaction I said in sum the same thing. Had the apologist been pleased to have produced instances of any evidence for the disprovement 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 express compliance with the Socinians in his so doing, as that I cannot have the least thought of letting fall my charge, which, with
render any such inquiry or inspection (as preservation), contains the first is, the truth that which is so.

'That the word of God being our guide, have done somewhat equal truth, that doctrine which issues, than thus occasion-divine writ, must by all Christians, corruption in general; as irrefragably confirmed, as a reformation of the truths of be conceived to confirm it,' under the false glosses put upon

Ans. It is confessed, that it once of Scripture wherein press text of Scripture, is a work being fallen on an aber any divine truth. But the professor of divinity, my de-out of the Annotations by the spirit of my endeavour for that of the great truth plea

there is no such thing. particulars insisted on by the had depraved all but rhetoric is laid out about was at hand; if it has not the reader's trouble is ledged to be clear about them. If they did, it that which was clear discover his mistakes in them all not. Let the place of most of them, lies in that which by an induction, or says, that 'I thus state the jen-or else the charge is, as it is owned by me, viz. that being

Secondly, I was accused in many things with the found in which he replies, that 'this does not so edest and I was a Papist.'

upon the case to prove Grotius to be a Papist, just infringes the management of the jealousy, but I can at all own it; all which are

which we say, whether he was in doctrine a

revised before insisted on, determined with the Roman interest or no,

preserved by others, I desire the apolo-

sions to the Roman interest in Rev. xii. 5. that book

received his last hand. But

hence to accuse Grotius, or to charge his me-

moral depravation in his Annotations

the sense to press the general aphorism (as

standard, &c. nor any person whatever

and in the sense thereof, perfecting ho-
the fear of God, shall ever see his face in glory, so
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 apolo-
gist in his first defence of him, giving some light to what
hath been insisted on, I thought it not unfit to communi-
cate them to the reader, as they came to my hand, having
not as yet been printed that I know of.

Reverendo summamque eruditionis ac pietatis viro Domino
Johanni Crellio pastori Recov. H. G. S.

Libro tuo quo ad eum quem ego quondam scripsaram (Erud-
itissime Crelli) respondisti, adeo offensus non fui, ut etiam
gratias tunc intra animum meum egerim, nunc et hisce agam
literis. Primo, quod non tautum humane, sed et valde
officiose mecum egeris, ita ut quæri nihil possim, nisi quod in
me prædicando, modum interdum excedes, deinde vero, quod
multa me docueris, partim utilia, partim jucunda scitu, me-
que exemplo tuo incitaveris ad penitendum sensus
sacrorum librorum. Bene autem in Epistola tua quæ mihi
longe gratissima advenit, de me judicas, non esse me eorum
in numero qui ob sententias salva pietate dissidentes alieno
a quoquam sim animo, aut boni alicujus amicitiam repudiem.
Equidem in libro 'de vera Religione,' quem jam percurri, re-
lecturus et posthaec, multa invenio summo cum judicio ob-
servata. Illud vero sæculo gratulator, repertos homines qui
nætuquam in controversiis subtilibus tantum ponunt, quan-
tum in vera vitae emendatione, et quotidiano ad sanctitatem
profectu. Utinam et mea scripta aliquid ad hoc studium in
animis hominum excitandum inflammandumque; conferre
possint: tunc enim non frustra me vixisse hactenus existi-
mem. Liber 'de veritate Religionis Christianæ' magis ut no-
bis esset solatio, quam ut alius documento scriptus, non video

b This book of Crellius lay unanswered by Grotius above twenty years. For
long he lived after the publishing of it. It is since fully answered by Eosenius.

*That is the body of Socinian divinity written by Crellius and Volckelius.*
quid post tot aliorum labores utilitatis afferre possit, nisi ipsa forte brevitate. Siquid tamen in eo est, quod tibi tuaque similibus placeat, mihi supra evenit. Libris 'de jure Belli et Pacis' mihi præcipue propositum habui, ut feritatem illam, non Christianis tantum, sed et hominibus indignam, ad bella pro libitu suscipientia, pro libitu gerenda, quam gliscere tot popularum malo quotidié 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 vero quod attinet, credas, rogo, si quid unquam facere possim tui, aut eorum quos singulariter amat, causa, experturum te, quantum te tuo merito faciam. Nunc quum aliud possim nihil, Dominum Jesum supplece animo veneror, ut tibi alisque; pietatem promoventibus propitius adsit.

x. Maii. M. DC. XXVI.

Tui nominis studiosissimus. H. G.

Tam pro Epistola (vir Clarissime) quam pro transmisso libro, gratias ago maximas. Constitui et legere et relegere diligentem quaecunque a te profiscuntur, expertus quo cum fructu id antehac fecerim. Eo ipso tempore quod literas tuas accepi, versabar in lectione tuae interpretationis in Epistolam ad Galatas. Quantum judicare possim et scripti occasionem et propositum, et totam seriem dictionis, ut magnum cura indagasti, ita feliciter admodum es assequutus. Quare Deum precor, ut et tibi et tui similibus, vitam det, et quae alia ad iusti usmodi labores necessaria. Mihi ad juvandum communem Christianismi causam, utinam tam adissent vires, quam promptus est animus: quippe me, a prima ætate, per varia disciplinarum genera jactatum, nulla res magis deductavit, quam rerum sacrarum meditatio. Id in rebus prosperis moderamen, id in adversis solamen sensi. Pacis consilia et amavi semper et amo nunc quoque; eoque doleo, quum video, tam pertinacibus iris committi inter se eos, qui Christi se esse dicunt. Si recte rem putamus, quantissis de causis——

Januarii. M. DC. XXXII. Amstelodam.

* Let the reader judge what annotations on that Epistle we are to expect from