SERMON III.

KINGS and EMPEROURS, not rightful Subjects to the POPE.

Mr. Henry J unt

Act. 26. 2. I think my self happy King Agrippa, because I shall answer for my self this day before thee, &c.

Though I cannot this day assume to my self that happiness the Apostle did, that he did Apologize before a King who was expert in all the Customs of the Jews, ver. 3; Yet (I do suppose) I may account my self happy, that I am to Apologize for Kings and Emperours, who do know, and have assumed to themselves their Royal Prerogatives granted to them from the King of Kings by whom they reign, confirmed to them by him who is set upon the Holy Hill of Zion; and infringed, eluded, or usurped by a Pretended Vicegerent, whose Right and Reason in his Pretences are no greater than his Humility or Modesty in the claim and exercise of his Power. Whilest I treat of this important Affair, I hope you that are my Auditors will do me reason to hear me patiently; and I humbly submit the Discourse to those sacred Persons whose cause needeth no more, or greater Advocates than have already appear'd in it: And if the immodest restlessness of incroachers do occasion a necessary Apology for this Cause, it deserveth a much better than now is by others define, not his own choice, put upon it. If there be any thing less becoming the greatness of the Cause, and the excellency of the Persons, and (as I fore-
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foresee it will be) not worthy the favourable acceptance of the meanest Prince; yet I humbly pray the favourable interpretation, and gracious pardon of all that my own weaknesses have rendered defective; and a condescending acceptance of what the strength of Reason, the resentment of Duty, the obligation of Oaths, the dictates of Nature, the Command of God, and a vowed Loyalty to my Great and Gracious sovereign, have in this (so much his) cause, better performed. With this desired candor and hoped favour I return to my Work, which yeareth in the Text I have read, because in that either directly or consequentially lieth this Thesis.

Kings and Emperours are not rightful Subjects to the Pope, neither hath he Power for pretended or real Heresie to Excommunicate and Depose them, nor to Absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance; but even the Clergy are subject to Secular Princes, and their Bodies and Estates under their Government.

In which Thesis (I observe) two different sorts of Propositions, the first Negative, the other Positive; and these kind of Propositions in the Schools are differently treated, for the Positives are to be proved by the Opponent, the Negative to be defended by the Respondent; so should Rome if the Pope would carry his Cause, prove his own Right, which he can as easily now as ever; and with just such Arguments as formerly make good; whilest immodest Claims, forcible Usurpations, enslaved Councils, citations of treasonable Decretals, appellations to seditious Canon-Law, blasphemous appropriation of Omnipotency, self-designing flatteries, and vowed obedience to the Pope against Nature, Reason and Religion; whilst these are accounted good proofs, what Romanists will think the Pope an Usurper? or his Wars against the Emperor Rebellion? May all Christian Kings enjoy their undoubted Rights, and keep in the undisturbed Possession of them until such Arguments of weak and senseless become strong and reasonable, his Roman Holiness will scarce think the reversion worth his thanks, if it be bequeath’d him, or worthy of his hope if it be promised him on such Terms, and on better I trust he will never have it. This Negative part of the Position (for reasons kept to myself) I do cast into the latter part of my Discourse, The Positive Position, viz. The Clergy are subject to Secular Princes, and their Bodies and Estates under their Government, I put in the first place, and shall first handle it; whence the Negative Propositions will as consequences follow and take their own place. Now here it is necessary I

1. Explain the Terms which are here used, and state the Thesis.  
2. Confirm the Thesis so stated.  
3. Discover the Doctrine and Doctors who avow the contrary.  
4. Give you their Reasons, and an Answer to them.  
5. Present you with some Corollaries from the Discourse.
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Properly and strictly all Princes are Secular.

Sel. III. The next Term to be explained is Secular Princes; where by the way note, That Princes are properly Secular, their Dignity, Power, and Government is (quad Origem) in its rite Divine; the Powers that are,
Serm. III. *rightful Subjects to the Pope.*

are, are of God, but *quoad objecta* as to the things they do take cognisance of, they are (though not solely, yet) Primarily Secular. And *quod externum formam* as to the manner of pomp and state which may render the Government more Awful, 'tis and justly is, ordered and determined *prout sapientia principis visum est* as seemeth good to the will of the Prince, and so is Secular. But *what through the Royal favour of some good Princes, and more through the Ambition and Usurpations of Popish Ecclesiastics,* who have invested themselves with Principalities, and a Power equal with the Princes of this World; It is become necessary we should distinguish Princes into Secular and Ecclesiastical: The Secular being those Princes which we will call now Temporal and Civil; The Ecclesiastical such as the Pope, his Cardinals, and some Bishops, such as the Spiritual Electors in the Empire, &c. To which Inferior Clergy do with less scruple acknowledge, and pay their ready Subjection; beside which I doubt not to assert, (and hope I shall be able to prove) they do owe a Subjection, and Obedience to the Temporal, Civil, i.e. Secular Prince; of which a word or two, that we may not mistake, or be mistaken. Whence it is that we must now distinguish into Princes Secular and Ecclesiastical.

Who these are.

Now this term Prince may be taken either 1. In respect to the Person; or 2. In respect to the Office; In the first sense it referreth to Governments in a single Person, as in Kingdoms, in the latter it referreth to Government, managed by a State or Council, as of old in the Roman Commonwealth; or now in the Commonwealts of Venice, Genoa, or the Dutch. Neither of these may be excluded, where the Clergy are Subjects to a King, as in France, or Spain, they are his rightful Subjects: Where they are under a Commonwealth they are Subjects to the Secular Power; *i.e.* they owe Subjection to the Supreme Civil Magistrate; as to their perpetual honour, and to the good example of all Christendom, the Illustrious Republick of Venice made both the proud Pope Paul the Fifth, and the stubborn Clergy of their State to learn and acknowledg, *Sid tyr annu* out of fear of the Magistrates Power, when they would not *Sid tyr oweldhnow* out of sense of their own Duty. Again, ere I leave this, *a Prince may be considered either with respect to Subjects that,*

First, *Are born Subjects to whom the Supreme Magistrate is Native Princes and Subjects Natural and perpetual.*

Secondly, *Princes may be considered with respect to Subjects that are such, occasionally, and Pro tempore, as when either necessary occasions, invite or call men into a foreign Princes Countreys, or when an arbitrary choice out of curiosity, or the like, bringeth men into a foreign Jurisdiction: The case of Merchants, Students, and Travellers, whilest they are in those Countreys, they are in Conscience bound by the just known Laws of that Land; and if they transgress those Laws, to
to the forfeiture of State, Limb, or Life; the favour of the Prince may save the Criminal: But there is no benefit of Clergy can exempt him from the Jurisdiction of the Prince, or rescue him from the execution of the Law, by their Ministers of Justice.

Sect. IV. The next thing to be explained is, How their Bodies are, said to be, under Government of the Civil or Secular Prince. In short their Persons are

First, Both liable to Arrests, Restraints, Imprisonments, and Coercion, as there shall be a just cause, or suspicion of just cause.

Secondly, And obnoxious to the sentence of the Law, according to the nature of their offence, so as either to lose Life, or Limb, or suffer by Stripes, or Stigmatizing, or Exile, or losS of Liberty, or any like corporal Penalty.

Thirdly, What personal services the community of the lay-Subjects are bound to do for their Countrey and their Prince, the Clergy are bound to (though usually exempt from it through the favour of their Prince) and in an urgent necessity, on the command of their Prince, they may be obliged; and ought to afford their Assistance. (As in case of an Invasion to Arm, or in an assault of a City to defend it, or in the danger of his Prince’s Person to rescue him with the Labour, Courage, and Hazard of his own Life) That Clergy-man, who in a storm would not obey the Pilots order, and take his turn at the Pump, to save the Vessel, and Goods, with his own Life and the Life of others; were as unworthy of a room in the Ship, as other lading that is cast over-board to prevent a danger from its weight.

Sect. V. The Estates of the Clergy, are next to be considered, and that in divers respects.

First, Their inheritances from their Fathers, do not by the Sons being a Clergy Man, become free from the common burdens, which Authority layeth on the Publick or generality of the Subjects for defraying publick charges.

Secondly, The Lands and Estates of their preferments of what sort forever, are in like manner chargeable, if the Magistrate judgeth it necessary and equal: And in such case they ought to obey as readily as other men, when their Prince with advice and consent of such Counsel as can duly impose it on others. have imposed it on them.

Thirdly, The Estates of Ecclesiastical Societies are under the Government of the Secular Authority, as well as the Estates of Lay-Societies and Corporations, to limit their increase by gifts, as by our Statute of Mortmain: To enquire and compel them, to employ them to the uses for which they were given, as by commissioon of charitable uses.

Fourthly, The Estates of Clergy-men which are (beneficia &c.) given as encouragement to them, and reward of their labour, and duties discharged
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are so under the Civil Magistrate's Government, that he may eject and remove the negligent, and incorrigible male-administrators in that Office, as in other cases of male-administration. Though it may be most convenient to do this by Clergy-men, as Co-adjutors in the process; yet the Authoritative determination deriveth itself from the supreme Magistrate, who as He judgeth the Offender unworthy of the Trust of such an Office, so may dispossess him of the Benefit and Estate belonging to it.

Fifthly, The Estates so taken from the one, may by the Power which justly took them away, be adjudged to another, who may better discharge the Office, and deserve the Benefit. And in this case the Clergy-man must be subject, though possibly an error may be in the judgment passed, and no legal way be left for his relief; as fell out in the deprivation of the Protestant Ministers by Queen Mary.

Sixthly, The Estates of Clergy-men are forfeitable on crimes of high nature, as well as other mens Estates. Treason, of which (with or without leave from Rome, I say) a Clergy-man may be guilty, will forfeit his estate, and the Prince may (on conviction at least) seize it.

Sec. 6. I come to the last Term to be opened, Are under their Government; where I do remind you, that we speak now of matter of Right, not of matter of Fait separate from Right: Their Persons, and Estates, ought to be under the Government of the secular Prince, as their Rightful Lord and Governour. Now Government,

First, Is for Protection and defence: Governours are shields of the Protection of Earth, and Heirs of restraint, a praise to them that do well, and they watch over their people as Shepherds: whence the Poet rightly called his Prince παμφωλαβων: And here, in this part, none do with such importunate clamors, and immodest injunctions expect a share, as the disloyal Shavelins; as if the secular Arm were framed to the Body-Politic, only to defend the Persons and Estates of Ecclesiasticks, and to offend all others.

Secondly, Is Directive; and this, some of them will indeed allow the secular Magistrate over the Clergy; but ere the Magistrate can get clear of them with this small allowance of his right, it fares with him as they say, it doth with those who receive money of Witches, or the Devil, when they come to use it, 'tis vanish'd or turned into wither ed leaves. For,

Thirdly, The Coercive Power of the Civil Magistrate in Governing them, they with more Wit than good manners, or dutifulness, endeavour to wrest from the Magistrate; and when he hath parted with the Government, this Power of punishing the ill-natur'd disobedience of the Clergy, he must the Popish Clergy reject.

H Na-
Nature would seem to allow: Indeed a Directive Power without Coercive, is an Engine to pull down the honour of a Prince, and to extalt the stubborn humour of every Male-contented Subject, a fit Project for Rome; and some brain-fick Millionarie, who in his hot fit dreameth of a Crown for himself on Earth. But our Thesis intends to Subject the Clergy of Rome (for our own, they readily acknowledg it, and live) in a subjection to the directive Government of the Christian Magistrate, as the Rule of their Duty, and to the Coercive Government as the just Rule of punishment for neglect of their duties.

Fourthly, Where the Government secular is not Christian, yet in all just and lawful commands, the Clergy is Subject to the Directive Power of it; and in commands unjust and unlawful, their Persons and Estates are under the Coercive Power, though it should be exercised to the highest degree of Perfection: And I do not remember beside Prayers, Supplications, Patience, and Tears, any remedy left them for the last relief, but an honest, peaceable and justifiable flight from their rage, and cruelty; I added this over and above, seeing our Thesis speaks of Subjection to Princes, who are supposed Christians, and not Heathens. Summarily then the Clergy, who by the Pope and his Law are exempt from the jurisdiction of the secular Prince in all cases, are far from a due and rightful claim to such exemption, that in all cases Civil and Criminal, and Ecclesiastical, they are both as to their Persons and Estates, subject to the Directive and Coercive Power of the Secular Prince, be he a Christian, or Heathen Magistrate; in so much, that the Clergy owe him an Active obedience in the due and lawful exercise of his Directive Power: and in the undue exercise thereof, the Clergy as others owe him a Passive obedience, and neither may resist by force, or appeal from him to a Forreign, to evade or null his Coercive Power.

The state of the Position thus laid down, I come to the second thing proposed. viz: To prove that the Clergy are Subject to the Secular Prince, &c. And so

1. First, I argue from the Text; a Majore ad Minus; St. Paul was a Clergy-man, fitter to be trusted with such an exemption from obedience to the Secular Prince, than any of our Present Clergy: And if any such Priviledg had been given by Chrift, or had been inherent in the Office, he would have known it, claimed it, and stood on it; but St. Paul knew none such, stood not upon any such Priviledg: Therefore surely there is none such inherent in the Clergy, or annexed to the Clergy.

I think there is not much doubt to be made, whether 1. He were a Clergy-man, who had his commission from God and Chrift, without the ceremonies with which men do ordain to that Office. Or 2. Whether he were concerned to plead his Priviledg if he had any; for it was a Cafe that toucht his Life, wherein he now was engaged. Or 3. Whether he might be bold on account of his Innocency to claim his Priviledg, since his judges determined he had done nothing worthy of Death
or of Bonds, Act 26.31. Had one of our Roman Priests been thus seized, imprisoned, impleaded, and endangered; we should soon have heard him, excepting to the jurisdiction of the Court, and appealing from an Incompetent Judge, and shuffling off the Process with impotune clamours, that he was a Spiritual Man, and not to be call'd to breach of Allegiance by a Temporal Power. But here you find nothing of such an appeal, which cannot be imputed to the Neceffion of the Apostle who was inspired by the Infallible Spirit: He would have known it if there had been any such exception, nor may it with colour of Reafon be said, he would not make use of his Priviledg, and that he did relax of his Right. * For 1. This would be suppos'd against all Reafon, 1. His Life was then in question. 2. He was a Man would make use of his Priviledges, as when he pleaded himself a Roman. 3. He should have impleaded his Priviledg, that from his testimony, succeeding Ecclefiafticks might firmly prove theirs, though he could not have gotten clear of their hands. 4. His silence in the Cafe hath done the Church much wrong, which date the Immunities, some Centuries later than Paul's time. 5. Whereas, Had he been as Zealous, and Wife as our Roman Priests now are; He had been more faithful to his Trust, and we had more clearly proved our Right. Farther yet, 6. It fecmeth little short of a culpable difimulation, that he should count, or profefs to count himself happy that he was to answer before a Secular Prince. Nothing can be imagined more unbecoming him who was set for the defence of the Gospel, than such tame and soft Cowardifie as he was guilty of, on the Supposition of these pretended Exempts. No, St. Paul would never have betrayed the Preachers of the Gospel, and the Religious in all ages succeeding; but have at least owned his Right to the Privileg; (if there had been any fuch,) before Festus, who was under the Roman Cæfar, Governor of Judea; and so Judg in Paul's Cafe, though Agrippa was but an honourable Auditor.

his Prince and Benefactor, who found Tho. Becket most resolute to exempt the Clergy, though guilty of Murthers, from the judgment of the Secular Prince; that he might preserve the usurped Priviledges of the Church, when Reafon, Law, and Gods own Word required just execution on fuch crimes proved against the Clergy.

And of later years, the like bred a quarrel betwixt the Serene Republick of Venice, and Paul the fifth.

* It is Bellarmine's Evason, and Suarez approves it, qui dicit Paulum non jure sed facto Cæsarem appellasse.—Nam juridictione exemptius ut utiq. jure divino sed quia alia ratione non potrerat inimicorum in fidias Evitare.

I conclude therefore this Argument, the Clergy of this present Age, and of Ages past are as much under the Secular Government as was St. Paul; But he was so much under it, that he accounted himself happy, that he might have a candid hearing before the Secular Power, and could find no Privileg to exempt himself: Therefore neither have our present Clergy any fuch Privileg of exemption, and should acknow-
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kedg it a happiness to defend a just cause before an Impartial Judg, and no wrong to be adjudged to a deserved correction for any crime condemned by the righteous Laws of their Sovereign Prince.

2. What was just and right, and ought to be owned by St. Paul a Clergy-man in the point of subjection to the Secular Power, that is just, right, & ought to be owned in the point of subjection to the Secular Authority now by the Clergy. This Proposition I think will need no proof, and if it should we shall meet with due place for it. But S. Paul owned this Subjection as what was just, right, and which ought to be. Now this Proposition is almost in express terms in that, Act. 25. 10. I stand before Cerar's judgment-seat, (Which Phrase comprehendeth the whole matter of his Subjection) where I ought to be judged, which pageage exclu-
deth any just exception; I stand at Cesars judgment-seat; de facto, he was now before the Supreme Authority Civil, & left any should sur-
mise that he did tacitely repine at it, or that we argue a facto ad jus; It is added by Saint Paul, Where I ought to be judged. I know some say that S. Paul did not this as what was of right to be done, but what was then most safe to be done, and because he could not otherwise escape the hands of the Jews; To which I Answer,

of Belial, i.e. without a Superior) affirm Paulum non jure sed fae to Cesarum ap-

(1.) That the word (de) may in some places be so taken to denote what must in a case be done, without respect to dueness and right; but from this it may be so taken [to the Jesuits, Must be so taken] is too weak an inference.

Mat. 17. 10. Ha
d 
and

(2) The Greek de in the New Testament doth in most places denote that which ought ex debito, justaque ordine, to be done, and so the Must

is a Moral Must resulting from the dueness of the thing, and that this is so the places cited in the Margent will prove. And yet farther we say,

Mat. 23. 23. te to 

(3) Since St. Paul is most competent Judg of his own meaning, we'll view how he doth ordinarily take this de, Rom. 1. 27. Receiving----

that recompense of their error (in de) which was meet, i.e. just and due
to them. And Rom. 8. 26. We know not what to pray for as we ought,

And Rom. 12. 3. I say to every man----not to think----

1 Cor. 8. 2. de 

1 Cor. 15. 25. die

d  

So Col. 4. 4. and 1 Thes. 4. 1. piis de uides tereat dein. And in his Epistles to Timothy, to Titus, and to the Hebrews, he still do use the word de of which we now do treat,
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(τοί & οὕτως) above what be ought, &c. And so in other his Epistles his τά δικαιόντα, or his Ma$p$ is what is right and ought, ex debito & justo rerum ordine, not what must of necessity be done. And this had so passed in the Text if it had not been so much against the Priviledge of these Roman Clergy, who cannot now bear the plain and literal meaning of this Word of God, because they will not keep in the place to which the Word of God assigned them.

(4) The Apostle could not without sin of a high nature according to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome thus appeal to a Secular Judge; and now think with your selves whether to gratifie the Jesuits and Clergy of Rome we shall make the Apostle guilty in so high a nature, and transgressing his own rule, by doing evil that good may come of it; the judgment for which sin slumbers not.

So Paschal chargeth King Henry the first of England, that he gave not honour to St. Peter, nor to the Lord, because no Appeals came to Rome, i.e. Pope. Tho. Becket by way of Penance suspend himself from Prieffly function for confessing once that Priests should be tried by Secular Power for Robberies, Murthers, &c. And he calls the Royal Decrees of the King and Parliament at Clarendon, for trying such crimes of the Clergy, wicked devices, Bayon. ad. Ann. 1167. Sect. 26.

(5) So by this Glos we shall fairly make every resolute (not to call them obstatute) Priest that refused to own the Supream Power of his Soveraign Prince, and chose rather to die condemned according to just Laws against Traytors, and so died a stout and brave Martyr for the Truth and the Church; When Paul through weaknesses of courage, or crafty shifts betrays the just Rights of the Church, which aspersion you do as much abhor I know as becomes good Christians. Let them for ever remain Traytors to their Prince, who avow Appeals from him to an alien pretended Superior; St. Paul would not out of design do it, he was too honest, he knew he could not of right do so, though his Person and Cause were Ecclefiaftical, his Supream Secural Prince ought have the hearing of it, Isand (faith he) at Cæsar's Judgment-seat where I ought to be judged.

Such a Saint and Martyr was Tho. Becket in disposition of mind, though (pity twas) he never was brought to legal trial for his treasonable practices. Such were Exmem, Middlemore, and Nidngate executed for denying the Supremacy in Hen. 8. time, and Bishop Fishor, and also Sir Thomas Moor, with many others, who sacrificed their lives for a foreign Usurper against their Natural Prince.

(6) Lastly, what-ever weakness or obscurity may be in my arguing from the Text, yet I am sure the Text doth more plainly and more irrefragably assert Cæsars Jurisdiction over this eminent Ecclefiaftick than all the Texts produced to that end do prove the exemption of the Clergy from the Civil Magistrates Judgment, or their Subjection to the Pope. I cannot renounce common sense at so easie a rate as to say Christ said thrice to Peter, feed, &c. therefore the Pope is the Supream Judg of Ecclefiaftick Persons and Causes in the whole Church; or if I were so easie an Arguer I should through the frailty of clear sense

Nidngate executed for denying the Supremacy in Hen. 8. time, and Bishop Fishor, and also Sir Thomas Moor, with many others, who sacrificed their lives for a foreign Usurper against their Natural Prince.
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sence more readily make this Heretical Conclusion. All Clergy-men inferior to Saint Paul ought to own their Subjection to the Civil Authority without appeal from the Suprem Power of their Prince; because St. Paul owned it his duty, and Cæsars right by that Confession, I stand before Cæsars Judgment-seat where I ought to be judged. If the Romanists be of his opinion, who when he was told that it was the Doctrine of St. Paul, which was assur'd in opposition to his Tenet, made a quick reply, I am not of Pauls mind, I shall not take my self bound to reconcile them to his opinion; if we cannot have their company here-in, we shall not much want it whilet we have such good company as St. Paul and Cæsar. In next place,

Thirdly, I argue Clergy-men, Bodies and Estates are as other Subjects under the Government of the Secular Prince: Thus, They who are included in the Community, on whom the Word of God chargeth Subjection to Princes as a duty, are under the Government of the Prince. None can doubt this who doubt not that all is duty which the Divine Law chargeth on us in our places; But now the Clergy are included in the Community, which is apparent by that universal Proposition of the Apostle in Rom. 13. 1. Let every soul be subject to the higher Powers. It is now exploded (though pretending to Origen as to the Author) that this is meant of the Animal, not Spiritual man, i.e. the Clergy-man. Time was when such a gloss pass'd current with some whose Interest it was the Scripture should be elus'd, rather than plain duty understood; and the aspiring ambition of Papal Clergy nipt in the bud. Now it is clear, that the Apostle retaineth the Hebrew Dialect, Every soul, i.e. every man. So that either our Papal Clergy must disclaim their kindred with Mankind, or else with their whole Family be subject to the Prince.

Third Proof from Scripture.

Argument quam veris, faith Erasms in loc.


The Persons of the Clergy are comprised in that (μόνος λυχθ) let every soul; their Estates in the 6. verf. Render------tribute to whom tribute is due. And that you may know to whom Tribute is due, the Apostle tellth you, it is to him that beareth the Sword, who hath Power Civil, and Secular; verf. 4.

Neither would I advise Boniface to thurst in here swaggering with his two Swords; for here is not room for him, the place is designed for one who hath but one Sword, and who came honestly by it, and can give a good account thereof as he is the Minister of God, a terror to those that do evil, and revenger to execute wrath, not to excommunicate
nicate. In a word this place doth so peremptorily subject all Persons to the Civil Power, that I must needs though somewhat related to the Clergy, profess the Text makes equal Subjection our duty; and gratitude to the favour of our Prince maketh our Exemptions (whatever they are) at once our Priviledges above our Neighbours; and our debts to our Prince.

Fourthly, The Apostle St. Paul 'directeth Titus to preach Obedience and Subjection due from Principalities and Magistrates from Chriftians without any exception of Persons, Tit. 3. 1. Nay, if you enquire who they are that Titus must put in mind to be subject, you cannot refer it to other than such persons as by St. Paul's direction were committed to his care and teaching, among which you will cap. 1. find the Clergy-Elders, ver. 5. προς Πάπες, and Bishops, ver. 6. ἐπισκόπων. These are some of those whom Titus must put in mind to obey Magistrates. How much doth the Papal Clergy need such a Monitor to cool their fervours to their Ecclesiastical Immunities, and to kindle their decay'd zeal for Obedience to the Civil Powers. Whence I thus reason, Those that Titus is commanded to mind of their Obedience to Magistrates, were of right under the Government of the Magistrate; But Presbyters and Bishops, i.e. Clergy-men were some of those who were to be so minded by him: Therefore they are of Right under the Government of the Civil Magistrate. This is the Theopoliticia of St. Paul. But lest you should doubt he had not good will enough to the Successors and Clients of St. Peter, out of an old quarrel that fell out between him and St. Peter, when the Doctor of the Gentiles was so bold with the Prince of Apostles, that he did charge him with dissimulation, a very small and dwarfish fault in St. Peter, and hugely improved in his Successors. Who knows whether a spicce of this old grudge were not strew'd on the injunctions of Obedience, and Subjection to the Civil Power? But what was St. Peter's opinion in the case?

Fifthly, St. Peter then in Epift. 1. chap. 2. 13, 14, 15, 16. verses, doth Fifth Scripture very unluckily for his Successors and their Clergy fall into the same Proof. strain of Subjecting the Clergy as well as others; for he doth without exception require of all Chriftians that they submit themselves; i.e. their Persons, and by consequence their Estates, to every Ordinance of Man, whether to the King, &c. How unhappily forgetful was he of his Vicar! not one word of him and his Supremacy but all reserved intire to the King, and Inferiour Magistrates sent by the King, to whom all Chriftians within his Dominions are to submit themselves.

But in those days Chriftians were under Persecution, and it would not have been prudence to have published their Priviledges, and to have exempted the Clergy. It seems Rome hath long underflood by unwritten Verities and Apostolical Traditions, that Peter thought one thing, and wrote another. But the spite is, he doth desirous, determine this where certainly he is Infallible; since his Successors in after-ages.
ages claim the Infallible Priviledg in vertue of that first Grant made to Peter; who in practice did once what his Successors do very often without impair of their Infallibility err (in genere morum) as to practice, but cannot in Doctrine. Well, sure Peter did thus direct prudentially, and temporifying not so, his Reasons do as it falls out assure us he did own it as a perpetual Doctrine and Rule; for 1. It is for the Lords sake, ver. 13. And this farther, 2. is the will of the Lord; and 3. that by so doing they might stop the mouths of the foolish and ignorant who among the Heathens were ready to charge the Christians without any ground given, with that, which on just reasons from the seditious and rebellious practices of well-nigh a thousand years contesting with the Civil Suprem Power, Rome hath given the foolish Heretics to object against them; but in the words of Royal mouth, Their Faith is faction, and their Religion Rebellion.

Now to all these add we in the sixth place this Scripture-Argument; That the Clergy whether ordinary Priests, or the High-Priests, or Prophets, once were and that (jure) of right subject to the Government of the Secular Power, and were bound to appear and give account of themselves to the Civil Power in case they were accused and summoned. So when Ahimelech and the Priests that dwelt at Nob were accused and summoned to give account of themselves, and what they had done for David; they obey and appear before Saul their King, 1 Sam. 22, 11. Who indeed did as cruelly and tyrannically adjudg them to death as they had dutifully and readily obey'd his Summons. But now sure if there had been any Priviledg of exemption, some one or other among those fourscore and five Priests would have known it, and pleaded it before they had been so unmercifully Butchered; but here is not one word of all this, no exception to the Judg as incompetent, no deprivation, and degradation from the Priesthood, in order to reduce them to the Secular and Lay-state: No delivering them by the Ecclesiastick State into the hands of the Secular Power; in which and such like formalities the Romish Priest (if at any time he be so unbefriended and unhappy) is stript of his Clerical Immunities, and delivered over to the Civil Sword. It is a Riddle Rome will hardly unfold with dexterity, that Eighty-five Priests should have neither knowledge of such a Priviledg, nor courage to plead it for saving their life. I need not advise a Seminary Priest apprehended and in danger of condemnation, to seek a Precedent at Nob; he knows he shall lose his labour; it is Rome only that shaves the head, and then as sacred forbids Kings to meddle with it. Yet left the Tyranny of Saul whom the Scripture notes for this, or the meanness of the sufferers should any whit invalidate the instance, let us lock a little lower where we find Abiathar deprived of the Priestly Office by Solomon, 1 King. 2. 26, 27. Who commanded that he should get him to Anathoth, ver. 26. and thrust him from being Priest before the Lord, ver. 27. The chief Priests a-
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Among the Hebrews as they were put in by the Kings, so for grievous faults they might be put out, or punished with death by the Kings, for they were Subjects, and while the King sat the High Priest stood. So Grotius on the place.

& ad iisdem gratiæ ex culpā defiuit iūm et morte puniitur. Erant enim subditi idque, sedente Rex Saluati sumnum Sacerdotum: Hug. Grot. in loc. So Grotius took it for granted that Abimelech was High-Priest, to whom Sadok succeeded High-Priest, 1 Chron. 29.22.

Now the Case is altered at Rome, and hath been long since. Abiathar came and (on his appearance) received sentence of Judgment from his Sovereign; But Sergius the first was of a more unyielding mettall, and though the Emperor Justinian the second sent for him to Constantinople, to answer for his Disobedience to his Sovereign, who required him to receive the Canons of the Council of Trullo; yet this Pope found Parizans among his fellow-Subjects, who had less manners than to obey their Emperor, and more love to the Pope than to let him take so dangerous a Journey, and he good man would not be so unkind as to go against the will of those who offered violence to the extraordinary Pursuivant that summoned him. Nay men of less Authority have taken on them to refuse Obedience to the Summons of their Sovereign. Thus Thomas Becket though a greater Saint than Sergius, yet of a lower rank in Power refused to appear before King Henry II. and his Council of Nobles at Northampton. Nor was Anselm's carriage much more dutiful to his Sovereign King Henry I. to whom he refused to do Homage as was required and had been performed by his Predecessors.

By these Instances it appears that both ordinary Priests, say the High-Priest himself among the Jews, were under the coercive Government of the Kings of Israel, whose Authority the Prophets, though by extraordinary call they may with reason be thought in some respect above the High-Priest, submitted unto without appeal to a Superior, or exception to the incompetency of their Judgment. So did the Prophet submit to Asa, 2 Chron. 16.10. and patiently did bear the hasty judgment of his angry Sovereign; no noise here of an appeal, no mention made of Immunities, of his Office, or Priviledg of the Clergy. The Seer doth not (what once the Servant of Philip the Macedonian King did) appeal from Asa a good King in a bad humour, to Asa a better Judg in a good humour. How would an Anselm, a Becket, a Brandelino Valdemarino, or Scipio Saraceno have essayd and hector'd his Prince for such usage as Hanani from Asa, or Jeremiah from Zedekiah and his Princes, Jer. 38.5.6. found. But those great Clerks (so let me call the Prophets) pretended to no such exemption in those days, and yet Jeremiah had so ample commission that the Pope desireth no more to be granted him of Kings and Princes, and thinks this enough to set him above them all while he offers a violence to that Text, (Jer. 1.10. I have set thee over the Nations, and over the Kingdoms of the Earth.) Great as the violence he offers to
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to the Emperours Crown and Soveraign Dignity. But it admits a plea whether to his excuse in part or to his greater shame, let the Impartial Judg without violence to both the Text and Princes, he had left his longing, for neither do freely grant the Popes that Supremacy they must have, or they miscarry, though I think it was not the denial here-of was the cause of the miscarriage of the Female Pope; though both mother and brat too (I do guess, for I find not a word of this Popes Nieces or Nephews) died in the Child-bearing: Yet be it or better or worse for our own Clergy, or the shavelings of Rome; the Secular Authority did once govern the Clergy in the Church of the Jews; and ordinary Priests, the High-Priest and Prophets themselves submitted to it; whence our obedient and learned Clergy have example to their dutiffulness, and the Papal Clergy a reproof of their disloyalty; and our Thesis hath a good evidence of its truth; which I shall now endea-vour to prove by some farther Reaons (though I think enough to make out the truth hath been already delivered) perhaps Reason may convinced some who are not willing to see the truth in Scripture-precedents.

Reaf. 1. The Clergy are subject to the Government Secular, or else one of these two things will follow, viz.

1. Either each Clergy-man is a Soveraign, and under no Law and Government, which no sober man ever yet dreamt of, for this were to make every of them a God, or a King: Or else,

2. That they are by a Subordination of Persons of their own profession, Subjects and Vassals to a Supream Ecclesiastical Independent, or absolute Power without, or above, or against the Civil Power; which as no Loyal heart would with, so no Royal Crowned head should endure; for such considerations as I shall now offer to the Readers consideration.

1. This were to make either a native Subject equal to his Soveraign Prince, or to render a considerable body of his People Subjects to a forreigner; which appears thus: If the body of the Clergy (and the orders of the professed Religious) be only Subject and under the sole Government of one of their own Profession; and whoever is a native this person is, and his Successors will be (when advanced to the Supremacy and Ecclesiastical Soveraignty) set up in a power Independent on his Prince, and uncontrollable by his Prince, and so of a Subject be made a Soveraign over the Clergy, whose obedience will be withdrawn from the Prince to the Ecclesiastical head, and Supream; or, If this Person, who is supposed Ecclesiastical Soveraign, and who ought to govern the Religious and the Clergy, be a forreigner, then he that by birth and blood is a stran-ger to the Prince becomes by this means the Lord and Soveraign over the

Pope John, who was called John the 3d. story avow'd by more than fifty Authors of the Popish Religion, as Dr. Prideaux, and Blondell witness.
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the whole body of the Clergy and Religious, which in many Countries is no small part of the people,


2. This would lessen all the Princes and Soveraigns of the world in three things essential to the very being and stability, as well as to the Glory and Grandeur of their Kingly Thrones and Majesty; it would lessen their Freedom and liberty in making Laws for their whole Kingdom, and ere they can resolve on that Ordinance which they do apprehend will be for univerfal good of their Kingdom, they must enquire of the Ecclesiastical Exempts whether such a Law would not violate the Ecclesiastical liberty, and ask them leave to make it, or else they shall be taught as Auselius and Becket would teach their Soveraigns, or as Paul the Fifth taught the Duke of Savoy, and the State of Genoa, and would fain have taught the State of Venice, but they proved stubborn Scholars, and enforced that presuming tutor to forgo the Lecture.

Next it would lessen their Authority in commanding obedience to Laws made; the Exempt Clergy would undoubtedly first consider whether the Obedience required were not an infraction of their Immunities, and how far it intruded on the liberty of the Church, and when this is brought to an issue who does not see that the General priviledge pretended unto the (\textit{Vinculum necessario & debite observantie}) bond of a necessary Obedience which is due of Right to the Magistrate, and leaves the Exempt to the free determination, whether of good nature and voluntary choice he will comply with his Prince, or whether Prudence will not rather determine to secure their pretended Priviledge, and deny that to their Prince, which (they pretend) he hath no right to command. Almost by this means Obedience which by God and Nature is made the Prince's due, and the Clergy-mans debts is by a fraudulent pretext reduced to an uncertain and arbitrary benevolence. Here hence will ensue, The lessening of the Power which should execute Laws made, and which should support the Power in executing them. How feeble is a Precarious Power? It is next to none which is but so much as the good nature of one like to suffer or be restrained by it, will allow it to be. All this I have said is evident from an undeniable instance of Paul 5th. who better informed, or bolder resolved, told the Venetians He would not endure them to judge Ecclesiastical Persons who are not Subjects unto Princes, and whom they cannot chastise though they be Rebels. By this Princes may see how little Power that Indulgent Father the Pope would

Anno 1604. Paul 5th. envying the Soveraign Authority that was given to the Venetians by God, Nature, and the liberality of Emperours and Popes, as soon as he had assumed the Papacy he began to search out for ways to subvert it. \textit{Il Cardinal. part.2. lib.1. pag.127.}
would leave in their hands, who in Criminal cases of highest nature will so boldly deny them all power to judg Ecclesiasticks. Certainly by the same justice he taketh away power of judging by Laws Civil, he will also (when time serveth, and with equal right) deny them a power to make Laws to regulate the Obedience of the Ecclesiasticks; or if there be some daring Prince will venture to make the Law, the Pope, or who-ever shall be suppos'd the absolute Sovereign over the Clergy, shall by the injured Clergy have timely notice to interpose a Prohibition that the Obedience be not exacted, nor a non-Obedience to such Laws punish'd. And what will remain to such a Prince but a Title and Name, leastened to such a degree, That he must owe the Peace of his Kingdom, the Reverence of his Royal Dignity, the Safety of his Person, and the Succelion of his Pottery to the arbitrary will of every Clergy-man, or at least of the Ecclesiastical Prince.

2. Reaf. They that are by the Word of God bound to pray for the Secular Prince as for a Sovereign under whose Power and Authority they do live and enjoy the quiet and prosperity of their life, are certainly under the Government of the Secular Prince, both as to their Persons or Bodies, and as to their Estates or Goods, which have no small share in the peace and quiet that they should desire to enjoy. I think little doubt can be made of this Proposition, or any thing contained in it; for it speaketh not of Prayers which (ex debito Charitatis) out of Christian charity we ought to make for all men, and specially for men in great Power who through a just favour may much advantage the Church of God. But we speak of Prayers that are to be made for particular Rulers under whom we either were born, or by Gods over-ruling Providence are for present determined. Now the Scripture doth thus direct, 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. I exhort therefore (faith St. Paul) that first of all Supplications, &c. be made for

* ἔνακτα, all men, for Kings, &c. * In which words you have a Canon of the Apostle directing and commanding Timothy, and in him obliging Bishops to pray for all, for Kings and all in Authority over us; that under their Government our life may be peaceable and quiet to our selves, whilst our Persons are defended from violence of the cruel, and our Estates are defended from the injuries of oppressors. Which certainly is a benefit as we enjoy in the place of our abode, so by the Government of the place where we abide: And this seems to be comprised in that of (Eusebius * citing) Dionysius, without ceasing we pray for your Kingdom that it may abide unshaken in the stability whereof our affairs will abide stable and safe. Now who sees not that this needs must be in that State or Kingdom where those live who are bound thus to Pray?

* 11 μενεὶς ὑμῖν ἡς βασιλεῖς δι' ὅσως στόλιντος σφαλόντος διαμενεῖς προευχόμεθα:
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This Text then requireth those that pray to look on those Kings and Magistrates which in the Apostles words are βασιλεὺς καὶ ἐπισκόποι, for whom they pray, as Kings over them, as their Rulers, and so consequently they must acknowledg themselves the Ruled or Subjects, according to the rule, That Relates do mutually suppose each other. In a word or two that the Clergy must pray for Kings, and for those that are in Authority, is certain enough from the comprehensive words of the Text: But for what Kings, &c. if for foreign, how much more for their own? If for their own then is it only that they may give good counsels, and by them direct the Clergy? This hath very little availed with resolute and turbulent Clergy-men, and can as little contribute to quieting the life of the disturbed as it can restrain, punish, and by coercive Power chastifie the disturbers, which if it be (by an ill chance as often it hath been) found to proceed from the Clergy, alas the Prince is left helpless, and the Laity is left hopeles. And we had need to have another manner of address, viz. That all Men and Kings, and all in Authority should pray for the Clergy, that they may be good-natur'd, wise and thankful to God for their Immunities, that they may abuse none of their Immunities to the disturbance of the Prince or Laity, and so had we need the Text be changed.

Reaf. 3. The Clergy are bound to give an Exemplary Obedience and Fidelity to their King, that by their Example the People who are committed to them for Instructiion may be induced to and setled in their Obedience and Allegiance; but such an Example is not given, but rather a contrary example of disobedience, disrespect, and contumacy, by a pretended exemption of the Clergy; they are not then exempt, but ought to be in body and state, or goods under the Civil Government. Thus briefly, they that by God are commanded to give Exemplary Obedience to Civil Government, are as to their Persons and Goods under the Civil Government; But the Clergy are so commanded: Therefore they are under it. The Major Proposition can admit no doubt; for such a command from God makes our Obedience due to such a Government; the only dispute can be whether God hath commanded the Clergy to give example of such Obedience now? Thus I prove it; God commands them Exemplary doing what is to be done for the Lords sake, and what is to be done for Conscience sake; the Clergy more than others are bound by their Profession to let the World know that they are Conscientious, and that they act for the Lords sake: But now Obedience to Civil Magistrates is so commanded for the Lords sake, 1 Pet. 2:13. and it is commanded for Conscience too, Rom. 13:5. That the Clergy are comprehended in those general commands, as I have already proved, so now I say to confirm it, That where the Scripture doth not, they cannot except themselves.

Obedience to the Civil Government is every-where but at Rome, and in her appendant Schools a Moral virtue, and a necessary Ingredient to make
make an honest and vertuous man. And therefore the Loyal Moralistis, the wife Law-givers, with best warrant of Reaion and Religion always required it in all Subjects, only Rome, (where it matters not how much blind obedience to the Pope, or how little Religion toward God they find in their Clergy,) taketh care that their Clergy be not mancipated to the strict Rules of Political vertues, left of good Citizens and obedient Subjects, they should insensibly lapse into a differviceableness to the Papal Tyranny. But we must, guided by Reason and Scripture, acknowledge Allegiance a very great vertue, wherein (as in other vertues) the Reformed Clergy are bound to be Enamples to their flocks.

Reaf: 4. They who do defend their Persons and their Goods by the Authority and Power of the Civil Government, ought in all equity and reason to bear and profess true Allegiance to the Government. The right which is done for them in such cases obligeth them to this duty, and the benefit from Governours to the Governed is a most just reason for obedience from the Subject to the Prince. The Apostle St. Peter intimates this as one ground of obedience, 1 Pet. 2. 13, 14. Be ye subject, &c. Why? because Governours are his εἰς ἑαυτούς υποτελεῖ, appointed to restrain the injurious, and oppressive by judging, condemning and punishing their injustice. They are also εἰς ἡσαυρίαν ἀγά, ξονοτοί, for the praise of those that do well; Protecting, rewarding, and praising them. The benefit we enjoy should in reason bind us to the obedience and submisslion we owe our Governours.

By this Argument St. Paul prays the Christians at Rome to Obedience, Rom. 13. 3. For Rulers are not a terroour to good works, but to the evil, &c. Do good and thou shalt have praise of the same. So, ver. 4th. The Ruler is the Minister of God for good, &c. therefore be ye subject. And this is the Prophets reason. Pray for the Peace of the City, &c. But it's Babylon true, but in the Peace thereof you shall enjoy peace, Jer. 29. 1. with ver. 7. So then the Argument holds good in the Prophets and Apostles Logick. They who enjoy the benefits of a Government must be obedient to the Government. And I would fain know what will become of all the pleas which the Romanisit make for the Preeminence of Clergy-men, if this foundation be not solid and good; the great benefits the Laity reap from the counfel and labours of the Clergy, they judge reason enough for the Laity's Subjection to them. In a word to speak Reaion with Impartiality in the case. Let those that are benefitted, be submissive to and observant of those by whom they are benefitted, then the common people & all the Laity will duly observe in Spiritual cafes the counfel & authority of their Spiritual Guides, and the Clergy in Civil and Secular Cafes will be left where Chrift and St. Peter did leave them under the Civil and Secular Prince to be governed by him. There is indeed a dispute whether the Right of Governing be originally in the Benefactor, because of the Benefit he bestows, or on some other account; but there is no dispute, nor will it admit any, whether the Bene-
Beneficiary be bound to his Benefactor, and ought for that very
cause to observe and obey him.

Fifthly, What Privileges and exemptions for their Persons or Estates,
from common or publick burthens and services the Clergy do enjoy, they do
enjoy through the favour of their Prince or Governor, who pleaseth to re-
mit to them, what there may be some reason to perswade, but no Law, or
Right to command from the Prince: Who as at first he saw Reason to
grant that favour, so will (I believe) continue it until he see a suffi-
cient cause to recall his own Grant; which future cause may (by con-
jecture from what already hath been act'd in our view) soonst arise
from an usurping Ingratitude (the hereditary insinuity of the Papal
See) which never giveth to any, what it can by fraud or force keep to
itself: as the Grave and Impartial Author of the Council of Trent
well observeth, on the Pomptick and Ridiculous Act of Paul the
Fourth; giving the Kingly Title over Ireland to Queen Mary, who
had derived it from her Father, and her Brother, and had assumed it to
her self at her first coming to the Crown. Such Legerdemain hath
long past at Rome, coined with the impress of gratitude or bounty,
and when it hath cheated Kings and Princes, into a degree that a-
wakens their resentments and just indignation; they will resume
the exorbitant Grants of Priviledges, and teach the Papal Clergy to use
more manners, and acknowledge that none of their Immunities granted
by Princes, were intended to make them Princes fellows, or Rebels
against them without guilt, or fear of answer'ing at their Secular Judi-
catures. And when this shall come to pass, the Christian World shall
understand the mistake of the Canonists in their Law; which affirn,
That the Clergy, and all their Goods, are by Divine right free from the
Power of Secular Princes. Against which I shall now oppose no other
Authority than the Concession of Bellarmine, one, as any other, able
to say as much for, and as resolvd to yield no more than he must needs
in the Cause of the Ecclesiastick liberty; who confesseth (lib. de clericis.
inscriptiones. c. 28.) That not one word can be produced from the Word of God, by
which this exemption of the Clergy can be proved. And therefore hence I
shall briefly argue. They who owe their exemption of Body and
Goods from Personal services and tribute to the Power of their Secular
Princes, though by such favour they are actually free, yet originally
they were subject to him, and of Right they still are: and if the Prince
see cause to require it of them, they are bound to serve him with their
Bodies and Estates, which is certainly to be under their Government.
What the favour of the Prince granted once to any of his Subjects is
as encouragement to their obedience, not as security to their disobed-
ience, granted and it must be for common good: but when once it

Bona clericorum sunt & merita debent esse ab omnibus Principum terrenorum tributis liberis,
as exemptia iis humano juri non divino introducita est, prop. 5.
provesth a Universal, Publick inconvenience or mischief it ought to be reversed. Now Ecclesiastick Persons do owe their Immunities from personal Services and Tributes to the favour of their Secular Prince: Therefore their Persons and Goods are under their Government. If this do not appear evident, I would have a Papist tell me; What had been the Cave of the Clergy, if such Immunities had never been Granted? Had they not been under the Civil Magistrate? What if necessity awakenth the Civil Magistrate, and he seeth in point of prudence and safety, that these Exemptions and Immunities may not be continued, and so by a Law revokes them, Doth not the Clergy thereby return to their pristine Subjection? Ecclesiastical Immunities for the Bodies and Goods of the Ecclesiasticks are introduced, Jure humano, by the Law of Man; if no such Law had been made, or on just cause hereafter shall be repealed, no such Exemption had ever been, or else had been null'd though once granted; if no such Exemption had been granted, then had these Ecclesiasticks been equally subject with the non-exempt, and as much bound to obey the Civil Government as the Lays.

Sixthly, The Clergy as such are in the essential constitution of their Office, and as to the Immunities that are necessarily appendant to it, or flowing from it, wholly of a different nature, viz. Spiritual; and therefore cannot in Reason claim Immunities which are in their nature Secular and Civil: Such are these we have been discoursing of. Now, every one may soon know, that the Priviledges of every rank of men, are suitable to the Nature of that Office or Relation wherein they stand; so Civil Offices have the Immunities which are Civil, and Spiritual Offices are invested with Spiritual Immunities; as it is not a Priviledg due to a Christian as Christian, to be exempt from the Coercive Power of the Civil Magistrates: so neither is the Priviledg of the Clergy by virtue of their Office so great as to advance them above the Power of the Prince: God who knew what Priviledges were fittest for each Order of men, would sure have told us that the Clergy should be free from the Government of the Civil Magistrate, if he had either made or intended an Exemption in all Civil Cases should be a Priviledg to Ecclesiastick Persons. But Bellarmine himself confesseth, that there is not one Word of God proving such Immunities due to the Clergy. It were a great disorder, and would bring in a confusion upon the Universe to allow such a mixture; for why is not the Irrational creature raised to the Priviledges of the Humane Nature? What answer would a Shaveling give me to the question? Or why is the Humane Nature determined to a Satisfaction, with Priviledges below the Angelical? Is it not because their Natures are different? Well, why is this a satisfactory account of different Priviledges in different Ranks of Natural Beings, and may not be alike satisfactory, in the different kinds of Moral and Political Beings and Orders? These are as different as the other. It were a monstrous birth should a bruit bring forth somewhat half bruit and half
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half Man, and I do not yet see any less than monster in this; that the Indelible Characters of Priesthood should stamp a Licence of Immunities in Secular affairs: Such misshapen births Rome may perhaps little wonder at and tolerate, but we must do with them as our Laws, enquire out the offender, and condemn all that are proved guilty: So may the Fathers of this misshapen brat speed when ever they are taken in their Treasons, on the confidence that their Indelible Character protects them from the stroke of the Secular Sword.

7. Real. They who were born native Subjects, and by Priesthood or Orders, enter not on any Relation that doth necessarily and justly abolish that former Relation; these though so ordained, remain Subjects to their Natural Prince, and owe him obedience till. This Proposition surety none in their wits will deny; for the Native Subject is both as to Person and Estate under the Government of his Native Prince, and continues so until somewhat do (jure) by right, not only (ex consequenti) by consequence, abolish that primeval bond, which with its swaddling bands, Nature and God put upon him. Now then, one of these two must be asserted by the exempt Clergy:

1. Either that they were never born Subjects, and so were in different sense from the Apostle born free. If they like not this, say

2. Of else though born Subjects, their Holy Orders have nulled that natural Allegiance, and defeated the Prince of so many Subjects as have been made Clerks. If this be the Case,


I would enquire whence is this corroding quality in the Indelible Character, to eat out what is engraven so deep in our Natures by the God of Order and Nature? Certainly Christ and his Apostles never so tempered it: But Rome who found the bonds of Allegiance were fetters on them, restraining them from their resolved Usurpations, and hindering their growing Ambition, resolve what ever comes on't; These Bonds must be broken, and these Cords must be cast off (to allude to that, Psal. 2.) and it must be done by some curious engine too; for else the noise of it would give an Allarm: In one word, The Grace of God in Christ to his Church, hath been so far from abolishing any, that it hath mightily fortified on all the bonds of Natural and just necessary Relations, in all sorts of men, Civil, and Sacred, and commands Ecclesiastical Persons as well as Civil, to observe the just Laws of those Princes, to whom Nature had before made them Subjects. It is not Christ's Canon, but the Canon of Antichrist, which to make good Clerks spoils good Citizens. Had the truth in this been as consistent with Papal designs, as the distinct duties of a good Subject, and Sa-
Kings and Emperours, not

cred Person are consistent in one Person, I had neither troubled you and myself, nor had they troubled the World with this Controversy; It were time for Princes to command no more Priests should be made, until Rome, or who else do pretend the same Prerogative, had learnt to preserve a Loyal and good Citizen, while they make an Ecclesiastical Officer: might my motion be heard, they only should confer Orders on Subjects who had learnt this skill.

Eighthly, And lastly, were this a Truth, That the Clergy were both as to Bodies and Estates not under the Government of the Civil Magistrate, How could the Primitive Christians, the Martyred Bishops, the persecuted Clergy, avow it to the World, that Christianity did not teach any thing destructive or dangerous to Commonwealths and Civil Governments? How great an impudence would it be in it self to deny? Or how greatly would it have been to the shame of the suffering Christians, if that their adversaries could charge on them, that they professed a Religion, which directly spoil’d the Magistrate of his Coercive Power over their Priests, and Indirectly, i.e. in ordine ad spiritualia, in relation to spirituals, spoiled him of his Coercive Power over the rest of his Subjects. Julian’s Sarcasme had been but a Retaliation to them, if they had been so principled and persuaded. Might he not with some colour of Reason plead, You have spoil’d me of Supreme Authority over Sacred Persons their Bodies and Estates, as too Holy to be commanded by the polluted hands of Secular Princes: And I judge the Persons of Priests and Christians too Holy to meddle with the polluting things of this World, and will, in ordine ad spiritualia, free them from those cares and busineses? Had there been a proof made before any one Tribunal of the Roman Emperours, that the Christian Religion had published, maintained, and pratticed such a Proposition; the impartial World would soon have pull’d off the mask, and shew’d undeniably that those pretended Martyrs were not condemned for the profession of their speculative opinions, or the owning of the Truth of the History of Christ: but that those pretended Martyrs were real and avowed Traitors, enemies to Caesar, to the Civil Government, and dangerous usurpers on the Supreme Authority of the Prince. Such Martyrs indeed may now be talkt of in Rome; but what impartial Judg will not condemn the Treasonableness of the crime which deserved, and the Impudence of the Plea, which defends the sufferers, who died for disloyal rejection of their Native Prince, and traiterous subjecting themselves to the Power of a Forreigner, enemy to him in whose Kingdom they do flourish or might flourish?

Now after so much Reason pleaded for the subjection of the Clergy in Civil Causes to the Civil Magistrate, it may perhaps seem to some incredible, that any Doctrine by any Doctor should be avowed contrary hereto; can there be such an unreasonable opinion entertain’d, or maintained by any? The next thing proposed for to be treated, will plain enough
enough shew both who are the Teachers, and what is it that they Teach in this point: Wherein I will be brief, and but name particulars. The Church of Rome hath (excepting some few) in all places where they durst act barefaced owned this, and strongly contested for it: That neither the Goods nor the Persons of their Clergy, or Religious, were under any Coactive Power of the Civil Magistrate. Indeed some Persons of the Roman Communion as Loyal, as Learned, do disclaim such exemptions and Immunities, content with the favour of their Sovereigns, to whom they are ready to acknowledge they owe their Immunities whatever they are, above the Immunities that their fellow-Subjects enjoy for their Persons or Goods: Nay, whole Churches and Seignories that we rightly account Popish, as the French, the Venetians, do accord with the Protestant Churches, in the just opposition of such unlimited and absolute Immunities for the Clergy, and maintain the Sovereign Authority of the Prince over the Persons and Estates of the Ecclesiastics. Or in the Words of a Person of Honour who hath lately spoken to this case on the by. God be thanked that senless Usurpation and exemption of the Clergy from the common Justice of Nations, is pretty well out of countenance, and since the Republic of Venice so notoriously baited Paul the fifth in that very point; other Kings and Princes have chastised their own Clergy for transendent Crimes, without asking leave of his Holiness, or treating them in any other manner than they do their ordinary Malefactors. This is the Case now, but time was when the Pope and the Clergy would not so easily have forgone their Usurpations, and Princes how great soever, should have hardly exercised such an undoubted Right: And time will come again (if ever the Pope can attain to a Power that may encourage him to revive his pretended Right) when he will exempt the Clergy from the jurisdiction of Secular Princes, and resume all the Causes which concern the Persons or Estates of Clergymen into his own hand, and determine them as proper only for his Cognizance. Nor do I furnish more than I have ground for; it was some ages past, the humour of the Pope and his adherents, and still is their aim, as will be evident to those who can and will consult at leisure.

Priest excels a King. Stanislaus Oricorius in chimerâ. fol. 97. cited by H. Fowler, p. 37.

First, The treatises of some modern Jesuits excel in Scholar, yet sworn supporters of the Popedom, and very zealous ticklers for the Immunities of the Clergy; as resolute Souldiers who defend the outworks, for the greater safeguard of the City. So Bellarmine in his Book de clericis, avows, The Clergy by Divine Right, free from the Authority of the Secular Princes. And Emanuel Sa. tells you what he thought in the Case, when he gives you a Judicial i.e. an impudent and treasonable Reason, why a Clergy-Man cannot be guilty of Treason: viz., Because...
the Clergy-Man is not the Prince his Subject. So in the Colen and Antwerp editions of his Book.

Secondly, The Constitutions of some Councils; nor is it to be wondered at, that since Popes got usurped Power in their hands, they can by the Ecclesiastical Diet assume what Immunities may for future establish their Hierarchy, and confirm what hath been usurped with much profit and advantage to their Church and Caufe.

Thirdly, The Decretals of Popes (which is as valid an Authority, as the Ordinance of a Prosperous Rebel, determining himself and his confederates Innocent Persons and Loyal Subjects) and their Bulls, among which that of Paul the Fifth, against the Duke and Republic of Venice, as it is late so may suffice, being backed with Nine or Ten Precedents of other Popes, in like Cases. Whereas of late it came to our ear, that the Duke and Council of Venice have enacted divers Decrees contrary to the Liberty and Immunity Ecclesiastick, and repugnant to the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and to the Constitutions of the Roman Popes.--- And the said Duke and Council have Imprisoned and detained in Prison, Scipio Sarracenus, and Brandelino Valdemarino, Persons in Ecclesiastick dignity, for certain Crimes by them committed: All which it done with pretence, that it was lawful for them (Duke and Senate) to do these things.

Here you have the Act of the Illustrious Duke and State secretly translated as an unjustifiable Act, and the Power (by which they do it), represented to the World as an usurpation prejudicial to the Church-exemptions. The Crimes of the Persons were notoriously foul; especially of the Abbot, viz. Sorcery, Rapes, Incest, and many Murthers which the Papal offtone terms, certain pretended crimes (as was reported) by them committed, for which, as well they deferred, they were Imprison'd: But The Premisses being prejudicial to the Rights of the Apostolical See, and to our Authority (with Pope Paul the Fifth) and to the Privileges of the Persons Ecclesiastic, and for that they overthrow the Liberty and Immunity of the Church.

His Holines good man! could not bear it, and therefore after much ado he comes to tell us what he will do, and with what good examples and
and warrant for it in these words, and with the great names of Ten Popes. We who by no means ought to endure that the Ecclesiastical Liberty and Immunity, or our Authority and the Authority of the Apostolick See should be violated and contemned, following the example of most General Councils; and of fresh memory the examples of &c. And other Popes our Predecessours, who have revoked the like Statutes publish'd against the Ecclesiastick Liberty, as Statutes which in justice were Null, Invalid and not Ratified, and who have decreed and declared that they were Null, Invalid, and of no force.

cessorum Nosterum qui similia Statuta alias contra libertatem Ecclesiasticam edita rumpam ipso jure nulla, invalida & irrita revocarunt, ac nulla invalida & irrita decreverunt & declara-
runt.

In a little Paragraph you see how much less the Pope makes of the Authority of free Princes, and how he doth pronounce that his Prede-
cecessors and General Councils have in like Cases averted the Ecclesiasti-
cal Immunities; and a Sovereign Prince may not punish Rapes, and Murthers in a Person who is dignified with the Orders of the Church, if he doth, though they are Nullities in themselves, they shall be (as in this case they were) declared a-new from Rome Nullities. On Ma-
ture deliberation with our venerable Brethren the Cardinal's of the Holy Church of Rome, with their consent and Council, &c. though the fore-said Decrees, Edicts, and Commands, were in Law itself Null, Invalid, and Void) by these Presents do decree and declare notwithstanding a-new, that they were and are Null, Invalid, and Void, of no force or moment; And that none are bound to the observing of them.

Habita cum vencrabilibus fratribus nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus matura consiliorum et asenphi (licet super-
dita decreta & edita, & Mandata ipso jure nulla, invalida, & irrita sint) ea nihilominus ipso jure adhuc de novo nulla, invalida & irrita, nullius, &c. &c. necpermissturos ut officiales Ecclesie & personarum Ecclesiasticarum Im-
exempt the Clergy from the Coactive Power of a Civil Magistrate against Nature, Reason, and Religion. How far they would allow the Directive Power if time favoured them, I give you leave to guess from the late instance of Pope Urban, 1632. and Pope Innocent the Tenth; this latter interposing between the French King, requiring Cardinal de Retz to renounce his Title or pretence to the Archbishoprick of Paris, reviving the old Maxime, That Princes ought not to be suffered to meddle in Ecclesiastical affairs, this being to put their Sickle too boldly in another man’s barley. The former refusing to admit Ferdinand 2. his Embassador extraordinary which was Cardinal Pasman, for avoiding (as the excellent Historian Bapt. Nani reports it) to admit such an Embassador, be alleged, that a Cardinal honoured with the Purple and a Holy Character could not be employ’d in the service of Secular Princes.

This is plain dealing however, and so far Princes are obliged; that they will speak their minds sometimes freely. Now I see if Clergy-men offend the Laws, Princes are ill-natur’d to punish, because Clergy-men owe them obedience to Directive Laws; and if they employ them in a matter unwelcome to his Holiness, the Princes make too bold with them that bear the Impres of a Holy Character; so precarious must the Rule of Princes be over an exempted Clergy. Yet, What Reason may be supposed for this? Certainly so great a Priviledg cannot in Reason be pretended by wife and honest men, to be warranted by light and trivial Arguments.

Two sorts of Arguments I usually meet with urged; First, Drawn ab Indecoro, from the unseemliness of subjecting the Clergy to the Government of the Civil Magistrate, and this hath three indecencies in it; of which by and by.

The Second drawn a Furo, from their Right to be exempted, and this also is threefold, of which are long. Mean time return we to the first.

It is, say the Papal Orators, a very unseemly thing that the Clergy should be so subjected. For my part if there be an Indecency in it, I could be glad the Indecency were removed, I should think some advantage would thereby accrue to the Reformed Clergy; but without Spectacles of the Papal make, we shall never be able to descry the Indecencies; let us borrow Cardinal Bellarmin’s and with them look how unhandsome it is.

First, That the Shepherd should be under the Government of the Sheep. This is a clear Case: But the mischief is, Similitudes are no Demonstrations; Nor doth the Scripture forbear to call Kings Shepherds, and perhaps oftener than the Priest is called so; and the Argument is retorted Clergy-men are in Seculars and Civil matters to a Man (except some few crafty Foxes among them) Sheep, The Prince is their Shepherd, It is indecent that the Sheep should be exempt from the Shepherds Government; Therefore undue decent the Clergy be exempt from the Civil Magistrate, so we dismiss the first.

Secondly,
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2. It is an Indecency that he who doth governeth as the Clergy-man from the Pulpit in confession, or giving ghostly counsel to the Prince, should to morrow be cited before his tribunal, and be judged there. Very good!

2. An Indecency I confess there is that a Clergy-man should by any mis-demeanor deserve it: But as the Fathers in the Council of Trent sometime argued to their advantage: Customs manners and humours alter, and what was handsome of old becomes unhandsome now; and besides, Countrys differ, nothing more graceful than to be mounted on a white Asf among the Jews; but the Pope would resent it as an high affront if his Catholick Majesty should by a strange activity (like the Transubstantiating act of the Priest) turn the white Neapolitan Courser into an Asf for the Tribute due to his Holiness for the Kingdom of Naples, and send it for him to ride on. In a word all we heretical Protestants (and a great many of the good Catholicks of all Countrys) fancy to our selves, That it is very meet to see a Clergy-man preaching to his Prince from the Word of God, whilest he is dutiful and loyal; and to see him imprison'd and executed for his Treasons when he is guilty; if this be an unlucky custom among us, let the Clergy be (as the Protestant will be) loyal, or keep out of places where are practiced such unhandsome customs and laws, as to hang, murthering and fellonious Priest's in the common fashion of other Rogues without leave askt of the Pope.

3. A third Indecency is, That the Clergy who are servants of God and sacred persons, should be judged by the Vassals of the World, and the impure hands of Laymen. A mighty absurdity if well considered!

I never knew the full weight of this Argument before I had met with the information that Stanislaus Orihorus gave me, That every common Priest does as much excel a King as a beast does excel a man. Now by this Rule it were as much pity to see a King judge, condemn, and cause to be hang'd, or headed, a Priest, as it would be to see a Horse, or As by an usurped power turn upon and execute his Master and driver. In a word when I see the usurping beast so use a man I will endeavour to prevent the absurdity: But if ever it be my lot to see or hear an Soveraign Prince judg, condemn, and put to death a shaveling, and one of Rome's Consecrated Priest's, (or one of a more reformed profession) under the guilt of capital crimes, I should desire the Father to excuse me until I saw as clearly as Stanislaus did, The Priest was the man, and the King the beast; and ere that will be, my help will stand him in as much stead as a pardon doth after the Criminal is hanged. Lastly I wonder Kings will endure such absurdities when they might prevent it; let Rome make their Priest less, and account Kings greater; or if this superlative Greatness be essential to the Priesthood, I humbly submit the resolution, whether it were not fitter such a Priesthood should be abolished than all Kings be thus made Ases, (and without impair of their Intellectuals, and without the exemplary miracles wrought:}
wrought on a proud Heathen, only by the pride and ingratitude of a Papal Clergy, be thus turn’d a-grazing with beasts.

This is the sum of Bellarmines three Arguments, from the Indecency of the thing, and this all the Answer I think them worthy of; since his Eminency hath set up such fear-crows, and would fright us with them, let us have liberty to deride them as men would the bug-bears that Children set up; if better Arguments for the cause could (of this, or any other kind) have been produced, the learned Cardinal would have urged them, and then a better answer might have been given. But a puff will better blow away a feather than a mighty engin, and all the cost and labour would be lost that were bestow’d to bring Cannon, Spade, Mattocks and Engineers to overthrow a poor hutt, or cottage. From these pass we to the second sort of Arguments.

A 
*Jure Divino*, faith the Canonist, by Divine Right; but the Canonist who faith it *hath the wit to let us seek the Text*, for he takes not himself bound in duty to cite it, and we deserve not the kindness that he should do more than he thinks himself obliged unto: Others of the fraternity dissent and think they have reason to pretend the Immunities to be *Jure Humano*, and until they agree how the Clergy among them came by these Immunities we shall not think it breach of charity or good manners to tell them, we wish they came honestly by so rich a Commodity; certainly Christ never gave it them, nor do the more modest pretend his gift, they are content with the collation by Popes Decretals first, or next by favour of General Councils, ever since the Papal Power grew too great for Kings and Emperours; ever since the one durst not contemn, and the other was so hardy as to denounce Excommunications against infringers of the Immunities Ecclesiastical. These two will prove their Right to these Immunities in any place, and at any time where Power and Injustice are too great to be called to account: And as good Right they have to these Immunities as the Pope and Councils could give them, and I hope you will believe the Pope and his Councils would not fail to invest their sworn Vassals with power enough to disturb the Civil power, and lessen it, that the Monarchy of the Papal Church might more speedily and safely be aggrandized; they have these Priviledges indeed from the Ringleaders in the Conspiracy to strengthen it against the just Authority and Soveraignity of Princes. And now you clearly see how honestly they come by it; ask their fellows whether they be thieves?

But a third Plea is from the Favour of Princes they enjoy these Immunities. True, the more is their ingratitude and shame, they abuse that favour to the lessening of their Prince; who hath too often had many occasions given him to repent his Grant, to restrain his favour, and to teach the unthankful Clergy more duty, by requiring more. What the Prince giveth they enjoy without our envy, or complaint; let them keep within those bounds, and I will not disturb them. Finally to con-
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clude this point, now the Clergy (in all places of the world where the Prince is Christian) enjoy many considerable Immunities *Jure Humano*, which Immunities they never had Right to claim, till the Prince had Will to give; And which they may not expect to enjoy, when either abuse of them provokes the Prince to revoke them, or emergent inconveniences persuade him to diminish or null them. What is so granted, is neither Immutable in its Constitution, nor ever intended to the publick prejudice of the Prince and State; nor can it exalt the Clergy into a state of absoluteness and non-subjection to the Prince; or if you would imagin a soft Prince should so inadvertently, and in a transport of zeal to the Clergy and Church, grant them such a Privilege (as the Roman Clergy right or wrong will pretend unto) yet good Statists and best Reason will tell them, that the Grant being made to the prejudice of the Crown, it is neither good nature nor manners, nor justice to require it of their Prince, whose honour and dignity they are bound to conserve; *Errante clava*, the Infallible Decrees are null, say some Romanists; *Errante Sceptro*, Civil Grants to Subjects become Nullities. And such are the uncontrollable Immunities of the unsubjected Roman Clergy, to whom Princes had been less kind had they foreseen what use would be made of their Royal favours, and to whom they are not less equal and just, though for their Crowns and Honour more resolved and prudent, in recalling the ungovernable Ecclesiastics to that Subjection, which they ought in equal degrees and readiness with other Subjects give unto their Prince, whether by assinances from their Estates or by their Persons; both being, as our Thesis averreth, under the Government of the Civil or Secular Prince.

After so prolix Discourse on the positive part of our Position; I come to a briefer handling of the Negative parts of it, which was the fifth and last thing I proposed in the method of our proceeding. And so,

1. Consecut. The highest Power and Authority Ecclesiastical, as such, is lower than the Sovereign and Supream in all Matters Civil and Secular in what man or body of men so ever it be pretended to be jure to be, or vi &c fraude it be found by Usurpation to be. This follows from the former suppositions as they have been proved, and is evident enough in it self: If the Clergy as to Bodies and Estates be under the Civil Government, then it follows they are not as Clergy-men Sovereign, for he is no Sovereign in the same respect wherein he is under another's Authority; these are inconsistent: for Sovereignty and Supremacy set the Person in whom they are, above all within the limits of his Jurisdiction; but Ecclesiastical dignity, or the holy Character, leaves the Person on whom it is impress, under the Subjection he was in before.
It is possible (though the case hath seldom happened) that a Sovereign Prince may be a Clergy-man, or he that hath a right to a Sovereignty may succeed in his Right after he hath entered Holy Orders; yet the Powers are distinct, and the Civil usually most esteem’d and retained while the other is laid by; as in Rome it sometimes happens among the Princes of the Red Hat, when of a Cardinal they are well pleas’d to become Duke or Prince in Hereditary Principalities, descending on them by the death of the former Heirs. A Sovereignty I know is annexed to some Ecclesiastical Titles and Persons, as in Germany to some Bishops, and to the Arch-Bishops, Electors. But they that know their Constructions can readily tell us, how much they owe to *Fus Humanum* for it, and how little they owe to their Holy Orders, and the Priviledges of Clergy stated, *Fure Divino*, or indeed *Fure Ecclesiastico*. And notwithstanding any such intervenient occurrence it still holds a truth, No Clergy-man as such, and in vertue of his Holy Orders is, or can be *Fure*, and of Right a Sovereign and Supream, but is still under the Secular Prince, and his Government in matters Civil.

2. Confect. Were the Pope (what his flatterers say he is, and his Infallibility confirms) the Suprem Ecclesiastical Person and Head to that stupendous body of Ecclesiasticks (and were this proved his Right by a better title than ever it was, or ever it will be), yet still this cannot raise him to the dignity of Sovereign over Secular Princes or Kings.

For be the Power whatever it is for its eminency, still it is an Ecclesiastical Power, and the Person in whom it is invested derives it to himself not immediately and *virtute Personae*, but mediate & *virtute officii*; or indeed *Fure Ecclesiastico* by a Right granted to the Church, and by the Church to be convey’d on a fit Person; and so the Person chosen by the Church receives not what Power his boundles ambition can grasp, but what Power the Church can bestow, which hath been proved to be still a Power inferior to the Secular Power in all Secular affairs. It is a sure Rule in all Cases, *Nihil dat quod in se non habet*. Therefore well did Sancho, brother of Alphonfus the 7th, proclaims to the world the ridiculous Nothing the Pope gave him, proclaiming him, if he would conquer it, King of Egypt; and what his resentments were of such an idle conceit, when in requital of his Holinefs bounty he commanded him to be proclaimed Caliph of *Bandas*, on the same condition of con-
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queriting it. In brief, the Pope, pretended Head of the State Ecclesiastic de fatio, is now a free Prince as he is Pope, and hath a Secular Power annexed to his Ecclesiastical Office. But if *Constantine’s* Grant, and some other Princes bounty be a forgery, it is easy to say how their Holinesses came by, and how honestly they continue the possesion of such Power: And if prescription of time and possesion will not bar a Soveraign Prince his claim, there may arise some brisk Prince in the Empire who may start a better title to those Dominions, and reduce the Pope to the Primitive decorum of Bishop of the first See; requiring him to be content with what Immunities the Imperial Council shall judg fit to allow him, since in all likelihood they will be more than were ever given by Christ to St. Peter, and his real or pretended Successors. Let him whilst he can, retain his Temporal Soveraignty, and within his own Dominions be above all Persons in all Causes; yet this doth not flow out of his Ecclesiastick Office immediately, directly, and per se, as he is Bishop, which is an order wholly of different nature to Secular Power and Matters. And therefore were he Universal Bishop, yet his power would be but the power of a Bishop, that is in Spirituals; and the engin of their own making cannot draw in Temporals in ordine ad Spiritualia. That was as the Huntsmans dog in his younger days, nimble and hold-fast, but the Cur is now old, and his teeth worn out, and every free Prince now will shake him off. They are weary of the cheat, and I hope will not let an Usurper indirecťe & conféquenter, take out of their hands that which God, Nature, Grace and Reason, have direcťe & necessario entrusted in their hands.

3. *Confett.* The Clergy being proved in Body and Estate as to Civil affairs under the Government of the Secular Prince, No Clergy-man of what degree soever he be, nor any body of Clergy-men combined together, can absolve the Subjects of any Prince or free State from their Oaths of Allegiance. And if it be pretended, be or they may do so, the pretence is wicked; and if the pretended Power be executed, the Subject notwithstanding is as much bound as ever, nay somewhat more bound on this occasion, because the Prince is in an apparent danger; out of which to rescue him, every good Subject ought to contribute his assistance for his Princes safety. The Excommunication, or the menace of an approaching Excommunication from such a proud pretender, may be just reason why Princes should require renew’d assurance of their Subjects Allegiance, and why Subjects should give new instancess of their constant duty; but it can be no reason why Subjects should think themselves free from their Obedience and Oaths. The condition of Princes through the multitude and weight of their affairs is of all mens the most unealous; when it is (the most it can be) eased by a ready and universal Obedience in the Subjects but how miserable would it be on supposition that their Kingdoms were at the
disposal of a foreigner! How unfaithful are our Historians, or how shameless hath the encroaching pride of the Pope and the Papal Clergy been! either they who write the stories of Ages past have most injuriously dealt with their own and other succeeding Ages, or the Papal power hath with might and main set it self to ruin the Regal and Imperial Power. Now what will become of the Maxim which pleaded stilly for the Ecclesiastical power? *Tis retorted thus: All Authority appointed of God, is by him entrusted with Power and Authority sufficient to conserve it self, and effect its proper ends: But if a Bishop, who is a Subject, may depose the Prince, and release the sworn Allegiance, the Power of the Prince is not sufficient to preserve it self among Subjects; If the Bishop be a foreigner, as the Pope is to all Princes, who doth excommunicate, and depose, and release Subjects, then the Princes Power is not sufficiently qualified to preserve it self against strangers and usurping enemies.

In brief; Those that are Papal Bishops, and were born Subjects, are equally with other Subjects, natural Leige-men to their Prince; for we have proved that the dignity of Bishops doth not exalt them above the condition of Subjects: Now it is certain Subjects cannot absolve their fellow Subjects; none can loose the bond which doth as much stay himself as another; nor can Rebellion acquit Rebellion in a Subject. Those Bishops who being foreigners to a Prince, are always to be watcht as suspected, and mostli to be oppos'd as enemies, though Bishops (as Popes are accounted) can never be thought persons to be intrusted with a Power over Kings and Princes, whom they treat with no other kindness than a man doth one whom he resolveth to overthrow or humble with the first opportunity: So that as it is not in the Dignity and Office it self, to convey an uncontrollable Power to a native Subject in any case over his Soveraign, so neither is it in the Office to convey such a power to a foreigner; and both are a weakening of the Civil power to a degree of impotence that cannot defend its Subjects, or preserve it self, or attain the necessary ends of Government.

4. Confidential. If the Dignity of the Clergy be not sufficient to advance the Clergy-man high enough above the Civil Magistrate (as hath been proved) in Civil Matters; Then were the Pope Universal Bishop, and had be rightful Power to Excommunicate (which yet is not proved by any of his parasites, nor yielded by any Protefiant); yet could he not deprive the Prince or King, so excommunicated, of his Dominions in part or whole.

For in this case the Pope muft act as a Bishop; and this Office, as it is a Spiritual Office, and the Rules of it are Spiritual, so the effects and ends of it are also Spiritual, and ought to keep within these limits and bounds; but now, when (after admonition and intreaties prove vain) the Universal Bishop should Excommunicate, he hath gone to the utmost that
that his Rule directs, or his Authority can enable him to; the Deposits of a King, the giving his Kingdom to any that have the hardines of attempt, and the success to gain it; as it is wholly of a Secular nature, so it is wholly foreign to the Office of any Bishop. And it hath brought the greatest confusion, wars, bloodshed, and desolation into the Christian World; that by this we might guess from whom this usurped Power comes, since we know there have been such direful effects of it, and these effects the natural and proper effects of such unjust pretences. The Censure of the Church is an execution of a Spiritual Power, and was never appointed to leap so prodigiously high as with its foot to kick down the Crowns of Kings and free Princes; this (transitus de generi ad genum) skipping from a just execution of Ecclesiastical Power, into the Usurpation of a boundless Power in Affairs Secular over Princes and Kings, is the most insolent and intolerable presumption; and which gives Gods Vicegerents in Civils, a justifiable plea to hate and oppose the pride and designs of the Papal Clergy, who by this means have with a kind hand given their inferior Clergy so happy a lift, that the meanest person in Holy Orders among them, is Jure & virtute Officii, Stanislaus a better man than his Prince, whom he exceeds as much as a man ex-vicionibus exceeds a beast, or God exceeds the Priest, if you believe their flatterers. Amongst whom the Learned Cardinal Bellarmine (misemployed in the De Pontifice Office of Matter of the Ceremonies) does set Kings below Bishops, lib. i. cap. 7. Priests, and Deacons too: so glorious is this Roman Church, that Kings like our droffie bodies, sons of the earth, fall short of the Church-men as much as the body falls short of the Soul. Bravely spoken! what pity is it that every Ecclesiastical Sacred Head hath not an estate and revenues to maintain his Grandeur as much in Magnificence above Kings as their Office hath set them: if such transcendent Honour be the effect of Papal Ordination, our King and Parliament have reason to continue the Prohibition against the Subjects of this Kingdom going beyond the Seas to take Orders. It is not safe to have Subjects so advanced, and I do not wonder that Rebellion in a Clergy-man of the Roman Mint is become so small a Peccadillo, or rather thin'd into an invisible mist, and though the Priest be visible in the Rebellion and Treason, neither the Traitor, nor Rebel can be seen or found: alas good men and precious! the world unkindly owneth not their Excellency, and they by natural propensities (flowing from their constitutive principles) do innocently aspire to a state equal to their Orders, which blind Here-ticks nick-name Rebellion, and jealous Princes brand as Treason; and so the innocent Clergy (when they have the luck to be taken in it) are condemned and executed for Traitors. But the comfort is the enlightened Consistory at Rome can see and distinguish the Clergy-man quaad substantiam, innocent, nay meritorious; it is the Prince or State which mistook him, and under the separate accidents and form of a Traitor bloodily.
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So of a well-constituted Officer as Christ and Peter left him (if you'll believe them) he is made a mishapen Monster, and the wonder of the World; and now in the unjust claim of the Father of Lies draws deceived profelytes to worship him, shewing them the Kingdoms of the World, and the Glory of them, with promise that as they merit by their good service to the Apostolick-Chair, he will give them a right, and when they can they may take possession of his gift, for unto him pertain all these things, and to whomsoever he will he giveth them; and I assure you it is neither Jure Divino, nor Jure Humano, but quasi Neuto, i.e. Jure Inferno.

5. Conseéi. Hence it follows, That Emperours, Kings, Princes and free States, are not Rightful Subjects to the Pope, or to any other single Ecclesiastical Person, nor to any body of the Clergy-men, neither in Synods with Presbyterians, or in Convocations with Episcopal, nor in pretended General Councils with Papists, nor in the Conslitory or Conclave with the Cardinals and Pope collected together. He that designed the Office in his Church
Church hath left these Officers under the Obedience of the Civil Magistracy in all Civil Matters which concern the Government of their Estates and Persons. In which cause so many have appeared, and so clearly vindicated the Royal Prerogatives and Soveraign Authority of Kings, not only Protestant Writers, but among the Papists themselves many very learned Pens have asserted the Supream and Soveraign Power of free States, that it is become in most Countrys a ridiculous Claim the Pope maketh, or any of his Vassals flatter him with. That their Prince is a Vassal- and Subject to his Holiness; and that is now become as long since it should have been, a Trayterous Tenet and worthy of death, which was in the heighth of Popish Tyranny a necessary principle of the Papal Religion. How ill-natur'd foever the Children of that Church have proved, abridging their Father of his Power; I will not now enquire; but might a stranger to the Father and his Children speak a few words indifferently to both, I would adventure to say, it had been justice and honesty in the Ghostly Father to have left his Children the Power and Authority which he gave them, who said the Magistrates were gods, and then the Primitive kindness of Kings like Constantine the Great would have ensured the favours and observances of Princes to the Clergy: But since the Papal Infallibility hath almost reduced this affair to this hard choice, Either that we must have no Pope and Exempt Clergy, or no free and Soveraign Monarchs, I am easily inclined to believe, the Secular Princes will rather chuse that the Ecclesiasticks should part with their Immunities than that Princes should part with their Soveraignty; and how great a part of the Christian World would join with them is not hard to guess. The Soveraignty of the Pope is an Article of the Popes political Faith, but I verily think he hath more wit and care of his Soul than to make it an article of his Christian Faith: And if he will venture his soul, and the souls of his sheep on gage that he may keep his present Grandeur, I am well satisfied that he is not my shepherd; and I am not a little glad that there are so many Papists that do not make this an Article of their Faith. Free States and Kingdoms do know that Supream Soveraignty is not essential to Christ's Vicar, Peter's Successor, or Universal Bishop, that Exemptions of the Clergy are favours of the Prince and not natural and necessary properties of the Office; and which is ill news for Rome, have well considered the distinction between being of Communion with the Church Catholic, and with the Pope as first Bishop, and being in Subjection to the Pope as to a Soveraign. They now are skilled in the Method of observing the Church, and opposing the Court of Rome. And though I know not what may (per possibile) come to pass among men, and what King may make himself against all Right, a Subject to the Pope, yet I am sure no King or Emperor can ever be rightfully the subject of the Pope, who at most is but Bishop of the first See.