

**THE BOOK WAS
DRENCHED**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_210924

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 821.47/M66W Accession No. 35656

Author Milton, John.

Title Works of. v. 7. 1932

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE WORKS OF JOHN MILTON

JOANNIS MILTON I

Angli

PRO POPULO ANGLICANO

DEFENSIO

Contra claudii anonymi alias salmafii

Defensionem REGIAM.



LONDINI

Typis Du Gardianis Anno Domini 1651

THE WORKS OF
JOHN MILTON



VOLUME VII

NEW YORK
Columbia University Press
1932

COPYRIGHT
ColumbiaUniversityPress
1932

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE PRINTING HOUSE OF WILLIAM EDWIN RUDGE, INC.
MOUNT VERNON, NEW YORK

EDITORIAL BOARD

FRANK ALLEN PATTERSON

GENERAL EDITOR

ALLAN ABBOTT

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

DONALD LEMEN CLARK

JOHN ERSKINE

WILLIAM HALLER

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP

W. P. TRENT

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Title-page to the First Edition of Joannis Miltoni Angli Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Joannis Miltoni Angli Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio	1
EDITED BY CLINTON W. KEYES, WITH A TRANSLATION BY SAMUEL LEE WOLFF	
Notes	561

JOANNIS MILTONI ANGLI
PRO POPULO ANGLICANO DEFENSIO
CONTRA CLAUDII ANONYMI, ALIÀS SALMASII
DEFENSIONEM REGIAM

JOANNIS MILTONI
ANGLI
Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio
CONTRA
CLAUDII ANONTMI, ALIAS SALMASII
Defensionem Regiam.

PRÆFATIO.

TAMETSI vereor, si in defendendo Populo Anglicano tam sim profusus verborum, vacuus rerum, quam est plerisque visus in defensione regia Salmasius, ne verbosissimi simul et ineptissimi defensoris nomen meritis esse
5 videar, tamen cum in mediocri quavis materia tractanda nemo sibi adeo properandum esse existimet, quin exordio saltern aliquo pro dignitate suscepti a se operis uti soleat, id ego in re omnium fere maxima dicenda si non omittam, neque nimis perstringam, spero equidem, duas propemodum res, quas
10 magnopere vellem, assecuturum me esse: alteram, ut cause huic nobilissimæ, et seculorum omnium memoria dignissimæ nulla ex parte, quantum in me est, desim; alteram, ut reprehensam in adversario futilitatem et redundantiam, devitasse tamen ipse nihilo minus judicer. Dicam enim res neque
15 parvas, neque vulgares; Regem potentissimum, oppressis legibus, religione afflicta, pro libidine regnantem, tandem a suo

JOHN MILTON
AN ENGLISHMAN HIS
Defence of the People of England
AGAINST
CLAUDIUS ANONYMOUS, ALIAS SALMASIUS
his Defence of the King

PREFACE.

IF I be as copious of words and empty of matter in my Defence of the People of England as most men think Salmasius has been in his Defence of the King, I fear that I shall apparently have deserved to be called a defender at
5 once wordy and silly. Yet no man thinks he must make such haste, even in handling any ordinary subject, as not to employ an opening worthy of its importance. In handling well-nigh the greatest of all subjects, then, if I neither omit an introduction, nor overdo it, I am in hopes of attaining two things,
10 both of which I earnestly desire: the one, that I be nowise wanting, as far as in me lies, to this cause, most renowned and most worth the remembrance of all the generations of men; the other, that I myself be yet deemed to have avoided the silliness and verbosity which I blame in my antagonist.
15 For I shall relate no common things, or mean; but how a most puissant king, when he had trampled upon the laws, and

populo, qui servitutem longam servierat, bello victum; inde in custodiam traditum; et cum nullam omnino melius de se sperandi materiam vel dictis vel factis praeberet, a summo demum regni Concilio capite damnatum; et pro ipsis Regiae
5 foribus securi percussus. Dicam etiam, quod ad levandos magna superstitione hominum animos multum contulerit, quo jure, praesertim apud nos, judicatum hoc atque peractum sit; meosque cives fortissimos et integerrimos, deque universis orbis terrarum civibus ac populis egregie meritos ab impro-
10 bissimis maledicorum, sive nostratium, sive exterorum calumniis, turn imprimis ab hujus inanissimi Sophistae maledictis, qui pro duce et coryphaeo exterorum se gerit, facile defendam. Quae enim ullius regis alto solio sedentis majestas unquam tanta eluxit, quanta turn Populi Anglicani effulgebat,
15 cum excussa ilia veteri superstitione, quae diu invaluerat, ipsum regem, seu potius de rege hostem, qui solus mortalium impunitatem sibi divino jure vendicabat, suis legibus irretitum judicio perfunderet; et quo is quemcunque alium supplicio affecisset, eodem sontern ipsum afficere non vereretur?
20 At quid ego hax tanquam populi facta prsedico; quae ipsa per se pene vocem edunt, et praesentem ubique testantur Deum? Qui, quo ties suae sapientissimae menti complacitum est, super-

stricken down religion, and was ruling at his own lust and wantonness, was at last subdued in the field by his own people, who had served a long term of slavery; how he was thereupon put under guard, and when he gave no ground
5 whatever, by either word or action, to hope better things of him, was finally by the highest council of the realm condemned to die, and beheaded before his very palace gate. I shall likewise relate (which will much conduce to the easing men's minds of a great superstition) under what system of
10 laws, especially what laws of England, this judgment was rendered and executed; and shall easily defend my valiant and worthy countrymen, who have extremely well deserved of all subjects and nations in the world, from the most wicked calumnies of both domestic and foreign railers, and chiefly
15 from the reproaches of this utterly empty sophister, who sets up to be captain and ringleader of all the rest. For what king's majesty high enthroned ever shone so bright as did the people's majesty of England, when, shaking off that age-old superstition which had long prevailed, they overwhelmed
20 with judgment their very king (or rather him who from their king had become their enemy), ensnared in his own laws him who alone among men claimed by divine right to go unpunished, and feared not to inflict upon this very culprit the same capital punishment which he would have inflicted upon any
25 other.

Yet why do I proclaim as done by the people these actions, which themselves almost utter a voice, and witness everywhere the presence of God? Who, as often as it hath seemed

bos et effrænatos reges, supra humanum modum sese efferentes, solet deturbare, et tota sæpe cum domo funditus evertit. Illius nos manifesto numine ad salutem et libertatem prope amissam subito erecti, illum Ducem secuti, et impressa passim
5 divina vestigia venerantes, viam baud obscuram, sed illustrem, illius auspiciis commonstratam et patefactam ingressi sumus. Hæc ego omnia digne satis explicare, et quod omnes fortasse gentes legant atque states, monumentis tradere, si diligentia solum mea, cujusmodicunque est, meis tantum viri-
10 bus sperem me posse, frustra sim. Quæ enim oratio tam augusta atque magnifica, quod tam excellens ingenium huic oneri subeundo par esse queat, ut cum illustrium virorum aut civitatum res gestas vix reperiatur tot seculis qui luculente possit scribere, confidat quisquam hæc, non hominum, sed omnipo-
15 tends plane Dei gloriose et mirabiliter facta ullis se verbis aut stylo assequi posse? Quod quidem munus ut susciperem, tametsi summi in republica nostra viri sua autoritate perfecerunt, mihi que hoc negotium datum esse voluerunt, ut quæ illi, Deo ductore, magna cum gloria gesserant, ea, quod certe
20 proximum est, contra invidiam et obtrectationem, quas in res ferrum et apparatus belli nihil potest, alio genere armorum defenderem, quorum ego quidem iudicium magno mini ornamento esse existimo, me scilicet eorum suffragiis eum esse

good to his infinite wisdom, useth to cast down proud unbridled kings, puffed up above the measure of mankind, and often uprooteth them with their whole house. As for us, it was by His clear command we were on a sudden resolved
5 upon the safety and liberty that we had almost lost; it was He we followed as our Leader, and revered His divine footsteps imprinted everywhere; and thus we entered upon a path not dark but bright, and by His guidance shown and opened to us. I should be much in error if I hoped that by my diligence
10 alone, such as it is, I might set forth all these matters as worthily as they deserve, and might make such records of them as, haply, all nations and all ages would read. For what eloquence can be august and magnificent enough, what man has parts sufficient, to undertake so great a task? Yea, since in so
15 many ages as are gone over the world there has been but here and there a man found able to recount worthily the actions of great heroes and potent states, can any man have so good an opinion of himself as to think that by any style or language of his own he can compass these glorious and wonderful works
20 —not of men, but, evidently, of almighty God?

Yet such is the office which the most eminent men of our commonwealth have by their influence prevailed upon me to undertake, and have wished this next best task assigned to me of defending their deeds from envy and calumny, against
25 which steel and the furniture of war avail not—of defending, I say, with far other arms and other weapons, the works which under God's guidance they had gloriously wrought. Their decision, certainly, I count a great honor to myself—that they

præ cæteris, qui hanc patriæ meæ fortissimis liberatoribus
haud poenitentiam operam navarem, quin et ipse ab ineunte
adolescentia iis eram studiis incensus, qua: me ad optima qua
que si minis facienda, at certe laudanda incitatum ferebant,
5 his tamen diffisus adminiculis ad divinam opem recurro:
Deumque Opt. Max. donorum omnium largitorem invoco,
ut quam prospere quamque pie nostri illi ad libertatem claris-
simi duces regies fastus, et dominatum impotentem acie fre-
gerunt, dein memorabili tandem supplicio extinxerunt, quam-
10 que facili nuper negotio unus de multis ipsum regem veluti ab
inferis resurgentem, inque illo libro post mortem edito novis
argutiis, et verborum lenociniis populo se venditantem redar-
gui atque summovi, tarn nunc feliciter tamque vere declama-
toris hujus exotici petulantiam et mendacia refellam atque di-
15 scutiam. Qui alienigena cum sit, et, quamvis id millies neget,
Grammaticus, non ea tamen stipe contentus, quam hoc nomine
meretur, magnus ardelio esse maluit; non reipub. solum immi-
scere se ausus, sed etiam alienæ: cum neque modestiam, neque
judicium, neque aliud quicquam afferat, quod oporteret sane
20 tantum arbitrum, præter arrogantiam et Grammaticam. Et
sane hæc quæ jam Latine utcunque scripsit, si inter Anglos,
et nostro sermone protulisset, vix esset, credo, qui de response
laborandum esse judicaret; sed partim trita, et refutationibus
jam crebris explosa negligeret, partim tyrannica et foeda, vilis-
25 simo quovis mancipio vix ferenda, quamvis ipse regias secutus

voted me, before all others, the one to render this never-to-be-regretted assistance to the valiant liberators of my country; and indeed from my youth upward I had been fired with a zeal which kept urging me, if not to do great deeds myself, at
5 least to celebrate them. Yet, mistrusting these advantages, I have recourse to the divine assistance, and pray the great and holy God, dispenser of all gifts: Even as successfully and piously as those our glorious guides to freedom crushed in battle the royal insolence and tyranny uncontrolled, and then
10 at last by a memorable punishment utterly ended them; even as easily as I, singlehanded, lately refuted and set aside the king himself when he, as it were, rose from the grave, and in that book published after his death tried to cry himself up before the people with new verbal sleights and harlotries; so,
15 I pray, may I now as auspiciously and as truly refute and demolish this outlandish rhetorician's wanton lies.

Foreign born as he is, and (though he deny it a thousand times) a mere grammarian, yet, not satisfied with the grammarian's dole, he has chosen to mind everybody's business,
20 and has presumed to mix in an affair of state, a foreign state at that, though he brings to the task neither moderation nor understanding nor anything else that so grand a judge would surely need, save his presumption and his grammar. Indeed if he had published here, and in English, the same things as
25 he now has writ in Latin (such as it is) I think scarce any man would have thought it worth while to return an answer to them, but would partly despise them as common, and exploded over and over already, and partly (even one who sided

10 DEFENSIO PRIMA

partes, aversaretur. Nunc cum inter externos, et nostrarum rerum penitus ignaros grandi pagina turgescat, sunt illi quidem, qui res nostras perperam intelligunt, edocendi; hic suo more, (quandoquidem tanta maledicendi aliis libidine fertur) 5 suo inquam more ac modo erit tractandus. Quod si quis miretur forte, cur ergo tam diu intactum et ovantem, nostroque omnium silentio inflatum volitare passi simus, de aliis sane nescio, de me audacter possum dicere, non mihi verba aut argumenta, quibus causam tuerer tam bonam, diu quaerenda 10 aut investiganda fuisse, si otium et valetudinem (quae quidem scribendi laborem ferre possit) nactus essem. Qua cum adhuc etiam tenui admodum utar, carptim haec cogor, et intercisus pene singulis horis vix attingere, quae continent! stylo atque studio persequi debuissim. Unde hoc si minus dabitur, cives 15 meos praestantissimos, patriae conservatores digno laudum praconio celebrare, quorum immortalia facinora jam toto orbe claruerunt, defendere tamen, et ab hujus importuni litteratoris insolentia, et professoriae linguae intemperis vindicare haud mihi difficile futurum spero. Pessime enim vel natura 20 vel legibus comparatum fuisset, si arguta servitus, libertas muta esset; et haberent tyranni qui pro se dicerent, non haberent qui tyrannos debellare possunt: miserum esset, si haec ipsa ratio, quo utimur Dei munere, non multo plura ad homines conservandos, liberandos, et, quantum natura fert, inter

with the king) abhor them as foul despotic maxims, hardly to be endured by the most worthless of slaves. But as he undertakes to puff his portentous sheet among outsiders, who are quite ignorant of our affairs, they, who thus get an utterly
5 false notion of them, certainly ought to be fully informed; and he, who is so very forward to speak ill of others, should be treated in his own kind,

If haply anyone wonder why, then, we all have suffered him so long to strut unharmed, swollen in triumph at our
10 silence, I know not what others may say, but for myself I can boldly declare that I had neither words nor arguments long to seek for the defence of so good a cause, had I but found leisure, and such health as could bear the toil of writing. Yet as I still possess but slender strength, I am forced to write by
15 piece-meal, and break off almost every hour, though the subject be such as requires unremitted study and attention. If for this reason it be not given me to clarion with right heraldry, befitting their praises, those glorious fellow-citizens of mine, their country's saviors, whose deathless deeds already ring
20 round the world, yet I hope it will not be difficult for me to defend, at least, and justify them, against the impertinence of this bore of a pedant, and the squallings of his professorial tongue. Nature and laws would be in ill case if slavery were eloquent, and liberty mute; if tyrants should find defenders,
25 and they that are potent to master and vanquish tyrants should find none. And it were deplorable indeed, if the reason mankind is endued withal, which is God's gift, should not furnish more arguments for men's preservation, for their deliverance,

se æquandos, quam ad opprimendos et sub unius imperio male perdendos argumenta suppeditaret. Causam itaque pulcherrimam hac certa fiducia lacti aggrediamur, illinc fraudem, fallaciam, ignorantiam, atque barbariem, hinc lucem, veritatem, rationem, et seculorum omnium optimorum studia atque doctrinam nobiscum stare.

Age nunc jam, satis præfati, quoniam cum criticis res est, tarn culti voluminis titulum imprimis, quid exponat, videamus: *Defensio regia pro Carolo I. ad Car. II.* Magnum sane præstas, O quisquis es! patrem defendis ad filium: mirum ni causam obtineas. Verum ego te falso alias sub nomine, nunc sub nullo latitantem, Salmasi, ad alia voco subsellia, ad alios iudices, ubi tu illud euge et sophws, quod in palæstra tua literaria captare misere soles, fortasse non audies. Sed cur ad regem filium defensio hæc regia? non opus est tortore, confidentem habemus reum; *Sumptibus* inquit *Regiis*: O te venalem oratorem et sumptuosum! Siccine defensionem pro Carolo patre, tua sententia, rege optimo, ad Carolum filium regem pauperrimum noluit nisi sumptibus regiis? Sed veterator etiam haud irridiculus esse voluisti, qui *regiam defensionem* dixeris; non enim amplius tua quam vendidisti, sed legitime jam *regia defensio* est; centenis nimirum Jacobæis

and, as much as the nature of the thing will bear, for their equality, than for their oppression and utter ruin under one man's dominion. Let me therefore enter upon this noble cause with cheerfulness grounded upon the assurance that on the
5 other side are cheating, and trickery, and ignorance and outlandishness, and on my side the light of truth and reason, and the practice and theory of the best historic ages.

So much by way of introduction. And now, since our affair is with critics, let us consider first the title of this choice
10 volume. What does it say? "A Royal Defence for Charles the First, to Charles the Second." You undertake a wonderful piece of work, whoever you are—to plead the father's cause before his own son: a hundred to one but you carry it! But, Salmasius, though you hide from legal process as you for-
15 merly did under an assumed name, and do now under no name at all—I yet summon you to appear before another tribunal and before other judges, where perhaps you shall not get those "Bravo's" and "Hear Hear's" which you are wont to hanker after so desperately in your classroom. But why this
20 royal defence dedicated to the king's own son? We need not put him to the torture; he confesses: "At the king's expense," says he. Mercenary and costly advocate! so you would not write a defence for Charles the father, whom you pretend to have been the best of kings, to Charles the son, the most indi-
25 gent of kings, but it must be at the king's own expense? You old rogue, in calling it the "*King's* Defence" you certainly contrived not to have yourself laughed at; for, as you have sold it, 'tis no longer yours, but lawfully the *King's* indeed,—

empta, ingenti pretio ab egentissimo rege: Non enim ignota loquimur; novimus qui illos aureos domum attulit tuam, qui crumenam illam tessellis vitreis variatam; novimus qui te avaras manus porrigentem vidit, in speciem quidem ut Sacel-
 5 lanum Regis missum cum munere, re vera ut ipsum munus amplecterere; et una tantum mercede accepta totum pene Regis ærarium exinanires. Sed eccum ipsum, crepant fores, prodit histrio in proscenium.

Date operam, et cum silentio animadvertite,
 10 Ut pernoscatis quid sibi Eunuchus velit.

Nam quicquid est, præter solitum cothurnatus incedit. *Horribilis nifer nuntius aures nostras atroci vulnere, sed magis mentes perculit, de parricidio apud Anglos in persona Regis sacrilegorum hominum nefaria conspiratione admissa.* Pro-
 15 fectò nuntius iste horribilis aut machæram multo longiorem ea quam strinxit Petrus habuerit oportet, aut aures istas auritissimæ fuerint, quas tam longinquo vulnere perculerit: nam aures non stolidas ne offendisse quidem potuit. Ecqua enim vobis fit injuria, ecquis vestrum læditur, si nos hostes et per-
 20 duelles nostros, sive plebeios, sive nobiles, sive reges morte multamus? At ista mitte, Salmasi, quæ ad te nihil attinent: ego enim de te etiam *horribilem* habeo quem mittam *nuntium*; quique omnium Grammaticorum et Criticorum aures, modò teretes habeant et doctas, atrociori vulnere si non per-

yea, bought for one hundred Jacobuses, a great sum to get from a needy King. I speak not of things unknown: I know who took those gold-pieces to your house in that beaded purse; I know who saw you reach out your greedy hands
5 under pretence of embracing the king's chaplain who brought the gift, but in fact to hug the gift itself, and by taking this single fee almost to empty the king's treasury.

But here comes the man himself; the door creaks; enter the actor.

10 In silence now and with attention wait,
That ye may learn what th' Eunuch has to prate.

For whatever's the matter with him, he struts on with heroics more than usual stilted. "A horrible message has lately struck our ears, but our minds more, with a heinous wound concern-
15 ing a parricide committed in England in the person of a king, by an execrable conspiracy of sacrilegious men." Surely that horrible message must either have had a much longer sword than the one that Peter drew, or those ears must have been exceeding long-eared ears, that it could wound at such a dis-
20 tance; for it could not so much as in the least offend any ears but dull ones. What harm is it to you foreigners—are any of you hurt by it—if we amongst ourselves put our own enemies, our own traitors, to death, be they commoners, noblemen, or kings? Salmasius, you had better mind your own business;
25 for 7 have "a horrible message" to send about *you*, and I shall be surprised if it strike not with a more heinous wound all grammarians' and critics' ears, so these be but refined and

culerit, mirabor; *de parricidio* apud Hollandos *in persona* Aristarchi, *nejaria* Salmasii barbaric *admisso*: te magnum scilicet Critkum *sumptibus regis* conductum, ut defensionem regiam scriberes, non solum putidissimo exordio, præficarum
5 funebribus nugis et næniis simillimo, nullius, non fatui, mentem miseratione permovisse, sed prima statim clausula risum pene legentibus multiplici barbarismo excitasse. Quid enim, quæso, est *parricidium in persona Regis* *admittere*, quid *in persona Regis*? qua: unquam latinitas sic locuta est? nisi ali-
10 quem nobis forte Pseudophilippum narras, qui personam Regis indutus, nescio quid parricidii apud Anglos patriverit; quod verbum verius opinione tua ex ore tibi excidisse puto. Tyrannus enim, quasi histrionalis quidem rex, larva tantum et persona Regis, non verus Rex est. Cæterum ob hujusmodi
15 noxas Gallicolatinas, quibus passim scates, non tarn mihi, neque enim est otium, quam ipsis tuis Grammatistis poenas dabis; quibus ego te deridendum et vapulandum propino. Hoc multo atrocius; quod a summis Magistratibus nostris de Rege statutum est, id *sacrilegorum hominum nefarid conspiratione*
20 *admissum* ais. Tune furcifer potentissimi nupcr regni, nunc reipub. eo potentioris acta et consulta sic nominas? quorum de factis ne Rex quidem ullus ut quicquam gravius pronun-

learned: "Of a parricide committed in Holland in the person of Aristarchus by the abominable barbarism of Salmasius": to wit, that you, a great critic, hired forsooth, at a king's expense to write a king's defence, did with a sickening ex-
5 ordium, most like the trumpety doleful wailings of hired mourner-women, not only fail to move with pity the mind of any but a fool, but by die end of your first sentence instantly provoke, in those who had scarce read it, laughter at your manifold barbarisms. For, pray what is "parricidium in per-
10 sona regis admittere"? What is "in persona regis"? What Latinity ever used such diction?—as it were a murder committed in the mask or disguise of a king! Unless maybe you are telling us of some sham Philip—some Perkin Warbeck—who by *impersonating* a king did in a way perpetrate
15 parricide in England. This word, methinks, you have spoken better than you knew. For a tyrant is no real king; he is but a player-king, the mere mask and spectre of a king. At all events, for such Frenchified Latin blunders as this, with which you abound, you shall be punished not by me, for I
20 have no time, but by your own fellow-grammarians; to them I turn you over to be laughed and flogged out of court—and much good may it do them.

Far more heinous is it, that what was decreed by our supreme magistracy to be done to the king should be said by
25 you to have been done "by an execrable conspiracy of sacrilegious men." Rogue, is it thus you name the acts and decrees of our late most potent realm and present yet more potent commonwealth, concerning whose deeds no king, even,

tiaret, aut scriptum ederet, adduci adhuc potuit. Merito itaque amplissimi Ordines Hollandiæ, liberatorum olim patrie vera progenies, defensionem hanc tyrannicam, populorum omnium libertati pestilentissimam edicto suo tenebris damnarunt; 5
cujus et ipsum authorem omnis libera Civitas suis prohibere finibus, aut ejicere deberet: eaque præcipue quæ tarn ingratum tamque tetrum reipublicæ hostem suo stipendio alit; 10
cujus ille reipublicæ baud secus atque nostræ, fundamenta ipsa atque causas oppugnat; necnon utramque unâ et eadem opera labefactare et subruere conatur; præstantissimosque illic Libertatis vindices nostrorum sub nomine maledictis proscindit. Reputate jam vobiscum illustrissimi Fcederatores Belgarum Ordines, et cum animis vestris cogitate, 15
quis hunc regiæ potestatis assertorem ad scribendum impulerit, quis nuper apud vos regie se gerere incoepent, quæ consilia, qui conatus, quæ turbæ denique per Hollandiam secutæ sint, quæ nunc essent, quam vobis parata servitus, novusque dominus erat, atque ilia vestra tot annorum armis atque laboribus vindicata libertas, quam prope extincta apud vos nunc 20
iuisset, nisi opportunissima nuper temerarii juvenis morte respirasset. Sed pergit iste noster ampullari, et mirabiles tragedias fingere, *Quosunque infandus hie* parricidialis nimirum barbarismi Salmasiani *rumor attigit, hand secus ac si julmine*

could hitherto be brought to utter or publish aught more abusive?

Rightly, then, have the High and Mighty States of Holland, true offspring of the ancient liberators of their country, 5 by their edict damned to darkness this defence of tyranny, most noxious to the liberty of all peoples. As for the author, him every free state ought to keep out of its bounds, or cast out; especially the state which supports and subsidizes so ungrateful and so foul an enemy of the republic. That republic's 10 foundations and causes he attacks precisely as he attacks ours; by one and the same effort, in fact, he strives to undermine them both, and make them totter to their fall; and under our names foully maligns the most eminent champions of liberty there. Consider with yourselves, most illustrious States Gen- is eral of the United Netherlands, and bethink you who it was that moved this assertor of kingly power to write; who it was that lately began to king it among you; what counsels were taken, what attempts made, what tumults at length ensued throughout Holland; to what pass things might have been 20 brought by this time—how slavery and a new master were made ready for you, and that liberty of yours, vindicated by so many years' war and toil—how near spent it had now been among you, had it not recovered breath again of late by the exceeding timely death of a rash young man.

25 But that fellow of ours goes on with his bombast, play-acting strange tragedies: "Whomsoever this dreadful news reached"—the news, doubtless, of Salmasius's parricidal barbarism—"suddenly, as if they had been scorched by light-

afflati essent, derepente his arrecteque horrorc coma et vox jaucibus hasit. Quod nunc primitus auditum discant Physici comas fulmine arrectas. Verum quis hoc nescit, viles et imbelles animos, magni cujuspiam facinoris vel rumore obstu-
 5 pescere; quodque prius fuerunt, turn se maxime stipites indicare? Alii *lacrymas non tenuerunt*, mulierculæ credo aulicæ, aut siqui his molliores; inter quos et ipse Salmasius nova quadam metamorphosi Salmacis factus est; et fonte hoc suo lacrymarum fictitio, et nocte parato viriles animos emollire
 10 conatur. Moneo itaque et cavere jubeo,

— *infamis ne quern mall jortibus undis*

Salmacis enervet.

— *ne vir cum venerit, exeat inde*

Semivir, et tactis subitb mollescat in undis.

15 *Fortiits verb inquit animati* (nam fortes puto et animosos ne nominare quidem nisi putide potest) tanta *indignationis flammâ exarserunt, ut vix se caperent.* Furiosos illos non flocci facimus; vera fortitudine sui que compote istos minaces pellere, et in fugam vertere consuevimus. *Nemo certi non*
 20 *diras imprecatus est tanti sceleris authoribus.* Vox tamen, ut tu

ning's flash, 'Up on end stood their hair in horror, and voice in their throat stuck,' " Something hitherto unheard of for natural philosophers to learn—that to be struck by lightning makes hair stand on end! But who knows not that base and
5 coward minds do get thunderstruck even at the mere noise of any great deed soever, and then most unmistakably show themselves for the blockheads they have been all along? Some, he says, "could not but weep"—some *petites jennes*, I suppose, and *cortegiane*, or others yet more sentimental,—
10 among whom, indeed, Salmasius himself has by a modern metamorphosis turned into Salmacis, and in this his counterfeit fountain of night-lucubrated tears, attempts to emasculate manly courages. I give warning therefore, and bid beware

Lest ill-reputed Salmacis with wave
15 Of evil power some victim shall unman;
Who, though a man he came, yet thence shall go
Hermaphrodite, and at the water's touch
Swift grow effeminate.

"In fact, the more bravely couraged," he says (for I suppose he cannot even name the brave and courageous without
20 nauseous affectation), "burned with such a flame of indignation that they could hardly control themselves." For such madmen we care not a rush, but have a way of driving off your blustering bullies, and routing them with that true
25 courage which does control itself.

"Surely not one but invoked curses upon the authors of so horrible a villainy." Yet, you were just saying, their voice in

modo aiebas, *jaucibus hcesit*; atque hæsisset utinam in hunc usque diem, si de nostris duntaxat perfugis hoc vis intelligi, quod nos etiam pro comperto habemus, nihil illis crebrius in ore esse, quam diras et imprecationes omnibus bonis abomi-
5 nandas quidem, non tamen metuendas. De aliis credibile vix est, cum supplicii de rege sumpti fama illuc pervenisset, repertum in libero præsertim populo fuisse ullum, tarn ad servitutum natum, qui nos dicto læderet, aut factum nostrum crimini daret; immo potius omnes bonos omnia bona dixisse;
10 quinetiam Deo gratias egisse, qui exemplum justitix tarn illustre et excelsum ediderit, quodque cæteris regibus tam salutari documento esse possit. Istos itaque *feros ac ferreos ccedem* nescio cujus *miserabilem, ac mirabilem* plorantes, cum suo tinnulo oratore, *post regium in orbe nomen natum notumque*,
15 frigidissimo, etiam atque etiam plorare jubemus. At quis interim è ludo fere puer, aut e coenobio quovis fraterculus casum hunc regis non multo disertius, immo Latinius hoc oratore regio declamitasset? Verum ego ineptior sim, si infantiam hujus et deliramenta hunc in modum toto volumine accurate
20 persequar; quod tamen libens facerem, (quoniam superbia et fastidio, ut ferunt, supra modum turget) ni moli tanta libri inconcinna atque incondita se protegeret, et veluti miles ille Terentianus post principia lateret: callido sane consilio, ut de-

their throat stuck. And as far as our exiles are concerned—if you mean them—would that it had stuck there even unto this day; for we have learned to a certainty that nothing is oftener upon their lips than curses and imprecations, to be by all good
5 men abhorred certainly, yet not feared. For the rest, it can scarce be believed that when news of the king's execution arrived, there was found, especially among a free people, anyone so much a slave by nature as to calumniate us or count our deed a crime; but rather that all righteous men said all was right-
10 eous—nay even thanked God for having published so high and shining an example of justice for so wholesome a lesson to the rest of the kings.

And so, to those "savage, sternly steeled and stony-hearted" persons who (he says) bewail the "miserable and amazing
15 marvellous murder" (whose, pray?), to them and their jingling spokesman, the dullest, surely, "since ever in the world the kingly name was native and known," I say: "Let them wail again! Let them wail again!" But meanwhile what boy just out of school, or what dear brotherkin from any
20 friary you like, could not have made a rhetorical exercise out of this royal fall more eloquently—yea, more Latinly—than this royal speechmaker?

It would surely be uncalled for were I carefully to follow up the man's babblings and ravings on the present scale through-
25 out his volume; yet I would do it willingly (for he swells, they say, with measureless pride and conceit) did he not shield himself behind the enormous ill-composed disordered bulk of his book, like Terence's soldier skulking behind the front

fessus singula notando etiam acerrimus quisque, tædio prius conficeretur, quam omnia redargueret. Nunc ejus quoddam specimen dare hac veluti prolusione duntaxat volui; et cordatis lectoribus a principio statim degustandum hominem
5 præbere, ut in hac paginæ unius promulside experiamur quàm laute nos et luculenter cæteris ferculis accepturus sit: quantas ineptias atque infantias toto opere congesserit, qui tarn densas, ubi minime decuit, in ipsa fronte collocavit. Ex-
10 inde multa garrientem, et scombris concionantem facilè prætere; ad nostras autem res quod attinet, haud dubitamus quin ea, quæ autoritate Parlamenti scripta publice et declarata sunt, apud omnes bonos et prudentes externos plus ponderis habitura sint, quam unius impudentissimi homuncionis calumniæ et mendacia; qui ab exulibus nostris, patriæ hosti-
15 bus, pretio conductus, quolibet eorum dictante quibus operam suam locaverat, aut rumusculum spargente, falsissima quæque corradere, et in chartam conjicere non dubitavit. Utque plane intelligant omnes quam non illi religio sit, quidlibet scribere, verum an falsum, pium an impium, haud alius mihi
20 testis adhibendus erit, quam ipse Salmasius. Scribit is in *Apparatu contra primatum Papæ, maximas cssc causas cur cclesia redire ab episcopatu debeat ad Apostolicam presbyterorum*

ranks;—and a clever plan too—that even the most energetic might weary of marking all the details, and die of boredom before he could refute them. Yet I did wish to give at least a sample by way, so to speak, of the present curtain-raiser, and
5 offer on the spot to let my thoughtful readers taste the man at the beginning, that by trying these *hors d'oeuvres* and *anti-fasti* from a single page we may learn how splendidly he will entertain us with the rest of his gorgeous dishes: how many silly puerilities he will prove to have heaped together in his
10 whole work, who has put them so thick—where least seemly—at its very head and front.

Thenceforward I gladly disregard his much-twaddling harangues, predestined as they are to wrap up mackerels; moreover, as far as concerns our affairs, we doubt not that
15 what has been published and proclaimed by authority of Parliament shall have more weight with all right-minded and judicious foreigners than the lies and slanders of one brazen *petit-monsieur* who has been hired at a price by our exiles, their country's enemies, and has unhesitatingly scraped to-
20 gether and written down utter lies, whenever anyone to whom he has leased his pen spreads a bit of malicious gossip, and gives him his orders.

That all may see clearly how it matters nothing to his conscience what he writes—true or false, holy or unholy,—I
25 shall have to call no other witness than Salmasius himself. In his *Apparatus contra Primatum Papæ* he writes: "The reasons why the church ought to return from Episcopacy to the Apostolic institution" of Elders "are very strong: in Episco-

institutionem; longe majus ex episcopatu introductum in ecclesiam esse malum, quàm illa schismata quæ prius metuebantur: Pestem illam quæ ex eo ecclesias invasit, totum ecclesie corpus miserabili tyrannide pessumdedisse; immo ipsos

5 *reges ac principes sub jugum misisse; Majorem in ecclesiam utilitatem redundaturam Hierarchid totid extinctid, quhm solo capite Papa p. 196. Posse episcopatum cum Papatu tolli cum summo bono ecclesie; sublato episcopatu ruere ipsum Papatum, super illo utpote jundatum, p. 171. Cur removeri de-*

10 *beat in illis regnis quæ jam Papatui renuntidrunt proprias habere causas. Cur ibi episcopatus retineatur se non videre; non integram videri reformationem quæ hac in parte imperjecta sit; nihil afferri posse rationis aut causes probabilis, cur sublato Papatu retineri debeat aut possit episcopatus, p. 197.*

15 *Hæc et multo plura cum ante annos quatuor scripserit, tanta nunc vanitate et impudentia est, ut Parlamentum Angliæ graviter incusare hoc loco audeat, quod episcopatum non solum senatu ejiciendum, sed etiam penitus abjiciendum censuerint. Quid? quod ipsum etiam episcopatum suadet atque*

20 *defendit, iisdem usus argumentis et rationibus, quas libro illo priore magno impetu confutaverat; necessarios nempe juisse episcopos, et omnino retinendos, ne mille pestiferte sectæ et fuerescs in Anglia pullularent. O vafrum et versipellem! adeone te etiam in sacris non puduit desultorem agere, propè*

5 pacy there was brought into the church an evil much greater than those schisms which used to be feared before: the plague which came out of it into the church struck down the whole body of the church beneath a vile despotism: nay, put even
10 kings and princes under the yoke: the church would profit more by the abolition of the whole hierarchy than by the abolition of its head only, the Pope (p. 196). That episcopacy and papacy together might be removed with the greatest benefit to the church: that, episcopacy once removed, papacy itself, as
15 founded thereon, would fall (p. 171). He considers that there are special reasons why it should be done away in those kingdoms which have already renounced papacy, and sees no reason why it should be retained there. That a reformation this part of which has been left unaccomplished seems incomplete:
20 that no jot of reason or probable cause can be adduced why, when Papal supremacy is got rid of, episcopacy ought to be kept, or can be" (p. 197).

But though he wrote all this and much more four years ago, yet now he is so false and so shameless that he dares in this
25 passage violently to reproach the Parliament of England for voting that Episcopacy was to be "not only turned out of the House of Lords, but cast off utterly." Yea, he even recommends and defends episcopacy itself by means of the same reasons and proofs which in that earlier volume of his he had
30 forcibly confuted—namely that "the bishops are necessary" forsooth, "and by all means to be kept, lest a thousand plaguy sects and heresies should burgeon out in England." Sly turncoat, are you not ashamed even in matters of religion to play

dixeram, ecclesiam prodere ? cujus tu ide6 sanctissima instituta tanto strepitu asseruisse videris, ut quoties tibi commodum esset, eo majore cum infamia ea ipsa ludificari atque subvertere posses. Neminem hoc latet, cum regni Ordines, 5 Ecclesiæ nostræ, ad exemplum cæterarum, reformandæ studio flagrantibus, episcopatum funditiis tollere statuissent, prim6 regem intercessisse, dein bellum nobis ea potissimum causa intulisse; quod ipsi tandem in perniciem vertit. I nunc, et te defensorem regium esse gloriare, qui ut regem gnaviter de- 10 fendas, susceptam a temetipso ecclesiæ causam nunc palam prodis atque oppugnas: cujus gravissima quidem censura esses notandus. De forma autem reipub. nostræ, quoniam tu Professor triobolaris et extraneus remotis capsulis atque scriniis tuis nugarum refertissimis, quas melius in ordinem redegisses, 15 in aliena reipub. satagere et odiosus esse mavis, sic breviter tibi, vel cuivis potius te prudentiori respondeo; eam formam esse quam nostra tempora atque dissidia ferunt; non qualis optanda esset, sed qualem obstinata improborum civium discordia esse patitur. Quæ autem respublica factionibus laborat, atque armis se tuetur, si sanæ et integræ tantum partis rationem habet, cæteros sive plebeios sive optimates præterit aut

fast and loose, and—I had almost said—to betray the church, whose most holy ordinances you seem to have defended with so much noise for the very purpose of ridiculing and overturning them with all the deeper ignominy whenever you
5 thought convenient?

Everybody knows that when the Houses of Parliament, ardently desiring to reform our church after the pattern of the rest of the churches, had resolved to abolish episcopacy, first the King vetoed the measure, and next, chiefly for that
10 reason, made war upon us—which at last proved his own undoing. Go now and brag that you defend a king, you, who, to do it to the hilt, now openly betray and attack what you were the very one to support—the cause of the church—and should undergo her heaviest reprimand.

15 To come back, however, to the constitution of the English Commonwealth. Forasmuch as you, a tuppenny-thrippenny outlandish pedant, neglect those desks and portfolios of yours, stuffed as they are with trumpery that you would do better to put in order,—since you, I say, choose instead to play the
20 hateful busybody in the public affairs of a nation not your own,—I give you, then, or, preferably some wiser man than you, this short answer. Our constitution is what the dissensions of our time will permit: not such as were to be desired, but such as the persistent strife of wicked citizens will surfer
25 it to be. But any state soever which in the throes of partisan strife takes up arms for safety, surely does full justice if it maintains relations with its sound and uncontaminated part alone, and expels or removes the rest, whether populace or

excludit, satis profecto sequa est; quamvis regem et proceres, suis ipsa mails edocta, amplius nolit. *Concilium* autem illud *supremum* quod insectaris, atque etiam *Concilii Præsidentem*, nã tu ridiculus es; Concilium enim illud, quod somnias, non
5 est supremum, sed Parlamenti autoritate ad certum duntaxat tempus constitutum, quadraginta virorum ex suo fere numero, quorum quilibet cæterorum suffragiis praises esse potest. Semper autem hoc usitatissimum fuit, ut Parlamentum, qui noster Senatus est, delectos ex suorum numero pau-
10 ciores, quoties visum erat, constitueret: iis unum in locum ubivis conveniendi, et veluti minoris cujusdam habendi Senatus potestas delata est. Iisdem res sæpe gravissimæ, quo celerius et majore cum silentio transigerentur, commissæ atque credits; Classis, exercitus, ærarii cura aut procuratio,
15 quævis denique pacis aut belli munia. Hoc sive concilium nominetur, sive quid aliud, verbo forte novum, re antiquum est; et sine quo nulla omnino Respub. recte administrari potest. De regis autem supplicio, et rerum apud nos conversione mitte vociferari, mitte virus illud tuum acerbitatis evomere; donec
20 ista *quod lege, quo jure, quo judicio* facta sint, te licet repugnantem, singulis capitibus ostendam, et pedem conferam. Si tamen instas *quo jure, quod lege*, ea, inquam, lege quam Deus ipse et natura sanxit, ut omnia quæ reipub. salutaria essent,

patrician,—even though, taught by its own sufferings, it thenceforth utterly refuses a King and a House of Lords.

How absurd of you to rail at our "Supreme Council" and even at a supposed "President of the Council"! For that Council—figment of your dreams—is not supreme, but appointed
5 by authority of Parliament, for a definite time only, of about forty of its members, anysoever of whom may by vote of the rest be president. It has always been, moreover, a well-established practice for Parliament, which is our Senate, to fix a
10 comparatively small number of its members, choose and appoint them, and delegate to them authority to meet anywhere, and to hold, as it were, a kind of smaller Senate. To these, often, weightiest matters were turned over and entrusted, to be despatched the more quickly and quietly: the manage-
15 ment or administration of the navy, the army, the treasury,—in fine, any and all business of peace or war. This body, call it "council" or anything else, may be new in name, but is ancient in substance; without it no commonwealth can be managed properly.

20 Moreover—about the king's execution and about our revolution,—stop your howling, stop that celebrated act of vomiting up the venom of your bitterness, till I fight you hand to hand, and despite your struggles show, chapter by chapter, "in accordance with what law, under what system of right,
25 in virtue of what judgment" (as you put it) these things were done. If you yet insist upon your "What right? What law?"—under that law, I say, which God himself and nature hath appointed, that all things for the safety of the commonwealth

legitima et justa haberentur. Sic olim sapientes tui similibus responderunt. *Leges fer tot annos ratas refixisse nos criminari; bonasne an malas non dicis; nee si diceres audiendus esses; nam nostræ leges Ole quid ad te? Utinam plures re-*
 5 *fixissent turn leges turn leguleios; rectiis sane et rei Christianæ et populo consulissent. Frenes quod tuec, Manii, terra filii, vix domi nobiles, vix suis noli licere sibi crediderint. Meminisses quid te non solum libri sacri, sed etiam Lyricus doceat:*

10

— *Valet ima summit**Mutare, et insignem attenuat Deus**Obscura fromens. —*

Sic etiam habeto; eorum quos tu vix nobiles esse ai's, alios nulli vestrarum partium vel generis nobilitate cedere; alios ex
 15 *se natos per industriam atque virtutem ad veram nobilitatem iter affectare, et cum nobilissimis quibusque posse conferri; se autem malle filios terræ dici, modo suæ, et domi strenue facere, quàm sine terra et lare fumos vendendo quod tu facis, homo nihili et stramineus eques, in aliena terra dominorum*

should be deemed lawful and righteous. Thus did wise men aforetime answer such as you.

You charge us with "having abolished laws that had been settled so many years," but you do not say whether they were
 5 good or bad; nor, if you did, would you be entitled to a hearing; for our laws—Olus, what business are they of yours? Would that they had abolished more of the laws as well as more of the pettifogging lawyers: they would have had more regard for the people, and for the cause of Christianity. You
 10 gnash your teeth because "the Manii, sons of the soil, persons scarce of the nobility at home, scarce known to their own countrymen, should have believed themselves entitled to do such things." You should have remembered what not only Scripture but even the Lyrist teaches you:

15 God can highest with lowest interchange—
 Such is his might;
 Degradeth men of mark,
 But hidden fortunes dark
 Bringeth to light.

20 Take this, too: of those whom you call "scarce noble," some are second to none of your land or kind in nobility; others, being as it were their own ancestors, tread the path to true nobility by way of industry and personal worth, and are comparable with any the noblest soever. They had rather be called
 25 "sons of the soil," too (it being their *own* soil!), and to work hard at home, than be, like you, a landless homeless worthless straw-stuffed scarecrow-knight, selling smoke to stave off star-

nutu et stipendio famem tolerare: ab ista, mihi crede, peregrinatione ad agnatos potius et gentiles deducendus, nisi hoc unum saperes, quod frivolas quasdam pradectiones et nugamenta scis tanta mercede apud exteros effutire. Reprehendis
5 quod magistrates nostri *colluicim omnium Sectarum redpian*; quid ni recipiant? quos ecclesiæ est è cœtu fidelium ejicere, non magistratum è civitate pellere; siquidem in leges civiles non peccant. Primo homines ut tuto ac libere sine vi atque injuriis vitam agerent, convenere in civitatem; ut sanctè
10 et religiose, in ecclesiam; illia leges, hæc disciplinam habet suam, plane diversam: hinc toto orbe Christiano per tot annos bellum ex bello seritur, quod Magistrates et Ecclesia inter se officia confundunt. Quapropter et Papisticam minime toleramus; neque enim earn tarn esse religionem intelligimus,
15 quam obtentu religionis tyrannidem pontificiam civilis potentiaë spoliis ornatam, quæ contra ipsum Christi institutum ad se rapuit. *Independents*, quales a te solo finguntur, nulli apud nos unquam visi; præter eos duntaxat qui cum classes et synodos supra Ecclesiam quamque singularem esse non agnoscant, eas omnes velut Hierarchic particulas quasdam, aut
20 certe truncum ipsum, eradicandas esse tecum sentiunt. Hinc nomen Independentium apud Vulgus obtinuit. Quod restat

vation in a strange land at the beck and call, and in the pay, of masters. Take my word for it, you would soon be sent packing from your foreign tour back to your own kith and kin, but for your one accomplishment: you do know how to blab out
5 trumpery pamphlets among strangers—and what price to get for them.

You blame our magistrates because they "admit the off-scourings of all the sects." Why should they not admit them? It is for the church to expel them from the company of the
10 faithful, not for the magistrates to banish them the country, provided they break no civil law. To live safe and free, without suffering violence or wrong, to this end it was that men first entered into a polity; to live piously and religiously, into a church; the former has its laws, the latter its doctrine and
15 discipline, quite distinct; and it is because the Magistracy and the Church confuse their jurisdictions that for so many years war has sown a harvest of more war throughout all Christendom. This, too, is why we cannot endure Popery; for we perceive it to be not so much a religion as a pontifical despotism
20 decked out, under pretence of religion, with the spoils of civil power, which it has seized unto itself contrary to Christ's own precept.

As for "Independents," none such as are assumed by you (and you alone) have ever been seen among us; except in so
25 far as they recognize no assemblies or synods above each individual congregation, and feel, with you, that such should be uprooted as branches of the Hierarchy, or in fact its very trunk. From this the name of Independents has got popular currency.

video te id agere, ut regum omnium et Monarcharum non invidiam solum, sed etiam bellum atrocissimum in nos concites. Olim rex Mithridates, quamvis causa dissimili, omnes reges in Romanos concitabat, eadem prope calumniatus; Romanis consilium esse, omnia regna subvertere, iis nulla humana neque divina obstare, a principio nihil nisi partum armis habuisse, latrones, regnorum maxime hostes; Hæc Mithridates regi Arsaci. Te vero in ilia tua exedra infantissime rhetoricantem quæ tanta fiducia provexit, ut ad bellum hortando, et licet nolis videri, *classicum canendo*, ullum vel inter pueros regem commovere te posse animum induceres, isto præsertim ore tam exili et rancidulo, ut ne mures quidem Homericos, te buccinatore, bellum unquam ranunculis illaturos fuisse credani? Tantum abest ut metuam quid tu belli nobis aut periculi, homo ignavissime, apud exteros reges ista tua rabida et insulsa simul facundia conflare possis: qui ad illos, acsi *regum capita quasi pilas habeamus, de coronis quasi trocho ludamus, sceptræ imperialia non pluris jaciamus, quam bacula mononum capitata*, lusorie sane nos defers. At tu interea, stultissimum caput, morionis ipse baculo dignissimus es, qui reges ac principes tam puerilibus argumentis ad bellum suaderi putes. Omnes deinde populos inclamas, dicto audientes

Your course is such, I see, as would in the future stir up against us, on the part of all kings and monarchs, not hatred merely, but crudest war. King Mithridates of old tried to rouse all kings against the Romans—for a different reason, to
5 be sure, but by using almost the same slanders: that the Romans were planning to overturn all thrones; that they would allow nothing human or divine to stand in their way; that from the beginning they had never got anything but by violence; that they were a gang of robbers, enemies above all to
10 royal authority. So wrote King Mithridates to King Arsaces. But you, mouthing your unspeakable baby-rhetoric there in your classroom, what overweening self-assurance carried *your* mind to the point of supposing that you could rouse a king (even one still a boy) to war by your urging, and (though you
15 like not to be caught at it) by your "trumpeting the signal to join battle"—especially with so foul a scrannel mouth that Homer's mice, had you been their bugler, would never, I do believe, have made war upon tadpoles!

Just as far am I from fearing any war or danger to us which
20 you, arrant coward, can blow up among foreign kings with your windy rush of raving yet insipid language. You tell tales of us—you must be joking—that we "toss kings' heads like balls, play hoop with crowns, and make no more of imperial sceptres than of fools' bauble-sticks with heads atop." You,
25 most foolish head, are yourself most fit to top a fool's bauble, when you fancy that kings and princes can by such childish reasonings be persuaded to war. Then you cry aloud to all nations, but they, I know full well, will never heed what you

tuo, sat scio, minime futuros. Hibernorum etiam conscelerata illam ac barbaram colluicm regiis partibus in auxilium vocas. Quod unicum indicio esse potest quam scelestus sis et væcors, quam omnes pene mortales impietate, audacia, et
5 furore superes, qui devotee gentis fidem atque opem implorare non dubites, cujus ab impia societate tot civium innocentissimorum sanguine perfusa etiam rex ipse aut abhorruit semper, aut abhorrere se simulavit. Et quam ille perfidiam, quam ille crudelitatem occultare, quantum potuit, atque ab se longe
10 remove summo studio contendit, earn tu, bipedum nequissime, quo minus ultrò atque palam suscipias, neque Deum neque homines vereris. Agedum; Hibernis igitur fautoribus ac sociis ad defensionem regis jam te accinge. Caves imprimis quod cauto mehercule opus erat, nequis te Tullio fortasse aut
15 Demostheni omnem eloquentix laudem præreptum ire suspicetur; et pnedicis, *oratorio more non tibi agendum videri*. Næ tu haud stulte sapis, id quod non potes, non videtur tibi esse agendum; oratorie autem ut tu ageres, quis, qui te satis novit, unquam exspectavit? qui nihil elaborate, nihil distincte,
20 nihil quod sapiat, in lucem emittere aut soles aut potes, sed veluti Crispinus alter, aut Tzetzes ille græculus, modo ut multum scribas, quam recte non laboras; neque si labores valeas. *Agetur, inquis, hæc causa to to or be audicnte, et quasi ad judicandum sedente*. Id adeo nobis pergratum est, ut ad-

say. Even those depraved and barbarous offscourings of Irish you call to the aid of the King's party; and this one thing may be taken as a measure of your wickedness and folly—how you surpass almost all men in irreligion, impudence, and madness; 5 for you scruple not to beg the loyalty and aid of a nation accursed and set apart for destruction, from whose godless fellowship, stained with the blood of so many harmless citizens, even the King himself always shrank in horror—or pretended to shrink. That treachery he did all he could to cover up, and 10 strove with all his might to clear his skirts of that cruelty, which you, most worthless of two-legged creatures, have not respect enough for God or man to keep you from wilfully and publicly adopting. Come on, then, gird up your loins to defend the King—with your Irish for claque and for company! 15 At the beginning you take care (by Jove, a necessary caution!) not to be suspected of a possible design to snatch away all of Tully's or Demosthenes's oratorical laurels; you say in your preface that you think it "not proper for you to behave like an orator." Bright mind—to perceive that what you 20 cannot do is not proper for you to do! Who indeed that knows you well ever looked to see you fill the role of orator?—you who never do, and never can, produce anything rightly developed, anything clean-cut, anything that has gust or savor, but—like a second Crispinus, or Tzetzes that decadent Greek 25 —so you write much, care not how well you write, nor if you care, can do it.

"This cause," you say, "will be tried with the whole world hearing, and, as it were, sitting in judgment." That is what

versarium non cerebrosum et imperitum, qualis tu es, sed cordatum et intelligentem dari jam nobis optemus. Perorans plani tragicus es, immo Ajax ipse Lorarius: *Horum ego injustitiam, impictatem, perfidiam, crudelitaiem proclamabo*
 5 *ccclo et terra, ipsosque authores convictos posteris tradam, redsque pcragam.* O Flosculos! Tiine igitur sine sale, sine genio proclamator et rabula, bonis authoribus divexandis tanturn aut transcribendis natus, quicquam de tuo quod vivat
 10 producere te putas posse? quern una cum scriptis tuis futilissimis abreptum setas, mihi crede, postera oblivioni mandabit. Nisi si defensio hæc regia suo fortasse responso aliquid debitura est, ut neglecta jam pridem et consopita, in manus iterum sumatur. Idque ego ab Illustrissimis Hollandiæ Ordinibus peterem, ut earn e fisco protinus dimissam, neque enim The-
 15 saurus est, pervagari quò velit sinant. Si enim qua vanitate, inscitia, falsitate referta sit, planum omnibus fecero, quo latius excurrit, eò arctius, mea quidem sententia, supprimitur. Jam nos, quemadmodum *rcos peragat*, videamus.

CAPUT I

20 **Q**UONIAM tibi vano homini et ventoso multum hinc forsitan superbix, Salmasi, multum spiritus accessit, magnæ scilicet Britanniæ regem fidei defensor esse, te verò regis, ego quidem et ilium regi titulum,

we like so well that we could wish unto ourselves an adversary not, like you, hot-headed and unskilled, but full of understanding and sagacity. You are quite the tragic hero—quite the Ajax-with-the-Whip, when you perorate: "These men's
5 injustice, impiety, perfidy, cruelty, I will cry out unto heaven and earth; themselves the perpetrators I will turn over to posterity convicted, and transfix the culprits." Ye Little Flowers of Rhetoric! And so, you senseless witless bawling pettifogger, born only to pick good writers to pieces or transcribe them, do
10 you really think yourself capable of writing anything that will live?—you whom posterity—take my word for it—will damn to oblivion with all your scribbled trumpery.—Except perhaps your Royal Defence shall turn out to be something beholden to my answer to it, and after long slumbering unread
15 be once more handled. And this I would petition of the most Illustrious States of Holland, that they would allow it to be straightway dismissed their Treasury—'tis no treasure!—and to wander whither it will. For if I shall have made clear to all what idle talk and ignorance and deceit it is stuffed with,
20 then the more widely it circulates, the more straitly, methinks, it is suppressed. And now let us see how he will "transfix" us "culprits."

CHAPTER I.

INFLATED empty man that you are, Salmasius, you were haply yet more puffed up at the King of Great
25 Britain's being Defender of the Faith, and your being Defender of the King. For my part, I think you deserve your

et hunc tibi jure pari ac merito concedam: cum sane rex fidem, tu regem sic defenderis, ut causam uterque suam evertisse potius videatur. Quod cum passim infnc, turn hoc primo capite ostendam. Dixeras tu quidem prsefationis pagina duodecima,

5 *Ornari pigmentis rhetoricis tarn bonam et justam causam non debere: nam simpliciter rent, ut gesta est, narrare re gem de- jendere est.* Quando igitur toto hoc capite in quo narrationem illam simplicem futuram pollicitus eras, neque rem simplici- ter, ut gesta est, narras, neque non pigmentis, quantum in eo

10 genere consequi potes, rhetoricis ornas, profecto vel tuo ju- dicio si standum esset, causa regia neque bona neque justa erit. Quanquam hoc cave tibi sumas quod dat nemo, posse te quic- quam rhetorice narrare; qui neque oratoris, neque historici, immo ne causidici quidem partes narrando sustinere possis;

15 sed quasi circulator quispiam, arte circumforanea, magnam de te in proemio, velut in posterum diem, expectationem concitabas, non tarn ut rem promissam turn demum narrares, quam ut pigmenta ilia misera, et ampullas fuco refertas lectoribus quam plurimis divenderes. Nam *de facto dicturus tot novi-*

20 *tatum monstris te circumdari ac terreri sentis, ut quid pri- mum exequaris, quid deinde quid postremb, nescias.* Hoc- cine est simpliciter narrare? dicam quod res est, tot tuorum ipse mendaciorum monstris, primum terreri te sentis, deinde tot nugis, tot ineptiis levissimum illud caput non *circundari*

tides both alike; for the king so defended the faith, and you have so defended him, that each of you seems rather to have ruined his case; as I shall make appear throughout the whole ensuing discourse, and particularly in this first chapter. You
5 told us on the twelfth page of your preface that "so good and just a cause needed no rhetorical colouring, for simply to tell the thing as it occurred was to defend the king." Yet in your first chapter, in which you had promised us that your tale would be plain, you neither tell the thing simply as it occurred,
10 nor abstain from adorning it with such rhetorical colors as you can command; so that—to take your own view of it—the king's cause will be neither good nor just.

Nevertheless, be careful not to attribute to yourself (what nobody grants you) the ability to state the facts of a case as
15 a right orator ought; for you can play the part neither of an orator nor of an historian, nor even of a hired partisan advocate. Like some itinerant hawker, instead, touting from fair to fair, you in your preface kept raising great expectations of next day's performance—not that you might at last relate the
20 facts you promised, but that you might peddle out to as many readers as possible those your wretched bottlefuls of rhetoric-paint and fustian dye. For "being now about to give us an account of the matter of fact," you find yourself "encompassed and affrighted with so many monsters of novelty"
25 that you "know not what to say first, what next, and what last." Is this your plain tale? I will tell you what is the matter with you. First of all you find yourself affrighted at your own monstrous lies, and next you find that empty head of yours not

solum, sed circumagi, *ut quid primum, quid deinde, quid postremb* dicendum ullo tempore sit, non modo nunc *nescias*, sed nunquam antea non nesciveris. *Inter difficulties qua occurrunt ad exprimendam tarn incredibilis flagitii im-*
5 *manitatem hoc unum facile dictu suppetit, quod iterum iterumque repeti debet, nempe solem ipsum atrocius factum nunquam adspexisse alter urn.* Multa sol aspexit, bone magister, qux Bernardus non vidit. Solem autem iterum atque iterum repetas licebit, id tu quidem prudenter feceris, quod non
10 nostra flagitia, sed defensionis tuæ frigus vehementissime postulabit. *Regum, inquis, origo cum sole novo cæpit.* Dii te, Damasippe, dexque solstitio donent, quo te caifacias, qui ne pedem sine *sole*; nequis fortasse te umbraticum doctorem esse dicat. At hercle etiam in tenebris es, qui jus patrium a regio
15 non distinguis: et cum reges Patriæ Patres nominaveris, ea statim metaphora persuasisse credis, ut quicquid de patre non negaverim, id continuo de rege verum esse concedam. Pater et rex diversissima sunt. Pater nos genuit; at non rex nos, sed nos regem creavimus. Patrem natura dedit populo, regem
20 ipse populus dedit sibi; non ergo propter regem populus, sed propter populum rex est; ferimus patrem, morosum etiam et durum, ferimus et regem; sed ne patrem quidem ferimus ty-

only "encompassed" but set awirl with so many trifles and follies that what was fit to be said first, what next, what last, you not only do not know, but never did know.

"Amid the difficulties of expressing the heinousness of so
5 incredible a piece of impiety, this expression alone offers
itself," you say, "which is easily said and must be oft re-
peated," to wit, "that the sun itself never beheld a more out-
rageous action." My good schoolmaster, the sun has beheld
many things that Bernard never saw. Yet we are content you
10 should bring in the sun over and over, and you shall act wisely
so to do, for it will be insistently required—not by our wick-
edness but by the frigidity of your defence. "The origin of
kings," you say, "arose with the new-created sun." May the
gods and goddesses, Damasippus, bless you with a solstice
15 to warm yourself withal, that cannot warm a foot enough to
stir a foot without "the sun."

Perhaps you would avoid the imputation of being called a
doctor that lounges in the shade. Alas, your shade is utter
darkness! You make no difference betwixt a paternal power
20 and a regal; and, once you have called kings fathers of their
country, fancy this metaphor so persuasive that whatever I
would admit concerning a father I would at once grant true
of a king. A king and a father are very different things. Our
fathers begot and made us; our king made not us, but we him.
25 Nature gave the people fathers, but the people itself gave
itself a king; so that the people is not for the king, but the
king for the people. We bear with a father, as we do with
a king, though he be harsh and severe; but we do not bear

rannum. Pater si filium interficit, capite poenas dabit: cur non item rex eadem justissima lege tenebitur, si populum, id est filios suos, perdiderit? præserdm cum pater, ut ne pater sit, efficere non possit, rex facile possit, ut neque pater sit neque
 5 rex. Quod si *de jacti qualitate*, quod ai's, *inde* æstimandum est, tibi dico, peregrine, et rebus nostris alienissime, testis oculatus et indigena tibi dico; nos regem neque *bonum*, neque *justum*, neque *clementem*, neque *religiosum*, neque *pium*, neque *pacificum*; fed hostem prope decennalem; nee paren-
 10 tern patrise, sed vastatorem *de medio sustulisse*. *Solct hoc fieri*, fateris, inficias enim ire non audes, *sed non a reformatis, regi reformato*. Siquidem reformatus is dici potest, qui scriptis ad Papam literis, Sanctissimum appellaverat Patrem, qui Papistis æquior semper quæm Orthodoxis fuit. Talis cum fuerit, ne
 15 suæ quidem familiæ primus è reformatis est *de medio* sublatus. Quid? ejus avia Maria nonne a reformatis exuta regno solum vertere coacta est, supplicio demum capitis affecta, ne Scods quidem reformatis ægre ferendibus? immo si operam contulisse dicam, haud mentiar. In tanta autem regum *rejo-*
 20 *matorum* paucitate, nihil hujusmodi accidisse, ut eorum aliquis morte plecteretur, non est quod miremur. Licere autem regem nequam, sive tyrannum regno pellere, vel supplicio quovis, prout meritus erit, punire (etiam summorum senten-

with even a father, if he be a tyrant. If a father murder his child, he shall suffer capital punishment; and why should not a king likewise be subject to the same most just law if he have destroyed the people his children ? Especially as a father
5 can never cease to be such, but a king can easily bring it to pass that he shall be neither father nor king. If this "action" of ours is to be considered "next" according to its "quality," as you call it, I who am an eye-witness and a native, tell you, who are a foreigner and an utter stranger to our affairs,
10 that we "removed from among us" a king neither "good," nor "just," nor "merciful," nor "devout," nor "godly," nor "peaceable," as you style him, but one who was an enemy to us for almost ten years, and no father, but a destroyer of his country.

15 You confess, for you dare not deny it, that "such things have been practised, but not by Protestants upon a Protestant king." As if he deserved the name of Protestant, who in a letter to the Pope could give him the title of Most Holy Father, and who was always more favorable to the papists
20 than to those of the right faith. And being such, he is not the first, even of his own family, that has been removed "from among us" by Protestants. What! Was not his grandmother Mary deposed and banished and at last beheaded by Protestants, while not even the Scottish Protestants took it ill ? Nay,
25 if I should say they were parties to it, I should not lie. There being so few Protestant kings, no wonder it never happened that one of them was put to death. But that it is lawful to depose a wicked king or a tyrant, and to punish him accord-

tia Theologorum, qui ipsi reformandæ ecclesiæ authores
fuere) aude tu modò negare. Concedis quam plurimos reges
non sicca morte periisse, hunc *gladio*, illum *veneno*, alium
squalore *careens*, aut *laqueo*. Omnium tamen hoc tibi miser-
5 rimum videtur, et monstri quiddam simile, regem in judi-
cium adduci, *causam capitis dicere coactum, condemnatum,*
secum percussum. Die mihi, homo insipientissime, annon hu-
manius, annon æquius, annon ad leges omnium civitatum
accomodatius est, cujuscunque criminis reum in judicio si-
10 stere, sui defendendi copiam facere, lege condemnatum ad
mortem haud immeritam ducere, ita ut damnato vel poeni-
tendi, vel se colligendi spatium detur, quam statim ut prehen-
sus est, indicta causa pecudis in modum mactare? Quotus-
quisque est reorum, qui, si optio detur, non illo potius quam
15 hoc modo puniri se maluerit? Quæ ratio igitur animadver-
tendi in populum moderatior in rege est habita, cur non ea-
dem animadvertendi in regem moderatior in populo, et vel
ipsi regi acceptior fuisse creditur? Tu secreto, et sine arbitris
extinctum regem malebas, vel ut exempli tarn boni salubritate
20 omnis memoria careret, vel ut facti tarn præclari conscientia
defugisse lucem, aut leges atque ipsam justitiam minime sibi
faventem habuisse videretur. Exaggeras deinde rem, quòd

ing to his deserts, nay, that this is the opinion of eminent divines who have been the very leaders in the late reformation, do you deny it if you dare. You admit that great numbers of kings have met a violent death, some "by the sword," some
5 "by poison," some in a filthy "dungeon," some "in a noose"; but for a king to be brought to trial, "to be put to plead for his life, to be condemned, and brought to the block"—this you think a more lamentable instance than all the rest, and make it a prodigious piece of impiety. Tell me, superlative fool,
10 whether it be not more humane, more just, more agreeable to the laws of all civilized states, to bring a criminal, be his offence what it may, before a court of justice, to give him the opportunity of defending himself, and if the law condemn him, then to put him to death as he has deserved, so as he may
15 have time to repent or to compose himself; than presently, as soon as ever he is taken, to butcher him like a sheep, without trial or hearing? Is there a malefactor in the world who if he might have his choice would not choose to be punished that way rather than this? And if that proceeding be accounted
20 the fairer of the two when used by king against subjects, why should it not be so counted when used by subjects against king? Nay, why should we not think that himself liked it better? You would have had him killed in secret, without witnesses, either that all history might lose the advantage of
25 so good an example, or that this glorious action might in supposed guilt seem to have shunned the light, as having no law or even justice on its side.

Next you aggravate the matter by telling us that it was not

neque per tumultum aut factionem optimatum, aut rebel-
Hum furorem, sive militum sive populi; non odio, non metu,
non studio dominandi, non cacco animi impetu, sed consilio et
ratione meditatam diu facinus peregerint O merito quidem
5 te ex jurisconsulto Grammaticum! qui ab accidentibus causæ,
ut loquuntur, quæ per se nihil valent, vituperationes instituis,
cum nondum docueris illud facinus in vitio an in laude ponen-
dum sit. Jam vide quam in te facile incurram. Si pulchrum
et decorum fuit, eo magis laudandi quod nullis affectibus
10 occupati, solius honestatis causa fecerint; si arduum et grave,
quod non caxo impetu, sed consilio et ratione. Quanquam
ego *hæc* divino potius instinctu gesta esse crediderim, quoties
memoria repeto, quam inopinato animorum ardore, quanto
consensu totus exercitus, cui magna pars populi se adjunxerat,
15 ab omnibus pene regni provinciis una voce regem ipsum suo-
rum omnium malorum authorem ad supplicium depoposce-
rit. Quicquid erat, sive magistratum, sive populum spectes,
nulli unquam excelsiore animo, et, quod etiam adversarii fa-
tentur, sedatiore, tarn egregium facinus et vel heroicis ætatibus
20 dignum aggressi sunt: quo non leges tantum et judicia, de-
hinc mortalibus ex æquo restituta, sed ipsam justitiam nobili-

done in the uproar of party strife amongst our nobles, or in a raging rebellion either of the people or of the army, or through hatred or fear or ambition or blind precipitate rashness, but was long designed and thought upon, and accomplished deliberately. You did well from advocate to turn 5 grammarian! For from the accidents of a case, so to speak, which in themselves sway neither one way nor another, you inveigh against it before you have proved the deed itself either good or bad. See how easily I refute you: if the deed 10 was well and seemly, they that did it deserve the greater praise in that they were prepossessed with no passions, but did that they did for virtue's sake; if it was difficult and grievous, the greater praise for doing it not upon blind impulse but upon deliberation and design. Though for my own part, when I 15 call to mind with how unexpected an importunity and fervency of mind, and with how unanimous a consent, the whole army and a great part of the people from almost every county in the kingdom cried out with one voice for justice against the king as the very author of all their calamities, I cannot but 20 think that these things were brought about rather by a divine impulse. However that may be, whether we consider the magistrates or the body of the people, no men ever undertook with a loftier courage, and, as our adversaries themselves confess, with a more tranquil mind, an action so distinguished, 25 so worthy of heroic ages—an action whereby they ennobled not only law and its enforcement, which thenceforth seem restored to all men equitably, but Justice's very self, and ren-

tarunt, seque ipsa illustriorem dehinc, seque ipsa majorem post hoc insigne judicium reddiderunt. Jam tertiam prope hujus capituli paginam exantlavimus, nee tamen illa simplex narratio, quam promisit, usquam apparet. Queritur nos do-
5 cere, *quoties rex molesti et odiose regnat, impune fosse regno exui: ab hac, inquit, doctrina inducti, si mille rebus meliorem regem habuissent, non ei vitam conservassent.* Spectate hominis acumen; nam istuc aveo ex te scire, quo pacto hoc sequitur, nisi tu nobis concesseris, nostro rege mille
10 rebus meliorem moleste et odiose regnare; unde in eum deductus es locum, ut hunc quern defendis, iis regibus qui molestè et odiose regnant mille rebus deteriore facias; id est tyrannorum omnium fortasse immanissimum. Macti estote reges tarn strenuo defensore. Nunc narrare incipit. *Torse-*
15 *runt eum variis crucibus.* Die quibus. *De carcere in carcerem traduxerunt.* Nee injuria, quippe ex tyranno hostem bello captum. *Custodiis safe mutatis: ne ipsæ mutarent fidem. Libertatis interdum sfe ostensa, interdum et restitutionis per pactionem.* Vide quam non antea meditatam nobis fuerit,
20 quam non *tempora et modos* diu captavimus regis abdicandi. Quas res ab eo turn propemodum victore multo ante postu-

dered her after so signal a judgment more glorious, more august, than even she had been before.

We have now toiled to the end of the third page of his first chapter, and have not yet the plain tale he promised us. He
5 complains of our doctrine "that a king ruling burdensomely and odiously may lawfully be deposed: according to this," he says, "if they had had a king better in a thousand respects than the one they had, they would not have spared his life," Keen reasoned I long to have you tell me how this follows,
10 unless you allow that a king a thousand ways better than our king may rule burdensomely and odiously. So now you have brought yourself to a pass where you make out the king that you defend a thousand ways worse than kings whose government is burdensome and odious, that is, the most monstrous
15 perhaps of all tyrants. Kings, I wish you joy of 'o brisk a defender!

Now his narrative begins, "They put him to several sorts of torments." Give instances. "They removed him from prison to prison"; and so they might lawfully, for from a tyrant he
20 was become a public enemy taken in war. "Often changing his guards,"—lest his guards should change their fidelity. "Sometimes they gave him hopes of liberty—sometimes even of restoring him to his crown upon articles of agreement." It seems then the taking away his life was not done upon so
25 long premeditation as he talked of before, and that we did not so long before lay hold on all "opportunities and means" to renounce our king. Those things that we demanded of him in the beginning of the war, when he had almost brought us

lavimus, quæ nisi concederentur, nulla libertas, nulla salus populo speranda erat, easdem a captivo suppliciter, baud semel, immo ter et amplius petivimus; toties repulsam accepimus. Cum nulla de rege spes reliqua esset, fit Parlamenti
5 consultum illud nobile, nequa deinceps ad regem postulata mitterentur; non ex quo is tyrannus esse, sed ex quo insana- bilis esse coepit. Postea tamen quidam ex Senatorum numero nova sibi consilia capientes, et idoneum tempus nacti, condi- tiones iterum regi ferendas decernunt; pari sane scelere atque
10 dementia ac Romanus olim Senatus, reclamante Marco Tullio et cum eo bonis omnibus, legatos decrevit ad Antonium: pari etiam eventu, nisi Deo immortalis visum aliter fuisset, illos in servitutem tradere, nos in libertatem vindicare. Nam cum rex nihilo plus quam antea concessisset, quod ad firmam pacem
15 et compositionem revera spectaret, illi tamen satisfactum sibi a rege esse statuunt. Pars itaque sanior, cum se remque publicam prodi videret, fidem fortissimi, et semper reipub. fidis- simi exercitus implorat. In quo mihi quidem hoc solum occurrit quod nolim dicere, nostras legiones rectiora sensisse
20 quàm patres conscriptos; et salutem reipub. armis attulisse, quam illi suis suffragiis prope damnaverant. Multa deinde

under—things the denial of which would cut our people off from all hope of liberty and safety—those very things we petitioned of him when he was our prisoner, petitioned humbly and submissively, not once or twice, but thrice and often-
5 er, and were as often denied. When we had now lost all hopes of the king's complying with us, then was made that noble order of Parliament that from that time forward there should no articles be sent to the king; so that we left off not from the time he began to be a tyrant, but from the time he began
10 to be incurable. Still, afterward some Parliament men set upon a new project, and meeting with a convenient opportunity to put it in practice, passed a vote to send proposals once more to the king. Their wickedness and folly nearest resembles that of the Roman Senate, who, against the opinion
15 of Marcus Tullius and all honest men, voted to send ambassadors to Antony; and the event had been the same, but that it pleased God Almighty to order it otherwise—to deliver *them* into slavery, but to assert our liberty. For though the king did not agree to anything that might conduce to a firm
20 peace and settlement more than he had before, they go and vote themselves satisfied. Then the sounder part of the house, finding themselves and the commonwealth betrayed, implore the aid of the army, valiant and ever faithful to the commonwealth. Whereon I can observe only this, which yet I am
25 loath to utter: that our soldiers showed better judgment than our senators, and saved the commonwealth by their arms, when the other by their votes had almost ruined it.

Then he tells a long tale of woe in a lamentable strain,

flebiliter narrat, verum tarn inscite, ut luctum emendicare, non commovere videatur. Dolet, quod *co modo, quo nullus unquam, rex supplicium capitis passus sit*: cum sæpius affirmaverit, nullum unquam regem supplicium capitis omnino
 5 esse passum. Tune, fatue, modum cum modo conferre soles, ubi factum cum facto quod conferas non habes? *Supplicium, inquit, capitis passus est, ut latro, ut sicarius, ut parricida, ut proditor, ut tyrannus.* Hoccine est regem defendere, an sententiam de rege ferre, ea sane qua? a nobis lata est, multo seve-
 10 riorem? quis te tarn subito pellexit ut nobiscum pronuntiares? Queritur *personates carnifices regi caput amputasse.* Quid hoc homine facias? questus est supra *de parricidio in persona regis admissio*, nunc in persona carnificis admissum queritur. Quid reliqua percurram, partim falsissima, partim frivola *de*
 15 *pugnis et calcibus militum gregariorum, et licentiâ spectandi cadaveris quatuor solidis taxatâ*, quæ frigidissimi literatoris inscitiam et pusillitatem animi clamitant; legentem certe neminem pilo tristiore reddere possunt: satius mehercule fuisset Carolo filio, quemvis ex eo balatronum grege con-
 20 duxisse, qui ad coronam in triviis elegidia cantant, quam oratorem hunc, luctificabilem dicam, an perridiculum deploro.

but so senselessly that he seems rather begging his readers please to be sorrowful than moving them to sorrow. It grieves him "to think that the king should undergo capital punishment after such a manner as no other king had ever done"—
5 though he had often told us before that there never was a king that underwent capital punishment at all. Fool, are you wont to compare manner with manner when you have not fact to compare with fact? "He suffered death," says he, "as a robber, as a murderer, as a parricide, as a traitor, as a
10 tyrant." Is this defending the king, or is it not rather giving a more severe judgment upon him than the one we gave? Who has so suddenly drawn you round to give sentence with us? He complains "that masked executioners cut off the king's head." What shall we do with this fellow? He complained before of "a murder done in the mask of a king"; now he complains that it was done in the mask of an executioner.

It were to no purpose to take particular notice of every false or silly thing he says. He tells stories of "bufferings and
20 kicks that were given by common soldiers, and how it cost fourpence to see the dead body." These and such-like stories betray the ignorance and small-mindedness of our poor scholar, but are far from making any reader ever a whit the sadder. To bewail his father's misfortunes the younger
25 Charles had done better, in good faith, to have hired one of the mountebanks that chant their doleful ballads to the crowd at a street corner, than this lamentable—shall I call

rando patris infortunio adhibuisse; tarn insipidum et insulsum, ut ne ex lacrymis quidem ejus mica salis exiguissima possit exprimi. Narrare jam desiit; et quid deinde agat, dictu sane difficile est; adeo lutulentus et enormis fluit; nunc fremit, nunc oscitat, nullum quidlibet garrandi modum sibi statuit, vel decies eadem repetendi, quæ ne semel quidem dicta non sordescerent. Et certe nescio, an blateronis cujuspiam extemporales quadibet nugæ, quas ille uno pede stans versiculis forte efTudisset, non digniores multo fuissent quæ chartis illinentur: usque eo indignissimas esse reor quibus serio respondeatur. Prastereo quod regem *religionis protectorem* laudat, qui ecclesiæ bellum intulit, ut episcopos religionis hostes et tyrannos in ecclesia retineret. *Puritatcm autem religionis* qui potuit is conservare, ab impurissimis episcoporum traditionibus et cæremoniis ipse sub jugum missus? *Sectarurn* vero, quibus tu *sacrileges suos coetus tenendi licentiam ais dari*, quam ipsa Hollandia non dat, errores velim enumeres: interim nemo te magis sacrilegus, qui perpetuo maledicendi pessimam omnium licentiam tibi sumis. *Non poterant gravius rempubl. Icedere quhm ejus dominum tollendo.* Disce verna, disce mastigia, nisi dominum tollis, tollis rempublicam: privata res est, non publica quæ dominum habet. *At pastores jacinus eorum abominantes cum summa injustitia persequuntur.* Pastores illos nequis fortè nesciat quales sint, breviter dicam;

him ?—or rather most laughable—orator, so flat and tasteless that his very tears want salt.

Now his narrative is done; and it is hard to say what he does next, his discourse runs so muddy and irregular. Now he
5 rages, then he gapes, and keeps no method in his chatter but to repeat the same things ten times over that could not but be disgusting said but once. Really I know not but that the trumpety stuff of any babbling *improvisatorc*, rhymed extempore while he stands on one foot, were better worth daubing
10 paper withal; so far am I from thinking aught he says worthy of a serious answer.

I pass by his praising as "protector of religion" a king who chose to make war upon the church rather than part with those church tyrants and enemies of religion, the bish-
15 ops. How is it possible, moreover, for one to "maintain religion in its purity" that was himself a slave to those impure traditions and ceremonies of theirs? And pray tell what errors you ascribe to those our "sects, whose sacrilegious meetings," you say, "have a public license" which even Holland
20 grants not. Meanwhile no one is more sacrilegious than you, who take unto yourself—worst license of all—the license of incessant slander. "They could not wound the commonwealth more dangerously than by taking off its master." You menial slave, learn, while you wait the lash, that unless ye
25 take away the master, ye destroy the commonwealth, for 'tis a private wealth, not a common wealth, that owns a master. "They persecute most unjustly those pastors that abhor this deed of theirs." Lest it be not clear what pastors he means, I

iidem sunt qui regi resistendum armis esse, et verbo et scriptis docuerant; qui omnes tanquam Merozum indesinenter execrari non destiterant, quotquot huic bello aut arma, aut pecuniam, aut vires non suppeditassent; quod illi non contra regem, sed contra tyrannum Saule quovis aut Achabo, immo Nerone ipso Neroniorem susceptum esse in concionibus sacris vaticinabantur. Sublatis episcopis et sacerdotibus, quos Pluralistarum et non residentium nomine insectari vehementissime solebant, in eorum amplissima sacerdotia, hic bina, ille 10 trina, quam ocysse irruebant: unde suos greges quam turpiter negligant pastores isti merito egregii nemo non videt: nullus pudor, nulla numinis reverentia dementes cupiditate et furiatos cohibere potuit, donec pessimo ecclesiae publico eadem ipsi infamia flagrarent, quam paulo ante sacerdotibus 15 inusserant. Nunc quod avaritia eorum nondum satiata est, quod iniquis ambitione animus turbas concire, pacem odisse consuevit, in Magistrates qui nunc sunt, id quod prius in regem fecerant, scditios concionari non desinunt; regem scilicet pium crudeliter sublatum; quem modo ipsi diris omnibus 20 devotum, omni authoritate regia spoliandum, et bello sacro persequendum, in manus Parlamento, quasi divinitus, tradiderant; sectas scilicet non exstirpari; quod certe a magistratibus postulare perabsurdum est, qui avaritiam et ambitionem, quae *dux* in ecclesia hæreses perniciosissimae sunt, ex 25 ipsorum ordine pastorum ac tribu, nullo adhuc modo aut ra-

shall say briefly: they were those very men who by their writings and sermons justified taking up arms against the king; who cursed without ceasing, as Deborah did Meroz, all such as would not help this war with arms or men or money; who
5 kept preaching to their congregations that they were fighting not against a king but against a greater tyrant than any Saul or Ahab, nay, one that out-Nero'd Nero. As soon as the bishops and the priests, whom they used to rail at with the names of pluralists and absentees, were taken out of their way, in-
10 stantly they jump, some into two, some into three, of their best benefices; so that everybody knows how foully these herdsmen, so deservedly raised above the common herd, neglect their own. Their wild covetousness brake through all restraints of modesty and religion, till they were branded before
15 the church (ill notoriety!) with the same infamy which they had branded but a little before upon the priests. Their covetousness yet unsated, and their restless ambition grown accustomed to raise tumults and hate peace, they cease not to preach up sedition against the government now established, as they
20 had formerly done against the king. He was a kindly king cruelly murdered, they say—this king upon whom but just now themselves had heaped all their curses, and delivered up as by God's will to the Parliament, to be despoiled of his royalty and pursued with a holy war. They now complain that
25 the sects are not extirpated: a most absurd thing to ask of the magistrates, who never yet by any means or method have been able to extirpate avarice and ambition—the two heresies that are most calamitous to the church—out of the very order and

tione extirpare valuerunt. Quas illi sectas apud nos msectantur, obscuras esse scio; quas ipsi sequuntur, famosas, et ecclesiae Dei longe periculosiores; quarum principes Simon ille Magus et Diotrephes fuere. Hos tamen, nequissimi cum sint,
5 adeo non persequimur, ut factiosis et res novas quotidie molientibus nimium indulgeamus. Offendit jam te Gallum et errabundum, quod Angli *suis molossis, quæ* tua canina facundia est, *ferociores*, nullam *legitimi successors et heredis* regni, nullam *natu minimi*, nullam *reginæ Bohemæ* ratio-
10 nem habuerint. Tute respondebis tibi, non ego. *Ubi reipub. forma mutatur ex monarchica in aliam, non datur successio inter differentis regiminis curatores*; Apparatus. de primatu. *Minima*, inquis, *regni unius pars hæc omnia per tria regna* effecit: et digni quidem, si hoc verum esset, quibus in caeteros
15 imperium sit, viris in foeminas. *Isti sunt, qui regimen regni antiquum in alium qui hæc fluribus tyrannis teneatur, mutare presumpserunt*; recte quidem illi et feliciter; quos tu reprehendere non potes, quin simul foedissime barbarus et soloecus
20 opprobrium. *Angli maculam hanc nunquam delcverint*. Immo tu, licet omnium literatorum litura ipse sis, et vere macula, Anglorum tamen famam et sempiternam gloriam nunquam

estate of the ministers themselves. For the sects which they inveigh against, there are obscure ones, I know; but their own sects are notorious, and much more dangerous to the church of God: their heresiarchs were Simon Magus and Diotrophes.

5 Yet are we so far from persecuting these men, though they are pestilent enough, that, though we know them to be ill-affected to the government, and plotting change, we allow them but too much liberty.

You, vagabond Frenchman, seem displeas'd that "the
10 English, more fierce and cruel than their own mastiffs," as your barking eloquence has it, "have no regard to the lawful successor and heir of the crown, and take no care of die king's youngest son, or of the Queen of Bohemia." You, not I, shall answer yourself. "When the frame of a government is changed
15 from a monarchy to any other, the succession is not granted among the new-modellers" (*Apparatus de Primatu Papae*). "The great change throughout three kingdoms," you say, "was brought about by a small minority in one of them." If so, that small minority were worthy to have dominion over
20 the rest, as men over women. "These are they that presumptuously took upon them to change the ancient government of the realm into one held by many tyrants"—and well and auspiciously too! You cannot find fault with them without being a filthy barbarian and solecist, as well in morals as in syntax—
25 you shame of all grammarians. "The English will never be able to wash out this stain." Nay, you, though a blot and stain to all learned men, were never yet able to stain the renown and everlasting glory of the English nation, that with so great

valueris commaculare. Qui tanta animi magnitudine, quanta
omni memoria vix audita est, non hostes tantum armatos, sed
hostiles intus, id est, superstitiosas vulgi opiniones eluctati
atque supergressi, Liberatorum cognomen posthac per omnes
5 gentes in commune sibi pepererunt: populariter id ausi, quod
apud alias nationes heroi'cæ tantum virtutis esse existimatur.
Reformat! et antiqui Christiani quid hac in parte fecerint, aut
facturi fuissent, turn respondebimus, cum de jure tecum suo
loco agetur; ne tuo vitio laboremus, qui gerrones omnes et
10 Battos loquacitate vincis. Quæris quid sis in nostra causa *Jesu-*
itis responsurus. Tuas res age transfuga; pudeat te facinorum
tuorum, quando ecclesiam tui pudet; qui primatum Papæ, et
episcopos tarn jactanter modò et ferociter adortus, nunc episco-
porum assecla factus es. Fateris *aliquos reformatorem*, quos
15 non nominas (ego tamen nominabo, quoniam tu eos *Jcsuitis*
longt pejores esse ai's, Lutherum nempe, Zuinglium, Calvi-
num, Bucerum, Paræum cum aliis multis) docuisse, *amo-*
vendum csse tyrannum: quis autem sit tyrannus ad judicium
sapientum, et doctorum sc retulisse. Isti verb qui? an sapien-
20 *tes, an docti, an virtute nobiles, an nobilitate illustres?* Liceat,
quarso, populo, qui servitutis jugum in cervicibus grave sentit,
tarn sapienti esse, tarn docto, tamque nobili, ut sciat quid ty-

a resolution as we hardly find the like recorded in any history, struggled with, and overcame, not only their enemies in the field, but the hostile — that is, superstitious — persuasions of the common people, and won for themselves in general
5 amongst all posterity the name of Deliverer: the body of the people having undertook and performed an enterprise which in other nations is thought to proceed only from the magnanimity peculiar to heroes.

What "the Protestants and primitive Christians" did or
10 would do upon such an occasion, I will tell you hereafter, when we come to debate the merits of the cause; not to be guilty of your fault, who outdo in prolixity all the babbling Battuses. You wonder how you shall be able to answer all the Jesuits in our behalf. Mind your own business, renegade, and
15 be ashamed of your own actions, for the church is ashamed of you, who, though but of late you so boastfully and fiercely attacked the Pope's supremacy and the bishops, are now yourself become the bishops' sycophant. You confess that "some Protestants have asserted it lawful to depose a tyrant," and you do
20 not name them; but I will, because you say "they are far worse than the Jesuits." They are no other than Luther, and Zwingli, and Calvin, and Bucer, and Pareus, and many besides. "The question, though, who shall be accounted a tyrant," you say, "they have referred to the judgment of learned men and
25 wise. But what for men were these? Were they wise men, or learned? Were they anywise remarkable for either virtue or nobility?" A people that has felt the yoke of slavery heavy on its neck may well be allowed to be wise and learned and noble

ranno suo faciendum sit, etiamsi neque externos, neque grammaticos sciscitatum mittat. Tyrannum autem fuisse hunc non Anglise solum et Scoriæ Parlamenta ciim verbis turn factis disertissimis declaraverunt, sed totus fere utriusque regni populus assensus est; donee episcoporum technis et fraudibus in duas postea factiones discessit. Quid si Deus, quemadmodum eos qui lucis evangelicæ participes fiant, ita eos qui decreta ejus in reges hujus mundi potentissimos exequantur, non multos sapientes aut doctos, non multos potentes, non multos no-

10 biles esse voluit ? ut per eos qui non sunt, aboleret eos qui sunt; ut ne gloriatur caro coram eo. Tu quis es qui oblatras? an doctus ? qui spicilegia, qui lexica et glossaria ad senectutem usque trivisse potius videris, quam authores bonos cum judicio aut fructu perlegisse; unde nil præter codices, et varias

15 lectiones, et luxatum et mendosum crepas; doctrinæ solidioris ne guttulum quidem hausisse te ostendis. An tu sapiens ? qui de minutiis minutissimis rixari, et mendicorum bella gerere soles, qui nunc astronomis, nunc medicis in sua arte credendis imperitus ipse et rudis convitia dicis; qui, siquis tibi voculæ

20 unius aut literulæ in exemplari quovis abs te restitute glorio- lam præripere conaretur, igni et aqua, si posses, illi interdiceres ? Et tamen stomacharis, et tamen ringeris, quod omnes te Grammaticum appellant. Hamondum nuper regis hujus

enough to know what should be done to its oppressor, though it send not to ask either foreigners or grammarians. But that this man was a tyrant not only the Parliaments of England and Scotland have declared by actions and words the clearest, but
5 almost all the people of both nations assented to it—till by the tricks and artifices of the bishops they were divided into two factions. For the execution of His decrees upon the most potent kings of this world, what if it has pleased God to choose such men as He chooses to be made partakers of the light of
10 the Gospel ? "Not many wise or learned, not many mighty, not many noble; that by those that are not He might bring to naught those that are; that no flesh glory in His presence."

And who are you to scold at this ? A learned man ?—you that even unto your old age seem rather to have turned over
15 phrase-books and lexicons and glossaries than to have perused good authors with judgment or profit; so that you prate of naught but manuscripts and various readings and dislocated passages and scribal errors, but show that you have drunk never the least drop of more substantial learning. A wise
20 man ?—you that use to carry on your beggarly disputes about the meanest trifles ? You that being altogether ignorant in astronomy and physic, yet are always reviling astronomers and physicians who should be trusted in their own faculties ? You that if any one should offer to deprive you of the vain glory of
25 having corrected or supplied the least word or letter in any copy you have criticised, would ban him, if you could, with the ban of fire and water ? And yet you snarl in anger because everybody calls you a grammarian ! In some trumpery book

Sacellanum imprimis dilectissimum in libro quodam nugatorio nebulonem appellas, quòd is te Grammaticum appellavisset: idem, credo, esses ipsi regi convitium facturus, et defensionem hanc totam retractaturus, si Sacellani sui de te iudicium approbasse audivisses. Jam vide quam te Anglorum unus, quos tu *janaticos, indoctos, obscuros, improbos* vocitare audes, contemnam et ludibrio habeam, nam nationem ipsam Anglicanam de te quicquam publice cogitare curculiunculo, indignissimum esset; qui sursum, deorsum, quoquoversum
10 versatus et volutatus, nihil nisi grammaticus es: immo quasi Deo nescio cui votum ipso Mida stultius nuncupasses, quicquid attrectas, nisi ctim soloecismos facis, Grammatica est. Quisquis igitur *de fæce ilia plebis*, quam tu exagitas, (illos enim vere optimates nostros, quorum sapientiam, virtutem
15 et nobilitatem facta inclyta satis testantur, non sic dehonestabo, ut te illis, aut tibi illos componere velim) quisquis, inquam, *de fsece ilia plebis* hoc tantummodo sibi persuaserit, non esse se regibus natum, sed Deo et patriæ, multo sane te doctior, multo sapientior, multo probior, et ad omnem vitam
20 utilior existimandus erit. Nam doctus ille sine literis, tu literatus sine doctrina, qui tot linguas calles, tot volumina percurris, tot scribis, et tamen pecus es.

of yours you call Dr. Hammond, who was lately this king's best beloved chaplain, *\navc*, for no other reason than because he had called you grammarian. And you would have been as ready to throw the same reproach upon the king himself, I do
5 believe, and to withdraw this whole Defence, if you had heard that he had approved his chaplain's judgment of you.

Take notice now how much I, a single one of those Englishmen that you have the impudence to call "madmen, unlearned, ignoble, wicked," slight and despise you; that the
10 English nation in general should take any public notice of such a worm as you would be an infinite undervaluing of themselves. For whichever way you turn and twist you round-about and upside down and inside out, you are a grammarian and nothing but a grammarian; nay, as if you had made to
15 some god or other a foolisher wish than Midas's, whatever you touch—except when you make blunders—*is* grammar. Whosoever therefore he be, though from among "those dregs of the common people" that you are so hard upon (as for those men of eminency amongst us whose great actions evidence
20 their wisdom and nobility and virtue, I will not disgrace them so much as to compare you with them or them with you),—whosoever, I say, among those dregs of the common people has but made this principle his own, that he was not born for kings, but for God and his country, should be deemed far
25 more learned and honest and wise than you, and every way of greater use in the world. For he is learned without letters, while you are lettered without learning,—you that understand so many languages, turn over so many volumes, write so many screeds, and yet are but a sheep when all is done.

CAPUT II.

QUOD argumentum pro se *indubitatum* esse, superiore capite perorans dixerat Salmasius, *rem ita se habere ut creditur, cum omnes unanimiter idem de ea sentiant*, quod tamen is *de facto* falsissime affirmabat, id ego nunc, de jure regio disceptaturus, potero in ipsum verissime retorquere. Cum enim regem definiat, *cujus suprema est in regno potestas, nulli alii nisi Deo obnoxia, cui quod libet licet, qui legibus solutus est*, siquidem id definiri dicendum est, quod infinitum in terris ponitur, evincam ego
 5
 10 contrà non meis tantum, sed vel ipsius testimoniis et rationibus, nullam gentem aut populum, qui quidem ullo numero sit, nam omnem penetrare barbariam necesse non est, nullam, inquam, gentem istiusmodi jura aut potestatem regi concessisse, *ut legibus solutus esset, ut quod libet liceret, ut omnes*
 15 *judicaret, h nemine judicaretur*; nec verò quenquam cujuscunque gentis tarn servili ingenio exstitisse puto, prater unum Salmasium, qui tyrannorum immania quæque flagitia, regum jura esse defenderit. Eorum plerique apud nos, qui regi maxime favebant, ab hac tarn turpi sententia semper abhorruere;
 20 quinetiam ipse, nondum pretio corruptus, his de rebus longe aliter sensisse aliis jampridem scriptis facile deprehenditur. Adeò ut hæc non ab homine libero in libera civitate, nedum in

CHAPTER II.

IN winding up his first chapter Salmasius urged as "irrefragable" the argument that "a thing really is as it is believed to be, when all men unanimously agree in thinking it so." This argument, when applied, as he was then
5 applying it, "to matter of fact," is an utter fallacy; nevertheless I, that am now about to discourse matter of law—the right of kings—shall be able to turn it upon himself with full truth. He defines a king (if that may be said to be defined which he makes infinite) to be "a person in whom resides the supreme
10 power of the kingdom; who is answerable to God alone; who is permitted to do whatever he lists; who is loosed from the law." I will undertake to demonstrate, not by my own reasons and authorities alone, but even by his, that there never was a nation or people of any account (for to ransack all the
15 uncivilized parts of the world were to no purpose) that ever allowed it to be their king's right or power "that he should be loosed from the law, do what he pleased, and judge all, but be judged of none." Nor can I think that, save Salmasius alone, there ever was any one of any nation so slavish in spirit as
20 to assert the outrageous enormities of tyrants to be the rights of kings. Those amongst us that were the greatest royalists always abhorred this base opinion; nay, even Salmasius himself in some earlier writings of his—before he was bribed—was evidently of quite another mind. Insomuch that these
25 doctrines, so slavish in nature and spirit, seem to have been penned not by a free man in a free State, much less in the most

Repub. nobilissima, et Batavorum Academia celeberrima, sed in ergastulo quovis aut catasta, tarn servili ingenio atque ammo scripta esse videantur. Etenim, si quicquid regi libet, id jure regio licitum erit, quod teterrimus ille Antoninus Caracalla, ab Julia noverca per incestum persuasus, non statim ausus est credere, nemo profectus est, aut unquam fuit, qui tyrannus dici debeat. Cum enim divina omnia atque humana jura violavit, nihilo tamen minus rex, jure regio insons erit. Quid enim peccavit homo æquissimus? jure suo usus est in suos. Nihil rex tarn horrendum, tarn crudele, tamque furiosum committere in suos potest, quod præter jus regium fieri quispiam possit queri aut expostulare. *Hoc tu jus regium h jure gentium, vel fortius naturali originem habere* statuis bellua? Quid enim hominem te dicam, qui in omne hominum genus, adeo iniquus et inhumanus es? quique omnem gentem humanam Deo simillimam sic deprimere atque dejicere conaris, ut quos nunc superstitio, nunc scelus aut ignavia quorundam, aut denique perfidia tam feros atque immites dominos gentibus imposuit, cos & natura matre mitissima comparatos atque impositos esse doceas. Qua tu nefaria doctrina multo jam ferociores factos, non solum ad proterendos omnes mortales, et posthac miseriorem in modum conculcandos immittis, sed jure naturali, jure regio, ipsis etiam populi legibus

excellent Dutch Republic and at its University of most renown, but at some prison-house or auction-block of slaves.

If whatever a king has a mind to do, the right of kings will bear him out in (a lesson that the hideous tyrant Antoninus
5 Caracalla, though his stepmother Julia taught it him through incest with herself, yet could not at once accept) then there neither is nor ever was anyone that deserved the name of tyrant. For though he has broken all the laws of God and man, yet the king shall be innocent none the less by the law of
10 kings. Excellent man—what wrong has he done? He has but used his own right upon his own subjects. No king can perpetrate upon his subjects an outrage so frightfully, so madly cruel, as anyone can remonstrate or complain that it exceeds the king's right.

15 Dare you assert that this "law of kings arises from the law of nations, or rather that of nature," you beast? Why should I call you a man, who to the human race are so unjust, so inhuman?—who endeavor so to bear down and vilify all mankind (made after the image of God) as to assert and
20 maintain that those fierce merciless masters whom the fanaticism of some, or crime, or cowardly indifference, or even treachery, has inflicted upon nations, are provided and appointed by Nature herself, that mild and gentle mother of us all. By which pestilent doctrine of yours having rendered
25 them far more fierce and fell, you not only incite them to tread down all poor mortals, and to trample the wretches under foot in the bargain, but endeavor with the law of nature, the law of kings, nay the very laws of the people, to arm them

in populum armare, quo nihil simul stultius et sceleratius esse potest, contendis. Dignus profectò qui, contrè atque olim Dionysius, ex grammatico tyrannus ipse sis; non quo tibi in alium quemvis detur ilia regia licentia male faciendi, sed ilia
5 altera male pereundi; qua sola, ut inclusus ille Capreis Tiberius, a temetipso perditus quotidie te sentias perire. Verum jus illud regium paulò accuratius quale sit consideremus. *Sic Oriens lotus, inquis, judicavit, sic Occidens.* Non reponam tibi quod Aristoteles et Marcus Cicero, authores, si qui alii,
10 cordatissimi, ille in Politicis, hie in oratione de Provinciis scripsit, Gentes Asiaticas facile servitutum pad, Judæos autem et Syros servituti natos fuisse: fateor paucos ferè libertatem velle, aut ea posse uti, solos nempe sapientes, et magnanimos; pars longe maxima justos dominos mavult, sed tamen justos;
15 injustos et intolerabiles ferendi, neque Deus unquam universe generi humano tarn infensus fuit, neque ullus unquam populus tarn ab omni spe et consilio derelictus, ut necessitatem hanc atque legem omnium durissimam in se atque in suos liberos ultr6 statuerit. *Prefers imprimis verba regis in Ecclesiaste sapientid clari.* Nos itaque ad legem Dei provocamus, de rege
20 posterius videbimus; cujus exinde sententiam rectius intelligemus. Audiatur ipse Deus, Deut. 17. *Cum ingressus fueris in terram, quam jehova Deus dat tibi, et dices, statuam super*

against the people: the extreme at once of folly and of wickedness. As Dionysius of old from a tyrant became a school-master, so you from a grammarian deserve to become a tyrant; that you may have—not that royal right to live an evil
5 life, but that other—to die an evil death; whereby, like Tiberius shut up in Capri—yourself the author of your own ruin—you shall feel yourself perish daily.

But let us look a little more narrowly into this right of kings that you talk of. "This," you say, "was the sense of the eastern
10 and of the western part of the world." I shall not answer you with what Aristotle in the *Politics* and Cicero in the oration *De Provinciis* (both as trustworthy authorities as any we have) have writ, viz. that the people of Asia easily submit to slavery, but the Syrians and Jews are actually born to it. I confess there are but few, and those men of great wisdom and
is courage, that are either desirous of liberty or capable of using it. Far the greatest part of the world prefers just masters—masters, observe, but just ones. As for masters unjust and unbearable, neither was God ever so much an enemy to man-
20 kind as to constrain our submission to them, nor was there ever any people so destitute of all sense and sunk into such depth of despair as of its own accord to impose so cruel a law upon itself and its posterity.

You produce first "the words, in Ecclesiastes, of the king
25 illustrious for his wisdom." So we too appeal to God's law; of the king we will consider hereafter, whose opinion we shall thence better understand. Let God Himself be heard, Deut.
17. "When thou art come into the land which the Lord

me Regem sicut omnes gentes qua sunt circa me: Quod ego omnes velim etiam atque etiam animadvertant, teste hie ipso Deo, penes populos omnes ac nationes arbitrium semper fuisse vel ea, quæ placeret, forma reipub. utendi, vel hanc in aliam
5 mutandi: de Hebrads diserte hoc dicit Deus, de reliquis haud abnuit: deinde formam reipub. monarchia perfectiorem, ut sunt res humanæ, sui que populi magis ex usu Deo visam esse: cum hanc ipse formam instituerit; monarchiam non nisi sero petentibus, idque ægre concesserit. Sin regem plane vellent,
10 ut ostenderet Deus id se liberum Populo reliquisse, ab uno an a pluribus respub. administraretur, modo juste; regi etiam futuro leges constituit, quibus cautum erat, ut *ne multiplied sibi equos, ne uxores, ne divitias;* ut mtelligeret nihil ipsi in alios licere, qui nihil de se statuere extra legem potuerit. Jussus
15 itaque est *omnia legis illius pracepta,* etiam sua manu perscribere; perscripta *observare; ne efleratur animus ejus præ fratribus suis.* Ex quo perspicuum est, regem æque ac populum istis legibus astrictum fuisse. In hanc ferme sententiam scripsit Josephus, legum suæ gends interpret idoneus, in sua reipub.
20 versatissimus, mille aliis tenebrionibus Rabbinis anteponen-

thy God giveth thee, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me." Which passage I could wish all men would consider again and again, for here it appears by God's own witness that all nations and peoples
5 have always possessed free choice to erect what form of government they will, and also to change it into what they will. This God affirms expressly concerning the Hebrews, and of other nations denies it not. A commonwealth, moreover, in the opinion of God, was, under human conditions, a more
10 perfect form of government than a monarchy, and more useful for His own people; for He himself set up this government, and could hardly be prevailed withal a great while after, and at their own importunate desire, to let them change it into a monarchy. But were they to insist upon a king, then
15 God, to show that He had left the people their choice to be governed by a single person or by more, so they were justly governed, prescribed laws for the king, though still but in prospect, whereby he was forbidden "to multiply to himself horses and wives, or to heap up riches." This was to make him
20 understand that outside the law no power over others was his, who concerning his very self could take no action outside the law. He was commanded therefore to transcribe with his own hand "all the precepts of the law," and, having writ them out, to "observe and keep them, that his mind might not be
25 lifted up above his brethren." Whence it is evident that as well the prince as the people was bound by those laws.

To this effect writes Josephus, a qualified interpreter of the laws of his nation, excellently versed in the Jewish polity, and

dus: Antiquitat. lib. 4, *'Apcffroxparia pkv obv xpdTtarov*, etc.
Optimum est inquit, *optimatum regimen; nee vos alium*
reipub. statum requiratis; satis enim est Deum habere pcesid-
dem. Attamen si tanta vos regis cupido ceperit, plus legibus
 5 *et Deo tribuat is, qubm sues sapientix; prohibeatur autem, si*
potentior fieri studet, quhm rebus vestris expedit. Hæc et plura
 Josephus in istum Deuteronomii locum. Alter Philo Judæus,
 gravis author, Joseph! coætaneus, legis Mosai'cæ studiosissi-
 mus, in quam universam diffusa commentatione scripsit, cum
 10 in libro de creatione Principis hoc caput legis interpretatur,
 non alio pacto regem legibus solvit, atque hostis quilibet solu-
 tus legibus dici possit.

etc: *qui, inquit, adperniciem et detrimentum populi magnam*
sibi acquirunt potentiam, non reges sed hostes appellandi
 15 *sunt; ea facientes, qua hostes nulla pace reconciliandi jacunt;*
nam qui per speciem gubernandi jaciunt injuriam, apertis
hostibus pejores sunt; hos enim facile est propulsare, illorum
autem malitia haud jacill detegitur. Detecti igitur, quid obstat
 quominus hostium loco habendi sint? Sic libro secundo Al-
 20 legoriarum Legis, *rex et tyrannus contraria sunt; et deinde,*
rex non imperat tantum, sed paret. Vera sunt ista, dicet ali-
 quis; regem oportet quidem leges, ut qui maxime, observare;
 verum si secus fecerit, qua lege puniendus? eadem, inquam,
 lege qua cæteri; excepiones enim nullas reperio. Sed nee de

preferable to a thousand obscure rabbins. *Antiquities*, Book 4.

"An aristocracy is the best form of government; wherefore seek ye not any other; it is enough to have God for your ruler.

But if so huge desire of a king have seized you, let him yield
5 to the laws and to God more than to his own wisdom; and let
him be restrained if he offer at more power than is proper to
your affairs," Thus, in part, Josephus upon this passage in
Deuteronomy.

Another solid authority, Josephus's contemporary Philo
10 Judæus, one very studious in the law of Moses, upon the whole
of which he wrote an extensive commentary, when in his book
concerning the creation of the king he interprets this chapter
of the law, releases the king from the law no otherwise than as
an enemy may be said to be so released. "They," says he, "that
15 acquire great power to the prejudice and destruction of their
subjects should be named not kings but enemies, for their
actions are those of an irreconcilable enemy. Nay, they that
under a show of government commit usurpation are worse
than open enemies. The latter we may easily ward off, but the
20 wicked craft of the former is not always easy to discover."
Once discovered, then, why should they not be dealt with as
enemies? In the second book of the *Allegories of the Law*,
"A king," says he, "and a tyrant are contraries." And a little
after, "A king not only commands, but also obeys."

25 'All this is very true,' someone will say; 'a king ought to
observe the laws most exactly, but if he will not, what law is
there to punish him?' The same law, I answer, that there is
to punish all others; I find no exception. There is no express

Sacerdotibus, sed nee de infimis quidem magistratibus puniendis lex ulla scribitur; qui omnes, cum de iis puniendis nulla lex scripta sit, pari certe jure et ratione possent impunitatem scelerum omnium sibi vindicare; quam tamen neque eorum
 5 quispiam vindicavit, neque quenquam iis arbitror idcirco esse daturum. Hactenus ex ipsa Dei lege didicimus regem legibus obtemperare debuisse; nee se præ cæteris efferre, qui etiam fratres ejus sunt. Nunc an quid aliud Ecclesiastes moneat videamus: Cap. 8. ver. i. etc: *Mandatum regis observa; vel*
 10 *propter juramentum Dei, ne perturbati à jade ejus abito, ne persistito in re mala, nam quicquid volet fadet. Ubi verbum regis, ibi dominatio, et quis dicat ei, quid fads?* Satis constat Ecclesiastem hoc in loco non synedrio magno, non senatui, sed privato cuique præcepta dare. Jubet mandata regis ob-
 15 servare, vel propter juramentum Dei; at quis jurat regi, nisi rex vicissim in leges divinas atque patrias juratus sit? Sic Reubenitæ et Gaditæ obedientiam suam Jehosue pollicentur, Jos. I: *Ut die to audientes Mo si fuimus, ita erimus tibi, modb ut Deus tecum sit, quemadmodum juit cum Mose.* Conditionem
 20 vides expressam; alioquin ipsum audi Ecclesiasten, cap. 9: *Verba sapientum submissa potius audienda esse, quàm clamorem dominantis inter stolidos.* Quid porro monet? *Ne persistito in re mala, nam quicquid volet, fadet;* in malos nimi-

law to punish the priests or even the least important magistrates, who might all, no matter what their guilt, with equal right and reason claim impunity because there is no positive law for their punishment; and yet none of them ever made
5 the claim, nor would it ever, I suppose, be allowed them on that ground.

Hitherto we have learned from the very law of God that a king ought to obey the laws, and not lift himself up above the rest, who also are his brethren. Let us now consider whether
10 the Preacher teaches any other doctrine, Chapter VIII. v. i, etc, "I counsel thee to keep the king's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God. Be not hasty to go out of his sight; stand not in an evil thing; for he doeth whatsoever pleaseth him. Where the word of a king is, there is power;
15 and who may say unto him, What doest thou?" It is well enough known that here the Preacher directs his precepts not to the Sanhedrim or to a parliament, but to private persons. He bids "keep the king's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God"; but who makes oath to the king unless
20 the king for his part have made oath to the laws of God and his country? So the Reubenites and Gadites promise obedience to Joshua, Josh. I: "According as we hearkened unto Moses in all things, so will we hearken unto thee; so but God be with thee as he was with Moses." Here is an express
25 condition. Hear the Preacher else, Chapter IX: "The quiet words of wise men ought to be heard rather than the shouting of him that ruleth among fools." Next he cautions us, "Stand not in an evil thing; for he doeth whatsoever pleaseth

rum mala in re persistentes faciet, autoritate legum armatus; nam leniter, aut severe agere, prout volet, potest. Nihil hie tyrannicum sonat, nihil quod vir bonus extimescat. *Ubi verbum regis, ibi dominatio; et quis dicat ei, quid fads?* Et tamen legimus qui regi dixerit non solum quid fecisti, sed etiam stulte fecisti, i Sam. 13. At Samuel extraordinarius. Tuum tibi regero, licet infra dictum pag. 49, *quid, inquis, extraordinarium in Saule et Davide?* itidem ego, quid, inquam, in Samuele? Propheta fuit: sunt et illi hodie, qui ejus exemplo faciunt; ex voluntate enim Dei vel *expressa* vel *insita* agunt: quod etiam ipse infra concedis, pag. 50. Prudenter igitur Ecclesiastes hoc in loco monet privates, ne cum rege contendant: nam etiam cum divite, cum potenti quovis, ut plurimum damnosa contentio est. Quid ergo? an optimates, an omnes reliqui magistratus, an populus universus, quoties delirare libet regi, ne hiscere quidem audebunt? an stolido, impio, furenti, bonis omnibus perniciem machinanti non obstabunt, non obviam ibunt, ne divina omnia atque humana pervertere occupet, ne rapinis, ne incendiis, ne cædibus per omnes regni fines grassetur, ita *legibus solutus, ut quod libet liceat?* O de Capadocis eques catastis! quern omnis libera natio (si unquam

him." He does, certainly, to malefactors that persist in evil; for he is armed with the law's authority, and may proceed with mercy or severity as he will. Naught here sounds tyrannical; naught here that a good man need dread. "Where the
5 word of a king is, there is power; and who may say to him, What doest thou?" And yet we read of one that did say to a king not only "What hast thou done?" but "Thou hast done foolishly." i Sam. 13. But Samuel, you may say, was an extraordinary person. I answer you with your own words,
10 further on, from your forty-ninth page. "What was there extraordinary," say you, "in Saul or David?" And so say I, What was there in Samuel extraordinary? He was a prophet, you will say. So are they today that follow his example, for they act according to the will of God, either as "outspoken,"
15 or as "implanted in them"; which yourself grant farther on, in your fiftieth page.

Prudently, then, does the Preacher in this passage advise private persons not to contend with princes; for it is passing dangerous to contend with any rich man even, or powerful
20 man soever. But what then? Shall the nobility, shall all the other magistrates, shall the whole body of the people—when a king chooses to rave, shall they not dare open their mouths? Shall they not oppose a foolish, wicked, raging plotter of all good men's ruin? Shall they not meet halfway his attempt to
25 overthrow all things divine and human—lest with plunderings and burnings and murders he riot through the realm—being so "loosed from the law that what he listeth is lawful to him"? O cavalier from Cappadocian slave-blocks! Whom

posthac in natione libera pedem ponere audebis) aut in ultimas terras veluti portentum exportandum ejicere, aut servitutis candidatum dedere in pistrinum debebit, ea lege atque omine, ut si te inde exemerit, ipsa sub aliquo tyranno, eoque
 5 stultissimo, pro te molat. Quid enim poterit dici, aut ab aliis dictum peti tam truculentum, aut ridiculum, quod in te non cadat? Perge modo: *Isrælites regem h Deo petentes eodem jure se ab eo gubernari velle dixerunt, quo omnes alicæ nationes, quæ hoc regimine uterentur. At Orientis reges summo*
 10 *jure, et potestate non circumscriptæ regnabant, teste Virgilio.*

— *Regem non sic Ægyptus et ingens
 Lydia, nec populi Parthorum, et Medus Hydaspes
 Observant.* —

Primum quid nostra refert qualem sibi regem Isrælite voluerint, præsertim Deo irato, non solum quod regem vellent ad
 15 exemplum gentium, et non suæ legis, sed plane quod vellent regem? Deinde regem injustum, aut legibus solutum petivisse credibile non est, qui Samuelis filios legibus obstrictos ferre non potuerunt, et ab eorum tantum avaritia ad regem
 20 confugerunt. Postremo quod ex Virgilio recitas, non probat reges Orientis *absoluta potestate* regnasse; Apes enim illæ Virgilianæ, quæ vel Ægyptiis et Medis observantiores regum sunt, teste tamen eodem Poeta,

— *Magnis agitant sub legibus cæcum.*

every free people, if hereafter you shall dare set foot among a people that is free, ought to cast out and transport to the world's end as a monstrosity of dire foreboding, or set aside—fit candidate for slavery—to grind in the mill; solemnly
 5 obliging themselves, if ever they let you go, to grind in your stead under some tyrant—and him a fool. For what words could be said or borrowed so expressive of cruelty or folly as may not justly be applied to you ?

But go on. "When the Isrælitcs asked God for a king, they
 10 said they would fain be governed by him under the same rule as all the other nations which had a monarchy. But the kings of the East had supreme rule and unlimited power, as Virgil testifies:

Not Egypt and huge Lydia, nor the hordes
 15 Of Parthians, and Hydaspes, Median stream,
 Do so revere a king."

First, what is it to us, what sort of king the Isrælitcs desired ? Especially since God was angry with them not only for desiring a king after the manner of the nations and not of
 20 his own law, but for desiring a king at all. Nor is it credible that they should have desired a king unjust or loosed from the law, they who could not bear the government of Samuel's sons, though bound by the law, and only from their covetousness sought refuge in a king. Lastly, what you quote out
 25 of Virgil does not prove that the kings of the East reigned "with absolute power"; for those bees in Virgil who more revere their kings, he says, than do the Egyptians or Medes, those bees, even by the witness of the same poet,

Pass their lives under mightv laws—

Non ergo sub regibus omni lege solutis. At vide quam tibi minime velim male; cum plerique te nebulonem esse judicent, ostendam te personam tantum nebulonis mutuam sumpsisse. In Apparatu ad primatum Papse doctores quosdam Tridentinos exemplo Apium usos ai's, ut monarchiam Papse probarent: ab his tu pari malitia hoc mutuum cepisti. Quod illis itaque respondisti cum probus esses, jam factus nebulo tute respondebis tibi, tuaque tibi manu personam nebulonis detrahes. *Apium respub. est; atque ita Physici appellant:*

10 *Re gem habent, sed innocuum; ductor est potius quam tyrannus, non verberat, non vellicat, non necat apes subditas.* Minime igitur mirum, si ita observant. Ista mehercule apes mala ave tibi tactio erat; Tridentinae enim licet sint, fucum te esse indicant, Aristoteles autem, rerum politicarum scriptor diligentissimus, monarchic genus Asiatics, quod et barbaricum vocat,

15 id est, secundum legem fuisse affirmat: Pol. 3. immo cum monarchic quinque species enumeret, quatuor secundum legem, et suffragante populo fuisse scribit, tyrannicas autem, quod iis tanta potestas, volente licet populo,

20 data erat; regnum vero Laconicum maxime regnum videri, quod non omnia penes regem erant. Quinta, quam is vocat, et ad quam solam id refert, quod tu regum om-

—not, then, under kings that are loosed from all law. But now I will let you see how little ill-will I bear you. Though most people think you a knave, I will show that you have only put on the borrowed mask of a knave. In your *Affparatus ad Primatum Papæ* you say that some divines of the Council of Trent made use of the example of the bees to prove the Pope's supremacy. This, with equal wickedness, you have borrowed from them. That very answer, therefore, which you gave them whilst you were an honest man, you shall yourself, 5 now you are grown a knave, give yourself, and with your own hand pull off the knave's mask. "The bees," say you, "have a commonwealth, and so do natural philosophers call it; they have a king, but a harmless one; he is a leader rather than a despot; he beats not, pulls not, kills not his subject bees." No 10 wonder therefore that they revere him so. Faith, 'twas under no lucky star of yours that you made contact with those *Tridentine* bees; three-toothed as they are, they show you up as a toothless drone.

Aristotle, a most exact writer on politics, affirms that the 20 Asiatic monarchy, which yet himself calls barbarous, was *xara vopov*, that is, according to law, *Pol.* 3. More: whereas he counts five sorts of monarchies, and four he calls governments according to laws, and with the people's approval, yet he calls them tyrannical, because, though with popular consent, so 25 much power had been lodged in them. But the kingdom of the Lacedemonians, he says, is most properly deemed a kingdom, because there not all power is lodged in the king. The fifth sort he calls *νατααδειαν*; to this alone he attributes what

nium jus esse scribis, ut ad libitum regnent, ubinam gentium, aut quo tempore unquam obtinuerit non dicit: nee aliam ob causam fecisse mentionem ejus videtur, quam ut absurdam, injustam, et maximè tyrannicam esse demonstraret. Samuelem
5 ai's, cum eos ab eligendo rege deterreret, *jus illis regium* exposuisse. Unde haustum, a lege Dei? at illa lex jus regium, ut vidimus, longe aliud exhibuit: an ab ipso Deo per Samuelem loquente? at improbavit, vituperavit, vitio dedit: non igitur jus regium divinitus datum, sed morem regnandi pravissimi
10 mum, superbia regum et dominandi libidine arreptum exposuit propheta; nee quid debebant reges, sed quid volebant facere; rationem enim regis populo indicavit, sicut antea rationem sacerdotum Eliadarum eodem verbo (quod tu p. 33. Hebraico etiam solcecismo vocas) supra indicaverat:
15 C. 2. *ratio sacerdotum istorum cum populo hccc erat, v. 13.* impia videlicet, odiosa, et tyrannical ratio itaque illa nequam jus erat, sed injuria. Sic etiam patres antiqui hunc locum exposuerunt; unus mihi erit multorum instar, Sulpitius Severus, Hieronymi æqualis, eique charus, et Augustini ju-
20 dicio vir doctrina et sapientia pollens. Is in historia sacra Samuelem ait dominationem regiam, et superba imperia populo exponere. Sane jus regium non est dominatio et superbia; sed

you call the right of all kings, the right to rule as they please; but where in the world, or when in the whole course of time, it ever obtained, he saith not. Nor seems he to have mentioned it for any other purpose than to show that it is unjust, absurd,
5 and in the last degree tyrannical.

You say that when Samuel would deter the people from choosing a king, he propounded "to them the right of kings." But where did he get it—from the written law of God? Nay, that law, as we have seen, has shown a very different right of
10 kings. Was it from God Himself speaking through Samuel? But God disapproved it, blamed it, deemed it a fault; so that the prophet expounded not any divinely appointed law for kings, but a mode of government most corrupt, seized by the pride of kings and lust to rule. He tells not what kings ought
15 to do, but what they were fain to do; for he showed the people the manner of a king, as before he had shown the manner of the priests, the sons of Eli—using the same word (which you in your thirty-third page, by a solecism even in Hebrew, call
) . Ch. 2. v. 13. "Those priests' manner with the people
20 was this"—surely an impious manner, and a hateful and tyrannical. That manner then was nowise a right but a wrong.

The fathers too have explained this passage in the same way: one will serve me as the measure of many—Sulpitius Severus, a contemporary and friend of St. Jerome, and in
25 St. Augustine's opinion, a man of great wisdom and learning. He tells us in his sacred history that Samuel is exhibiting to the people the monarchical despotism and pride of power. Now despotism and pride, to be sure, are not the right of

jus atque imperium regium, teste Sallustio, conservandæ libertatis atque augendæ reipub. causa datum, in superbiam dominatione'que se convertit. Idem Theologi omnes Orthodoxi, idem Jurisconsulti, idem Rabbini plerique, ut ex Sichardo 5 didicisse potuisses, de explicatione hujus loci sentiunt; ne Rabbiorum enim quisquam jus regis absolutum isto loco tractari dixit. Ipse infra cap. 5. pag. 106. *non Alexandrinum Clementem solum, sed omnes hie quereris enare*, te unum ex omnibus rem acu tetigisse: Jam vero cujus vel impudentiæ est 10 vel socordiae, contra omnes, præsertim orthodoxos, mores regum ab ipso Deo damnatissimos in jus regium convertere; et honesta juris præscriptione defendere: cum jus tamen illud in rapinis, injuriis, violentiis, contumeliis sæpius consistere fatearis? An quisquam sic *sui juris* unquam fuit, ut rapere, 15 agere, prosternere, permiscere omnia sibi liceret? an Latini, quod affirmas, hæc *suo jure ab aliquo fieri unquam dixerunt?* Dixerat apud Sallustium C. Memmius tribunus Plebis, in superbiam et impunita flagitia nobilitatis invecus, *impune quælibet jacere, id est, regem esse*; Arrisit hoc tibi, et statim in 20 lucro ponis, nequicquam sane, si paulum evigilaveris. An jus hie regium asseruit? annon plebis ignaviam potius increpuit,

kings; according to Sallust, however, the lawful power and authority granted to kings for the preservation of liberty and the promotion of the common weal degenerates into pride and despotism. This is the sense of all orthodox divines and
5 of all legists upon the interpretation of this passage, and as you might have learned from Sichardus, that of most of the rabbins as well; not a single rabbin ever asserted that what this passage handled was the king's absolute right. Yourself, farther on, in your fifth chapter, page 106, complain that "not
10 only Clement of Alexandria but all others are in error here," and that you alone have hit the mark. Now what a piece of impudence is this,—or is it folly?—in opposition to all the expositors, especially the orthodox, to turn those very ways of kings which God Himself so much condemns, into the right
15 of kings, and to defend them with a specious pretext of law, though yourself confess that that right is too often exercised in committing robberies, injustices, insults, and outrages.

Was any man ever so much "his own master" that he might lawfully prey upon mankind, drive and bear down all that
20 stood in his way, and overturn all things? Did the Romans ever maintain, as you say they did, that anybody "did so by virtue of some right inherent in himself"? In Sallust, Gaius Memmius, a tribune of the people, inveighing against the pride and unpunished crimes of the nobility, did say: "To do
25 whatever one has a mind to, without fear of punishment, is to be a king." This looked good to you; and instantly you put it to your credit—in vain, surely, had you but kept your eyes open. Did he here assert the right of kings? or did he not

quæ nobiles impune dominari sineret, eosque mores reges jam rursus pateretur, quos jure suo majores eorum cum rege ipso finibus expulerant? Marcum Tullium saltern consuluis-
 ses; is te et Sallustium, et Samuelem etiam rectiis interpretari
 5 docuisset. Qui pro C. Rabirio *nemo*, inquit, *nostrum ignorat consuetudinem regiam; re gum sum hæc imperia, animad-
 verte et dicto fare*: Alidque hujusmodi ex poetis ibidem reci-
 tat, quæ non jus, sed *consuetudinem regiam* vocat, eaque
 legere et spectare nos ait debere, non *ut delectemur solum, sed*
 10 *ut cavere etiam et effugere discamus*. Vides quam te male
 multaverit Sallustius, quem tyrannis inimicissimum, juris
 tyrannici patronum attulisse te putabas. Nutare, mihi crede,
 et suum sibi occasum accelerare jus regium videtur, dum
 mentis in modum tenuissima quæque sic arripit, seque susti-
 15 nere iis testibus atque exemplis conatur, quæ tardius for-
 tasse alioqui ruiturum vehementius impellunt. *Summum*
 inquis, *jus, summa injuria est id in regibus maxime lo-
 cum habet; qui cum summo jure utuntur, ea jaciunt in qui-
 bus Samuel dicit jus regis esse fositum*. Miserum jus; quod
 20 tu jam an extrema perductus, nisi per summam injuriam de-
 fendere ulterius non potes! Summum jus id dicitur, cum quis

rather chide the common people's listlessness in suffering the nobility to lord it over them unpunished, and in submitting again to those kinglike ways which, together with the king himself, their ancestors, in the exercise of a rightful independence, had driven into exile? You ought to have consulted Tully; he would have taught you to expound Sallust more correctly, yea Samuel too. In his oration *Pro C. Rabirio*, "None of us," says he, "is ignorant of the way of kings; these are their lordly dictates: mark my words and obey them." 5 There he quotes from the poets other passages to this effect, which speak not of the right, but of the "way of kings"; and he says we ought to read and observe them carefully, not only "for our pleasure, but that we may learn to beware and to escape." You perceive what a dead loss you have made of 10 Sallust, whom, utter enemy of tyrants though he is, you thought you had brought into court to advocate your right of tyrants. Take my word for it, the right of kings seems to be tottering, and even hastening its own downfall, when like a sinking man it snatches at all the straws about, and strives to 15 maintain itself by examples and authorities which, were its ruin otherwise to linger on the way, would even speed it.

"The extreme exercise of a legal right," you say, "is the height of injury; this saying is verified most properly in kings, who, when they go to the utmost of their right, fall into those 25 courses in which Samuel says the right of kings consists." Wretched right, which, now that you are brought to bay, you can defend no further than by confessing that it is the height of injury! This it is that is called the extreme exercise of a

formulas legum sectatur, singulis pene literis immoratur, æquitatem non servat; aut scriptum jus callidi nimis et malitiose interpretatur, ex quo illud proverbium Cicero ortum esse ait. Cum autem jus omne de fonte justitiæ manare certum sit, impius sis necesse est, qui *regem injustum esse, iniquum, violentum, raptorem esse, et quales esse solebant* qui pessimi erant, jus regis esse dicas, idque *prophetam populo insinudssc* Quod enim jus summum aut remissum, scriptum aut non scriptum ad maleficia perpetranda esse potest? Id ne tibi de aliis concedere, de rege pernegare in mentem veniat, habeo quern tibi opponam, et puto regem, qui istiusmodi jus regium et sibi et Deo invisum esse profitetur: Psal. 94; *an consociaretur tibi solium tcrumnarum, jormantis molestiam per statutum?* Noli igitur Deo hanc atrocissimam injuriam facere, quasi is regum pravitates et nefaria facinora jus esse regium docuerit, qui etiam hoc nomine societatem cum improbis regibus se detestari docet, quòd molestiam et ærumnas omnes populo juris regii titulo creare soleant. Noli Prophetam Dei falso insimulare; quern tu dum juris regii isto loco doctorem habere putas, non verum nobis affers Samuelem; sed, ut venefica ilia, inanem umbram evocas; quamvis et ilium ab inferis Samuelem non adeo mendacem fuisse credam, quin illud quod tu jus regium vocas, impotentiam potius tyranni-

legal right: when a man hunts after legal formulas, dwells almost upon the letters of the law, and regards not its justice; or too cunningly and maliciously interprets a statute; wherefrom, says Cicero, the proverb arose. But since it is certain
5 that all right flows from the fountain of justice, it follows inevitably that you are most wicked in affirming that "for a king to be unjust, rapacious, tyrannical, and such as they were who were worst," is the king's right, and that it was this "the prophet intimated to the people." For what right,
10 whether extreme or relaxed, whether written or unwritten, can there be to do wrong? Lest you take it into your head to admit this of other men, yet to keep on denying it of kings, I have one to object to you, a king methinks, who avows that your sort of right of kings is odious both to God and to him-
15 self: "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, that frameth mischief by law"? Psalm 94. Put not then so black an insult upon God as to ascribe to him the doctrine that the perversities and impious wickednesses of kings are the right of kings. Nay, God Himself tells us that he abhors all
20 fellowship with wicked princes for the very reason that under pretence of royal right they create misery and vexation for their subjects. Neither bring a false accusation against a prophet of God; for by supposing that in this passage he expounds the right of kings, you bring not before us the right
25 Samuel, but call up an empty shade, as did the witch. Though for my part I verily believe that even that Samuel from Hell would not have been such a liar as not to call your right of kings rather the extravagance of tyranny.

cam dicturus fuisset. Jus datum sceleri legimus, tuque *licentia jure concessa reges minus bonos uti consuevisse* ai's. At jus hoc ad perniciem humani generis abs te introductum, non esse a Deo datum probavimus; restat, ut sit a Diabolo; quod infra clarius liquebit. *Hæc*, inquis, *licentia dat posse, si velis*; et authorem hujus juris habere Ciceronem præ te fers. Nunquam ægre facio ut testimonia tua recitem; tuis enim ipse tibi testibus conficere te soles. Audi igitur verba Ciceronis in 4. Philip. *Quæ causa justior est belli gerendi, quam servitutis depulsio? in qua etiamsi non sit molestus dominus, tamen est miserrimum posse si velit.* posse vi scilicet; nam de jure si loqueretur, repugnantia diceret, et ex justa belli causa injustam faceret. Non est igitur jus regum quod tu describis, sed injuria, sed vis, et violentia regum. Transis ab regia licentia ad privatam: *licet privato mentiri, licet ingrato esse.* Licet et regibus; quid inde efficis? licebit ergo regibus impune rapere, occidere, stuprare? Quid interest ad injuriæ gravitatem rex an latro, an aliunde hostis populum occidat, diripiat, in servitutem agat? eodem certe jure, et hunc et illum humanæ societatis inimicum et pestem propulsare, atque ulcisci debemus; immo regem eo justius quod is tot beneficiis et honoribus

We read of impiety countenanced by law, and you yourself say "it was the less good kings that were wont to make use of the right they got under leave granted." Now I have proved that this right, which you have introduced for the destruction
5 of mankind, proceeds not from God; naught remains but that it comes from the Devil; as will appear more clearly hereafter. "This leave," say you, "grants the power if one will"; and for this you pretend to have Cicero's authority. I am never unwilling to mention your authorities, for it generally hap-
10 pens that you spoil your case by means of your own witnesses. Hear then what Cicero says in his Fourth Philippic: "What reason for war can be more just than the driving off a despotism? For under this, even though the master happen not to be irksome, yet 'tis a wretched thing that he can if he will."
15 Can by force, that is; for if Cicero were speaking of a right, he would contradict himself, and of a just cause of war make an unjust cause. What you describe, then, is not the right of a king, but the wrongfulness of kings, their force and their fury.

From a king's leave and license you turn to a private man's.
20 "A private man," say you, "may lie, may be ungrateful." And so may kings, but what then? Shall they therefore have leave to plunder, murder, ravish, with impunity? How does it affect the seriousness of the wrong done to a people whether it be the king, or a robber, or an enemy from some other
25 quarter, that slays, plunders, and enslaves them? And questionless, being both alike enemies and plagues to human society, the one as well as the other ought by the same law to be driven off and punished—a king indeed with even more

nostris auctus commissam sibi sub juramento publicam salutem prodat. Concedis postremo, *leges dari h Mose secundum quas rex ille quandoque eligendus imperare debebat, quamvis diversas ab illo jure quod Samuel proposuit*. Quod cum assertionem tua dupliciter pugnat; cum enim regem legibus omnino solutum posueris, nunc obstrictum dicis: dein jus juri contrarium ponis Mosis et Samuelis, quod est absurdum. At *servi*, inquit Propheta, *vos eritis regi*. Ut servos fuisse non abnuerim, non jure tamen regio servi fuerunt, sed regum fortasse plurimorum usurpatione et injustitia. Illam enim petitionem obstinatam non jure regio, sed suo merito in poenam illis cesuram propheta præmonuit. At vero si regi legibus soluto quicquid libet licuerit, profecto rex longe plus quam dominus erit, populus infra omnium servorum infimos plus quam infimus. Servus enim vel alienigena legem Dei vindicem injuriosum in dominum habebat; populus universus, libera nimirum gens, vindicem in terris neminem, nullam legem habebit, quo læsus, afflictus et spoliatus confugiat: a servitute regum Ægyptiorum ideo liberatus, ut uni ex fratribus suis duriore si libuisset servitute opprimendus traderetur. Quod cum neque divinæ legi, nee rationi consentaneum sit, dubium ne-

justice, because, though raised to that dignity by the honors that his people have conferred upon him, and though under his oath entrusted with the public safety, he yet betrays it.

At last you grant that "Moses prescribes laws according
5 to which the king sometime to be chosen ought to govern, though different from that right which Samuel promulgated"—a double contradiction to what you have said before. For whereas you had affirmed that a king is quite unbound by law, you here confess he is bound. And you set up two con-
10 trary systems of law or right, one according to Moses, the other according to Samuel; which is absurd.

"But," says the prophet, "ye shall be servants to the king." Suppose I did not deny that they were so; yet it was not by royal right, but maybe by the usurpation and injustice of most
15 of their kings. For the prophet had forewarned them that that importunate petition of theirs would turn to their punishment, not through a royal right, but through their own deserts. Indeed if a king, as unbound by the law, have leave to do what he list, he shall be far more than lord and master, and
20 his people sink down lower than the lowest of slaves. For even a slave foreign-born had the law of God to his defender against a cruel master; and shall a whole people, yea a free nation, find no protector upon earth, no law whither to betake themselves for refuge when hurt and stripped and stricken?
25 Were they set free from their bondage under the Egyptian kings only that they might be delivered to one of their own brethren to be crushed, should he choose, under a bondage yet sterner? All which being agreeable neither to the law of God

mini esse potest, quin propheta mores enarraverit, non jus regum, neque mores prorsus regum omnium, sed plurimorum. Descendis ad rabbinos; duosque adducis eadem, quæ prius, infelicitate: nam caput illud de rege in quo R. Joses jus 5 regum aiebat contineri, Deuteronomii esse, non Samuelis, manifestum est. Samuelis enim ad terrorem duntaxat populo injiciendum pertinere rectissime quidem et contra te dixit R. Judas. Perniciosum enim est id jus nominari atque doceri quod injustitia plane est, nisi abusive forsitan jus nominetur.

10 Quo etiam pertinet versus 18. *Et exclamabitis die illa propter regem vestrum, sed non exaudiet vos Jehova*; obstinates nimirum ista poena manebat, qui regem nolente Deo dari sibi voluerunt. Quanquam ista verba non prohibent, quo minus et vota et quidvis aliud tentare potuerint. Si enim clamare ad Deum 15 contra regem populo licebat, licebat proculdubio omnem etiam aliam inire rationem honestam sese a tyrannide expediendi. Quis enim quovis malo cum premitur, sic ad Deum clamat ut cætera omnia quæ officii sunt sui negligat, ad otiosas tantum preces devolutus? Verum utcunque sit, quid hoc ad jus re- 20 gum, quid ad jus nostrum? qui regem nee invito Deo unquam petivimus, nee ipso dante accepimus; sed jure gentium usi, nee jubente Deo nee vetante, nostris legibus constituimus.

nor to common sense, nobody can doubt that what the prophet declared to the people is not the right of kings, but their manner, nor yet the manner of all kings, but of most.

Then you come down to the rabbins, and quote two of
5 them, but with the same bad luck as you had before; inas-
much as that chapter about a king, which, as Rabbi Joses re-
peatedly said, contains the right of kings, clearly is the one in
Deuteronomy, not the one in Samuel. For Rabbi Judah has
declared very truly, and against you, that that discourse of
10 Samuel's was only to put fear into the people. It is most per-
nicious that a thing should be named a right, and so incul-
cated, which in itself is utter wrong—unless perhaps it be
called a right ironically. Upon this argument verse 18 is in
point: "And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king
15 which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear
you in that day." Yea, that punishment awaited them for
obstinately persisting to desire a king against God's refusal.

Yet these words forbid them not to try prayers or anything
else, for if the people might lawfully cry out to God against
20 the king, without doubt they might use all other honorable
means to rid themselves of his tyranny. For who that is hard-
pressed by misfortune merely cries out to God, and does
naught but fall to his lazy prayers, so as to neglect all else
his duty?

25 But be it how it will, what is all this to the rights of kings or
of our English people? We neither asked a king against the
will of God, nor had one at his hands, but—neither in obedi-
ence to nor against any command of God—exercised the right

Quæ cum ita se habeant, non video quamobrem nobis laudi
 atque virtuti tribuendum non sit, regem abjecisse; quando-
 quidem Isrælitis crimini est datum regem petisse. Quod etiam
 res ipsa comprobavit; nos enim qui regem, cum haberemus,
 5 deprecati sumus, tandem exauditos Deus liberavit; illos, qui
 dim non haberent, a Deo efflagitabant, servire jussit; donec
 Babylone redeuntes ad pristinum reipub. statum reversi sunt.
 Ludum Talmudicum deinde aperis; quin et hoc sinistro au-
 gurio tentatum. Dum enim regem non judicari cupis osten-
 10 dere, ostendis ex Codice Sanhedrim *regem nee judicari nee*
judicare; quod cum petitione istius populi pugnat, qui ideo
 regem petebant, ut judicaret: id frustra resarcire studes; in-
 telligi nempe id de regibus Postbabylonicis debere. At ecce
 tibi Maimonides, qui *hanc inter reges Isrælitas et Judceos dij-*
 15 *ierentiam ponit: Davidis enim posteros judicare et judicari;*
 Isræliticis neutrum concedit. Occurris tibi, tecum enim liti-
 gas, aut cum Rabbinis tuis; meam rem agis. Hoc *primis in*
regibus locum non habuisse, quia dictum est v. 17. *vos eritis*
 20 *ci scrvi*; consuetudine scilicet, non jure; aut si jure, poenas pe-
 tendi regis, quamvis non sub hoc forte vel sub illo, at sub pie-

of nations, and appointed a king by laws of our own. And this being the case, I see not why it should not redound to our virtue and our praise to have deposed our king, since it was reckoned a reproach to the Isrælites to have asked for theirs.

5 And this the event has confirmed; for we, when we had a king, prayed to God against him, and were heard, and at last delivered; but the Jews, who having no king kept importunately asking God for one, he bade be slaves, till, after their return from Babylon, they betook themselves to their former
10 government again.

Next you throw open your Talmud School, but this too is an unlucky undertaking. In your desire to prove that kings are not to be judged, you quote from the treatise of the Sanhedrim "that the king neither judges nor is judged." But this
15 runs counter to that people's own petition, who kept begging a king for the very purpose that he might judge them. Fain would you patch this up to fit your purpose (but in vain) by telling us that it is to be understood of those kings that reigned after the Babylonish captivity. For here against you is Mai-
20 monides, who "makes this difference betwixt the kings of Isræl and those of Judah: that the kings of the posterity of David judge and are judged," but the kings of Isræl do neither. You work against yourself; for you contradict yourself or your rabbins, and plead my cause. This, say you, "ap-
25 plied not to the first kings of Isræl," for in the lyth verse it is said "Ye shall be his servants." To be sure—that is to say by his actual practice, not by any right; or if by right, then as a penalty for asking a king: a penalty which they kept on

risque luebant, quod nos non attingit. Tibi vero adversario opus non est, adeò semper tibi adversaris. Narras enim pro me, ut primò Aristobulus, post Jannæus cognomento Alexander, jus illud regium, non a synedrio juris custode, et inter-
5 prete acceperint, sed paulatim sibi assumpserint, et senatu renitente usurpaverint: quorum in gratiam bella ilia fabula de primoribus synedrii à *Gabride exanimatis* adinventata est, jusque hoc magnificum, quo niti maximè videris, *regem* scilicet *non judicari*, ex ilia fabula plusquam anili, utpote rabbinica,
10 conflatum esse fateris. Reges autem Hebræorum *judicari posse, atque ctiam ad verbera damnari* fuse docet Sichardus ex libris Rabbinicis, cui tu hæc omnia debes, et tamen obstrepere non erubescis. Quinimmo legimus ipsum Saulem cum filio Jonathane sortis iudicium atque etiam capitale subiisse,
15 suòque ipsum edicto paruisse. Uzzias quoque è sacerdotibus templo deturbatus, lepræ iudicio, tanquam unus e populo, se submisit, rexque esse desiit. Quid si templo excedere, quid si magistratu abire et seorsim habitare noluisset, jus illud regium legibus solutum sibi asseruisset, an passuros fuisse censes Ju-
20 dæos et sacerdotes templum contaminari, leges violari, popu-

paying under most of their kings, though not perhaps under this king or that. So your point has nothing to do with the case. But you need no antagonist, you are such a perpetual antagonist to yourself. For you tell, as if arguing on my side, 5 how first Aristobulus, and after him Jannæus, surnamed Alexander, did not receive that kingly right of theirs from the Sanhedrim, guardian and interpreter of rights, but usurped it by degrees against the will of the Senate. To please these usurpers, you say, that pretty story of the principal men of the 10 Sanhedrim being "struck dead by Gabriel" was made up for the occasion. And thus you confess that this magnificent prerogative, upon which you seem mainly to rely, viz., "that a king is not to be judged," was forged out of this rabbinical fable, worse than an old wives' tale.

15 But that the Hebrew kings "were liable to be judged, and even to be punished with stripes," Sichardus shows at large out of the writings of the rabbins; to which author you are indebted for all this erudition, and yet you blush not to clamor against him. Nay, we read that even Saul thought himself 20 bound by a decree of his own making, and in obedience thereunto cast lots with his son Jonathan which of them two should die. Uzziah likewise, when the priests thrust him out of the temple as a leper, submitted as though he had been a subject, and ceased to be king. Suppose he had refused to go out from 25 die temple, to lay down the government, and to dwell in a several house, and had asserted that royal right unbound by law, think you the Jews and their priests would have suffered the temple to be defiled, the laws violated, and the whole

lum universum contagione periclitari ? In leprosum ergo regem vigeant leges, in tyrannum nihil poterunt ? Ecquis tam demens, aut stultus est, ut existimet, cum rex morbosus ne populum contagione lædat, cautum atque provisum legibus
5 sit, si rex impius, iniquus, crudelis populum diripiat, excruciet, occidat, rempub. funditus evertat, nullum his malis longe gravioribus remedium legibus repertum esse ? Verum *exemplum ullius regis afferi non potest, qui iudicium capitis subierit in jus vocatus*. Ad illud Sichardus baud absurde respon-
10 det, perinde esse, ac si quis ad hunc modum dissereret. Cæsar nunquam citatus est coram Electore; ergo si Palatinus diem Cæsari dixerit, non tenetur Cæsar in iudicio respondere. Cum tamen doceat Bulla aurea Carolum IV, se et successores suos huic cognitioni subjecisse. Quid in corrupto populi statu re-
15 gibus adeo indultum fuisse miramur, ubi tot privati aut opibus suis aut gratia impunitatem vel gravissimorum scelerum assequuntur ? Illud autem _____, id est, *h nemine pendere, nulli mortalium rationem reddere*, quod tu regiæ Majestatis maxime proprium esse ai's, Aristoteles, Polit. 4, c. 10. maxime
20 tyrannicum, et in libera natione minime ferendum esse affirmat. Tu verò Antonium tyrannum immanissimum, Romanæ reipub. eversorem, idoneum sane authorem producis, non esse

people endangered by infection? Shall laws then be of force against a leprous king, and avail naught against a tyrant? Can any man possibly be so mad and foolish as to fancy that while the law has carefully provided against a diseased king's
5 hurting his people, yet, should a wicked unjust cruel king tear and torture and slay them, and quite overturn the state, no legal relief had been devised against these far greater mischiefs?

"But," say you, "no precedent can be shown of any king
10 that has been arraigned in a court of justice, and condemned to die." Whereto Sichardus answers pat, that 'tis as if one should argue on this manner: The Emperor never has been summoned before an Elector; therefore, if the Elector Palatine should set a day for his appearance, the Emperor were not
15 bound to appear or plead; though from the Golden Bull it is clear that Charles IV submitted himself and his successors to that investigating jurisdiction.

No wonder if kings have been indulged so far when the people are depraved, and when so many private persons with
20 either money or interest escape the law, though guilty of crimes the most heinous. That that is, "to be wholly independent upon any other, and accountable to none upon earth," which you say is peculiar to royal majesty, Aristotle in his *Politics*, Book 4, Chapter 10, calls most tyrannical,
25 and nowise to be endured by a free people. In proof that a king cannot rightfully be required to give an account of his actions, you cite as authority—proper authority forsooth!—that monstrous tyrant Mark Antony, destroyer of the Roman

justum repositi a Rege factorum suorum rationem: et tamen Herodem cædis reum ad causam dicendam in Parthos proficiscens, accersivit ad se Antonius: et animadversurus etiam in regem fuisse creditur, nisi rex eum auro corrupisset. Ita ab
 5 eodem fonte profluxit regime potestatis Antoniana assertio, et tua *regia dejensio*. At non sine ratione, inquis; *nam reges ab alto non habent quod regnant, sed soli Deo acceptum rejerunt*. Die sodes quinam? nam istiusmodi reges exstitisse unquam, nego. Primus enim Saul, nisi populus, refragante etiam Deo,
 10 regem voluisset, nunquam rex fuisset; et quamvis rex renunciatus esset Mispar, vixit tamen penè privatus, armentum patris secutus, donec Gilgale rex a populo secundum creatus est. Quid David, quamvis unctus a Deo, nonne iterum unctus est ab Judæis Chebrone, deinde ab omnibus Hebrads, pacto ta-
 15 men prius foedere? 2 Sam. 5, I Chron. 11. foedus autem obligat reges, et intra certos fines continet. Sedit Solomon, inquis, *super solium Domini, et cunctis placuit*, i Par. 29. ergo et placuisse populo aliquid erat. Constituit Jehoiadas regem Joasum, foedus tamen eodem tempore pepigit inter regem et popu-
 20 lum, 2 Reg. 11. Hos reges, necnon et reliquos Davidis posteros et a Deo et a populo constitutos fateor; cæteros omnes, ubicunque gentium, a populo tantum constitutos esse affirmo; tu os-

commonwealth; yet Antony, when marching against the Parthians, summoned Herod before him to answer a charge of murder, and it is thought would have punished even a king, had not the king bribed him with gold. So that your *Royal*
5 *Defence* and Antony's assertion of the royal prerogative have flowed from one and the same spring.

Not without reason, say you, "for kings hold their authority from no other than God, but are indebted and obliged for it to Him alone." What kings, pray? For I deny that there
10 ever were any such kings. Saul, the first king of Israël, had never reigned but that the people desired a king even against the will of God, and though he was proclaimed king at Mizpah, yet he lived almost a private life, and came after the herd of his father, till he was created king a second time by
15 the people at Gilgal. And what of David? Though anointed by God, was he not anointed a second time in Hebron by the tribe of Judah, and then by all the Hebrews—yet even so only after a mutual covenant betwixt him and them? 2 Sam. 5; i Chron. 11. But a covenant binds kings and restrains them
20 within bounds. Solomon, you say, "sat on the throne of the Lord, and was acceptable to all men," i Chron. 29. So that it did use to be something to be well-pleasing in the eyes of the people! Jehoiadah, the priest, made Joash king, but first he made him and the people enter into a covenant to one
25 another, 2 Kings II. I acknowledge that these kings and the rest of David's posterity were appointed both by God and by the people, but all other kings of what country soever were appointed, I affirm, by the people only. I challenge you to

tende constitutes esse a Deo; nisi ea solum ratione qua omnia cum maxima turn minima a Deo fieri et constitui dicuntur. Solium itaque Davidis peculiar! quodam jure solium Jehovæ dicitur; solium aliorum regum non alio, atque cætera omnia, 5 Jehovæ sunt. Quod tu ex eodem capite didicisse debuisti, vers. ii, 12. *Tua sunt omnia in cælo et in terra, tuum est, Jehova, regnum, divitia et gloria a facie tua sunt, vis et potentia, etc:* diciturque hoc toties, non ut intumescant reges, sed ut moneantur, quamvis deos se esse putent, Deum tamen supra se esse 10 cui debent omnia. Unde illa Essenorum et Poetarum doctrina, reges *non sine deo, et ab Jove esse* facile intelligitur; nam et minores quoque magistratus, nempe judices ab eodem esse Deo statuit rex ipse Solomon, Pro. 8. 15, 16. et ab eodem esse Jove statuit Homerus Iliad, a.

15 —δικαστοί, οἵτε θέμιστας, *judices qui leges*
Ἡρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται—ab Jove custodiunt.

Et omnes certe homines a Deo itidem sumus, Deique genus. Jus igitur hoc universum Dei, non tollit jus populi; quo minus omnes cæteri reges, non a Deo nominati, regnum suum soli 20 populo acceptum referant; cui propterea rationem reddere tenentur. Quod, quanquam Vulgus assentari regibus solet, ipsi tamen reges sive boni, ut Homericus ille Sarpedon, sive mali, ut illi apud Lyricum tyranni, agnoscunt.

show that they were appointed by God, except in the sense that all things, great and small, are said to be made and appointed by him. The throne of David, then, was in a peculiar manner called "the throne of Jehovah," whereas the thrones
5 of other princes are Jehovah's no otherwise than are all things else; which you should have learnt out of the same chapter, verses 11, 12. "All that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord. Both riches and honor come of thee, and power and might." This is so often re-
10 peated, not that kings may be puffed up, but to warn them that though they think themselves gods yet there is a God above them to whom they owe all. Thus we easily understand what the poets and the Essenes mean when they tell us that "it is by God that kings reign, and they are from
15 Jove"; for Solomon, himself a king, considers that even lesser officers also, namely judges, are from the same God, Prov. 8. 15,16; and from the same Jove Homer, in the first Iliad: ". . . judges who at Zeus's hand guard the dooms." Surely all we are of God likewise, and God's offspring. There-
20 fore this universal right of God's takes not away the people's right; so all other kings not named to their office by God are indebted and obliged for their authority to the people only, and consequently are accountable to them for it.

This, though the common people are apt to flatter their
25 kings, yet kings themselves acknowledge, whether good ones, as Sarpedon in Homer, or bad ones, as those tyrants in the Lyrist.

Γλαῦξε

etc.

*Glance cur nos maxima honore afficimur**In Lycia, omnes autem nos tanquam Deos intuentur?*

Ipse sibi respondet; *quia virtute cæteris prcelucemus: quare*
 5 *fortiter pugnemus, inquit, ne Lycii nobis ignavlam objiciant:*
 quâ voce et honores regio a populo acceptos, et bellicæ ad-
 ministrationis rationem populo reddendam esse innuit. Mali
 autem reges, ut metum populo incutiant, Deum imperii regii
 authorem palam predicant: tacitis autem votis nullum nu-
 10 men præter Fortunam vnerantur. Juxta illud Horatii,

*Te Dacus asper, te profugi Scythes,**Rcgtimque matres barbarorum, et**Purpurei metuunt tyranni,**Injurioso ne pede proruas*15 *Stantem columnam, neu populus jrequens**Ad arma cessantes, ad arma**Concitet, imperiumque fran gat.*

Si ergo reges hodie per Deum regnant, etiam populi per Deum
 in libertatem se vindicant, quandoquidem omnia a Deo et per
 20 Deum fiunt. Utrumque etiam æque testatur Scriptura, et
 reges per eum regnare, et per eum solio dejici; cum tamen id
 utrumque longe sæpius a populo fieri perspiciamus, quam
 i Deo. Jus itaque populi pariter ac regis, quicquid est, è Deo

Glaucus, wherefore have we twain the chiefest honor
In Lycia, and all men look on us as gods ?

Himself answers himself: "Because we outshine the rest in valor; wherefore let us fight manfully," says he, "lest the
5 Lycians tax us with cowardice." In which words he intimates both that kings derive their royalty from the people, and that for their conduct of war they are accountable to them. Bad kings indeed, to strike terror into their people, declare publicly that God is the author of their royal power, yet in their
10 secret prayers reverence no other divinity but Fortune. The well-known passage in Horace is in point:

Wild Dacians fear thee, thee nomad Scythians fear,
Barbarian tyrants' mothers dread thee,
Scarlet-enrobed usurpers tremble,

15 Lest thou with foot irreverent tumble down
Their stately column, while the mob pouring in
To arms arouse the slow to arms and
Instantly shatter the tyrant's power.

If it is by God, therefore, that kings nowadays reign, it is
20 by God too that peoples assert their liberty, since all things are of him and by him. Scripture bears like witness both that by him kings reign and that by him they are cast down from their thrones, though yet we perceive that the one and the other are brought about far oftener by the people than by
25 God. The right of the people then is as much from God as is the right of the king—whatever that is. And whenever any

114 DEFENSIO PRIMA

est. Populus ubicunque sine Deo manifesto regem creavit, potest eodem jure suo regem rejicere. Tyrannum sane tollere quam const!tuere divinius est; plusque Dei cernitur in populo quoties injustum abdicat regem, quam in rege qui innocen-

5 tern opprimit populum. Immo reges noxios Deo auctore judicat populus: hoc enim ipso honore dilectos suos decoravit Deus, Psal. 149. ut Christum regem suum laudibus celebrantes, gentium reges, quales sub Evangelio sunt omnes tyranni, *vinculis coemrent, inque cos jus scriptum exercerent*, qui

10 jure omni scripto atque legibus solutos se esse gloriantur: ne quis tarn stolide, ne quis tarn impie credat tanti esse apud Deum reges, fere mortalium ignavissimos, ut eorum nutu orbis terrarum totus pendeat et gubernetur; eorum ut gratia, præque illis, divinum, ut ita dicam, hominum genus eodem

15 quo bruta et vilissima quarque animalia loco atque numero habendum sit. Age nunc, ne nihil enim agas, M. Aurelium, quasi tyrannis faventem, in medium prefers; at satius tibi fuit Marcum Aurelium non attigisse. Ille an Deum de principibus solum judicare dixerit, nescio. Xiphilinus certe, quem citas,

20 de loquitur;

autem monarchic synonymum illic esse non assentior; eoque minus quo sxpius prxcedentia lego; nam qui cohxreat, aut quid sibi velit aliena ilia sententia subito in-

people, without some visible designation of God Himself, have appointed a king, they can by the same right put him down. To depose a tyrant certainly is a more godlike action than to set one up; and there appears much more of God in
5 the people whenever they depose an unjust king than in the king that oppresses an innocent people. Nay, the people have a warrant from God to judge wicked kings, for God has conferred this very honor upon his saints, Psalm 149, that while they celebrate the praises of Christ their own king, yet as for
10 the kings of the heathen, (and such, according to the Gospel, are all tyrants), "they shall bind them with chains ... to execute upon them the judgment written"—even upon them that boast themselves unbound by any laws or judgment written! Let none then be so stupid and wicked as to think that
15 kings, commonly the worst of men, are so high in God's account that the whole world is to hang upon their nod and governance, and that for their sakes and on their account the human race divine, if I may so call it, should be reckoned and treated as abject brute beasts.

20 After all this, rather than say nothing, you publish your discovery that Marcus Aurelius countenanced tyranny; but you had better have let him alone. I cannot say whether he ever affirmed that God is the sole judge of princes. Xiphili-
nus, to be sure, whom you quote on an _____ says: "Con-
25 cerning an *aurapyia* God alone has power to judge." But that an *aurapyla* is there synonymous with monarchy I cannot agree; and the less the oftener I read what goes before. Indeed any reader would wonder how that outlandish opinion, ab-

sititia, qui legerit miretur; præsertim cum Marcus Aurelius Imperatorum optimus, non aliter cum populo egerit, ut Capitolinus tradit, quam est actum sub civitate libera; jus autem populi quin supremum tunc fuerit nemo dubitat. Idem Thra-
5 seam, Helvidium, Catonem, Dionem, Brutum tyrannicidas omnes, aut istam gloriam æmulantes coluisse, sibi que reipublicæ formam proposuisse in qua æquis legibus, parique jure omnia administrarentur, in primo libro de vita sua profitetur: in quarto, non se, sed legem, dominum esse. Agnovit etiam
10 omnia Senatus populique esse: nos, inquit, adeo nihil proprium habemus, ut in vestris ædibus habitemus. Hæc Xiphilinus. Tantum abfuit ut quicquam jure regio sibi arrogaret. Moriens, filium suum regnaturum ea lege Romanis commendavit, si dignus esset: jus itaque illud regnandi absolutum
15 atque fictitium, tanquam a Deo per manus traditum, illam denique præ se non tulit. *Plena tamen omnia Græcorum et Latinorum monumenta esse ai's: at nusquam visa: plena Judæorum; et tamen addis, Judæos in plerisque regia potestati minus cequos fuisse: immo Græcos et Latinos*
20 multo minus Tyrannis æquos et reperisti et reperies; multo minus Judæos, si liber ille Samuelis in quo is, i Sam. 10, jus

ruptly engrafted upon the context, hangs together with it, or what is its own meaning; especially since Marcus Aurelius, best of emperors, conducted himself towards the people, Capitolinus tells us, just as if Rome had still been a free republic. And
5 we all know that when it was so, the supreme power was in the people. The same emperor, in the first book of his autobiography, openly professes that he revered Thrasesas, and Helvidius, and Cato, and Dion, and Brutus, who were all tyrant-slayers, or affected that reputation, and that he pro-
10 posed to himself a form of government under which all men might equally enjoy the benefit of the law, and right and justice be equally administered to all. And in his fourth book he says the law is master, and not he. He acknowledged that all power and property belong to the Senate and the people:
15 we are so far, says he, from having anything of our own, that we live in your house. Thus Xiphilinus. So little did he arrogate aught to himself by virtue of a royal right. When he was dying he offered the Romans his son for his successor, to rule upon condition he should prove worthy. He exhibited
20 not, then, that absolute and imaginary right of sovereignty supposed to be delivered by God's hand,—made, in short, no pretence to that *afaapyia* of yours.

Still you say that "the annals of Greece and Rome are full." But nobody has seen them anywhere. "So are the annals of
25 the Jews." And yet, you add, "the Jews in most respects were unfavorable to royal power." Nay, you have found and you will find that both the Greeks and the Latins were exceedingly unfavorable to tyrants; the Jews too—if that book that Sam-

regni descriperat, exstaret; quem librum Doctores Hebræorum à regibus discerptum aut combustum esse tradiderunt, quo impunius tyrannidem in suos exercerent. Circumspice jam, numquid captare possis: occurrit tibi rex David postre-
5 mo torquendus, Psal. 17; <è *facie tua iudicium meum prodeat*: ergo, inquit Barnachmoni, *nullus iudicat regem nisi Deus*. Et tamen similis veri videtur, Davidem *hæc* scripsisse cum a Saule vexatus, ne Jonathanis quidem iudicium, quamvis jam
turn unctus a Deo, detrectabat; *si est in me iniquitas, tu me*
10 *affice morte*, inquit, i Sam. 20. deinde ut quis alius ab hominibus falso accusatus, ad iudicium Dei provocat; id sequentia declarant, *tui oculi vident qua recta sunt, cum exploravens cor meum*, etc, quid hoc ad iudicium regium, aut forense? Sane jus regium illi maxime labefactant atque destru-
15 unt, qui fundamentis tam fallacibus niti, atque exædificari produnt. En tritum illud tandem, et aulicorum nostratum argumentum palmarium, *Tibi soli peccavi*, Ps. 51. 6. quasi verò rex David in merore et lacrymis penitentiam agens, sordidatus et squalidus in terra jacens, misericordiam a Deo sup-
20 pliciter petens, quicquam de jure regio cogitaverit hæc loquutus; cum se vix jure mancipii dignum esse arbitraretur. An omnem Dei populum, fratres suos usque adeo præ se con-

uel wrote of "the manner of the kingdom," i Sam. 10., were extant; which book, the Hebrew doctors tell us, the kings tore in pieces or burnt that they might tyrannize over their subjects with the more impunity.

5 Now look about and see whether you can catch hold of somewhat or other. Finally you come to wrest David's words in Psalm 17: "Let my sentence come forth from thy presence": therefore, says Barnachmoni, "None but God judges the king." And yet it seems rather likely that David penned
10 these words when he was persecuted by Saul, and when, though already God's anointed, he did not decline being judged even by Jonathan. "If there be iniquity in me, slay me thyself," he says, i Sam. 20. Thereupon, like anyone else that is falsely accused by men, he appeals to the judgment of God,
15 as appears in the sequel: "Thine eyes behold the thing that is right, for thou has searched mine heart," etc. What has this to do with a judgment passed by a king or a court of law? Certainly they do most to shake and pull down the right of kings who expose how it is built upon and rests upon so
20 treacherous a foundation.

Then you come with that threadbare argument, the prize argument of our courtiers: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned," Ps. 51. 4. As if King David, when doing penance with tears and grief, when in sackcloth and ashes he lay upon
25 the ground imploring God's mercy, said this with any thought of a king's right, at a moment when he deemed himself scarce worthy the right of a slave! And can we think that he despised all God's people, his own brethren, to that degree, as to be-

tempisit, ut cædibus, adulteriis, rapinis peccare in cos non se posse censeret? absit è rege tarn sancto tanta superbia, tamque fœda ignoratio vel sui vel proximi. *Tibi igitur soli peccavi*, proculdubio intelligendum est, tibi præcipue. Utcunque sit, 5 profecto verba psallentis, et sentential affectibus plenæ haudquaquam sunt ad jus explicandum accommodate, aut eo trahendæ. At *non cst in jus vocatus, nee coram synedrio causam capitis dixit*. Esto; qui enim potuit id resciri, quod adeo sine arbitris, et secreto peractum fuit, ut per aliquot fortasse annos 10 (cujusmodi aulæ arcana sunt) vix unus aut alter conscius fuisse videatur, 2 Sam. 12, *Tu hoc clam jecisti*. Deinde quid si in privatis etiam puniendis cessaret synedrium? numquis inde puniendos non esse argumentabitur? Sed ratio obscura non est; ipse se condemnaverat; v. 5, *reus capitis vir ille qui jecit* 15 *hoc*; cui statim subjicit propheta, *tu vir ille es*; prophetæ etiam judicio capitis reus. Veruntamen Deus pro suo jure atque in Davidem eximia dementia, et peccato absolvit regem, et ipsa mortis sententiâ, quam is in semetipsum pronuntiaverat, v. 13, *non es moriturus*. Nunc in advocatum nescio quern 20 sanguinarium debaccharis, et in eo totus es ut perorationem

lieve that he might perpetrate upon them murder, and adultery, and robbery, and yet not be sinning against them? Far be it from so holy a king ever to have been guilty of such pride, or such abominable ignorance of himself and his
5 neighbor! Unquestionably, then, "against thee only have I sinned" means 'against thee chiefly. But however this may be, the words and thoughts of the psalmist, rhapsodical and passionate, are nowise fitted to expound law, nor should be dragged into that use.

10 "But David was never summoned, or made to plead for his life before the Sanhedrim." Of course he was not. How could his sin have been found out, which was committed so secretly that perhaps for some years after (such are secrets at court) not above one or two seem to have been privy to it?
15 2 Sam. 12. "Thou didst it secretly." Moreover, if the Sanhedrim should neglect to punish private persons, would anyone allege this as proof that these are not punishable? But the reason why David was not proceeded against as a malefactor is not much in the dark. Though he had condemned
20 himself in the fifth verse, "The man that hath done this thing shall surely die," and though the prophet at once replies, "Thou art the man," so that in the prophet's judgment also he deserved death, yet God by his sovereignty and his singular mercy to David absolves him both from the guilt of his sin and
25 from the sentence of death as well which he had pronounced against himself: verse 13, "Thou shalt not die."

Next you rage against some "bloodthirsty" advocate or other, and go at it body and soul to refute his peroration. Let

ejus refellas: de qua ipse viderit; ego quod propositum mihi est, id ago ut quam paucissimis absolvam. Quædam tamen praterire non possum; primum, insignes repugnantias tuas: qui p, 30 hæc habes: *Isrælite non deprecantur injustum re-*
5 *gem, violentum, raptorem, et quotes esse solerent qui pessimi.* At p. 42 Advocatum vellicas quod Isrælitas tyrannum petisse arguerat. *An de jumo, inquis, in flammam ire præcipites ma-*
luerunt, id est, savitiam pessimorum tyrannorum experiri po-
10 *tius quàm judices malos pati quibus jam assueverant?* Illic
Hebræos maluisse ai's tyrannos quam judices, hie judices ma-
luisse quàm tyrannos; et *nihil minus quàm tyrannum volu-*
isse. De tuo igitur respondebit tibi advocatus; juxta enim te
omnis rex jure regio tyrannus est. Quod sequitur bene habet,
authoritatem in populo maximum tunc juisse, quòd judices
15 *repudidrun, regem optdrunt.* Memineris, cum hoc ego è te
reposcam. *Negas Deum iratum Isrælitis regem tanquam ty-*
rannum aut poenam attribuisse, sed ut rem salutarem et bo-
nam. Quod tamen facile refellitur. Cur enim exclamarent
propter regem ilium quem elegerant, nisi quod res mala erat
20 imperium regium; non quidem per se, sed quod plerunque,
sicut Propheta hie monet, in superbiam et dominationem se
convertit. Si adhuc non satisfacio, agnosce jam tua, syngra-
pham agnosce tuam, et erubescere. Apparatus ad primatum, *Ira-*

him look to that; I will endeavor to be as short as I can in what I have undertaken to perform. Yet some things I cannot pass by,—first your extraordinary self-contradictions. On your thirtieth page you say: "The Israelites are not begging 5 for an unjust, violent, rapacious king, such as kings are at their worst." And yet, page 42, you rail at the advocate for maintaining that the Israelites asked for a tyrant. "Would they have chosen," say you, "to leap headlong out of the frying pan into the fire, and risk the cruelty of the worst tyrants, 10 rather than suffer the bad judges to whom they were by now grown accustomed?" First you said the Hebrews preferred tyrants to judges; here you say they preferred judges to tyrants, and "a tyrant was the thing they least desired." So that the advocate will answer you out of your own book, for 15 according to your principle every king is by royal right a tyrant.

What you say next is very true: "The supreme power was then in the people, as appears by their rejecting judges and choosing a king." Remember this when I shall ask you for 20 it again! It is not true, you say, that "God in his anger gave the Israelites a king as a tyrant or a punishment, but as a thing good and profitable." But that is easily refuted; for why should they cry to God because of the king that they had chosen, were it not that royal government was an evil—not in 25 itself, but because most commonly, even as the prophet here warns, it does degenerate into pride and tyranny? If you are not yet satisfied, acknowledge your own words, acknowledge your own written bond, and blush. In your *Apparatus ad*

tus Deus re gem iltis dedit offensus eorum peccatis, quod Deum habere regem renuissent. Ita Ecclesia quasi in posnam ejus delicti, quod h puro Dei cultu desciverat, in unius mortalis monarches plusquam regium dominatum data est. Tua igitur
 5 similitude si sibi constat, aut dedit Deus regem Isrælitis in poenam, et tanquam rem malam, aut dedit Papam ecclesiæ in bonum, et tanquam rem bonam. Quid hoc homine levius, quid insanius? Quis huic in re minima fidem habeat, qui tantis in rebus quid asserat, et mox neget, nihil pensi habet. Af-
 10 firmas p. 29, *regem legibus solutum esse apud omnes gentes; sic Oriens judicavit, sic Occidens: At p. 43, omnes reges Orientis et legitimos juisse', immo Ægypti reges in maximis minimisque rebus legibus obstrictos, cum inido capitis hoc te probaturum pollicitus sis, omnes reges solutos*
 15 *legibus esse, leges dare, non accipere.* Equidem non irascor tibi, aut enim insanis, aut stas a nobis. Hoc certe oppugnare est, non defendere, hoc regem est ludos facere. Sin miniis, Catullianum profecto illud in te aptissime quadrat, sed inversum; nam quanto quis unquam optimus poeta fuit, tanto tu
 20 pessimus omnium patronus. Certe nisi stupor ille quo advocatum esse *demersum* ai's, te potius obcæcavit, jam tute *obbrutuisse* te senties. Nunc *omnibus quoque gentium regibus*

Primum, "God gave them a king in his anger," you say, "being offended at their sin in refusing to have God for their king. So the Church, as if in punishment for its crime of forsaking the pure worship of God, has been delivered up to the
5 more than kingly government of one mortal head." Therefore if your own comparison holds, either God gave the children of Israel a king to their loss and as an evil, or he gave the Church a Pope for its profit and as a good. Was there ever anything more lightheaded and mad than this man? Who
10 would trust him in the least thing, that in things of so great concern says and presently unsays without attaching the slightest weight to the matter? You tell us in your twenty-ninth page that "among all nations, kings are loosed from law; this was the judgment both of the Eastern and of the
15 Western world." And yet, page 43, you say "that all the kings of the East were legal and lawful, nay, that the very kings of Egypt in all matters great or small were tied to laws"; though in the beginning of this chapter you had undertaken to demonstrate "that kings are bound by no laws, that they give laws
20 but receive none." For my part I am not angry with you, for either you are mad or you are of our side. Surely this is attacking, not defending, the king; this is making game of him; or if you are in earnest, that phrase of Catullus's fits you squarely, but contrariwise, for by as much as anyone was ever the best
25 of poets, by so much are you the worst of all defenders. Unless that stupidity in which, you complain, the advocate you mention is "sunk," has blinded you instead, you shall now feel that you are yourself "become a very brute." For now

leges datas fuisse fateris; non tamen ut its tenerentur, iudiciorum metu et posnce capitis. Quod nequedum ex scriptura, neque ex ullo authore fide digno ostendisti. Tu igitur paucis accipe: leges civiles iis dare qui legibus non tenentur, stultum
5 *et ridiculum est; omnes alios punire, uni duntaxat omnium scelerum impunitatem dare, cum lex neminem excipiat, iniquissimum est. Quæ duo in sapientes legumlatores minime cadunt, multò minus in Deum. Ut omnes autem videant te nullo modo ex Hebræorum scriptis id probare, quod proban-*
10 *dum hoc capite susceperas, esse ex magistris tua sponte confiteris, qui negant alium suis maioribus regem agnoscendum fuisse prater Deum, datum autem in pcsnam fuisse. Quorum ego in sententiam pedibus eo. Non decet enim, neque dignum est regem esse, nisi qui cæteris omnibus longe antecellit; ubi*
15 *multi sunt æquales, ut sunt in omni civitate plurimi, imperium ex æquo atque per vices dandum esse arbitror: æquali, aut plerumque deteriori, ac sæpissime stulto servire omnes, quis non indignissimum putet? Nee ad commendationem regalis imperil plus facit, quod Christus è regibus originem*
20 *duxit, quàm facit ad pessimorum regum commendationem, Christum eos habuisse nepotem. Rex est Messias: agnoscimus, gaudemus, et quam citissime veniat oramus; dignum enim est, nee ei quisquam similis aut secundus: interim regia governa-*

you confess that "the kings of all nations too have laws prescribed to them, yet not so as to be held to them by fear of judgment and capital punishment." Which yet you have proved neither from Scripture nor from any authority worthy
5 of credit. Observe then in few: to prescribe civil laws to such as are not bound by them is silly and ridiculous; to punish all others, but leave some one man at liberty to commit all sorts of wickedness without fear of punishment, is most unjust, for law makes no exception. These two things simply do not
10 happen to wise lawgivers, much less to God. But for all to see that you nowise prove out of the writings of the Hebrews what you had undertook in this chapter to prove by them, you confess of your own accord that there are some rabbins "who affirm that a king other than God ought not to have been
15 acknowledged by their forefathers, yet was given them for their punishment." With their opinion I agree.

He is not fit or worthy to be king that does not far excel all the rest. But where many are equal, as in all governments the majority are, they ought, I think, to have an equal inter-
20 est in the government, and hold it by turns. But that all men should be slaves to one that is their equal, or, as generally happens, their inferior, and most often a fool, who would not think this a thing most unworthy? Nor does it "recommend royal government," that Christ had kings for ancestors,
25 any more than it recommends some very bad kings, that they had Christ for a descendant. "The Messiah is a king." We acknowledge him, we rejoice, and we pray that he will come as soon as may be; for he is worthy, nor is there any that is like

tio commissa indignis et immerentibus, ut plerumque fieri solet, plus mali quàm boni attulisse humane generi recte existimatur. Nee continuè sequitur omnes reges tyrannos esse. Verum ita esto: do tibi hoc, ne me nimis tenacem putes; utere
5 tujamdato. *Hac duo sequuntur, inquis, Deus ipse rex fuerit tyrannorum dicendus, et quidem tyrannus ipse maximus.* Horum alterum si non sequitur, sequitur profectò illud quod toto libro tuo semper fere sequitur, te non scripturæ solium, sed tibimet perpetuo contradicere, ut qui proxima periodo
10 supra dixeras, *unum Deum regem esse omnium rerum, quas et ipse creavit.* Creavit autem et tyrannos et Dæmonas; eorum itaque rex vel tua ipsius sententia. In alterum despuimus, et blasphemum illud tibi os obturatum volumus, qui Deum affirmes tyrannum esse maximum, si tyrannorum, quod ipse
15 sæpius dicis, rex et dominus dicatur. Sed nee rem regiam multo plus adjuvas, dum ostendis, Mosen etiam cum *summa potestate regent fuisse.* Nam fuerit sane, vel quivis alius, dummodò is sit qui res nostras, quemadmodum Moses, *ad Deum referre* possit, Exod. 18. 19. Verum neque Mosi, quanquam
20 is Dei quasi sodalis fuit, licuit in Dei populo quicquid libuit facere. Quid enim ille? *Venit ad me hic populus, inquit, ad consulendum Deum;* non ergo ad mandata Mosis accipienda. Turn suscipit Jethro, *esto tu pro hoc populo erga Deum, et*

unto him or that can follow him. .Meanwhile the royal power, entrusted to unworthy and undeserving persons, as most commonly it is, may well be thought to have done mankind more harm than good. Nor does it follow for all this that all kings
5 are tyrants. But suppose it did; I grant you this lest you think me obstinate; now make the best of it. "These two conclusions follow," you say; "God himself would properly be called king of tyrants, and indeed himself the greatest tyrant." If the first of these is a non-sequitur, at least there does follow
10 the thing that almost always follows from your whole book, viz., that you perpetually contradict not only the Scriptures but your own self. For in the very next sentence above, you have affirmed that "there is one God, the king of all things, having himself created them." Now he created as well ty-
15 rants and devils, and consequently by your own reasoning is their king too. The second of your conclusions we detest, and wish that blasphemous mouth of yours stopped, with which you affirm God to be the worst of tyrants, if he is to be called, as you so often say he is, their king and lord.

20 Nor do you much advantage the royal cause by telling us that Moses "was a king, with supreme power." So mote he be indeed, or any other for that matter, who could, like Moses, "bring the causes unto God," Exod. 18. 19. But even Moses, though, so to speak, God's confidant, was not permit-
25 ted to do whatever he pleased to God's people. For, what says he? "The people come unto me to inquire of God"—not, then, to receive Moses's own commands. Then Jethro takes up the point: "Be thou for the people to Godward, . . . and

commonejacias cos de legibus Dei. Et Moses, Deut. 4. 5. *do-*
cui vos statuta et judicia, quemadmodum pracepit mihi Deus.
 Unde *fidelis* dicitur *in tota domo Dei*, Num. 12. Rex itaque
 Jehova turn populi fuit; Moses veluti interpres tantum }
 5 hovæ regis. Impium igitur et sacrilegum te esse oportet, qui
 summam hanc potestatem a Deo ad hominem injussus ausis
 transferee, quam ipse Moses non summam sed vicariam tan-
 tum et intermediam sub present! numine obtinuit. Accedit
 etiam cumulus ad improbitatem tuam, quod Mosen hie sum-
 10 ma potestate regem fuisse dicis; cum in Apparatu ad Prima-
 tum, p. 230, *Sum in commune cum LXX senioribus populum*
rexisse; et primum populi non dominum fuisse dixeris. Si
 igitur rex fuit, ut erat certe, et regum optimus, idque, sicut ipse
 ai's, cum *potestate plane summa et regia*, nee tamen dominus,
 15 neque solus populum regebat, vel te authore, necessariò se-
 quitur, reges, quamvis summa potestate praditos, jure tamen
 regio atque summo non esse dominos, neque solos populum
 regere debere; quanto minus ad libitum suum? Jam vero qua
 impudentia Dei mandatum ementiris, *de rege statim atque*
 20 *ingressi essent terram sanctam sibi constituendo*, Deut. 17.
 suppressis enim veteratorie quod præcedit, *si dixeris, statuam*
super me regem: tuque memento quid à te jam repositam;

thou shalt teach them God's ordinances and laws." And Moses again, Deut. 4.5. "I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me." Hence it is that he is said to have been "faithful in all God's house,"

5 Numb. 12. So that the people's king was then Jehovah, and Moses as it were an interpreter only of Jehovah the king. Impious and sacrilegious you must needs be who without warrant have dared shift this supreme power from God to man—a power which, as held by Moses himself, was not supreme,

10 but only deputed or intermediate under God's present deity. To heap up your wickedness to its summit, you here say Moses was a king with absolute power, yet in your *Apparatus adPrimum*, page 230, you say: "Together with the seventy elders he ruled the people, and was their foremost, but not

15 their master." If Moses therefore was a king, as certainly he was, and the best of kings, and had, as you say he had, "sovereign royal power," and yet, again as you say, was neither the people's master nor their sole ruler, then it necessarily follows that kings, though endued with the supreme power, yet

20 ought not by virtue of that sovereign royal right of theirs be lords over the people, or sole rulers, much less rulers according to their own will and pleasure.

With what shamelessness you counterfeit a supposed command of God "to set up a king over them as soon as they

25 should be possessed of the Holy Land," Deut. 17! For you craftily leave out the preceding words, "*When thou . . . shalt say*, I will set a king over me." And pray call to mind also what you said before, page 42, and what I shall now ask

cum dixeris p. 42, *liberrima tunc potestate populus erat præditus*. Nunc iterum fanaticus an profanus esse veils, ipse videris. *Deus*, inquis, *cum tanto antea determinaverit regum regimen instituendum tanquam optimum populi illius regendi statum, quomodo hæc conciliabuntur? Propheta repugnavit, Deus sic egit cum propheta, ut quasi nollet*. Videt se illaqueatum, videt se impeditum; Jam attendite quanta cum malitia adversus Prophetam, impietate adversus Deum, expedire se quærat: *cogitandum in his est*, inquit, *Samuelem esse cujus filii populum tunc judicabant, eos populus repudiabat ob corrupta judicia; Samuel igitur noluit filios suos h populo rejici; Deus ut gratificaretur propheta suo, innuit non valde sibi placere, quod populus desideraret*. Die uno verbo, improbe, quod per ambages dicis; Samuel populo fucum fecit, 15 Samueli Deus. Non advocatus ergo, sed tu *ceritus* ille et *lymphaticus* es, qui modo ut regem honores, nil Deum revereris. Isne tibi Samuel videtur, qui saluti aut charitati patriæ filiorum avaritiam et ambitionem præposuerit, qui populo recta et salutaria petenti, tam callido consilio, tamque vafro illuserit, 20 falsa pro veris docuerit? Isne tibi Deus, qui in re tam turpi cuivis gratificaretur, aut cum populo simulate ageret? Aut

you to recite, viz. "The people were then possessed of quite unlimited power."

Now once more you shall decide whether you are sacrilegious or crazed. "God," you say, "having so long before ap-
5 pointed a kingly government as best and most proper for that people, what shall we say to the Prophet's opposing it, and God's own dealing with the Prophet as if himself were rather against it? How do these things agree?" He sees himself enmeshed, he sees himself entangled; observe now with how
10 great malice against the Prophet, and impiety against God, he seeks to disentangle himself! "We must consider," says he, "that it was Samuel's own sons who then judged the people, and that the people rejected them because of their corruption; now Samuel was loth his sons should be laid aside, and God,
15 to gratify his prophet, intimated that what the people desired did not much please him." Speak out, wretch, and never mince the matter: you mean, Samuel deceived the people, and God Samuel. It is not that advocate of yours, therefore, but yourself, that are the "frantic" and "raving" one; who, so you
20 may but honor a king, cast off all reverence to God. Does Samuel seem to you one that would have preferred his sons' ambition and covetousness before his people's grace or safety; one that, when the people sought what was right and beneficial, would have imposed upon them with such sly crafty
25 advice, and made them believe things that were not? Does God himself seem to you one that in so disgraceful an affair would stoop to oblige a friend? Would God act a part before the people? So, then, either what Samuel taught the people

ergò jus regium non erat quod Propheta populo exposuit, aut jus illud, teste Deo et Propheta, malum, molestum, violentum, inutile, sumptuosum reipub. erat; aut denique, quod nefas est dicere, et Deus et Propheta populo verba dare voluerunt. Passim enim testatur Deus valdè sibi displicuisse quòd regem petissent: ver. 7; *Non te, scd me spreverunt ne regnem super ipsos, secundum ilia jacta quibus dereliquerunt me et coluerunt Deos alienos:* planè quasi species quædam idololatriæ videretur regem petere, qui adorari se, et honores propè 5
10 divinos tribui sibi postulat. Sane qui supra omnes leges terrenum sibi dominum imponit, prope est ut sibi Deum statuatur alienum; Deum utique haud sæpe rationabilem, sed profligata sæpius ratione brutum, et belluinum. Sic i Sam. 10. 19, *Vos sprevestis Deum vestrum qui ipse servat vos ab omnibus mails* 15
15 *et angustis vestris, cum dixistis ei, Regem prapones nobis:* et cap. 12. 12, *Vos regem petistis, cum Jehova sit rex vester:* et ver. 17, *Videte malum verum magnum esse coram Jehova, petendo vobis regem.* Et contemptim Hosea de rege, c. 13. 10,11; *Ubi rex tuus, ubinam est? servet te jam in civitatibus* 20
20 *tuis. Ubi vindices tui? quoniam dixisti, da mihi regem et proceres: dedi tibi tegem in ira mea.* Hinc Gedeon ille Heros rege major, *Non dominabor in vos, neque filius meus in vos do-*

was not the right of kings, or else that right, by the testimony of God and of the Prophet, was an evil thing, burdensome, injurious, unprofitable, and costly to the commonwealth; or lastly (which, as sacrilege, is inadmissible), both God and
5 the Prophet wished to deceive the people.

God frequently protests that he was extremely displeased with them for asking a king, verse 7: "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have
10 done . . . wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods." As if it were considered a kind of idolatry to ask for a king, who requires adoration and worship almost divine. Surely, whoever subjects himself to an earthly master that is above all law comes but little short of setting up a
15 strange god, a god that at least is seldom rational, but too often abjectly brutish and beastly. So i Sam, 10. 19.: "And ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and your tribulation, and ye have said unto him, Nay, but set a king over us"; and chapter 12,
20 verse 12: Ye asked for a king "when the Lord your God was your king"; and verse 17: "See that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of the Lord, in asking you a king." And Hosea speaks contemptuously of the king, chap. 13. 10-11: "Where is thy king? Let him now save thee in
25 thy cities. Where are thy judges? For that thou saidst, give me a king and princes, I gave thee a king in mine anger." Hence it is that heroic Gideon, greater than a king, "I will not rule over you," says he, "neither shall my son rule over

minabitur, sed dominabitur in vos Jehova, Jud. 8. plane ac si simul docuisset, non hominis esse dominari in homines, sed solius Dei. Hinc Hebræorum rempublicam, in qua Deus principatum solus tenuit, *deoxpariav* vocat Josephus contra

5 Apionem Grammaticum Ægyptium et maledicum tui similem. Populus denique resipiscens apud Isaiam 26. 13, calamitosum hoc sibi fuisse queritur, quod alios præter Deum dominos habuisset. Indicio sunt hæc omnia regem irato Deo

10 Isrælitis fuisse datum. In historia tyranni Abimelechi quis est cui non risum moveas? de quo dicitur, cum is partim saxo a muliere, partim armigeri gladio interfectus fuit. *reddidit Deus malum Abimelechi. Hæc, inquis, historia potentissimè adstmit Deum solum re gum judicem esse et vindicem: immo tyrannorum, nebulonum, nothorum, si hoc valebit: quicun-*

15 *que per fas aut nefas tyrannidem occupaverit, is jus regium statim in populum adeptus erit, poenas effugit, confestim arma magistratui de manibus fluent, mussare deinceps populus non audebit. Verum quid si magnus aliquis latro hoc modo in bello periisset, an Deus ergo solus latronum vindex? Quid si*

20 *carnificis manu lege damnatus, an ideo minus illi Deus malum reddidisset? Ne judices quidem eorum unquam legisti*

you; the Lord shall rule over you," Judges 8; intimating thereby that it belongs not to a man, but to God only, to exercise dominion over men. And hence Josephus in his book against Apion, an Egyptian grammarian and a foulmouthed
5 fellow like you, calls the commonwealth of the Hebrews, in which God was sole ruler, a Theocracy. In Isaiah 26. 13 the people, in their right minds at last, complain that it had been mischievous to them to have had other rulers than God. All which passages go to prove that the king was given the
10 Israelites in God's anger.

Who can forbear laughing at the use you make of the story of the usurper Abimelech? Of whom it is said when he was killed, partly by a woman that hurled a piece of millstone upon him, and partly by the sword of his own armor-bearer,
15 that "God rendered the wickedness of Abimelech." "This history," say you, "proves strongly that God alone is the judge and punisher of kings." Yea, if this argument hold, he is the only judge and punisher of tyrants, rascals, and bastard usurpers. Whoever by hook or crook can seize a throne shall
20 have got a sovereign kingly right over the people, and is out of all danger of punishment; instantly the weapons shall fall from the magistrates' hands, and the people thenceforth not dare to mutter. What if some strong thief had perished in like manner by violence, would any man infer that God
25 alone is the judge and punisher of thieves? Or what if he had been legally convicted, and had died by the executioner's hand—would it have been any the less God that rendered his wickedness? You have never read that the judges of the chil-

lege postulates; tamen *in optimatum statu vel principem, si quid committal, fosse ac debere judicari, ultro fateris, '?. 47.* cur non item tyrannus in regno? quia Deus reddidit malum Abimelechi. At reddidit quoque mulier ilia, reddidit etiam 5 armiger, in quos ille ambos jus regium habere præ se tulit. Quid si reddidisset magistratus? an non is idcirco Dei gladium gerit, ut malum malis reddat? Ab hoc *potentissimo* de morte Abimelechi argumento ad verborum contumelias more suo se convertit; nil nisi *coenum et lutum* ore funditat; cum eorum 10 quæ promisit se probaturum, nihil vel ex sacris libris, vel ex rabbinicis probaverit. Nam neque regem legibus solutum esse, nee cur puniri, si delinquat, solus mortalium non debeat, quicquam ostendit. Immo suis ipse testibus se induit, et sententiam suæ contrariam esse veriolem suamet ipse opera de- 15 monstrat. Cumque argumentis parum proficiat, criminatio- nibus atrocissimis omnium in nos odium excitare conatur, quasi rege optimo et innocentissimo crudeliter sublato. *An Solomon, inquit, melior rex Carolo I. juit?* Sunt, ut verum fatear, qui patrem ejus Jacobum cum Solomone comparare 20 non dubitaverint, et natalibus quidem anteferre. Solomon

dren of Israël were ever proceeded against according to law, and yet you admit of your own accord (p. 47) that "in an aristocracy even the prince may and ought to undergo judgment if he break the law." And in a kingdom why may not a
5 tyrant likewise undergo judgment? Because God rendered the wickedness of Abimelech! So did the woman, and so did his own armor-bearer, over both of whom he pretended to a right of sovereignty. And what if a magistrate had rendered his wickedness? Does not a magistrate bear God's sword for
10 that very purpose, to render the wicked their wickedness?

Having done with this "most powerful" argument from the death of Abimelech, he betakes himself, as is his way, to slanders and calumnies; his discourse does naught but sling "mud and dirt"; but as for those things that he promised to
15 prove, he has proved not one, either from the Scriptures or from the rabbinical writings. Nowise does he show that a king is unbound by law, or why a king, alone of all mortal men, if he commit a crime should not be punished. Nay, he gets entangled in those very authorities that he makes use of,
20 and by his own discourse shows the opinion that he argues against to be the truer. And perceiving that he is like to do but little good with his arguments, he endeavors to bring odium upon us by loading us with abominable accusations, as if we had cruelly put to death the most virtuous innocent prince
25 that ever reigned. "Was Solomon," says he, "a better king than Charles I?" I confess some have ventured to compare his father King James with Solomon, nay, to prefer King James for his illustrious descent. Solomon was David's son,

Davidis filius; is primò Saulis musicus erat: Jacobus, Darlii comitis filius, qui Davidem musicum, reginæ uxoris thalamos nocte ingressum, cum ostio pessulum obdidisse apprehendit, baud multò pòst interfecit, ut narrat Buchananus. Na-
 5 talibus ergo illustrior Jacobus, et secundus Solomon sæpe dictus; quamvis Davidis musici filius an fuerit, divinandum lectoribus historia ilia in medio reliquerit. At Carolum conferre cum Solomone, qui tibi in mentem venire potuerit non video. Quern enim tu Carolum tot laudibus tollis, ejus pervi-
 10 ciam, avaritiam, crudelitatem, et sævum in omnes pios atque bonos dominatum, ejus bella, incendia, rapinas, et miserorum civium cædes innumeras, dum hæc scribo, Carolus ipse filius in ilia publicæ pœnitentiæ sedecula apud Scotos coram populo confitetur atque deplorat: immo tuum illud
 15 regium jus ejurat. Verum si Parallelis tantopere delectaris, Carolum cum Solomone conferamus. Solomon è meritissimo *jratri* supplicio *regnum auspicatus est*: Carolus a patris funere; non dico a nece, quamvis indicia veneni omnia in corpore patris mortui conspecta sint; ita enim suspicio in Buc-
 20 chinghamio constitit; quern tamen Carolus, et regis interfec-torem et sui patris, non solum in Summo regni concilio omni culpa exemit, sed ne omnino res ea Senatus cognitioni subji-ceretur, conventum dissolvit. Solomon *gravissimis tributis*

and David used to be Saul's musician; but King James was the son of the Earl of Darnley, who, Buchanan tells us, caught David the musician in his wife the Queen's bedchamber at night with the door bolted, and killed him not long after. So
5 that King James was of more distinguished origin, and was frequently called a second Solomon, though whether he was the son of David the musician the tale has left uncertain, for readers to guess. But how it could ever come into your head to make a comparison between Charles and Solomon, I cannot
10 see. For that very Charles whom you praise thus to the sky, that very man's obstinacy, and covetousness, and cruelty, his hard mastership to all good and honest men, his wars, and arsons, and plunderings, and slaughters innumerable of his wretched subjects, all this, whilst I am a-writing, does his
15 son Charles himself publicly confess and bewail on the stool of repentance in Scotland, nay, renounces there that kingly right of yours.

Still, if you take such pleasure in Parallels, let us compare King Charles and King Solomon. Solomon "began his reign"
20 with the execution "of his brother," who had jusdy deserved it. Charles began his with his father's funeral—I do not say his father's *murder*, though all the evidences of poison appeared on the dead body, for that suspicion rested upon Buckingham; whom yet, though murderer of the king and
25 Charles's father, Charles not only cleared of guilt in the highest Council of the realm, but dissolved Parliament to keep the affair by hook or crook from Parliamentary investigation. Solomon "oppressed the people with heavy taxes,"

populum pressit: at ille in templum Dei, et ædificia publica impendit; Carolus in luxum. Solomon è plurimis uxoribus ad Idolorum cultum pellectus est; hie ab una. Pellectus in fraudem Solomon, pellexisse alios non legitur; hie alios, non solum uberrimis corruptis Ecclesiæ præmiis pellexit, sed etiam edictis et canonibus ecclesiasticis coegit, ut invisa reformatis omnibus altaria statuerent, et pictos in pariete crucifixos altaribus imminentes adorarent. At non est ideo *Solomon h populo capitis damnatus*. Nee inde, inquam, sequitur damnari 10 à populo non debuisse; multa enim incidere potuerunt, cur id turn expedire populo non videretur. Populus certe quid sui juris esset baud multo post et verbis et factis patefecit: cum Solomonis filium decem tribus expulerunt; et nisi mature se in fugam coniecisset, etiam lapidibus regem tantum- 15 modo minacem obruituros fuisse credibile est.

CAPUT III.

CUM satis jam disputatum atque conclusum sit, reges Mosai'cos ex præscripto Dei omnibus obstrictos legibus pariter cum populo fuisse, nullas legum exceptiones perscriptas inveniri, ut reges *quod vellent, impune possent*, aut ut à *populo puniri ne possent*, Deum proinde *vindictam de his tribunali suo reservasse* falsissimum esse, sine authore, sine ratione dictum, videamus an id suadeat Evan-

but he spent that money upon the temple of God and other public buildings; King Charles spent his in extravagances. Solomon was enticed to idolatry by many wives, Charles by one. Though Solomon were himself seduced, we read not
5 that he seduced others; but Charles, as well by the richest benefices of a corrupt Church seduced and enticed others, as by his edicts and ecclesiastical decrees he compelled them to set up altars, which all Protestants abhor, and to bow down to crucifixes painted over them on the wall. But yet not for
10 all this "was Solomon by his people condemned to die." Nor does it follow because he was not, say I, that therefore he ought not to have been; for perhaps there were many circumstances that made it then inexpedient. But not long after, the people by both words and actions made clear what was their right,
15 when ten tribes revolted from Solomon's son; and if he had not made speed to flee, very likely they would have stoned to death even a king who had but threatened them.

CHAPTER III.

IT HAS now been sufficiently argued and proved that the
20 kings of the Jews were by God's ordinance bound to all the laws even as were the people, and that no exemptions from the law are found in Scripture; so that it is quite unauthorized, quite unreasonable, and quite untrue, to say that kings "may do what they list with impunity," or that "they may not be punished by the people," and accordingly that
25 "God has reserved their punishment to his own tribunal."

gelium, quod dissuasit Lex, non imperavit: videamus an Evangelium, divinum illud libertatis præconium, nos in servitute addicat regibus et tyrannis, quorum ab impotent! imperio etiam servitutis cujusdam magistra lex vetus popu-
 5 lum Dei liberavit. Primum argumentum ducis a persona Christi, quem quis nescit non privati solum, sed etiam servi personam ideò sumpsisse, ut nos liberi essemus. Neque hoc de interna tantum libertate intelligendum est, non de civili: quam enim aliena sunt ista quæ Maria, mater Christi, ejus in
 10 adventu cecinit, *superbos dissipavit cogitatione cordis ipsorum, detraxit dynastas è thronis, humiles evexit*, si adventus ejus tyrannos potius in solio stabilivit, Christianos omnes eorum sævissimo imperio subjecit? Ipse sub tyrannis nascendo, serviendo, patiendo omnem honestam libertatem nobis
 15 acquisivit: ut posse servitute, si necesse est, æquo animo pati, sic posse ad libertatem honeste aspirare non abstulit Christus, sed majorem in modum dedit. Hinc Paulus i Cor. 7, non de evangelica solum, sed de civili libertate sic statuit: *Servus vocatus es? ne sit tibi cura; sin autem potes liber fieri, potius*
 20 *utere; pretio emti estis, ne estate servi hominum*. Frustrà igitur ab exemplo Christi ad servitute nos hortaris, qui suæ servitutis pretio libertatem nobis etiam civilem confirmavit:

Let us now consider whether the Gospel recommend what the Law not only did not command but discommended; let us consider whether the Gospel, heavenly proclamation of liberty, give us over in slavery to kings and tyrants, from
5 whose outrageous rule the old law, though it taught slavery of some sort, did set God's people free.

Your first argument you take from the person of Christ. But who does not know that he put himself into the condition not only of a subject, but even of a servant, that we might be
10 free? Nor is this to be understood of inward liberty only, to the exclusion of civil liberty. How out of place are the words that Mary mother of Christ spake in prophecy of his coming—"He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts; he hath put down the mighty from their seats, and
15 exalted them of low degree"—if his coming rather established tyrants on their thrones, and cast all Christians down beneath their cruel sway! He himself, by being born, and serving, and dying, under tyrants, has purchased all rightful liberty for us. As he has not withheld from us the resignation
20 to submit patiently, if we must, to slavery, so he has not forbidden us to strive nobly for our liberty—nay has granted this in fuller measure. Hence it is that Paul, i Cor. 7. 21, has resolved thus, not only of evangelical but also of civil liberty: "Art thou called, being a servant? care not for it; but if thou
25 mayest be made free, use it rather. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men." Vainly then do you endeavor to argue us into slavery by the example of Christ, who at the price of servitude for himself established liberty for us, even

Et formam quidem servi nostra vice suscipit, animum vero liberatoris nunquam non retinuit: unde jus regum quid sit, longe aliter docuisse ostendam, atque tu doces; qui non regii, sed tyrannici juris, idque in republica novus professor, si qua
5 gens tyrannum sive hæreditarium, sive adventitium, sive fortuitum sortita erit, eam non solum necessitate, sed etiam religione servam esse statuis. Tuis autem, ut soleo, in te utar testimoniis. Interrogavit Petrum Christus, cum ab eo coactores quidam Galilei didrachma exigebant, Mat. 17, a quibus acci-
10 perent reges terre tributa, sive censum, è filiis suis, an ab alienis? respondet ei Petrus, ab alienis. Ergo, inquit Christus, *liberi sunt filii; sed ne offendamus illos, da us pro me et pro te.* Varie hic locus interpretes exercet, cuinam persolverentur hæc didrachma, alii sacerdotibus in Sanctuarium, alii Cæsari: ego
15 quidem Herodi persoluta, interverso Sanctuarii reditu, sentio fuisse. Varia enim ab Herode et filiis ejus exacta tributa, ab Agrippa tandem remissa narrat Josephus. Hoc autem tributum per se exiguum, multis aliis adjunctum, grave erat: gravior autem fuerint oportet de quibus hic Christus loquitur;
20 alioqui, in republica etiam, pauperes capite censi fuerunt.

civil liberty. He took upon him indeed in our stead the shape of a servant, but he never did off the soul and purpose of our deliverer; whereby he taught, as I shall show, a quite other notion of the right of kings than this you teach. For you
5 preach not the right of kings, but the right of tyrants (a novel thing in a commonwealth!) and assert that whatever nation has in fate's lottery drawn a tyrant, whether by inheritance or by conquest or by chance, is enslaved not merely under compulsion, but under religious obligation.

10 Now, as usual, I will turn your own authorities against you. When certain Galilean collectors of the tribute money demanded tribute of Peter, Christ asked him, Matt. 17, of whom the kings of the earth took custom or tribute, of their own children or of strangers. Peter answers him, Of strangers.
15 Jesus saith unto him: "Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, . . . give unto them for me and thee." This passage troubles the commentators, who disagree about whom the tribute was paid to. Some say it was paid to the priests for the use of the sanctuary; others
20 that it was paid to the Emperor; I am of opinion that it was paid to Herod, who converted to his own use the revenue of the sanctuary; for Josephus mentions divers sorts of tribute which Herod and his sons exacted, and which Agrippa finally remitted. Now the tribute in question, though small in itself,
25 yet being accompanied with many more, was a heavy burden; indeed that of which Christ speaks here must needs have been oppressive; under other conditions, even during the commonwealth, poor persons were counted only, not taxed. Hence

Hinc itaque Christus Herodis injustitiam arguendi, cujus sub
ditione erat, occasionem cepit. Qui, cum cæteri reges terræ
(siquidem patriæ parentes dici se cupiant) non filiis, id est,
civibus suis, sed alienis, bello nempe subactis graviora tributa
5 imperare soleant, hie contra non alienos, sed filios opprimeret.
Utcunque sit, sive filios hie, cives regum proprios, sive filios
Dei, id est, fideles et in universum Christianos intelligi con-
cedas, ut intelligit Augustinus, certissimum est, si filius fuit
Petrus, et proinde liber, nos etiam authore Christo, liberos
10 esse: vel ut cives, vel ut Christianos: non esse ergo juris regii a
filiis et liberis tributa graviora exigere. Testatur enim Chri-
stus persolvisse se, non quod deberet, sed ne illos offendendo
qui exigebant, negotium sibi privatus exhiberet: cum officium
ac munus longissime diversum in illo vitæ suæ curriculo ex-
15 plendum sibi nosset. Dum igitur negat Christus jus regium
esse, graviora vectigalia liberis imponere, certe spoliare, diri-
pere, occidere, excruciare proprios cives, et præsertim Christi-
anos, jus esse regium multo evidentius negat. Hunc in mo-
dum de jure regio cum et alias disputasse videatur, venire in
20 suspicionem quibusdam coepit, non se tyrannorum licentiam
pro jure regio habere. Non enim de nihilo erat quod Phari-
sæi interrogatione hujusmodi animum ejus tentarent, quod

therefore Christ took occasion to censure the injustice of Herod, under whose government he then was, in that, whereas the rest of the kings of the earth, if indeed they desire to be called fathers of their country, use not to impose excessively heavy taxes upon their children, that is, their subjects, but upon foreigners, especially when subdued in war; he, quite contrary, oppressed not strangers but his children. However it be, whether you agree that children here is to be understood as the king's own subjects, or as the children of God, that is, the faithful, and, in general, Christians, as Augustine understands, this is certain, that if Peter was a child, and therefore free, then we are so too on Christ's own authority, either as citizens or as Christians, and that it therefore is not the right of kings to exact excessive tribute from their own children and freeborn subjects. Christ himself bears witness that he paid this tribute not because he ought, but in order that as an individual he might not bring trouble upon himself by offending those that demanded it; for he knew in his own mind that he had a far different duty and service to perform—a far other race to run. In denying, then, that it is the right of kings to burden their freeborn subjects with grievous exactions, Christ yet more plainly denies that it is their right to spoil and plunder, to massacre and torture their own citizens, especially Christians. As he seems to have discoursed of the right of kings to this same effect elsewhere too, he began to fall under certain persons' suspicion that he did not consider the license of tyrants to be the right of kings. It was not for nothing that the Pharisees put such questions to him, tempt-

de jure regio percontaturi, eum neminem curare, non respicere personam hominum dixerint; neque de nihilo, quod is proposita sibi istiusmodi quæstione irasceret, Mat. 22. Ante quispiam si insidiose aggredi, si loquentem captare vellet, 5 si elicere ex te quod fraudi futurum tibi esset, de jure regio sub rege interrogaret? an tu cuipiam de istoc interroganti irascere? non opinor. Vel hinc ergo perspicias, non id eum de jure regio sensisse quod regibus gratum erat. Idem ex responso ejus apertissime colligitur, quo ille percontatores aman- 10 dare è se potius quam docere videtur. Poscitnumisma census; *Cujus, inquit, imago ista est? Casaris. Reddite ergo Casari qua sunt Ccesaris, qua Dei sunt Deo.* Immo quæ populi sunt populo reddenda esse quis nescit? Reddite omnibus quod debetis, inquit Paulus, Rom. 13. non ergo Cæsari omnia. Li- 15 bertas nostra non Cæsaris, verum ab ipso Deo natale nobis donum est; earn Cæsari cuivis reddere, quam ab eo non accepimus, turpissimum esset, et humana origine indignissimum. Si enim os hominis et vultum aspiciens, interrogaret quisquam, cujus ista imago esset, annon facile quivis respon- 20 deret Dei esse? Cum igitur Dei simus, id est vere liberi, ob eamque causam soli Deo reddendi, profectò Cæsari nos, id

ing him, and that when they were about to press their inquiries concerning the right of kings they told him that he cared not for any man and regarded not the person of men; nor was it for nothing that he was angry when such an inquiry
5 was propounded to him, Matt. 22. What if someone should endeavor slyly to approach *you*, and entangle you in your talk, and question you (this under a monarchy) upon your own principles concerning the right of kings, in order to draw from you somewhat to your hurt—would *you* be angry
10 at him? Oh, no! Hence then pray observe that *his* opinions upon the right of kings were *not* agreeable to kings.

The same may be gathered very clearly from his answer, by which he seems rather to send away his questioners than to instruct them. He asks to be shown the tribute money.
15 "Whose image is that?" he says. "Cæsar's," say they. "Render therefore unto Cæsar," says he, "the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." And is there anyone who knows not as well that unto the people should be rendered the things that are the people's? "Render
20 to all men their dues," says Paul, Rom. 13. So that not all things are unto Cæsar. Our liberty is not Cæsar's, nay but God's own birthday gift to us; and to render unto any Cæsar you like this which we got not from him were an action most foul, most unworthy the origin of man. If one should look
25 upon the countenance of a man, and inquire whose image was that, would not any one answer at once that it was God's? Being then God's own, that is, free in very truth, and consequently to be rendered to none but God, surely we cannot

est, homini, et præsertim injusto, improbo, tyranno in servitutum tradere, sine piaculo et quidem maximo sacrilegio non possumus. Interim quæ Cæsaris sint, quæ Dei, in medio relinquit. Quòd si idem erat hoc numisma quod didrachmum
5 illud Deo pendì solitum, ut certè postea sub Vespasiano fuit, turn sanè controversiam non minuit Christus, sed implicavit: cum impossibile sit Deo et Cæsari idem simul reddere. At enim ostendit quæ Cæsaris essent; numisma nempe illud Cæsaris imagine signatum. Quid igitur inde lucraris præter de-
10 narium vel Cæsari vel tibi? Aut enim Cæsari Christus præter denarium illud nihil dedit, cætera omnia nobis asseruit, aut si quicquid pecuniæ Cæsaris nomine inscriptum esset, id Cæsari dedit, contrarius jam sibi, nostra fere omnia Cæsari dabit, qui duo modo didrachma regibus non se ex debito persolvere,
15 et suo et Petri nomine professus est. Ratio denique infirma est qua niteris; non enim principis effigiem habet moneta ut principis esse, sed ut probam se esse moneat; litque se principis effigie insignitam ne quis audeat adulterare. Sin autem ad jus regium inscriptio tantum valeret, reges profecto nostras om-
20 nium facultates, uti essent suæ, sola nominis inscriptione statim perficerent; aut si nostra omnia jam sua sunt, quod tuum dogma est, non idcirco Cæsari numisma illud reddendum erat, quia Cæsaris nomen aut imaginem pratulit, sed quia Cæsaris jam antea jure erat, nulla licet imagine signatum. Ex quo

without sin and sacrilege the greatest deliver ourselves over in slavery to Cæsar, to a man, that is, and, what is more, to an unjust man, a wicked man, a tyrant.

Christ leaves undecided, however, what things are God's,
5 and what Cæsar's. If that piece of money was the same as the didrachmum that was customarily paid to God, as it certainly was later, under Vespasian, then Christ, instead of limiting the controversy to its issue, has but entangled it; for it is impossible to give the same thing at the same time to God and
10 to Cæsar. But, you say, he intimated to them what things were Cæsar's, to wit, that piece of money stamped with Cæsar's portrait. But does this profit either you or Cæsar more than a pennyworth? Either Christ gave Cæsar nothing but that penny, and declared everything else ours, or
15 else, if he assigned to Cæsar all money that has Cæsar's name upon it, he gives Cæsar nearly all our property, and contradicts himself; for when he was paying kings only two didrachma of tribute, he protested that it was more than either Peter or he was bound to do. The argument you rely on,
20 in fine, is weak, for coin bears the prince's portrait not as a token of its being his property, but of its being good metal, and that none may presume to counterfeit it. If indeed stamping or writing availed so much to establish royal right, kings could instantly turn all our property over to themselves by
25 merely writing their names upon it. Or if all our possessions be already theirs, which is your doctrine, then that piece of money was to be rendered unto Cæsar not because it bore his name or image, but because of right it belonged to him before,

manifestum est, Christum hoc in loco non tam nos officii nostri erga reges aut Cæsares ita perplexè atque ambigue admonere voluisse, quim Pharisæos hypocritas improbitatis et malitiæ arguere. Quid? rursus cum ci nuntiarent Pharisad,

5 Herodem ejus vitæ insidias parare, an humile aut demissum ab eo responsum tyranno reddendum tulerunt? Immo *ite*, inquit, *et dicit vulpi* ',',',"; innuens reges non jure regio, sed vulpino civibus suis insidiari. Atqui *sub tyranno supplicium mortis subire sustinuit*. Enimverò qui potuit nisi sub tyranno?

10 *supplicium sub tyranno passus est*; ergo ad injustissima quævis juris regii testis et assertor: egregius tu quidem officiorum ratiocinator es. Atque Christus quamvis nostri liberandi, non sub jugum mittendi causa servum se fecerit, tamen ad hunc nodum se gessit; nee juri quicquam regio præter æquum et

15 bonum concessit. Nunc ad præcepta ejus hac de re aliquando veniamus. Zebedad filios maximam in regno Christi, quod mox in terris futurum somniabant, dignitatem affectantes, sic Christus corripuit, ut omnes simul Christianos commonefaceret quale jus magistrates et imperii civilis apud eos con-

20 stitui voluerit. *Scitis*, inquit, *principes gentium in eas dominari, et magnates auctoritatem exercere in eas; verum non ita erit inter vos. Sed quicumque volet inter vos magnus fieri, esto vester minister; et quicumque volet inter vos primus esse, esto*

though unstamped with any image. Whence it is clear that Christ in this passage meant not so much to teach us our duty to kings and kesars—so involved and dubious is its doctrine—as he meant to expose the malice and wickedness of the hypocritical Pharisees. Lo, when the Pharisees upon another occasion told him that Herod laid wait to kill him, did they bear from him an humble submissive answer to render unto the tyrant? "Go ye, and tell that fox," says he, intimating that when kings plot their subjects' destruction, 'tis by a right not kingly but foxy.

You say "he brought himself to endure death under a tyrant." How could he possibly except under a tyrant? "Under a tyrant he suffered death"—thus, forsooth, authorizing and championing the wickedest consequences of the royal right! You make an excellent moralist. Christ, moreover, though—not to put us under the yoke but to set us free—he underwent servitude, yet so measured his conduct as not to yield to royal right a jot beyond its just and proper due.

Now 'tis time for us to come to his teaching upon this subject. The sons of Zebedee were ambitious of the highest places in the kingdom of Christ, which they imagined would shortly be set up on earth. Christ reproved them so as to let all Christians know at once what manner of law concerning officials and the civil power he desired should be set up among them. "Ye know," says he, "that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister;

vester servus. Hæc tu nisi mente captus tecum facere credidisses ? hisne te argumentis vincere, ut reges nostros rerum dominos existimemus ? Tales in bello hostes nobis contingant, qui in castra hostium (quanquam et armatos vincere sat scimus) cæci atque inermes, uti tu soles, tanquam in suos incidant: ita semper quod tibi maxime adversatur, id demens veluti firmissimum causæ tuæ subsidium comparare consuevisti. Petebant Israëlite regem, ut habebant omnes istæ gentes: dissuasit Deus multis verbis, quæ Christus hie summatim complexus est, scitis principes gentium in eas dominari: petentibus tamen iis dedit regem Deus, quamvis iratus: Christus, ne peteret omnino Christianus populus more gentium dominaturum, adhibita cautione antevertit; inter vos non ita erit. Quid hoc clarius dici potuit ? non inter vos ista regum superba dominatio, tametsi specioso titulo Euergetæ et benefici vocentur; sed qui magnus inter vos fieri vult (quis autem principe major ?) esto vester minister: et qui primus sive princeps (Luc. 22.) esto vester servus. Non erravit itaque Advocatus ille quern insectaris, sed authorem habuit Christum, si regem Christianum populi ministrum esse dixit, uti est certe omnis

and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Unless you had been distracted, could you ever have imagined that this passage makes for you, and that by such reasonings you win us to regard our kings as masters over us
5 and ours? May enemies like you fall to our lot in war—
enemies who, though we know well enough we can beat them even when they are armed, blunder blindly unarmed, as you have a way of doing, into our hostile camp instead of their own; for whatever makes most against you, that very thing
10 you usually are foolish enough to allege as the strongest support of your cause. The Isrælités kept asking God for a king "like as all the nations that are about" had; God dissuaded them by many arguments, whereof Christ here gives an epitome: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise
15 dominion over them"; yet, because the Isrælités persisted in asking, God gave them ojie, though in his wrath. Christ, lest a Christian people should anywise desire one who would exercise dominion over them as did the kings of the Gentiles, prevents them with the caution "but it shall not be so among
20 you." What could be said plainer than this? There shall not be among you that haughty sway of kings, though by a plausible title they be called Euergetæ and benefactors. But he that will fain be great amongst you—and who is greater than the prince?—"let him be your minister"; and he that will be
25 "foremost," or "prince" (Luke 22), "let him be your servant." So that the lawyer you inveigh against was not wrong, but had Christ's authority if he said that a Christian king is the people's servant, as every good magistrate certainly is.

bonus magistratus. Rex autem inter Christianos aut omnino non erit, aut erit servus omnium: si plane vult esse dominus, esse simul Christianus non potest. Quin et Moses, legis quodammodo servilis institutor, non populo tamen superbe
 5 dominabatur, sed onus ipse populi ferebat; ferebat in sinu populum, ut nutricius lactentem: Num.II. nutricius autem servus est. Plato non dominos, sed servatores et adjuutores populi appellandos esse magistratus docuit; Populum non servos, sed altores magistratum, ut qui alimenta et stipendia ma-
 10 gistratibus etiam regibus præbeant. Eisdem Aristoteles custodes et ministros legum vocat, Plato et ministros et servos. Ministros Dei Apostolus quidem appellat, quod tamen nequaquam obstat quò minus sint et legum et populi; tarn leges enim quàm magistratus propter populum sunt. Et tamen
 15 hanc tu *Fanaticorum Anglia Molossorum opinionem* esse clamitas. Molossos esse Anglos certe non putarem, nisi quòd tu illos, hybrida, latratu tam degeneri oblatras; Lupi, si diis placet, Sancti Dominus: Lupus nimirum sanctus queritur Molossos esse fanaticos. Germanus olim, cujus ille Lupus
 20 Trecassinus collega fuit, incesto apud nos regi Vortigerno auctoritate sua regnum abrogavit. Sanctus itaque Lupus talem te Lupi non sancti, sed famelici cujuspian et latrunculi dominum, illo apud Martialem viperarum domino viliozem, asper-

Insomuch that a king either is no Christian at all, or is the people's servant: if he would be lord and master out and out, he cannot at the same time be Christian.

Moses himself, ordainer of a law that to a certain degree
5 legalized slavery, yet did not lord it haughtily over his people, but himself bore the burden of the people, and carried them in his bosom, as a nursing father does a sucking child, Numb. 11; moreover a nursing father is a servant. Plato would have the magistrates called not lords, but servants and helpers of
10 the people, nor the people called servants, but maintainers of their magistrates, because even when these are kings, the people give them food and wages. Aristotle called the magistrates the keepers and ministers of the laws; Plato, both ministers and servants. The Apostle, to be sure, calls them min-
is ters of God; but that does not prevent their being ministers of the laws and of the people; for the laws and the magistrates as well are for the people's sake.

Yet this, you keep howling, is merely "the opinion of the raving mastiffs of England." Of course I had not thought the
20 people of England mastiffs, did not you, mongrel, bark at them so currishly. The Lord and Seigneur de St. Loup, God 'ield you, yea the Holy Wolf himself, complains that the mastiffs rave! There was a time when St. Germain, whose colleague was that famous St. Loup of Troyes, deposed our
25 unchaste king Vortigern by his own authority. So St. Loup despise you, the master of no saintly wolf, but of some thievish starveling of a wolf, and more contemptible than that master of vipers of whom Martial makes mention. Yes, and

natur: qui et latrantem ipse domi Lyciscam habes, quæ tibi lupi domino misere dominate, titulisque tuis obstrepit, magnique voce refragatur: unde mirum non est velle te regiam dominationem aliis obtrudere, qui femineum ipse domi dominatum ferre tam serviliter assuevisti. Sis itaque Lupi Dominus, sit Lupa tui domina, sis Lupus ipse, sis Lycanthropus, molossis mehercule Anglicanis ludibrium debes. Verum lupos venari nunc non est otium; sylvis itaque egressi, in viam regiam redeamus. Qui contra omnem in ecclesia primatum nuper scripsisti, nunc *Petrum Apostolicæ corona principem appellas*. Quis tibi auctoritate tam fluxa homunculo fidem habeat? Quid Petrus? *subjecti estote omni humane ordinationi propter Dominum; sive regi ut supereminenti, sive præsidentibus, ut qui per eum mittantur, ad ultionem quidem facinorosorum, laudem verb benevolentium; quoniam ita est voluntas Dei*. Scripsit hæc Petrus non solum privatis, sed etiam advenis per minorem fere Asiam dispersis atque dispalatis; qui in iis ubi debebant locis nullius juris præterquam hospitalis capaces erant. An tu incolas, liberos, nobiles, indigenarum conventus, comitia, parlamenta idem in sua patria, quod sparsos et peregrinos in aliena decere putas? an idem privates

at home you even have a barking Lycisca too, and, though you be Lord of the Wolf, this She-wolf lords it pitifully over you, and loudly rails at your Seigneurie, and unlords your lordship. No wonder, then, that you endeavor to obtrude
5 absolute regal government upon others, who are yourself grown accustomed to bear female rule so slavishly at home. Go on then, be Master of the Wolf; a She-wolf be your mistress; be a Wolf yourself, be a Werewolf: be what you will, you are bound to be the English mastiffs' plaything. But I
10 have no time now to hunt wolves; so having got out of the woods, let us go back to the King's highway.

You that but of late writ against all primacy in the church, now call "Peter prince of the Apostolic fellowship." Who can trust you, little man, when your own principles are so un-
15 stable? What says Peter? "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of them that do well: for so is the will of God." This epistle
20 Peter wrote to persons who were not only private individuals, but actually strangers scattered astray throughout most of Asia Minor, and who in those places where they sojourned had no other right than what the laws of hospitality entitled them to. Do you think that what befits scattered strangers
25 in a strange land befits likewise inhabitants freeborn and noble, or meetings, assemblies, and parliaments of native citizens in their own country? or that, in their own land, what befits private persons equally befits members of Parlia-

decere in sua, quod senatores et magistrate, sine quibus ne reges quidem esse possunt? fac tamen indigenas fuissse, fac non privates, sed Senatum ipsum Romanum, cui hæc scripta sunt. Quid inde assequeris? *cum* nullum præceptum cui ratio
 5 aliqua adjuncta est, quenquam ultra illam præcepti rationem obligare aut soleat aut possit. *Estate subjecta*, , id est, si vim verbi spectes, subordinati, seu legitime subjecti, inquit Aristoteles, lex est ordo. *Subjecti estote proffer Dominum*. Quamobrem? quia cum rex, turn præses
 10 constituitur a Deo ad ultionem facinorosorum, laudem beneficentium. *Quoniam ita voluntas est Dei*. Videlicet ut talibus obsequamur, quales hie describuntur; de aliis nullum hie verbum. Vides quàm optimè hujus præcepti constet ratio; addit, v. 16, *ut liberi*; non ergo ut mancipia. Quid si versa vice
 15 ad crucem et perniciem bonorum, ad impunitatem et laudem et præmia facinorosorum regnent? an in perpetuum subjecti erimus non privati solum, sed primores, sed magistrates omnes, ipse denique Senatus? Annon humana ordinatio dicitur? cur ergo potestas humana, ad constituendum quod hominibus
 20 bonum et salubre est, valebit, ad tollendum quod iisdem malum et exitiosum est, non valebit? Atqui rex ille, cui subjecti esse jubentur, erat Romæ ea tempestate Nero tyrannus; ergo tyrannis etiam subjecti esse debemus. At inquam, et dubium

ment and officers of state, without whom kings themselves cannot subsist? But suppose the epistle addressed to natural-born subjects, suppose them not private persons but the very Senate of Rome; what then? When a command has some express reason attached to it, nobody, generally speaking, is or can be bound by it beyond the extent of that reason. Now the command is: "Submit," *dnord^rs*: that is (regarding the essential force of the word) "be subordinate, or *legally* subject"; as Aristotle says: For order is law.

5 "Submit for the Lord's sake." For what *reason*? Because as well the king as the governor is appointed by God *for the punishment of evildoers and the praise of them that do well*. "For so is the will of God," to wit, that we should submit and yield obedience to such as are here writ down; of others there

15 is not a word here. You see how firmly grounded is the reason for this command; and in the 10th verse he adds: "as free,"—therefore not as slaves. What then if princes reverse their office, and rule to the torture and destruction of good men, and the license and praise and reward of evildoers, shall we all

20 still submit forevermore, not private persons only, but our nobility, all our officers of state, our very Parliament in fine? Is not the ordinance called "of man"? How then? Shall human power avail to appoint what is good and profitable for men, but not avail to rid them of what is mischievous and

25 destructive to them?

But that king, you say, to whom we are bidden to submit, was Nero, in those days tyrant at Rome: therefore we must submit even to tyrants. But I say that it is uncertain

hoc est, Nero an Claudius tune temporis rerum potiretur, et illi qui subjecti esse iubentur, advenæ, dispersi, privati, non consules, non prætores, non Senatus Romanus erant. Nunc Paulum adeamus, (quoniam tu quod nobis de regibus licere
5 non vis, id tibi de Apostolis licere autumas, ut principatum Petro modo des, modo eripias) Paulus *hxc ad Romanos: c. 13, omnis anima potestatibus supereminentibus subjecta esto; non est enim potestas nisi b Deo; qua autcm sunt potestates a Deo sunt ordinatæ*: Romanis hæc scribit, non, ut Petrus, advenis,
10 dispersis, sed privatis tamen potissimum et plebeiis; ita etiam scribit, ut totam reipub. administrandas rationem, originem, finem luculentissime doceat. Quo magis obedientiæ quoque nostræ vera ac distincta ratio, ab omni servitute disjuncta eluceret. *Omnis anima*, hoc est, quisque homo *subjectus esto*.
15 Quid sibi Apostolus proponat hoc capite satis explanavit Chrysostomus, *note?* &c. *facit hoc*, inquit, *ut ostendat Christum leges suas non ad hoc induxisse, ut communem politiam everteret, sed ut in melius statueret*. Non ergo ut Neronem, aut tyrannum quemvis alium supra omnem
20 legem et poenam constituendo, crudelissimum unius imperium in omnes mortales constabiliret. *Utque simul doceret superflua et inutilia bella non esse suscipienda*; non ergo bella damnat contra tyrannum, hostem patriæ intestinum, atque adeo periculosissimum suscepta. *Pervulgatus tune erat homi-*

whether it was Nero or Claudius that then held sway; moreover they that are bidden to submit were scattered foreign private persons, not consuls or high officers of the law, not the Roman Senate.

5 Now let us come to Paul (for with the Apostles you allow yourself liberties that you will not allow us to take with princes; now you give Peter the primacy, now you snatch it away). Paul, Romans 13, says: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God:
10 the powers that be are ordained of God." This he writes to the Romans, not to strangers dispersed, as Peter did, but rather to private persons and those of the meaner rank; writes it, too, so as to set forth brilliantly the whole reason, origin, and end of government. Whereby also it is clear as day that the
15 true and proper ground of our obedience has no connection whatsoever with slavery. "Let every soul," says he, that is, every man, "be subject." What the Apostle purposes in this chapter Chrysostom has sufficiently explained. "St. Paul writes thus," says he, "to make it plain that Christ introduced
20 his principles with no intent to overthrow civil government, but rather to establish it upon truer foundations." He never intended, then, by placing Nero or any other tyrant beyond all laws and penalties, to set up cruelest despotism over all mankind. "He intended too," says the same author, "to dis-
25 suade from unnecessary and fruitless wars." He does not, therefore, condemn a war taken up against a tyrant, a bosom enemy of his own country, and consequently the most dangerous enemy possible. "It was a common slander in those

num sermo traduccns apostolos tanquam scditiosos, et novatores, quasi omnia ad evertendum leges communes et fecerunt et dicerent; his nunc ora obstruit. Non ergo tyrannorum defensiones conscripserunt Apostoli, quod tu fads, sed ea 5 fecerunt, ea docuerunt, quæ suspecta omnibus tyrannis defensione apud illos potius, et interpretatione quadam egebant. Propositum Apostolo quid fuerit, ex Chrysostomo vidimus; nunc verba scrutemur: *Omnis anima fotestatibus supereminentibus subjcta esto;* quæ tamen istæ sint non statuit: non 10 enim jura atque instituta omnium nationum abolere, unius libidini omnia permittere in animo erat. Certe optimus quisque imperator auctoritatem legum et Senatus auctoritate sua longe superiorem semper agnovit. Idem apud omnes nationes non barbaras jus semper sanctissimum fuit. Unde Pindarus 15 apud Herodotum legem omnium regem esse dixit; Orpheus in hymnis non mortalium solum, sed immortalium etiam regem appellat: '

ἀγνὸν ἄνακτα

Reddit rationem:

νοσ ζώων

Lex enim sola viventium gubernaculum tenet.

20 *lum tenet.* Plato in legibus TO id quod in civitate plurimum debet posse, legem esse aft. In epistolis eam maxime rempub. laudat, ubi lex, et domina et rex hominum, non homines tyranni legum sunt. Eadem Aristotelis sententia in Politicis, eadem Ciceronis in legibus, ita leges præesse magi-

days that the Apostles were seditious revolutionists who did and said everything to overturn the general laws. The Apostle in this chapter stops the mouths of such traducers." So that the Apostles did not write defences of tyrants as you do, but
 5 did such things and preached such things as made them suspected of all tyrants — things that in the eyes of such needed to be defended and interpreted.

What the Apostle's design was we have just seen in Chrysostom; let us now examine the words: "Let every soul be
 10 subject to the higher powers." These, however, he defined not, for he never intended to do away with the laws and constitutions of all nations, and turn all things over to one man's will and pleasure. Certainly every good emperor acknowledged his authority to be far below that of the laws and the
 15 Senate; so among all but barbarous nations it is the law that has been holy above all else. Therefore it is that Pindar, as cited by Herodotus, declared the law king over all. Orpheus in his hymns calls it king not of mortals only but even of immortals:

ἡθεωρέτων

ὄρνον ἀνακτα

20

He gives the reason: for that the law controls single-handed the helm of living things. Plato in *The Laws* says the law is that which ought to have the greatest power in the state. In
 25 his epistles he commends that form of government in which the law is ruler and king over men, and not men tyrants over the law. Aristototele is of the same opinion in his *Politics*, and so is Cicero in his *Laws*, that the laws govern the magistrates

stratibus, ut magistrates præsumt populo. Cum itaque sapientissimorum virorum iudicio, prudentissimarum civitatum institutis lex semper potestas summa atque suprema habita sit, nee evangelii doctrina cum ratione aut cum jure gentium pugnet, is utique potestatibus supereminentibus verissime sub-
 5 subjectus erit, qui legibus et magistratibus juxta leges Rempub. gubernantibus ex animo paret. Non ergo soliim populo subjectionem hanc, sed regibus etiam præcipit; qui supra leges nequaquam sunt. *Non est enim potestas nisi a Deo*; id est nulla
 10 reipub. forma, nulla homines regendi legitima ratio. Antiquissimæ etiam leges ad authorem Deum olim referebantur; est enim lex, ut Cicero in Phil, 12, *nihil aliud nisi recta et h numine deomm tracta ratio, imperans honesta, prohibens contraria*. A Deo igitur est magistratum institutio, ut eorum ad-
 15 ministratione gens humana sub legibus viveret: hanc autem vel illam administrationis formam, hos vel illos magistratus eligendi optio proculdubio penes liberas hominum nationes semper fuit. Hinc Petrus et regem et presides

humanam creationem vocat; et Hosea c. 8, *constituunt*
 20 *reges, at non ex me; proficiunt principes, quos non agnosco*. In ista enim sola Hebræorum repub. ubi Deum variis modis consulere poterant, de regis nominatione ad Deum referri ex lege oportebat: cæteræ gentes mandatum a Deo nullum istius-

as the magistrates govern the people. Therefore, since by the judgment of the wisest men and by the constitutions of the best-ordered states the law has always been accounted the highest power on earth, and since the teachings of the gospel
5 clash not with reason or with the law of nations, then certainly that man is most truly subject to the higher powers, who heartily obeys the law, and the magistrates so far as they govern according to the law.

St. Paul, then, charges this subjection not only upon the
10 people, but upon kings themselves, who are nowise above the laws. "For there is no power but of God," that is, no way of constituting a state, no lawful ground for rule over men. Nay, the most ancient laws that are known to us were formerly ascribed to God as their author; the law, as Cicero says
15 in his twelfth *Philippic*, "is no other than right reason, derived from the command of the gods, enjoining whatever is virtuous, and forbidding the contrary." So that the establishment of magistrates is from God, and its purpose is that by their governance mankind may live under law. But the lib-
20 erty to choose whether this form of government or that, and these officers or those, indubitably always belonged to the free nations of men. Hence St. Peter calls kings and governors a human institution or ordinance; and Hosea 8, "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and
25 I knew it not." For in the commonwealth of the Hebrews (and there only) where in divers ways they could consult with God, the appointment of a king must by law be referred to him; all we other nations have received no such command.

modi accepimus. Nonnunquam aut ipsa regiminis forma, si vitiosa sit, aut illi qui potestatem obtinent, et ab hominibus, et è diabolo sunt. Luc. 4; *Tibi dabo potestatem hanc omnem; nam mihi tradita est, et cui volo do illam.* Hinc princeps 5 hujus mundi dicitur; et Apocalyp. 13, dedit Bestiæ Draco potentiam suam, et thronum suum, et potestatem magnam. Quapropter necesse est hic intelligi non potestates quascunque, sed legitimas cujusmodi etiam infra describuntur; necesse est intelligi potestates ipsas, non semper eos qui impe- 10 rium obtinent. Hinc dilucide Chrysostomus, *Quid ais? inquit, omnis ergo princeps a Deo constitutus est? non dico: non enim de quovis principe, sed de ipsa re loquitur Apostolus; non dicit, non princeps nisi à Deo, sed non est potestas.* Hæc Chrysost. *Quæ autem potestates sunt, h Deo sunt ordinatæ.* 15 Legitimas ergo vult hic intelligi Apostolus; malum enim et vitium, cum ataxia sit, non est ut possit ordinari, et esse simul vitiosum. Hoc enim duo simul contraria ponit, taxin et ataxian. *Quæ autem sunt,* ita interpretaris ac si diceretur, *quæ nunc sunt;* quo facilius probare possis etiam Neroni, qui, ut 20 opinaris, tunc *imperavit,* Romanes obtemperare debuisse; nostra sane bona venia: quam enim voles de Anglicana repub. male sentias, in ea tamen Anglos acquiescere debere, quoniam *nunc est,* et a *Deo ordinatur,* ut Neronis olim imperium, necesse habebis concedere. Neque enim Nero minus quam

Sometimes either the very form of government, if it be faulty, or those persons that have the power in their hands, are not of God, but of men, yes and of the devil too, Luke 4: "All this power will I give thee, . . . for that is delivered
5 unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it." Hence he is called the prince of this world; and in Revelations 13. the Dragon gave to the Beast his power, and his seat, and great authority. Therefore St. Paul must be understood to mean, not all sorts of powers, but lawful ones, of the sort described
10 in what follows; and to mean the powers themselves, not the men, always, in whose hands they are lodged. Upon this passage Chrysostom speaks plainly. "What!" says he, "is every prince then appointed by God? No such thing. The Apostle speaks not of the person of the prince, but of the
15 thing. He does not say, there is no *prince* but of God; he says there is no *power* but of God." Thus far Chrysostom. The Apostle, then, when he says "The powers that be are ordained, or *ordered*, of God," would have it understood of lawful powers, for 'tis impossible that a thing evil and faulty,
20 being disordered, can be ordered: to say so asserts two contraries at once—order and disorder.

The words "that be" you interpret as "that *now* be," the easier to prove that the Romans ought to obey Nero, who you suppose was then emperor. Content! For then, think as ill
25 as you like of our English Commonwealth, you must needs grant that Englishmen ought to yield obedience to it, for "it now is," and is "ordained of God," like Nero's power of old. And lest you should answer that Nero had got *his* by lawful

Tiberius *artibus mains inferium nihil ad se pertinent* occupaverat, ne legitimè partum fuisse respondeas. Quo sceleratior et doctrinæ retractator ipse tuæ, Romanos potestati quæ tune fuit subjectos esse vis, Anglos potestati quæ nunc est, subjectos esse non vis. Verum nullæ in hoc orbe terrarum res duæ magis e regione adversæ sibi sunt, quam tu nequissimus nequissimo semper ferè adversus es tibi. Quid autem fades miser? acumine hoc tuo regem adolescentem plane perdidisti; ab ipsa enim tua sententia extorquebo ut fatearis, hanc potestatem in Anglia, quæ nunc est, a Deo ordinatam esse; atque omnes proinde Anglos intra ejusdem reipublicæ fines eidem potestati subjectos esse debere. Attendite igitur Critici, et manus abstinete, Salmasii nova hæc emendatio est, in epistola ad Romanos; non quæ sunt potestates, *sed quæ nunc existunt*, reddi debere adinvenit; ut Neroni tyranno tune scilicet imperanti subjectos esse omnes oportuisse demonstraret. At ò bone, ut regem modo, ita nunc interpretamentum hoc tarn bellum perdidisti. Quam tu epistolam sub Nerone scriptam esse ai's, sub Claudio scripta est principe simplici, et non malo: hoc viri docti certissimis argumentis compertum habent; quinquennium etiam Neronis laudatissimum fuit, unde argumentum hoc toties incul-

succession, I say that he no less than Tiberius had seized "by means of his mother's intrigues a power which nowise belonged to him." So that you are all the more unprincipled, and retract your own assertions, in affirming that the Romans
5 owed subjection to the power that then was, and yet denying that Englishmen owe subjection to the power that now is. But, you worthless thing, there are no two things in this world more directly opposite to one another than you nearly always are to your worthless self. What then will become of
10 you, wretch? With this keen wit of yours you have quite ruined the young king, for upon your own theory I will rack you to confess that the power that now is in England is ordained of God, and that all Englishmen within the confines of that Commonwealth are bound to submit to it. Therefore
15 give ear ye critics all! Hands off from this the new emendation of Salmasius upon the Epistle to the Romans! He has discovered for the occasion that the words ought to be rendered not "the powers that be," but "the powers that *now* be"; and all to prove that everybody owed submission to the tyrant
20 Nero, then emperor to wit!

But, my good man, your pitcher is gone once too often to the well. As you ruined the king but a moment ago, even thus you now ruin this so pretty emendation. The Epistle which you say was writ in Nero's time was writ in Claudius's,
25 a guileless ruler and no villain: scholars hold this for a certainty upon surest evidence. Besides, there were five years even of Nero's reign that were excellent. So that this oft-obtruded argument, which many have at their tongues' ends,

catum, quod multis in ore est, multis imposuit, tyranno paren-
 dum esse, eò quòd Paulus hortatus est Romanos ut Neroni es-
 sent subjecti, callidum indocti cujuspiam commentum esse
 reperitur. *Qui obsistit potestati, scilicet legitimæ, Dei ordi-*
 5 *nationi obsistit.* Astringit etiam reges præceptum hoc, qui
 legibus et Senatui obsistunt. At vero qui potestati vitiosæ, aut
 potestatis non vitiosæ corruptori et eversori obsistit, num is
 Dei ordinationi obsistit? sanus, credo, non dixeris. Tollit
 omnem dubitationem sequens versiculus, de legitima tantum
 10 potestate Apostolum hie loqui. Definiendo enim explicat,
 nequis errare, et opiniones hinc stolidas aucupari possit, qui
 sint magistratus potestatis hujus ministri, et quam ob causam
 subjectos esse nos hortetur: *Magistrates non sunt timori bonis*
operibus, sed malis; boni à potestate hac laudem adipiscentur;
 15 *Magistrates minister est Dei nostro bono datus; non jrustra*
gladium gerit, vindex ad iram ei qui malum facit. Quis negat,
 quis recusat, nisi improbus, quin hujusmodi potestati aut po-
 testatis administro libens se subjiat? non soltim ad vitandam
iram et offensionem, aut poenæ metu, sed etiam *propter con-*
 20 *scientiam.* Sine magistratibus enim, et civili gubernatione,
 nulla respublica, nulla societas humana, nulla vita esse potest.
 Quæ autem potestas, qui magistratus contraria his facit. neque
 ilia, neque hie a Deo proprie ordinatus est. Unde neque tali

and which has cheated many, to wit, that a tyrant is to be obeyed because Paul urged the Romans to submit to Nero, is found to be the sly invention of some dunce.

"Whosoever . . . resisteth the power," the lawful power,
5 that is, "resisteth the ordinance of God." This principle makes kings liable when they resist the laws and the Senate. But he that resists an unlawful power, or resists a person who goes about to overthrow and destroy a lawful one—does he resist the ordinance of God? In your right wits you would not say
10 so, I trow. The next verse removes any uncertainty that the Apostle speaks here of a lawful power only; for lest anyone mistake, and thence go chasing stupid notions, it explains, by defining bounds and limitations, who are the officers that are the ministers of this power, and why he urges us to submit.
15 "Rulers," says he, "are not a terror to good works, but to evil. . . . Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good . . . He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is . . . a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil." Who
20 but the wicked denies, who but the wicked refuses, willingly to submit to such a power or its minister? And that not only to avoid "the wrath" and the stumbling block, and for fear of punishment, but even "for conscience sake."

Without magistrates and civil government there can be no
25 commonwealth, no human society, no living in the world. But whatever power or whatever magistrate acts contrary to these precepts—neither the one nor the other is in any proper sense ordained of God. Neither to such a power nor to such

vel potestati, vel magistratui subjectio debetur aut præcipitur, neque nos prudenter obsistere prohibemur: non enim potestati, non magistratui obsistemus, qui hie optime depingitur, sed pradoni, sed tyranno, sed hosti; qui si magistratus tamen
 5 dicendus erit, eo duntaxat quòd habet potestatem, quod ad poenam nostram ordinari a Deo videri potest, etiam diabolus hoc modo magistratus erit. Sane unius rei una vera definitio est: si ergo Paulus hie magistratum definit, quod quidem accuratè facit, eadem definitione, iisdem verbis tyrannum, rem
 10 maxime contrariam, definire non potuit. Unde quern ipse magistratum definivit atque descripsit, ei duntaxat subjectos nos esse voluisse, non ejus contrario tyranno certissime colligitur. *Propter hoc tributa solvitis; rationem adjungit ad præceptum; unde Chrysostomus, Cur, inquit, vectigalia regi da-*
 15 *mus? Annon tanquam nobis prospicienti, curce ac tuitionis mercedem solventes? atqui nihil illi solvissemus, nisi ab initio utilem nobis talem esse præfecturam cognovissemus.* Quapropter illud repetam quod supra dixi; quandoquidem subjectio hæc non simpliciter, sed cum adjuncta ratione a nobis
 20 requiritur, illa profecto ratio quæ adjungitur, subjectiois nostræ vera norma erit: Cum ista ratione non subjecti, rebelles; sine ista ratione subjecti, servi erimus et socordes. *At Angli, inquis, nihil minus quhm liberi, quia mali, quia flagi-*

a magistrate, therefore, is submission owed or commanded, nor are we forbidden to resist them with discretion, for we shall be resisting not the power or the magistrate here excellently described, but a robber, a tyrant, a public enemy.

5 If he is notwithstanding to be called a magistrate just because he holds power, just because he may appear to be ordained by God for our punishment—in this sense the devil too shall be a magistrate!

Certain it is that there can be but one true definition of one
10 and the same thing. So that if Paul here defines a magistrate, which he certainly does, and with careful precision, he could not possibly in the very words of this definition define a tyrant, the exact opposite. Hence the sure consequence: that he would have us submit to such a magistrate only as he him-
15 self has writ down and by definition limited, and not to a tyrant, that magistrate's opposite. "For this cause pay ye tribute also": he adds a reason to his command. Hence Chrysostom: "Why pay we revenue to the king? Is it not as we pay hire for protection and care to one who watches out for us? We
20 should have paid him nothing had we not originally come to know that such supervision was good for us." Wherefore I shall repeat what I have said already, that since this subjection is demanded not absolutely but upon an express reason added, that reason will be the true rule of our subjection. Where that
25 reason holds, we are rebels if we submit not; where it holds not, we are cowards and slaves if we submit.

"But," say you, "the English are far from being free men, for they are infamous villains." For my part I will not re-

tiosi. Nolo ego Gallorum vitia commemorare, quamvis sub regibus sint; neque Anglorum nimis excusare; dico tamen ilia esse flagitia, quæ sub regibus tanquam in Ægypto didicerunt; neque dum in deserto, licet Dei sub imperio, dediscere statim potuerunt. Spes est tamen de plerisque bona; ut ne sanctissimos hie optimosque viros et veritatis studiosissimos collaudare incipiam; quorum apud nos non minorem credo esse numerum, quam ubi tu maximum esse existimas. At *jugum Anglis durum imponitur*. Quid si illis, qui jugum cæteris civibus imponere studebant? Quid si suo deinde merito subactis? nam cæteri puto non moleste ferunt, exhausto civilibus bellis serario, sumptibus propriis suam se tolerare libertatem. Relabitur jam ad Rabbinos nugivendos. Regem legibus adstrictum esse negat, ex iis tamen probat *læsæ majestatis reum esse posse, si jus suum patiatur imminui*: astrictus itaque et non astrictus, reus et non reus rex erit: adeò frequenter enim solet repugnare sibi, ut ipsa Repugnantia huic homini germana atque gemella esse videatur. Atqui Deus, inquis, multa regna Nebuchadnezzari in servitutem dedit. Fa-

5
10
15
20

count the vices of the French, though they live under a monarchy; neither will I too much excuse those of the English; yet this I say, that the acts which disgrace them are those they learnt under their Pharaohs in Egypt, as it were; nor have
5 they been able to unlearn them at once while yet in the wilderness, though under God's immediate government. But there is good hope of many amongst us—not now to begin an eulogy of those most excellent saintly men and lovers of the truth; whose number among us I think not less than where
10 you think there are most such. But "a heavy yoke is laid upon the English nation." What if it be laid upon those that endeavored to lay the yoke upon all their fellow-citizens? What if it be laid upon those that were deservedly subdued? As for the rest, I question not but they are very well content,
15 now the public treasury is exhausted by the civil wars, to bear the burden of maintaining their own liberty at their own expense.

Now he betakes himself again to his piddling rabbins. He asserts that a king is bound by no laws, and yet on their authority proves that "a king may be guilty of lese-majesty if he suffer the rights of his crown to be diminished." So kings are bound by laws, and not bound by laws; they may be criminals and yet not criminals. The man contradicts himself so perpetually that Contradiction herself seems his twin-born
25 sister.

You say that God gave many kingdoms over in slavery to Nebuchadnezzar. I confess he did so for a time, Jer. 27. 7; but do you make appear if you can that he gave the English

tern CaroloStuarto ad semihorulam dedisse ostende; permisisse non negaverim, dedisse nunquam audivi. Aut si Deus in servitutem dat populum, quoties tyrannus plus populo potest, cur non idem liberare dicendus erit, quoties plus potest populus
5 tyranno? an is Deo tyrannidem suam, nos Deo libertatem nostram acceptam non feremus? Non est malum in civitate quod Deus non immittat, Amos 3. famem, pestilentiam, seditionem, hostem; ecquod nam horum civitas ab se non totis viribus amolietur? faciet profecto, si possit, quamvis ab ipso
10 Deo immissa *hæc* esse sciat; nisi è coelo ipse secus jusserit. Cur non tyrannos pariter amovebit, si plus polleat? an ejus unius impotentiam ad commune malum esse magis a Deo credemus, quam potentiam totius civitatis ad commune bonum? Absit è civitatibus, absit ob omni coetu hominum ingenuo-
15 rum doctrinæ tarn stupidæ, tdmque pestiferæ labes, quæ vitam omnem civilem funditus delet, gentem humanam universam propter unum atque alterum tyrannum, ad quadrupedum prope conditionem detrudit: cum illi supra omnem legem excelsi par in utrunque genus et pecudum et hominum jus atque
20 imperium obtinebunt. Mitto jam stultai ladmata, in quibus ut te jactes, nescio quern fingis, *potestatem illam supereminentem de populo velle intelligere*; tametsi affirmare non

nation over for a single minute in slavery to Charles Stuart. That God allowed them I would not deny, but I have never heard that he gave them. Or if God be said to give a people into slavery whenever a tyrant prevails over the people, why
5 ought he not as well be said to set them free whenever the people prevail over a tyrant? Shall the tyrant credit and owe his tyranny to God, and not we our liberty? There is no evil in the state that the Lord hath not let in, Amos 3. Famine, plague, sedition, a public enemy—is there a single one of
10 these that the state will not strive with all its might to shake off? Shake them off it surely will if it can, though it know them to be sent by God, unless himself from heaven should command the contrary.

Upon the same reasoning why may not the state rid itself
15 of a tyrant if it be stronger than he? Why should we suppose the uncontrolled passions of this one man to be appointed by God for the common ill, rather than the self-controlled power of the whole state for the common weal? Far be it from all states and all societies of freeborn men to maintain principles
20 so senseless, plague-spots of such ignominy, which wipe out the whole life of the state, and, to gratify a tyrant or two, thrust mankind down to the level of four-footed brutes; for tyrants, once lifted up above all law, will wield the same law and sway over men as over catde.

25 I pass by those foolish dilemmas of yours, to indulge in which you invent someone's authority for the assertion that "that sovereign power means the people's power"; though for my part I hesitate not to assert that such is the source

dubito omnem magistrates auctoritatem i populo proficisci. Hinc Cicero pro Flacco; *Illinoſtri ſapientiffimi, et ſanctiffimi majores, quæ ſciſceret plcbs, quæ populus juberet, juberi vctarique voluerunt.* Hinc Lucius Crassus Orator eximius, et
 5 Senates eo tempore princeps, cujus turn causam agebat ad populum. *Nolite, inquit, ſinere nos cuiquam ſervire, niſi vobis uniſverſis, quibus et poſſumus et debemus.* Quamvis enim Senatus Populum regeret, Populus tamen illam mode-
 10 jectatem, populo Romano frequentius quam regibus olim attributam legimus. Idem Marcus Tullius pro Plancio; *Est enim conditio liberorum populorum, præcipueque hujus principis populi et omnium gentium domini poſſe ſuffragiis vcl dare vel detrudere quod vclit cuique; noſtrum eſt ferre*
 15 *modict populi voluntates: honores ſi magni non putemus non ſervire populo; ſin eos expetamus, non defatigari ſupplendo.* Egone ut regem populi ſervum dicere metuam, cum Senatus Romanus tot regum dominus ſervum ſe populi pro-
 20 feſſus ſit? Vera ſunt hæc, inquires, in populari ſtatu; nondum enim lex regia poteſtatem populi in Auguſtum, et ſucceſſores ejus tranſtulerat. Hem tibi ergo Tiberium ilium quern tu *tyrannum plus vice ſimplici* fuiſſe ai's, ut revera fuit, is tamen dominus, etiam poſt legem illam regiam, appellatus a

of all the power that any magistrate has. Hence Cicero in his Oration for Flaccus says: "Our wise and reverend ancestors appointed those things to be bidden and forbidden which the multitude resolved and the sovereign people ordained."

5 Hence too Lucius Crassus, a distinguished orator, and then president of the Senate, whose cause he was pleading with the people, says: "I beseech you, suffer not us to be subject to any but your own entire body, to whom we can and must submit."

For though the Senate governed the People, yet it was the
10 People that had given over that very power to regulate and govern themselves unto the Senate. Hence, in our reading we find majesty in those days more frequently ascribed to the Roman people than to kings. Marcus Tullius again in his Oration for Plancius: "It is the condition of free peoples, and
15 especially of this people, chief and lord of all nations, by vote to give or take away, to or from any, what it will. It is for us patiently to submit to the people's wishes. Those that care not much for office have the less obligation upon them to court the people; those that seek office must not grow weary of
20 entreating them." Should I scruple to call a king the servant of his people, when I hear the Roman Senate, which was the master of so many kings, profess itself to be but the people's servant? You will object perhaps that all this is very true under democratic conditions, for that the *Lex Regia* had not
25 yet transferred the people's power unto Augustus and his successors. But pray look at Tiberius, "a tyrant several times over," you say, as he certainly was—who yet, Suetonius says, when someone called him Lord or Master, though after the

quodam, ut tradit Suetonius, denunciavit ne se amplius contumeliam causa nominaret. Audisne ? tyrannus iste dominus dici contumeliæ sibi duxit. Idem in Senatu; *Dixi et nunc, et saepe aliis, patres Conscripti, bonum etsalutarem principem, quern*
 5 *vos tanta et tarn libera potestate instruxistis, Senatui servire debere, et universis civibus scepe, et plerumque etiam singulis; neque id dixisse me poenitet; et bonos et (equos et javentes vos habui Dominos, et adhuc habeo.* Nee simulata hæc ab eo si dixeris, ut erat simulandi callidissimus, quicquam proficies;
 10 quis enim id videri se cupit, quod esse non debet? Hinc ille mos non Neroni solum, quod scribit Tacitus, sed cæteris etiam imperatoribus fuit, populum in Circo adorandi. De quo Claudianus, VI. *Cons. Honorii:*

O quantum populo secreti numinis addit
 15 *Imperii prcesens species, quantdmque rependit*
Majestas alterna vicem, cum regia Circi
Connexum gradibus veneratur purpura vulgus,
Consensuque cavæ sublatus in cethera vallis
Plebis adoratce reboat fragor.—

enacting of that Lex Regia, gave notice that this person must name him so no more, for that it was an insult. Do you hear? That tyrant deemed it an insult to be called Lord. The same emperor addressing the Senate, "I have said," says he, "frequently heretofore, and now I say again, that a good prince and serviceable, whom you have invested with so great and unrestricted power, ought to submit to the Senate, often to the body of the people, and sometimes even to particular persons; nor do I repent of having said so: I confess that you have been both good and just masters to me, as well as indulgent ones, and that you are yet so." It will not help you to say that, proficient in the art of hypocrisy as he was, he feigned all this; for does any man desire to *seem* other than he *ought* to be? Hence it was the custom not only for Nero, as Tacitus tells us, but for the rest of the emperors, to do homage to the people at the Circus. Claudian, in his Panegyric upon the Sixth Consulate of Honorius, says of this:

Authority divine, mysterious,
Here present visibly unto the people—
20 Lo, how it graces them! And they in turn—
How grand their answering majesty's requital!
To throngs upon the Circus seats assembled
The royal purple makes obeisance,
And with one crash the adored multitude
25 Rebellows from the theatre's hollow vale
Its uproar to the skies.

Qua adoratione quid aliud Imperatores Romani, nisi universam plebem, etiam post legem regiam, suos esse dominos fatebantur? Atque illud est quod initio statim suspicatus sum, te glossariis pervolutandis, et tricis quibusdam laboriosis magnificè divulgandis operam potiis dedisse, quam bonis authoribus attente et studiose perlegendis; qui veterum scriptorum sapientiã ne leviter quidem imbutus, rem præstantissimorum opinionibus Philosophorum, et prudentissimorum in republica principum dictis celebratissimam, novam esse prorsus et
10 *Enthusiastarum* tantummodo *deliriis* somniatam censes. I nunc, Martinum ilium sutorem, et Gulielmum Pellionem quos adè despicias, ignorantia collegas et mystagogos tibi sume: quanquam erudire te poterunt illi, et illos tibi gryphos dissolvere stolidissimos, *An in Democratia serviat Populus,*
15 *cum serviat rex in Monarchia; utrum totus an pars ejus.* Ita illi, cum tibi Oedipi vice fuerint, tu illis Sphinx in malam rem præceps abeas licebit; alioquin fatuitatum tuarum et ænigmatum finem nullum fore video. Rogas, *Chm reges Apostolus nominal, an depopulo eos intelligemus?* Pro regibus qui
20 dem orandum esse Paulus docet, i Tim. 2. 2. at prius pro populo orandum esse docuerat, v. i. Sunt tamen et de regibus, et de populo nonnulli, pro quibus orare etiam vetamur.

By this adoration could the emperors of Rome possibly mean anything else than to acknowledge that even after the enacting of the *Lex Regia* the whole body of the people were their masters?

5 I find, as I suspected at first, that you have spent more time and pains in turning over glossaries and pompously publishing laborious trifles than in the careful and diligent reading of sound authors. 'Tis because you have not the slightest tincture of the wisdom of the ancients that you account as new, and as
10 the dream of mere "enthusiasts' delirium," a matter which has been perfectly well known through the opinions of the most eminent philosophers and the words of the most far-sighted statesmen. Your Martin Cobbler and William Tanner, whom you so despise, you had better take unto yourself
15 as your partners and guides in ignorance; though indeed they will be able to instruct you, and to solve those stupid riddles of yours, as thus: "Since in a Monarchy the king is supposed to be a servant, is the People supposed to be a servant in a Democracy?—All the People, or a part?" And when they
20 have played Oedipus to you, you have my permission to be Sphinx to them, and go headlong to the devil; else I see no end to your conundrums and follies.

You ask, "When the Apostle says *tyngs*, does he mean the *peopled*?" St. Paul does indeed tell us to pray for kings,
25 i Tim. 2. 2, but he had already told us, verse i, to pray for the people. Yet there are some for all that, both among kings and common people, that we are forbidden to pray for; and if a man may not so much as be prayed for, may he not be law-

Pro quo non orem, eumne ex lege non puniam? quid vetat? Atqui cum hæc scriberet Paulus, imperabant vcl pessimi: hoc etiam falsum est; scriptam enim sub Claudio et hanc Epistolam fuisse certissimis argumentis evincit Ludovicus Capellus.

5 De Nerone cum mentionem facit Paulus, non regem, sed *Leonem*, id est belluam immanem vocat, cujus ex ore ereptum se gaudet, 2 Tim. 4. Pro regibus itaque, non pro belluis, *orandum, ut vitam tranquillam et quietam transigamus, cum pietate tamen omni et honestate.* Vides non tarn regum hie

10 què tranquillitatis, pietatis, honestatis etiam rationem esse habendam. Quis autem populus non se suosque liberos tuendo (contra tyrannum an contra hostem nil interest) vitam *sollicitam, inquietam, bellicosam, honestam* mallet agere, quam sub hoste vel tyranno, non solum seque sollicitam et inquietam,

15 tarn, sed turpem etiam, servilem et inhonestam? Audi apud Livium Samnites utrumque statum expertos: rebellasse se, quod pax servientibus gravior, quam bellum liberis esset. Immo teipsum audi; te enim ipsum sæpenumero jam testem adhibeo; non quo tanti sis, sed ut perspiciant omnes quàm sis

20 duplex, et discors tibi, et mancipium regis mercenarium. *Quis, inquis, non perjerre mallet repub. Aristocratica ex optimatum emulatione dissensiones oririsolitas, quhm ex uno monarcha, tyrannico more imperare consueto certam miseriam ac per-*

fully punished? What is to hinder? But, you say, "When Paul wrote this epistle, the rulers were the most profligate persons in the world." That is false too, for Ludovicus Capellus proves by the most trustworthy evidence that this 5 epistle likewise was writ in Claudius's time. When St. Paul has occasion to speak of Nero, he calls him not a king but a lion,—that is, a savage beast, out of whose mouth he is glad he was delivered, 2. Tim. 4. So that it is for kings, not for beasts, we are to pray, that under them "we may live a 10 quiet and peaceable life," but, observe, "in all godliness and honesty." What we are here to take account of, clearly, is not so much kings as peace and quiet, godliness and honesty. Yet what nation would not choose, in defense of themselves and their children,—against tyrant or enemy is all one,—to 15 live a life "perturbed and restless," warlike and honorable, rather than under the power of tyrant or enemy to lead a life just as perturbed and restless, but vile into the bargain, in slavery and ignominy? Listen while the Samnites, who had tried both conditions, testify, according to Livy, that 20 they had gone to war again because war, with freedom, was less intolerable than peace with slavery. Nay, listen to your own words; for I often put you on the witness-stand, not to do you honor, but that all men may observe how double-tongued you are, and self-contradictory, and a king's hireling slave. 25 "Who would not rather," say you, "bear with the dissensions that through the rivalries of great men often occur under an Aristocracy, than with the misery and ruin that are sure to come of a monarch accustomed to absolute rule? The people

nicicm? Populus Romanus pratulit statum ilium Reipub. quantumlibet discordiis agitates jugo Casarum intokrabili. Populus qui vitanda scditionis causd monarchicum statum prceoptavit, ubi expertus est levius csse malum quod vitare
5 *voluit, ad priora sapc redirc expetit.* Hæc et plura tua verba sunt in ilia de episcopis dissertatione, sub Walonis Messalini adscititio nomine edita, p. 412; contra Petavium Loiolitam, cum ipse magis Loiolita sis, et eo de grege pessimus. Quid hac de re Scriptura sacra statuerit, et vidimus, et omni dili-
10 gentia investigasse non pœnitet: unde quid senserint Patres antiqui per tot ingentia volumina exquirere pretium fortasse operæ non erit. Si quid enim afferunt, quod Scriptura non exhibuit, eorum authoritatem, quantacunque sit, merito repudiamus. Quod autem ex Irenæo prefers, *regcs Dei jussu*
15 *constitui aptos his qui in illo tempore ab Us reguntur,* cum Scriptura pugnat evidentissime. Cum enim iudices ad regendum populum suum aptiores regibus esse palam significasset Deus, id tamen totum voluntati atque arbitrio populi permisit, ut aptiorem sibi sub optimatibus formam reipub.
20 deteriore sub regibus, si vellent, permutarent. Legimus etiam sæpe regem malum bono populo datum, et contra, regem bonum populo malo. Virorum itaque sapientissimorum est perspicere quid populo aptissimum et utilissimum sit: constat

of Rome preferred that condition of their Republic, no matter how much vexed with civil broils, to the unbearable yoke of the Cæsars. When a people which to avoid sedition has preferred a monarchy finds by experience that what it wished to
5 avoid is the lesser evil, often it desires to return to its former government." These are your own words, and more you have to this purpose, at page 412 of that discourse concerning bishops, which under the fictitious name of Walo Messalinus you wrote against Petavius the Jesuit—though yourself are more
10 a Jesuit, nay the worst of that crew.

We have already heard the sense of Holy Scripture upon this subject, and are not sorry to have searched it out with all possible care. Therefore perhaps it will not be worth our while to seek after the judgment of the Fathers through all
15 their huge volumes. For if they assert anything which has not been allowed by Scripture, we rightly reject their authority, great though it be. That passage which you cite from Irenæus, that "Kings are by God's command appointed suitable to the people they then govern" is clear against Scripture. For
20 though God himself declared openly that for the government of his own people judges were more suitable than kings, yet he left it wholly to the people's will and decision to exchange, if they would, their government by nobles, which was suitable to them, for one by kings, which was less suitable. And we
25 read that frequently a bad king was given to a good people, and contrariwise, a good king to a bad people. What is most suitable and profitable to a people, then, is something for the wisest men to ascertain; for certain it is that the same form of

enim neque omni populo, neque eidem semper eundem reipub. statum conyenire, sed vel hunc vel illum, prout civium virtus et industria nunc augetur, nunc minuitur, Qui tamen potestatem adimit populo eligendi sibi quam velit reipub. 5 formam, adimit profecto id in quo civilis libertas tota fere consistit. Citas deinde Justinum Martyrem Antoninis imperatorum optimis obsequium deferentem; quis iis tam egregiis et moderatis non detulisset? *At quantb, inquis, nos hodie peiores Christiani? tulerunt illi principem diversa religionis.* 10 Privati scilicet, et viribus longe inferiores. *Nunc sanè pontificii regem non jerrent reformatum, nee reformati Pontificium.* Facis tu quidem prudenter, ut ostendas te nee pontificium esse, nee reformatum; facis etiam liberaliter; ultro enim largiris quod nunc non petivimus, omnes hodie Chris- 15 tianos in hoc plane consentire, quod tu solus insigni audacia atque scelere oppugnas, Patrum etiam quos laudas dissimillimus; illi enim pro Christianis, ad profanos reges, defensiones conscribebant, tu pro rege pontificio atque deterrimo contra Christianos et Reformatos. Multa deinde ex Athenagora, 20 multa ex Tertulliano futiliter depromis, quæ ab ipsis Apostolis multo clarius et explanatius dicta jam sunt. Tertullianus autem longissime a te dissentit, qui regem vis esse dominum:

government is not equally fitting for all nations, or for the same nation at all times; but sometimes one, sometimes another, may be more proper, according as the diligence and valor of the people wax or wane. Yet whoso takes from a
5 people their power to choose what government they wish takes that indeed in which all civil liberty is rooted.

Then you tell us of Justin Martyr's humble and submissive behavior to the Antonines, those best of emperors; as if anybody would not pay deference to princes so excellent, princes
10 so measured in the exercise of their power! "How much worse Christians," you say, "are we in these days than they were! They submitted to a prince of a different religion." Of course they did, being private persons, and far inferior in strength. "But now Papists will not endure a Protestant king," or
15 "Protestants a Papist." As for you, you show yourself to be neither Papist nor Protestant: how discreet of you, and generous too; for you concede of your own accord what we have not now asked of you, that all Christians today agree in that very thing that you alone with so much impudence and wick-
20 edness oppose, in a manner too, most unlike those Fathers that you praise. They unto pagan kings kept writing defences for Christians; you write your Defence for a wicked Popish king against Christians and Protestants.

Next you fetch out of Athenagoras and Tertullian—quite
25 ineffectually—quantities of things that had already been said much more plainly and intelligibly by the Apostles themselves. Tertullian, moreover, is far from agreeing with you that a king is lord and master; as you either knew not, or

quod tu aut nescivisti, aut nequiter dissimulasti. Is enim Christianus ad Imperatorem Ethnicum in Apologetico ausus est scribere, non oportere Imperatorem appellari Dominum. *Augustus*, inquit, *imperii formator ne dominum quidem did se*
 5 *volebat, hoc enim Dei est cognomen: dicam plane imperatorem dominum sed quando non cogor ut dominum Dei vice dicam: ceterum liber sum illi, Dominus meus Deus unus est, etc.* et ibidem, *qui pater patrice est, quomodo Dominus est?* Gratulare nunc tibi de Tertulliano, quern sane præstabat missum
 10 fecisse. *At parricidas appellat qui Domitianum interjecerunt.* Recte appellat; uxoris enim et famulorum insidiis, a Parthenio, et Stephano interceptarum pecuniarum reo est interfectus. Quod si Senatus Populusque Romanus hostem judicatum, ut Neronem antea judicabant, et ad supplicium quærebant, more majorum punivissent, eos parricidas appellaturum
 is fuisse censes? immo si appellasset, dignus ipse supplicio fuisset; uti tu furca jam dignus es. Origeni responsum idem quadrabit quod Irenæo. Athanasius reges terræ ad humana tribunalia vocare nefarium esse dicit. Quis hoc dixit Athanasio?
 20 verbum enim Dei nullum hie audio. Credam itaque ego imperatoribus potius et regibus de se falsum hoc esse fatentibus, quam Athanasio. Adfers deinde Ambrosium ex proconsule et

wickedly pretended you knew not. For he, a Christian, dared in his *Apologeticum* to write to a heathen Emperor that an Emperor ought not to be called Lord. "Augustus himself," says he, "that formed the empire, would not be called 'Lord,' for this is God's title. I will, of course, call the Emperor 'Lord,' but only when I am not forced to call him so in God's place. For the rest, as regards the Emperor I am a free man; my Lord is God alone, etc." And in the same discourse: "He who is Father of his Country, how should he be its Master?"

5 Now take joy to yourself of Tertullian, whom you had better have let alone. But, you say, "the slayers of Domitian he calls parricides." And rightly so, for it was through a conspiracy of Domitian's wife and servants that he was killed, by Parthenius and by Stephanus, a person accused of stealing

15 moneys. If the Senate and the people of Rome had adjudged him a public enemy as erewhile they adjudged Nero, whom then they searched out and put to death,—had they, I say, thus punished Domitian according to the custom of their ancestors, think you Tertullian would have called them parricides?

20 If he had, he would have deserved to be hanged, as you do now.

Unto Origen the same answer will fit as did fit unto Irenæus.

Athanasius says that it is an abomination to summon the

25 kings of the earth before human tribunals. Who told him so? For in this I hear none of God's Word. And rather than Athanasius I will believe kings and emperors who admit that they have no such exemption. Then you bring in Ambrose,

catechumeno episcopum, verba ilia Davidis, *tibi soli peccavi*, imperitè, ne dicam assentatorie interpretantem. Volebat is omnes alios imperatori subjectos esse, ut imperatorem ipse subjiceret sibi. Quam enim superbe", et fastu plusquam
5 pontificio Theodosium imperatorem Mediolani tractaverit, cædis Thessalonicensis reum ipse judicaverit, ingressu ecclesie prohibuerit, quam se deinde novitium et rudem evangelicæ doctrine ostenderit, omnibus notum est. Imperatorem ad pedes ejus provolutum excedere salutorio jussit; sacris tan-
10 dem restitutum, et postquam obtulisset, altari adstantem his vocibus extra cancellos exegit. *O imperator, interiora loca tantum sacerdotibus sunt attributa, quæ cæteris contingere non licet.* Doctørne hie Evangelii, an Judaicorum pontifex rituum fuit? Hie tamen (quæ omnium fere ecclesiasticorum
15 artes sunt) imperatorem cæteris dominum imposuit, ut imperatoris ipse dominus esset. His itaque verbis Theodosium tanquam sibi subjectum repulit; *Coequalium hominum es imperator et conservorum; unus enim omnium dominus rex et Creator.* Belle profecto; quam veritatem calliditas et assen-
20 tatio episcoporum obscuravit, eam iracundia unius, et ut mollius dicam, zelus ineruditus protulit in lucem. Ambrosii im-

who after he had been a proconsul and then a catechumen at last commenced bishop; you cite, I say, his interpretation of those words of David, "Against thee only I have sinned,"—an interpretation which is ignorant, not to say adulatory.

5 Ambrose was willing all others should be enthralled to the emperor, that he might enthrall the emperor to himself. Everybody knows with what a more than high-priestly popish pride and arrogance he treated the emperor Theodosius at Milan, how he took upon himself to declare him guilty of

10 the massacre at Thessalonica, and forbade him to enter the church; and what a raw beginner in Gospel lore he next showed himself to be. When the emperor fell down at his feet, he commanded him to get him out of the church porch; at length when he was received again into the communion of

15 the church, and had made offering, and remained standing at the altar, Ambrose with these words ordered him outside the rails: "Emperor, these inner places are for priests only; it is not lawful for others to come within them." Was this a preacher of the Gospel, or was it a pontifical high priest of the

20 Jewish rite? Yet this man put the emperor to lord it over everyone else, that he himself might lord it over the emperor—quite an usual trick of churchmen. With words to this purpose he put Theodosius back as inferior to himself: "You are ruler over men that are your like and fellow-servants with

25 yourself, for there is one only lord and king and Creator over all." Excellent indeed! This truth, which the craft and flattery of bishops kept hid, was then brought to light by the irascibility, or to speak more mildly, by the ignorant zeal of one of them.

peritk tuam subjungis ignorantiam aut hxresin, qui diserte negas *sub veteri foedere remissionem peccatorum per sanguinem Christi locum tunc habuisse, cum David Deo confitebatur ei soli se peccavisse*; p. 68. Orthodoxi, non nisi per san-

5 guinem agni mactati ab initio mundi, peccata unquam remissa fuisse credunt; te novum hæreticum cujusnam discipulus sis nescio; certe summi Theologi discipulus ille quem exagitas, a vero non aberravit, cum dixit potuisse quemvis

c populo pari jure cum Davide Deum his verbis inclamasse,

10 *tibi soli peccavi*. Augustinum deinde ostentas, Clericos Hipponenses nescio quos producis; nam Augustini quæ sunt abs te allata nobis non obsunt. Quidni enim fateamur cum propheta Daniele, Deum tempora mutare, regna dare, et regna auferre, per homines tamen. Si regnum Deus solus

15 Carolo dedit, idem Carolo abstulit, opdmatis et Populo dedit. Si ea de causa præstandam Carolo obedientiam fuisse dicis, eandem nunc magistratibus nostris præstandam esse dicas necesse est. Nam Deum et nostris etiam magistratibus eandem dedisse potestatem quam dat malis regibus *ad casti-*

20 *ganda populi peccata* ipse concedis; nostros itaque a Deo pariter constitutes remove a magistrate nemo vel tuo judicio nisi Deus potest. Atque ita, uti soles, tuum tibi ipse mucronem in

To Ambrose's incompetence you now join your own ignorance or heresy in denying point blank (p. 8) that "under the old covenant there was forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ at the time when David confessed to God that
5 he had sinned against him only." It is the orthodox belief that any remission of sins there ever was, was but by the blood of the lamb that was offered up from the beginning of the world. I know not whose disciple you are that set up for a broacher of new heresies, but certain I am that that great Divine's dis-
10 ciple whom you so censure was not in error when he said that anyone of David's subjects might have cried upon God, "Against thee only have I sinned," with as much right as David himself.

Then you show off Austin, and trot out an obscure corn-
is pany of Hipponensian divines. What you bring in from Austin makes not at all against us; why should we not acknowledge with the prophet Daniel that God changeth times, sets up one kingdom, and pulls down another? Certainly,—
yet it is by means of men. If 'twas God alone gave a kingdom
20 to King Charles, God alone took it away, and gave it to the Lords and Commons. If you say it was for that reason our allegiance was due to King Charles, then you must needs say that for the same reason it is due to our present rulers. For you yourself grant that God has given even our rulers such
25 power as he gives wicked kings "to punish the people's sins"; so that, according to your own opinion, our present rulers, being likewise appointed by God, cannot lawfully be removed from office but by God. Thus, as usual, you turn your point

temet vertis, tuus tibi ipse sicarius es; neque injuria, cum ed improbitatis et impudentiæ processeris, eo stuporis et insaniæ, ut quos digito violandos non esse tot argumentis probas, eosdem omnium suorum bello persequendos esse idem affirmes.

5 Ismælem Godolise Præfecti interfectorem ab Hieronymo par-
ricidam esse nominatum ais, et merito; præsidem enim Judææ,
virum bonum, sine ulla causa interemit. Idem Hieronymus
in Ecclesiasten, præceptum illud Solomonis, *Os regis observa*,
cum præcepto Pauli concordare dixit; et laudandus quidem,
10 quod locum istum cæteris sui temporis moderatius exposuit.
*Ad inferiora tempora post Augustinutn non descendes, ut
doctorum sententiam exquiras.* Ut omnes tamen intelligant
facilius mentiri te posse quam tacere, si quos adhuc haberes
tuæ sentential fautores, post unam statim periodum non tem-
15 peras tibi quo minus ad Hispalensem Isidorum, Gregorium
Turonensem, Ottonem Frinsingensem etiam in mediam bar-
bariam descendas. Quorum autoritas quam nullius apud nos
pretii sit si modo scivisses, non hue eorum obscurum testimo-
nium per mendacium adduxisses. Vultis scire cur ad hæc
20 tempora descendere non audet, cur abdit se, cur subito evane-

against yourself, and are your own assassin. Serves you right too; for you have reached such a pitch of wickedness and shamelessness, of stupidity and madness, that those very persons whom, as you prove with so many arguments, we ought
5 not to lift a finger against, you yourself assert should be hunted down in war by all their subjects.

You tell us that St. Jerome calls Ishmæl, who slew Gedaliah the Deputy-Governor, a parricide; and rightly, for it was without cause that Ishmæl slew that ruler over Judea, who
10 was a good man. Jerome also in his comment upon Ecclesiastes says that Solomon's counsel "Keep the king's commandment" agrees with St. Paul's doctrine upon the same subject; and he deserves commendation for having made a more moderate construction of that text than did the rest of his con-
15 temporaries.

You say you will not "come down to times later than Austin to search out the opinions of the doctors." Yet, for all men (supposing you still had any adherents) to learn that you can more easily lie than say nothing, you do not refrain, after
20 but one sentence more, from coming down at once to Isidore of Seville, Gregory of Tours, and Otto of Freising—even into the midst of mediæval barbarism. Had you but known how worthless we consider their authority, you had not told a lie to quote their unintelligible evidence.

25 Readers, would ye know why he dare not come down to the present time, why he hides away and on a sudden disappears? I will tell you: 'tis because he knows full well that he shall encounter as many keen adversaries as there are eminent

scit ? dicam: quot sunt Ecclesiæ reformats præstantissimi doctores, tot videt acerrimos sibi adversaries fore. Faciat modò periculum, sentiet quam facile reluctantem, omnes in unum vires conferentem, Lutheris, Zwingliis, Calvinis, Buceris, 5 Martyribus, Parads in aciem eductis fundam atque obruam. Leidenses etiam tuos tibi opponam, quorum Academia, quorum respub. florentissima, libertatis olim domicilium, isti denique literarum humaniorum fontes atque rivi, servilem illam æruginem tuam et innatam barbariem eluere non potuerunt.

10 Qui cum Theologum orthodoxum habeas neminem tibi faventem, quern tuo commodo nominare possis, omnium præsidio reformatorum nudatus confugere ad Sorbonam non erubescis: quod tu Collegium doctrinæ pontificiæ addictissimum, nullius apud orthodoxos autoritatis esse non ignoras.

15 Sorbonæ igitur absorbendum tarn sceleratum tyrannidis propugnatorem tradimus; tarn vile mancipium nostrum esse nolumus; qui *populum unwersum regi ignavissimo far em esse* negat, Frustra id in papam deonerare atque transferre contendis, quod omnes liberæ nationes, omnis religio, omnes

20 Orthodoxi sibi sumunt, in se suscipiunt. Papa quidem cum episcopis suis, dum tenuis, et nullarum virium erat, tuæ hujus fcedissimæ doctrine author primus extitit: iis demum artibus magnas opes, magnamque potentiam paulatim adeptus, tyrannorum ipse maximus evasit. Quos tamen omnes sibi fir-

25 missime devinxit, cum populis, quorum animos jamdiu superstitione oppresses tenuerat, suaderet, non posse regibus

divines of the Protestant Church. Let him but put it to the test, and though he strive with all his might, he shall find how easily I will rout and overwhelm him, once I get the Luthers, Zwinglis, Calvins, Bucers, Peter Martyrs, and
5 Pareuses, marshaled out in battle array. I will set against you even your Leyden colleagues, whose University, whose flourishing commonwealth, where freedom dwelt of old—yea not even those fountains and streams of polite learning—could wash away that slavish rust and native barbarism of yours.
10 With not one orthodox divine to take your part (name any you please), stripped, I say, of all Protestant support, you blush not to take refuge in the Sorbonne, a College you know to be utterly given over to the teachings of popery, and of no authority among the orthodox. We surrender so wicked a
15 champion of tyranny: Sorbonne, absorb him!

We will not own a slave so despicable as to maintain that "the whole body of a nation is not the equal of a king the most slothful and cowardly." You labor in vain to unload and lay upon the Pope a doctrine which all free nations and religions
20 and all the Orthodox take unto themselves for their very own. True, the Pope, when he and his bishops were low and of but small account in the world, was the first author of this foul doctrine of yours; 'twas precisely by preaching such doctrine that little by little he got great riches and power into his own
25 hands, and himself turned out to be the worst of tyrants. Yet these tyrants he bound to himself by the closest tie, for he persuaded the nations, whose minds he had long held crushed beneath their superstitions, that it was unlawful to depose a

quamlibet pessimis, nisi sc fidelitatis sacramentum solvente, imperium abrogari. Verum tu scriptores Orthodoxos devitas, et quæ communis *d* notissima ipsorum sententia est, cam a Papa introductam esse causatus, veritatem in invidiam rapere
 5 conaris. Quod nisi astute faceres, appareret te neque Papanum esse neque reformatum, sed nescio quern semibarbarum Edomseum Herodianum, qui tyrannum quemque immanissimum tanquam Messiam coelo demissum colas atque adores, *Demonstrdsse te hoc dicis ex doctrina patrum, primorum*
 10 *quatuor sæculorum, qua sola evangelica et Christiana censeri debet.* Perit huic homini pudor; quim multa sunt ab illis dicta atque scripta, quæ Christus et Apostoli neque docuerint neque approbarint? quam multa in quibus reformati omnes a patribus dissentiant? Quid autem ex patribus demonstra-
 15 visti? *reges etiam malos a Deo constitui.* Fac esse constitutes, ut omnia etiam mala quodammodo a Deo constituuntur: *eos proinde Deum solum habere judicem, supra leges esse, nulla lege scripta, non scripta, naturali, neque divina posse reos fieri à subditis, neque apud subditos suos.* Quare? certe nulla
 20 lex vetat, nulla reges excipit: ratio, et jus, et fas omne animadverti in omnes qui peccant indiscriminatim jubet. Neque tu legem ullam scriptam, non scriptam, naturalem aut divinam protulisti quæ vetaret. Cur ergo non in reges quoque animadvertendum? *quia sunt etiam mali h Deo constituti, Ne-*

king, though never so bad, unless the Pope absolved them from their oath of allegiance. But you avoid Orthodox writers, and endeavor to bring odium upon the truth by making out the Pope to be the originator of what is a known and common
5 received opinion amongst them. If you did not do it cunningly you would bewray yourself for what you are, neither Papist nor Protestant, but some sort of half-barbarous Edomite Herodian, who worship and adore a monstrous tyrant as if he were a Messiah sent down from heaven.

10 Your opinions you say you "have proved by the teaching of the fathers that flourished in the first four centuries—teaching which alone should be deemed evangelical and Christian." This man is past all shame. How many things did they say and write which Christ and his Apostles would neither have
15 taught nor have approved? How many things in which all Protestants disagree with them? But what have you proved out of the fathers? Why, "that even evil kings are appointed by God." Allow that they, like all other evils, are, in some sense, by God appointed. What then? why, "therefore they
20 have no judge but God alone; they are above the laws; by no law written or unwritten, law of nature or law of God, can they be indicted by or before their own subjects." But why? Certainly no law forbids it; no law excepts kings; and all reason and right both human and divine requires that all of-
25 fenders be punished without distinction. Nor have you produced any law whatever, written or unwritten, of God or of nature, which forbids. Then why may not kings be proceeded against? "Because they, even the bad ones, are appointed by

bulonem te magis an bardum et caudicem esse dicam ? nequis-
 simus sis oportet qui doctrinam perniciosissimam in vulgus
 disseminare audeas, stupidissimus qui ratione tarn stolidam
 maximè nitaris. Dixit Deus Isaïæ 54, *Ego creavi interfecto-*
 5 *rem ad perdendum;* ergo interfector supra leges est; excute
 hæc, et pervolve quantum voles, parem utrobique consequen-
 tiam invenies. Nam et Papa etiam eodem modo quo tyran-
 nus à Deo est constitutes, et ecclesiæ in poenam datus, quod
 supra ex scriptis etiam tuis ostendimus; tamen *quia in fasti-*
 10 *gium potestatis non ferendum tyrannidi non absimilis prima-*
turn suum evexit, cum eum, turn cpiscopos meliori jure tol-
lendos esse affirmas quhm fuere constituti: Wal. Mes. p. 412.
 Papam et episcopos quamvis ab irato Deo constitutes ex eccle-
 sia tollendos esse ai's, quia sunt tyranni; tyrannos ex repub.
 15 tollendos esse negas quia sunt ab irato Deo constituti. Inepte
 prorsus et absurde: cum enim Papa ipsam conscientiam, quæ
 sola regnum ejus est, invito quoquam lædere non possit, eum
 qui revera tyrannus esse non potest, quasi tyrannum gravissi-
 mum tollendum esse clamas; tyrannum autem verum qui
 20 vitam et facultates nostras omnes in potestate sua habet, et sine
 quo papa in ecclesia tyrannus esse nequit, eum in repub. om-
 nino ferendum esse contendis. Hæc tua sibi invicem collata

God," Had I best call you knave, or fool and blockhead? A vile wretch you must be to dare propagate a doctrine so destructive and pernicious, and a dunce to lean upon such silly arguments. God says, Is. 54, "I have created the slayer to
5 destroy." Then a slayer is above the laws. Weigh and turn it round as much as you will, you shall find this conclusion to be as valid as yours.

For the Pope too is appointed by God just as much as tyrants are, and set up for the punishment of the church, as I
10 have already demonstrated out of your own writings. And yet you say, *Wai. Mes.* page 412: "Because he has raised his primacy to an insufferable pinnacle of power, so that it is nowise different from a tyranny, both he and his bishops may be more lawfully removed than they were appointed." You
15 tell us that the Pope and the bishops, *though* God in his wrath appointed them, ought to be removed from the church because they are *tyrants*; and yet you deny that *tyrants* ought to be removed from the commonwealth, *because* God in his wrath appointed *them*! How utterly irrelevant and self-con-
20 tradictory! On the one hand, though the Pope cannot without a man's consent harm even the conscience, which alone is his realm, yet you cry out that he—who in point of fact has not the power to tyrannize—should be removed as a tyrant intolerable; on the other hand you urge that a tyrant indeed, a
25 tyrant that holds all our lives and estates in his grip, and without whose support the Pope himself cannot lord it in the church, must in the commonwealth by all means be borne withal. These assertions compared with one another bewray

tarn imperitum te tdmque puerilem sive falsi sive veri argu-
torem produnt, ut levitas tua, inscitia, temeritas, incogitan-
tia neminem posthac latere queat. At ratio subest altera, *re-*
rum vices inverses viderentur, quippe in melius; actum enim
5 esset de rebus humanis, si quæ res pessimo loco sunt, in eodem
semper starent: in melius inquam; autoritas enim regia ad
populum rediret, ab cujus voluntate atque suffrages profecta
primò, atque in unum ex suo numero derivata erat: potestas
ab eo qui injuriam intulit, ad eum qui injuriam est passus,
10 æquissima lege transiret; cum tertius nemo inter homines ido-
neus esse possit; alienigenam enim judicare quis ferret? om-
nes æque homines legibus tenerentur, quo nihil justius esse
potest: Deus mortalis nemo esset. Quern qui inter homines
constituit, non minus in rempub. scelestus est, quam in Eccle-
15 siam. Tuis iterum in te armis utar. *Maximum hceresin esse*
ai's, quod creditur unum hominem in loco Christi sedere: duæ
hcc note Antichristum signant, injallibilitas in spiritualibus,
et omnipotentia in temporalibus, Appar. ad Primat. pag.
171. An Reges infallibiles? Cur ergo omnipotentes? aut si
20 hoc sunt, cur minus exitiales rebus civilibus quam Papa spiri-
tualibus? An vero Deus res civiles prorsus non curat? si non

you as so ignorant and childish a chatterer—whether the thing you say is true or false—that your fickleness and ignorance, your rashness and heedlessness, can be hidden no longer from anybody.

5 But you allege another reason: "Human affairs would seem turned upside down." They would, and for the better. It would be all over with human affairs if being once at their worst they must be always so. I say they would be changed for the better, for the king's power would revert to the
10 people, by whose will and vote it first proceeded and was conferred upon one of themselves. And most rightfully would the power be transferred from the doer of the wrong to the sufferer; since among all mankind there can be no third party qualified to wield it; for who would submit to the jurisdiction
15 of a foreigner? All men would equally be subject to the laws;—and than such a condition nothing can be more just. There would be then no God of flesh and blood; whoever sets up such among men is an offender no less heinous against the State than against the Church.

20 Now I mean to turn your own weapons upon you again. To believe that one man sits in Christ's seat, "this," you say, "is the greatest heresy. These two signs mark Antichrist, infallibility in spirituals, and omnipotence in temporals." *Apparat. ad Print.*, page 171. Are kings infallible? Why then
25 should they be omnipotent? And if they are, why are they not as destructive to temporalities as is the Pope to spiritualities? Does God really concern himself nowise with civil affairs? If he does not, surely he does not forbid us to take care

curat, certe nos curare non prohibet; si curat, eandem in republica reformationem atque in ecclesia vult fieri; præsertim si infallibilitatem et omnipotentiam attributam homini eadem malorum omnium utrinque causas esse exploratum sit.

- 5 Non enim in negotiis civilibus earn patientiam præcepit, ut sævissimum quemlibet tyrannum respública ferret, ecclesia non ferret; immo contrarium potius præcepit: et ecclesie quidem nulla arma præter patientiam, innocentiam, preces, et disciplinam evangelicam reliquit; reipublicæ et magistratibus
10 simul omnibus non patientiam, sed leges et gladium, injuriarum et violentiæ vindicem in manus tradidit. Unde hujus hominis perversum et preposterum ingenium aut mirari subit aut ridere; qui in ecclesia, Helvidius est et Thræseas et plane tyrannicida; in republica, commune omnium tyrannorum
15 mancipium et satelles. Cujus sententia si locum habeat, non nos solum rebellavimus, qui regem, sed reformati etiam omnes qui Papam dominum invitis regibus rejecerunt. Jam diu autem est quod suis ipse telis concisus jacet. Sic enim homo est, modo manus adversarii ne desit, ipse in se tela abunde
20 suppeditat: nee quisquam ad refutandum se, aut irridendum commodiores ansas ministrat. Defessus etiam cædendo citius quis abscedat, quam hic terga præbendo.

of them. If he does, he would have the same reformation made in the commonwealth as in the church, especially if it has been put to the proof that the assigning of infallibility and omnipotency to man is the identical cause of all the evils in
5 both. In civil affairs God has not enjoined such patience that the state must submit to the cruelties of tyrants, but not the church; nay, rather has he enjoined the contrary; indeed he has left unto the church no arms but patience and innocence, prayer and the teaching of the gospel; but into the hands of
10 the state and its officers altogether he has entrusted not patience, but the sword of the law, avenger of wrong and violence. So this man's upside-down back-foremost mind exposes itself to either astonishment or laughter: in the church he is Helvidius and Thraseas, tyrant-queller out and out; in
15 the state the common slave and lackey of tyrants all. If his doctrine hold, not we only that have cast off our king, but Protestants in general, who against the wishes of their kings have cast off the Pope's supremacy, are rebels all alike.

But long it is ere now that he lies felled by his own shafts.
20 For, let but his enemy's hand not fail, and Salmasius, such is his nature, himself furnishes an overplus of weapons against himself. Nor does any man offer you a handle more easy to refute and ridicule himself withal. You will sooner give over in actual weariness of flogging him, than he of offering his
25 back to the lash.

CAPUT IV.

MAGNAM à regibus iniisse te gratiam, omnes principes et terrarum dominos demeruisse defensione hac regia te forte putas, Salmasi, cum illi, si bona sua, remque suam ex veritate potius quim ex adulationibus tuis
5 vellent aestimare, neminem te pejus odisse, neminem a se longius propellere atque arcere debeant. Dum enim regiam potestatem supra leges in immensum extollis, admones eadem opera omnes fere populos servitutis suæ nee opinatæ; eoque vehementius impellis ut veternum ilium, quo se esse liberos inani
10 ter somniabant, repente excutiant; moniti abs te quod non putabant, servos se esse regum. Eoque minus tolerandum sibi esse regium imperium existimabunt, quo magis tu iis persuasum reddideris tam infinitam potestatem non sua patientiâ crevisse, sed ab initio talem atque tantam ipso jure regio natam
15 fuisse. Ita te tuamque hanc defensionem, sive populo persuaseris, sive non persuaseris, omnibus posthac regibus funestam, exitialem, et execrabilem fore necesse erit. Si enim populo persuaseris, jus regium omnipotens esse, regnum amplius non feret; si non persuaseris, non feret reges, dominationem
20 tam injustam pro jure usurpantes. Me si audiant, quibus in-

CHAPTER IV.

PERHAPS you think, Salmasius, that by this Royal Defence you have much ingratiated yourself with kings, and deserved well of all princes and lords of the earth; but if they would reckon their interest and advantage according to truth, not according to your flatteries, they ought to hate nobody worse than you, and banish and keep away nobody farther from their presence, For in the very act of exalting the power of kings above law and beyond measure, you remind most nations that they are under a slavery they had not guessed before, and the more violently drive them to shake off upon a sudden that lethargy in which they kept vainly dreaming they were freemen; for you admonish them what before they recked not, that they are slaves to their kings. And they will count royal government all the less endurable the more you persuade them that it is not by their sufferance and submission that this exorbitant power swelled up, but that from the beginning, even such and so great as it is, it sprang full-grown from the royal right itself. So that whether you convince the nations or not, you and this Defence of yours must needs be to all kings hereafter calamitous and ruinous and accursed. For if you shall persuade a nation that royal right is power without limit, they will no longer endure a monarchy; if you persuade them not, then they will not endure kings who assume so unlawful a power as if it were lawfully theirs.

If kings who are yet uncommitted as to this will heed me,

tegrum hoc est, seque circumscribi legibus patiantur, pro incerto, imbecillo, violento imperio quod nunc habent, curarum atque formidinum pleno, firmissimum, pacatissimum ac diuturnum sibi conservabunt. Consilium hoc sibi, suisque
5 regnis adè salutiferum si propter authorem contempserint, sciant non tam esse meum, quam regis olim sapientissimi: Lycurgus enim Spartanorum rex, antiqua regum stirpe oriundus, cum propinquos videret suos Argis et Messenæ rerum potitos, regnum quemque suum in tyrannidem convertisse,
10 sibi que pariter suisque civitatibus exitio fuisse, ut patriæ simul saluti consuleret, et dignitatem in familia sua regiam quam diutissimè conservaret, consortem imperii senatum, et Ephorum potestatem in ipsum regem quasi censoriam, firmiter regno suo induxit. Quo facto regnum suis nepotibus
15 firmissimum in multa secula transmisit. Sive, ut alii volunt, Theopompi, qui centum amplius annis post Lycurgum Lacedæmone regnabat, ea moderatio fuit, ut popularem Ephorum potestatem superiorem quam suam constitueret, eoque facto gloriatus est, stabilivisse se regnum, multoque majus ac
20 diuturnius filiis reliquisse, exemplum profectò haud ignobile hodierni reges ad imitandum habuerint, eundem etiam consilii tutissimi authorem egregium. Majorem enim legibus dominum ut perferrent homines hominem omnes unum, nulla lex unquam sanxit; ne potuit quidem sancire. Quæ enim lex

and will suffer themselves to be limited by the laws, then instead of the uncertain, weak, and violent government, full of cares and fears, which now they have, they will secure unto themselves a government perfectly steadfast, peaceable, and
5 lasting. If they slight this counsel, so wholesome to them and their kingdoms, because of its author, then let them know that it belongs less to me than to a very wise king of old. Lycurgus king of the Spartans, who was sprung of an ancient royal stock, observed that his kinsmen in power at Argos and
10 Messene had each turned his rule into a tyranny, and had been the ruin of themselves and their states; thereupon, that he might at once benefit his country and secure the kingly office to his own family as long as possible, he made the senate a partner in his power, and subjected himself, even the king,
15 to the almost censorial office of the Ephors—all this to prop his throne. By this means he handed down the royal power unshaken to his posterity for many generations. Others think it was Theopompus, who ruled over Lacedæmon more than a hundred years after Lycurgus, that adopted this polity, so
20 self-restrained as to set up the popular power of the Ephors above his own, and who thereupon boasted that he had settled the royal power on a sure foundation, and had left it to his posterity much augmented and much more lasting. However this may be, surely the kings of today would have here
25 no base pattern to copy, and distinguished authority too, for a counsel thoroughly safe.

That all men should submit to any one man as superior to law, no law ever did enact, or ever could, for whatever law

leges omnes evertit, ipsa lex esse non potest. Cum itaque ever-
 sorem te, et parricidam legum omnium rejiciant ab se leges,
 exemplis redintegrare certamen, hoc capite, conaris. Facia-
 mus itaque periculum in exemplis: sæpe enim, quod leges
 5 tacent, et tacendo tantum innuunt; id exempla evidentius
 docent. Ab Judxis auspicabimur voluntatis divinæ consultis-
 simis; *postea ad Christianas tecum descendemus*. Initium
 autem altius petitum ab eo tempore facimus, quo Isrælite
 regibus quocunque modo subjecti, jugum illud servile cervici-
 10 bus dejecerunt. Rex Moabitarum Eglon Isrælitas bello sube-
 gerat; sedem imperii inter ipsos Jerichunte posuerat: numinis
 contemptor non erat, facta enim Dei mentione, e solio sur-
 rexit: servierant Isrælite Egloni annos duodeviginti; non ut
 hosti, sed ut suo regi munus miserant. Hunc tamen dum pub-
 15 lice munerantur ut regem suum, interficiunt per insidias ut
 hostem. Verum Ehudes qui interfecit, Dei monitu id fecisse
 creditur. Quid factum hujusmodi commendare magis potuit?
 Ad honesta enim quæque et laudabilia hortari solet Deus,
 non ad injusta, infida, truculenta. Expressum autem Dei
 20 mandatum habuisse nusquam legimus. *Clamdrunt filii Isra-
 Ælis ad Jehovam; clamavimus et nos; excitavit iis Jehova ser-
 vatorem; excitavit et nobis*. Ille ex vicino domesticus, ex hoste

overthrows all law cannot itself be law. Now, seeing that law spurns you off as an underminer and murderer of law, you try in this chapter to renew the fight by means of examples. Let us make trial, then, of examples, for often they make plain
5 what the laws are silent in, yet hint at.

We will begin with the Jews, whom we suppose to have known most of the will of God, and then, according to your own method, we will "come down to the Christians." But we will make an earlier start, at the time when the Israelites,
10 however they had been subjected to kings, cast that slavish yoke from off their necks. Eglon the king of Moab had made a conquest of them, and had set up his throne at Jericho in the midst of them; he was no contemner of the true God, for at mention of His name he rose from his seat: the Israelites had
15 served him eighteen years, and had sent a present to him, not as to an enemy, but as to their own king. Yet in the very act of publicly making a present to him as their king, they kill him by stratagem as an enemy to their country. To be sure, Ehud, who slew him, is believed to have had a warrant from
20 God for so doing. What greater argument of its being a warrantable and praiseworthy action? God uses not to put men upon deeds that are unjust, treacherous, and cruel, but upon deeds honorable and praiseworthy. But we read nowhere that he had express command from God. "The children of Israel
25 cried unto the Lord"; so did we. The Lord raised them up a saviour; so did he for us. Eglon from their neighbor became their inmate, and from their enemy their king. Our gentleman from our king became our enemy, and so no king, for

rex factus erat: Noster ex rege hostis; non ergo rex erat; nam neque civis ullo modo esse potest, qui reipublicæ est hostis; neque Consul habebatur Antonius, neque Nero imperator, ex quo uterque hostis a Senatu est judicatus. Quod Cicero quarta
5 Philippica de Antonio clarissime docet: *Si consul Antonius, Brutus hostis; si conservator Reipublica Brutus, hostis Antonius. Quis illum consulem nisi latrones futant?* Pari ego jure, quis tyrannum, inquam, regem nisi hostes patriæ putant? Fuerit itaque Eglon externus, fuerit Noster domesticus
10 necne, quandoquidem uterque hostis et tyrannus, parum refert. Si illum Ehudes jure trucidavit, nos nostrum supplicio jure affecimus. Quin et heros ille Sampson, incusantibus etiam popularibus suis, Jud. 15. *An nesciebas Phelithceos dominium habere in nos?* suis tamen dominis bellum solus
15 intulit, neque unum sed multos simul patriæ suæ tyrannos, sive Dei, sive propriæ virtutis instinctu occidit; conceptis prius ad Deum precibus ut auxilio sibi esset. Non impium ergo sed pium Sampsoni visum est, dominos, patriæ tyrannos occidere; cum tamen pars major civium servitatem
20 non detrectaret. At David, rex et propheta, noluit Saulem interimere *unctum Dei*. Non quicquid noluit David, continue nos obligat ut nolimus; noluit David privatus; id statim nolle synedrium, Parlamentum, totum populum necesse erit? noluit inimicum dolo occidere, nolet ergo Magistratus noxium

no man can anywise be at once a member of the state and an enemy to it. Antony was never held a consul, Nero an emperor, after the Senate had voted them both enemies. This Cicero tells us unmistakably in his fourth *Philippic*: "If
5 Antony be a consul, Brutus is an enemy; if Brutus is a saviour and preserver of the commonwealth, Antony is an enemy. Who but robbers count him a consul?" By the same reason, say I, who but enemies to their country count a tyrant a king? So that whether or not Eglon was a foreigner, and Charles a
10 countryman of ours, makes no difference, since each was an enemy and a tyrant. If Ehud killed him justly, we too have done justly in putting Charles to death.

Samson, that renowned champion, though his countrymen blamed him (Judg. 15, "Knowest thou not that the Philis-
15 tines are rulers over us?"), yet made war singlehanded against his rulers; and whether instigated by God or by his own valor only, slew not one, but many at once of his country's tyrants. And as he had first duly prayed to God to be his help, it follows that he counted it no wickedness, but a duty, to
20 kill his masters, his country's tyrants, even though the greater part of his countrymen refused not slavery. Yet, you urge, David, who was both a king and a prophet, refused to take away Saul's life, because he was "the Lord's anointed." David's refusal to do a thing doth not necessarily bind us
25 to the same refusal. It was as a private person that David refused; is that a precedent binding at once upon a Council of State, upon a Parliament, upon a whole nation? David would not kill his private enemy by stealth; shall a public

lege punire ? noluit regem occidere, timebit ergo Senatus tyrannum plectere ? religio erat illi unctum Dei interficere, an ergo religio erit populo unctum suum capitis damnare ? præsertim qui unctionem illam vel sacram vel civilem totus
5 cruore civium delibutus tarn longa hostilitate aboleverat? Equidem reges, vel quos Deus per prophetas unxit, vel quos ad certum opus, sicuti olim Cyrum, nominatim destinavit, Isa. 44, unctos Domini agnosco; cæteros vel populi, vel militum, vel factionis tantummodo suæ unctos esse arbitror. Ve-
10 rum ut concedam tibi omnes reges esse unctos Domini; esse tamen idcirco supra leges, non esse ob scelera quæcunque puniendos, nunquam evinces. Quid enim ? et sibi et privatis quibusdam interdixit David, ne extenderent manus suas in unctum Domini. At regibus interdixit ipse Dominus, Psal.
15 105, ne attingerent unctos suos, id est, populum suum. Unctionem sui populi prætulit unctioni, siqua erat, regum. An ergo fideles punire, si quid contra leges commiserint, non licebit? Unctum Domini sacerdotem Abiatharem prope erat ut rex Solomon morte multaret; neque illi, quod unctus Domini
20 esset, pepercit, sed quod patris fuerat amicus. Si ergo summum sacerdotem, summum eundem in plerisque magistratum, unctio illa Domini et sacra et civilis eximere supplicio

officer therefore not punish a criminal according to law? He would not kill a king; will a Senate therefore be afraid to strike a tyrant? He scrupled to kill the Lord's anointed; must the people therefore scruple to condemn to death their own
5 anointed?—especially one who by so long acting the public enemy was all besmeared with his own subjects' blood, and thus had done away his royal unction, whether sacred or civil. Those kings indeed whom God by his prophets anointed, or by name appointed to some special service, as of old he did
10 Cyrus, Isa. 44,1 acknowledge as the Lord's anointed; the rest are in my opinion the people's anointed, or the army's, or the anointed of their own faction only. But that all kings are the Lord's anointed, yet that therefore they are above all laws, and not to be punished no matter what villainies they perpe-
15 trate—this you will never force me to grant you. What if David forbade himself and some private persons to stretch forth their hands against the Lord's anointed? God himself forbade kings to touch his anointed—that is his people, Psal.
105. He preferred the anointing wherewith his people were
20 anointed, before that of kings, if any such there were. Yet shall it not be lawful to punish even God's own believers if they have transgressed against the laws? King Solomon was about to put to death Abiathar the priest, though he were the Lord's anointed too; and did not spare him because he was
25 the Lord's anointed, but because he had been his father's friend. If therefore the Lord's sacred and civil unction could not exempt from death the high priest, the same being in many cases the highest officer of state, how comes a merely

non potuit, cur unctio tantum civilis tyrannum eximeret? At *Saul quoque tyrannus erat, et morte dignus*; esto: non inde enim sequetur, dignum, aut idoneum fuisse Davidem qui sine populi auctoritate, aut magistratum jussu Saulem regem
5 quocumque in loco interficeret. Itane vero Saul tyrannus erat? Utinam diceres; quinimmo dicis; cum tamen supra dixeris, *cap. 2. pag, 32, Tyrannum non fuisse, sed bonum et electum*. Ecquid causæ est nunc cur in foro quadruplator aut falsarius quispiam stigmatè notetur, tu eadem careas ignominia nota?
10 cum meliore profecto fide sycophantari soleant illi, quam tu scribere, et res vel maximi momenti tractare. Saul igitur, si id ex usu est tuo, bonus erat rex; sin id minus tibi expedit, repente non rex bonus, sed tyrannus erit; quod certe mirum non est; dum enim potential tyrannicæ tam impudenter lenocinaris,
15 quid aliud facis quam ex bonis regibus tyrannos omnes. At vero David quamvis regem socerum multis de causis, quæ ad nos nihil attinent, interimere nollet, sui tamen tuendi causa copias comparare, Saulis urbes vel occupare vel insidere non dubitavit; et Cheilam oppidum contra Saulem etiam præsidio
20 tenuisset, nisi oppidanos erga se male animates cognovisset. Quid si Saul urbe obsessa, scalis muro admotis, primus ascendere voluisset, an censes Davidem arma protinus abjecturum, suos omnes uncto hosti proditurum fuisse? non existimo. Quidni enim fecisset quod nos fecimus, qui rationum suarum

civil unction to exempt a tyrant? But you say, "Saul too was a tyrant, and deserved death." What then? It does not thence follow that David, wherever he happened to be, was qualified or empowered to kill King Saul without the people's authority, or the command of the magistracy. But really and truly was Saul a tyrant? I wish you would say so; indeed you do say so, though you had said before in your second chapter, page 32, that "he was no tyrant, but a good king, and chosen of God." Now is there any reason why base informers and perjurers should be publicly branded, and you escape without the same mark of ignominy? For they are wont to practice their falsifications with less treachery and deceit than you are wont to write and to treat even matters of the greatest moment. So Saul was a good king, if that serves your turn; if it suits you not, he shall be, of a sudden, no good king but a tyrant. No wonder; for in so shamelessly pandering to tyrannic power, what do you else than turn good kings into tyrants all? But David, though he would not put to death the king his father-in-law for a number of reasons that we have nothing to do withal, yet in his own defence hesitated not to raise an army, and to take or besiege Saul's cities, and would have defended the town of Keilah against the king's forces, had he not understood that the citizens were ill disposed toward him. Suppose Saul had besieged the city, and set up ladders against the walls, and himself resolved to be the first to scale them; do you think David would straightway have thrown down his arms, and have betrayed all his followers to his anointed enemy? I trow not! Why should he not have done what we did? When his

necessitate coactus, Philistads patriæ hostibus operam prolixè suam pollicitus, id fecit contra Saulem quod nos in nostrum tyrannum credo nunquam fecissemus. Pudet me, et jam diu pertæsum est mendaciorum tuorum; *Inimicis potius parcen-*
5 *dum quhm amicis*, Anglorum esse dogma fingis; *seque regi suo parccre non debuisse, quia amicus erat*. Quis unquam hoc prius audivit, quam a te confictum esset, hominum mendacissime? Verum ignoscimus: deerat nempe huic capiti præstantissimum illud et tritissimum orationis tuæ pigmentum,
10 jam quinto, et ante finem libri decies ex oculis tuis et myrotheciis expromendum, *molossis suis ferociores*. Non tam Angli suis molossis ferociores sunt, quam tu cane quovis rabido jejunior, qui ad illam, quam toties evomuisti, cramben duris ilibus identidem redire sustines. *David* denique *Ama-*
15 *lechitam* interfici jussit, Saulis, ut simulavit ipse, interfectorem; nulla hie neque facti neque personarum similitudo. Quod nisi David ad Philistæos defecisse, et pars eorum exercitfls fuisse visus, eo diligentius omnem a se suspicionem maturandæ regi necis amovere studuit, non erat, meo quidem
20 iudicio, cur virum ilium tam male exciperet, qui moribundum jam regem et ægre morientem opportune vulnere se confecisse nuntiavit. Quod idem factum in Domitiano, qui

interests so required, he freely proffered aid to the Philistines, the enemies of his country, thus doing against Saul what I am sure we should never have done against our tyrant.

I am ashamed, and have long been weary, of your lies.
5 Falsely you declare it to be a principle of the English "That enemies are rather to be spared than friends, and that because their king was their friend they ought not to spare him." You impudent liar, what mortal ever heard this whimsy before you invented it? Yet we overlook it, for this chapter did not
10 as yet present that most egregious worn-out rhetorical cosmetic of yours, which you now for the fifth time fetch out from the cabinets of pour perfumery-shop, and which before the end of your book is to be fetched thence ten times—that stuff about the English being "fiercer than their mastiffs I"
15 The English are not so much fiercer than their own mastiffs as you are hungrier than any mad dog whatsoever, who with your tough guts can bear to return again and again to the cabbage you have so often vomited.

Then you tell us that David commanded the Amalekite to
20 be put to death, who pretended to have killed Saul. But here is no likeness either in the deed or in the persons. There was, in my opinion at least, no motive for David's severe treatment of that man—who professed to have given the king a *coup de grace* when the king was already at the point of death, and
25 dying in anguish—unless David, because to all appearance he had gone over to the Philistines and joined their army, did the more zealously endeavor to clear himself from all suspicion of plotting the king's murder. The same action all men

Epaphroditum similiter capite damnavit, eo quod Neronem in adipiscenda morte adjuvisset, ab omnibus reprehenditur. Nova deinde audacia quern tyrannum modo dixeras, et *malo spiritu agitatam*, hunc non jam satis habes unctum Domini, 5 sed *Christum Domini* vocare; adeò tibi vile Christi nomen videtur, ut illo tarn sancto nomine vel Dæmoniacum tyrannum impertire non metuas. Venio nunc ad exemplum illud, in quo qui jus populi jure regis antiquius esse non videt, caucus sit oportet. Mortuo Solomone, populus de constituendo ejus 10 filio Sechemi comitia habebat; profectus est eo Roboamus candidatus, ne regnum tanquam hxreditatem adire, ne populum liberum tanquam paternos boves possidere videretur: proponit populus conditiones regni futuri; ad deliberandum rex tri-duum sibi dari postulat; consulit seniores; nihil illi de jure 15 regio, sed ut populum obsequio et pollicitationibus conciliet sibi, suadent, penes quern erat, vel ilium creare regem vel præterire. Consulit deinde æquales suos, secum a pueris educates; illi Salmasiano quodam oestro perciti, nil prater jus regium intonare, scuticas et scorpiones ut minitetur hortari. Horum 20 ex consilio respondit Roboamus populo. Videns itaque totus Israël regem *non auscultdsse sibi*, suam protinus libertatem et populare jus liberis palam vocibus testatur: *Quce nobis portio cum Davide? ad tentoria tua Israël; jam ipse videris de domo*

blame in Domitian, who put to death Epaphroditus likewise for helping Nero to kill himself. Next—another instance of your impudence—you call him not only the "anointed of the Lord," but "the Lord's Christ," whom you had just called a
5 tyrant, and one "driven and actuated by an evil spirit." Such base thoughts you have of the name of Christ that you fear not to give that so holy name to a tyrant possessed of a devil.

Now I come to that instance in which whoever sees not that the right of the people is superior to that of kings must indeed
10 be blind. When Solomon was dead, the people assembled at Sichem to make his son Rehoboam king. Thither himself went Rehoboam, as one that stood for the office, that he might not seem to claim the kingdom for his inheritance, or to hold a freeborn people as if they were his father's sheep and
15 oxen. The people propose conditions upon which his royal power shall rest. He desires three days time to advise; he consults with the old men; they advise him nothing about a royal right, but to comply with the people, and speak them fair, it being in their power to make him king or pass him by.
20 Then he consults with the young men that were grown up with him; they, as if stung mad by Salmasius's gadfly, keep dinning in his ears naught but royal right, and urging him to threaten whips and scorpions. Rehoboam answered the people as these advised him. So when all Israël saw that the
25 king "hearkened not unto them," at once with bold words they openly protest their own liberty and the right of the people. "What portion have we in David? To your tents, O Israël! now see to thine own house, David." When the king

tua David. Missum deinde a rege Adoramum lapidibus obruerunt; exemplum fortasse aliquod edam in regem edituri, nisi maxima celeritate se in fugam contulisset. Parat ingentem exercitum, quo in suam ditionem Isrælitas redigeret:
5 prohibet Deus; *ne ascendite*, inquit, *ne fignate contra fratres vestros, filios Isrælis, nam h me jacta est res ista.* Adverte jam animum; populus antea regem volebat, displicuit id Deo; eorum tamen juri noluit intercedere: nunc Populus Roboamum non vult regem; id Deus non solum penès populum esse
10 sinit, sed regem eo nomine bella moventem vetat ac reprimit: nee ideo rebelles, sed nihilo minus fratres eos qui desciverant appellandos esse docet. Collige te nunc jam; sunt omnes, inquis, reges a Deo; ergo populus vel tyrannis resistere non debet. Vicissim ego, sunt, inquam, populi conventus, comitia,
15 studia, suffragia, plebiscita pariter a Deo, teste hie ipso; ergò et rex itidem resistere non debet populo, authore edam eodem Deo. Quam enim certum est, esse hodie reges a Deo, quamque hoc valet ad imperandam populo obedientiam, tarn est certum esse a Deo etiam hodie libera populi concilia, tàmque
20 hoc valet vel ad cogendos in ordinem reges, vel ad rejiciendos; neque magis propterea bellum populo inferre debebunt, quam debuit Roboamus. Quæris cur ergò non defecerint Isra-

sent Adoram to them, they stoned him with stones, and perhaps were ready to make an example of the king himself had he not made speed to flee. He raises a great army to reduce the Israelites to their allegiance. God forbids: "Ye shall not go
5 up," says he, "nor fight against your brethren the children of Israel; for this thing is from me." Now consider: heretofore the people had desired a king; God was displeased with them for it, but yet would not interpose against their right. Presently the people reject Rehoboam from ruling them; and God not
10 only leaves the matter in their hands, but forbids Rehoboam to make war against them for it, and stops him; and teaches him withal, that those that had revolted from him were not on that account to be called rebels, but none the less brethren. Now look to your defences! You say that all kings are of God,
15 and that therefore the people ought not to resist even tyrants. I answer you that the meetings and assemblies of the people, their votes, their acts, endeavors, and decrees, are likewise of God, by the testimony of God himself in this place; and consequently, by the authority of God himself, a king likewise,
20 according to your argument, ought not to resist the people. For as certain as it is that at present kings are of God, and whatever argument thence follows to enforce a people's obedience, so certain is it, that at present free assemblies of the people are also of God, and this affords the same argument
25 for their right of keeping their kings in order, or for casting them off; nor will kings on this account be any more justified than was Rehoboam in making war on their subjects.

Why, then, you ask, did the Israelites not revolt from Sol-

clitæ a Solomone ? quis præter te tam stulta interrogaret, cum defecisse constet impune a tyranno ? In vitia quædam lapsus est Solomon; non idcirco statim tyrannus: sua vitia magnis virtutibus, magnis de rebus. meritis compensabat: fac tyrannum fuisse; sæpe est ut populus nolit tyrannum tollere, sæpe est ut non possit: satis est sustulisse cum potuerit. At *jactum Jeroboami semper improbatum juit, et Apostasia ejus detestata, successores ejus pro rebellious semper habiti.* Apostasiam ejus non a Roboamo, sed a vero cultu Dei reprehensam sæpius
10 lego; et successores quidem ejus sæpe reprobos, rebelles nusquam dictos memini. *Si quid fiat, inquis, juri et legibus contrarium, ex eo jus fieri non potest.* Quid quæso turn fiet juri regio? Sic tuus ipse perpetud refutator es. *Quotidie, inquis, adulteria, homicidia, furta impune committuntur.* An nescis
15 nunc te tibi respondere quærenti cur toties tyrannis impune fuerit? *Rebelles fuerunt isti reges, prophets tamen populum ab eorum subjectione non abducebant.* Cur ergò, sceleste, et pseudopropheta, populum Anglicanum a suis magistratibus, tuo sint licet judicio rebelles, abducere conaris? *Allegat, in-*
20 *quis, Anglicani latrocinii jactio, se ad id scelus, quod tam nefarti suscepit, nescio qua voce coditus missd impulsos fuisse.*

omon ? Who but you would ask a question so impertinent in view of the certainty that they did revolt from a tyrant, and with impunity ? It is true, Solomon fell into some vices, but he was not therefore a tyrant; he made amends for his vices
5 by many excellent virtues and by deserving greatly of the commonwealth. But admit that he had been a tyrant; yet circumstances are often such that the people will not, and often such that they cannot, depose a tyrant: enough that they did it when it was in their power. "But," say you, "Jeroboam's
10 act was ever had in detestation, and his defection abominated; his successors were ever accounted rebels." Rather I find plenty of passages that blame his defection not from Rehoboam but from the true worship of God; and I remember that his successors are frequently called wicked, certainly, but
15 nowhere rebels.

"From an act that is contrary to law and right," say you, "no right can arise." Pray what then becomes of your right of kings? Thus do you perpetually confute yourself. You say, "Adulteries, murders, thefts are daily committed with im-
20 punity." Are you not aware that here you answer your own question how tyrants so often escape unpunished? You say: "Those kings were rebels, and yet the prophets made no attempts to seduce the people from their allegiance." And why do you, you rascally false prophet, endeavor to seduce the
25 people of England from their present magistrates, even supposing these to be rebels as you think ? "This English faction of robbers," say you, "allege that they were put upon their wicked impious undertaking by some immediate voice from

Anglos hoc unquam allegasse, de innumeris mendaciis et figmentis tuis est unum. Sed pergo exemplis tecum agere; *Libna* Urbs validissima ab Joramo rege defecit, quia is dereliquerat Deum; defecit ergo rex, non urbs illa, neque defectione ista
5 notatur; sed si adjectam rationem spectes, approbari potius videtur. *In Exemplum trahi non debent hujusmodi defectiones.* Cur ergo tanta vaniloquentia pollicitus es, exemplis te nobiscum toto hoc capite decertaturum, cum exempla ipse
10 nulla præter meras negationes, quarum nulla vis est ad probandum, afferre possis: nos quæ certa et solida attulimus, negas in exemplum trahi debere? Quis te hoc modo disputantem non explodat? Provocasti nos exemplis; exempla protulimus; quid tu ad hæc? tergiversaris, et diverticula quæris; progredior itaque. Jehu regem è Propheta jussus occidit,
15 etiam Achaziam suum regem legitimum occidendum curavit. Si nolisset Deus tyrannum interimi a cive, si impium hoc, si mali exempli fuisset, cur jussit fieri? si jussit, certe licitum, laudabile, præclarum fuit. Non tamen tyrannum perimi, quia Deus jussit, idcirco bonum erat et licitum, sed quia bonum et licitum erat, idcirco Deus jussit. Jam septem annos

Heaven." That the English pretend to any such warrant as a justification of their actions is one of those many lies and fictions of yours.

But I proceed to treat you with examples. Libnah, a powerful city, revolted from King Joram, because he had forsaken God: it was the king therefore that revolted, not the city, nor is the city blamed for that revolt, but rather, if the added reason be considered, seems to be approved. "Revolts of this sort are not to be taken as examples," say you. But why did you then so vauntingly promise that throughout this chapter you would contend with me by examples, whereas you can produce no examples but mere denials, which have no validity as proofs, and when we have produced examples that are sure and substantial, you say they are no precedents? For arguing like this who would not hiss you from the platform? You challenged us at precedents; we produced them; and what do you do? you turn your back, and look for byways of escape.

I proceed: Jehu, at the command of the prophet, slew a king; nay, he ordered the death of Ahaziah, his own liege prince. If God would not have tyrants put to death by their own subjects, if it were a wicked thing, a thing of bad example, why did God himself command it? If he commanded it, it was lawful, commendable, and glorious. It was not because God commanded it that it was right and lawful to kill a tyrant, but it was because it was right and lawful that God commanded it. Again, Jehoiada the high priest did not scruple to depose Athaliah, and kill her, though she had been

regnantem Athaliam Jehoiada sacerdos regno pellere et trucidare non est veritus. *At regnum, inquis, non sibi dcbitum sumpserat. Annon Tiberius multo postea imperium ad se nihil pertinent?* illi tamen, et id genus tyrannis aliis, ex doctrina

5 Christi obediendum esse supra affirmabas: ridiculum plane esset, si potestatem regiam non rite adeptum interficere liceret, pessimè gerentem non liceret. At per leges regnare non potuit, utpote fcemina; *constitues autem super te re gem, non reginam.* Hoc si sic abibit, constitues, inquam, super te regem,

10 non tyrannum: discrepat enim longius rex a tyranno quam mas a fcemina. Amaziam regem ignavum et Idololatram non conjurati quidam, sed principes et populus, quod verisimilius est, morte affecerunt: nam fugientem Hierosolymis, et adjutum a nemine, Lachisum usque persecuti sunt. Hoc consilium

15 iniisse dicuntur *ex quo is Deum* deseruerat, neque ullam ab Azaria filio de morte patris quæstionem habitam fuisse legimus. Multum rursus nugaris ex Rabbinis, ut Regem Judaicum supra synedrium constituas; ipsa regis verba Zedechiæ non attendis. Jer. 38. *Non is est rex qui possit contra vos quic-*

20 *quam.* Sic principes alloquitur; fassus se planè suo senatu

seven years in actual possession of the crown. "But," you say, "she had taken the government when she had no right to it." And did not Tiberius long after assume, as you say, "a sovereignty nowise belonging to him" ? And yet you then kept
5 affirming that, according to Christ's teaching, he and other such tyrants ought to be obeyed. It were a most ridiculous thing to imagine, that a king who gets in by usurpation may lawfully be deposed, but one that rules tyrannically may not. But, say you, according to the law, she could not possibly
10 reign, being a woman. "Thou shalt set over thee a king," not a queen. If this comes off, I put it thus: "Thou shalt set over thee a king," not a tyrant. For there is a far greater unlikeness between a king and a tyrant than between a male and a female.

15 Amaziah a cowardly idolatrous king was put to death, not by a few conspirators, but rather, it should seem, by the nobility and the people. For he fled from Jerusalem, and had none to stand by him, and they pursued him even to Lachish. This counsel against him, says the history, they took "after
20 the time that Amaziah did turn away from following the Lord"; and we do not find that Azariah as a son made any public investigation into his father's death.

And now once more you quote much silly stuff out of the rabbins, to prove that the king of the Jews was superior to the
25 Sanhedrim, but you do not consider king Zedekiah's own words, Jer. 38: "The king is not he that can do anything against you." This is how he addresses the princes, clearly confessing himself inferior to the great council of the realm.

inferiorem. *Fortasse, inquis, nihil negare illis ausus metu seditionis.* At tuum illud *jortasse* quanti quæso est, cujus asseveratio firmissima non est pili ? quid enim te levius, quid inconstantius; quid instabilius? quoties te varium et versico-

5 lorem, quoties tibimet discordem, dissidentem è temetipso, et discrepantem offendimus? Rursus comparationes instituis Caroli cum bonis Judææ regibus. Davidem imprimis quasi contemnendum aliquem nominas; *Sume tibi Davidem, inquis, adulterii simul et homicidii reum; nihil tale in Carolo.*

10 *Solomon cjus filius qui sapiens audit vulgo.* Quis non indignetur maximorum et sanctissimorum virorum etiam regum nomina ab impurissimo nebulone et vappa hunc in modum jactari ? Tune Carolum cum Davide, superstitiosum et Christians doctrinæ vix initiatum cum rege et propheta

15 religiosissimo, stolidum cum sapientissimo, imbellem cum fortissimo, iniquissimum cum justissimo conferre sustinuisti? castimoniam tu ejus et continentiam laudes, quern cum Duce Bucchingamio flagitiis omnibus coopertum novimus ? secretiora ejus et recessus perscrutari quid attinet, qui in Theatro

20 medias mulieres petulanter amplecti, et suaviari, qui virginum et matronarum papillas, ne cætera dicam, attrectare in propatulo consueverat? Te porro moneo Pseudoplutarche, ut istiusmodi Parallelis ineptissimis dehinc supersedeas, ne ego

"Perhaps," say you, "he durst not deny them anything for fear of sedition." But what does your "perhaps" signify, when your most positive assertion is not worth even the estimation of a hair? For what can be more fickle and shifty and
5 inconsistent than you? How often have I caught you changing sides and colors, disagreeing with yourself, unsaying with one breath what you have said with another?

You make comparisons again betwixt king Charles and some of the good kings of Judah. First you mention David as
10 one to be despised. "Take David," you say, "guilty at once of adultery and murder; no such thing in Charles. Solomon his son, commonly called the wise," etc. Who would not grow indignant at this filthy rascally fool's bandying about the names of worthies, nay of kings, eminent in greatness and
15 piety? Dare you compare King David with King Charles; a most religious king and prophet with a superstitious prince and a mere novice in the Christian religion; a most prudent wise prince with a stupid one; a valiant prince with a cowardly; a most just prince with a most unjust? Can you com-
20 mend the chastity and self-control of one whom together with the Duke of Buckingham we know to be covered with every kind of infamy? It were to no purpose to inquire into the private actions of his life, who in public at the theatre would wantonly embrace and kiss women, and handle virgins'
25 and matrons' breasts, not to mention the rest. I advise you in your turn, you counterfeit Plutarch, henceforth to abstain from such absurd Parallels, lest I be forced to publish con-

quæ tacerem alioqui libens de Carolo, necesse habeam enun-
tiare. Contra tyrannos quid tentatum a Populo aut peractum
fuerit, et quo jure, per ea tempora quibus ipse Deus Hebræo-
rum repub. suo nutu ac verbo quasi præsens regebat, hacten-
5 nus liquet. Quæ sequuntur ætates non nos sua autoritate
ducunt, sed ad majorum suorum normam et rationem omnia
dirigentes, imitatione sua nostram tantummodò confirmant.
Ciim itaque Deus post captivitatem Babylonicam nullum iis
de repub. mandatum dedisset novum, quamvis regia soboles
10 extincta non esset, ad antiquam et Mosai'cam reipub. formam
reverterunt. Antiocho *Syrinx* regi, cui erant vectigales, ejusque
præsidibus, quòd is vetita imperaret, per Maccabæos pontifices
restiterunt; seque armis in libertatem vindicarunt; dignissimo
deinde cuique principatum dederunt: donee Hyrcanus Simo-
15 nis Judæ Maccabad fratris filius, expilato Davidis sepulcro,
militem externum alere, et regiam quandam potestatem ad-
jicere sacerdotio coepit; unde filius ejus Aristobulus diadema
sibi primus imposuit. Nihil in eum populus quamvis tyran-
num movit aut molitus est; neque mirum, annum tantum-
20 modo regnantem. Ipse etiam morbo gravissimo correptus, et
suorum facinorum poenitentia ductus, mortem sibi optare non
destitit, donee inter ea vota expiravit. Ejus frater Alexander
proximus regnabat. *Contra hunc aîs neminem insurrexisse,*

cerning king Charles what otherwise I would fain pass over in silence.

So far it is clear what the People acted or attempted against tyrants, and by what right, in those times when God himself
5 did immediately, as it were, by his word of command govern the Hebrew commonwealth. The ages that succeed do not guide us by their own authority, but, in governing all according to the rule and reason of their forefathers, they only confirm us in our opinion. For after the Babylonish captivity,
10 when God gave no new command concerning the state, though the royal line was not extinct, the people returned to the old mosaical form of government. They were one while tributaries to Antiochus, king of Syria; yet when he enjoined them things that were unlawful, it was under the conduct of
15 their high priests, the Maccabees, that they resisted him and his governors, and by force regained their former liberty. After that, whoever was accounted most worthy of it had the principality conferred upon him, till at last Hyrcanus the son of Simon, the brother of Judas Maccabæus, plundered
20 David's sepulchre, and began to keep foreign soldiers, and to invest the priesthood with a kind of regal power; whereupon his son Aristobulus was the first that assumed the crown. Though he was a tyrant, the people stirred not against him, which is no great wonder, for he reigned but one year.
25 And he himself being overtaken with a grievous disease, and repenting of his crimes, ceased not to wish for death, till amid his wishes he breathed his last. His brother Alexander succeeded him; "and nobody rose against him," you say,

tyrannus ciim esset. O te secure mendacem si periisset Josephus, restaret tantiim *Josippus* tuus, ex quo Pharisaëorum quædam nullius usus apophthegmata depromis. Res itaque sic se habet: Alexander, cum et domi et militiæ rempub. male ad-

5 ministraret, quamvis magna Pisidarum et Cilicum manu conductitia se tutaretur, populum tamen cohibere non potuit, quin ipsum etiam sacrificantem, utpote indignum eo munere, thyrsis palmeis et citreis pene obrueret; exinde per sexennium gentis ferè totius gravi bello petitus est; in quo Judæorum

10 multa millia cum occidisset, et pacis tandem cupidus interrogaret eos quid vellent a se fieri, responderunt uno ore omnes, ut moreretur; vix etiam mortuo se veniam daturos. Hanc historiam tibi incommodissimam, quoquo modo avertere ut posses, fraudi tuæ turpissimæ pharisaicas quasdam sententio-

15 las obtendisti; cum exemplum hoc aut omnino prætermisisse, aut rem, sicuti gesta erat, fideliter narrasse debuisses, nisi veterator et lucifugus mendaciis longe plus quam causæ confideres. Quinetiam Pharisæi illi octingenti, quos in crucem tolli jussit, ex eorum numero erant, qui contra ipsum arma

20 ceperant: quique omnes cùm ca[^]teris una voce testati sunt, se regem morte aflecturos fuisse, si bello victus in suam potestatem venisset. Post maritum Alexandrum Alexandra regnum capessit; ut olim Athalia, non legitime, nam regnare

tyrant though he were. Ah, you might have lied quite fearless of discovery had but Josephus been lost, and only your "Josippus" left extant, from whom you fetch out some ineffectual utterances of the Pharisees. The facts are these: Alexander governed ill, both in war and in peace; and though he kept a great troop of Pisidian and Cilician mercenaries for a bodyguard, yet could he not restrain the people; but even whilst he was sacrificing they fell upon him as unworthy of that function, and had almost smothered him with boughs of palm trees and citron trees. Afterward, for six years, almost the whole nation made war upon him; and when he had slain many thousands of the Jews in this war, and at length desired peace, and asked what they would have him do, they answered with one voice that he should die, nay, that they should hardly pardon him after his death. To get rid by hook or crook of this history, so inconvenient to you, you hid it behind a few trifling sententious Pharisaical speeches—to your own deep disgrace and damage; for you ought either to have let this example quite alone, or to have told the facts;—were it not that, like the old daylight-shunning trickster that you are, you give far more weight to your lies than to your cause. Even those eight hundred Pharisees whom he commanded to be crucified, were of their number that had taken up arms against him; and they and the rest of the people had unanimously protested that they would put him to death if they could defeat him and lay hands upon him. After the death of Alexander, his wife Alexandra seized the crown, like Athaliah of old, not according to law, for (as

foeminam leges non sinebant, quod ipse modo fassus es, sed partim vi, (extraneorum enim exercitum ducebat;) partim gratia, nam Pharisæos, qui apud vulgus plurimum poterant, sibi conciliaverat hac lege, ut nomen imperil penes illam, imperium ipsum penès illos foret. Haud aliter atque apud nos nuper Scoti Presbyteri nomen Regis Carolo concesserunt, ea mercede ut regnum sibi reservare possent. Post Alexandras obitum Hyrcanus et Aristobulus ejus filii de regno contendunt; hie viribus et industria potior fratrem natu majorem regno pellit. Pompeio deinde in Syriam a Mithridatico bello divertente, Judad nactos se jam xquissimum libertatis suæ arbitrum Pompeium rati, legationem pro se mittunt; fratribus utrisque regibus renuntiant; ad servitatem se ab iis adductos queruntur; Pompeius Aristobulum regno privavit; Hyrcano pontificatum reliquit et principatum more patrio legitimum; exinde Pontifex et Ethnarcha dictus est. Iterum sub Archelao Herodis filio Judsei, missis ad Augustum Cæsarem quinquaginta legatis, et Herodem mortuum et Archelaum graviter accusarunt; regnum huic pro sua virili parte abrogarunt, Cæsarem orant ut Populum Judai'cum sine regibus esse permetteret. Quorum Cæsar precibus aliquantum permotus, non regem eum, sed Ethnarcham duntaxat constituit. Ejus anno

you have just remarked) the laws of the Jews admitted not a woman to the throne, but partly by force, for she maintained an army of foreigners, and partly by favor, for she had got the support of the Pharisees, who had the greatest influence
5 over the people, upon the understanding that she was to have the royal name, but they the power. Just so in my country the Scotch Presbyterians lately granted Charles the name of king, but for a consideration—namely that they might keep the royal authority in their own hands. After the death of Alex-
10 andra, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus her sons were at strife for the sovereignty: Aristobulus, who was more active, and had stronger support, forced his elder brother out of the kingdom. A while after, when Pompey turned aside into Syria from the Mithridatic war, the Jews, thinking that in him they had now
15 found a wholly disinterested arbiter of their liberty, dispatch an embassy to him in their own name; they renounce the rule of both the brothers, and complain that they had been enslaved by them. Pompey deposed Aristobulus, and left to Hyrcanus the priesthood and the royal rank to which ances-
20 tral law entitled him: thenceforward he was called High Priest and Ethnarch. Once more, in the reign of Archelaus the son of Herod, the Jews sent fifty ambassadors to Augustus Cæsar; made serious charges against Herod that was dead, and Archelaus; deposed the latter as much as in them lay, and
25 petitioned the emperor to let the people of the Jews be without a king. Cæsar, somewhat moved at their entreaty, made the appointee not a king but only an Ethnarch. Yet again, in the tenth year of this governorship, the People by their am-

decimo rursus eum Populus per legates ad Cæsarem tyrannidis accusat; quibus Cæsar benign[^] auditis Romam accersitum, et iudicio damnatum Viennam in exilium misit. Jam mihi velim respondeas; qui suos reges accusatos, qui damnatos, qui punitos volebant, annon ipsi, si potestas facta, si optio data sibi esset, annon ipsi, inquam, iudicio damnassent, ipsi supplicio affecissent? Jam in Romanes presides avare et crudeliter provinciam administrantes, populum et primores etiam sæpitis arma sumpsisse non negas; causas more tuo stultissimas
10 affingis, *nondum iugo erant assueti*; sub Alexandro scilicet, Herode, ejiisque filiis. At C. Cæsari et Petronio *helium infcrre* noluerunt. Prudenter illi quidem, non poterant. Vis ipsorum audire verba?

Quod ipsi fatentur imbecillitatis esse suæ, hoc tu hypocrita
15 ad religionem refers? Magno dein molimine prorsus nihil agis, dum ex patribus probas, quod et antea tamen pari oscitatione feceras, pro regibus orandum esse. Nam pro bonis quis negat? pro malis quoad spes est; pro latronibus etiam et pro hostibus; non ut agros depopulentur, aut nos occisione
20 occidant, sed ut resipiscant. Oramus pro utrisque; illos tamen legibus, hos armis vindicare quis vetat? *Liturgias Ægyptiacas*

bassadors to Cæsar accused the Ethnarch of tyranny. Cæsar heard them graciously, sent for him, and upon his conviction banished him to Vienne. Answer me now: a people that accused their kings, that desired their condemnation, that
5 desired their punishment, would not they themselves rather, if it had been in their power, and that they might have had their choice, would not they themselves, I say, have convicted them, and put them to death? You do not deny that the people and the nobles often took up arms against Roman
10 governors who ruled provinces avariciously or cruelly; but you give a ridiculous reason for this, as usual: "They were not yet accustomed to the yoke." Very likely, under Alexander, Herod, and his son! But, say you, they would not "make war against" Gaius Cæsar and Petronius. And very
15 wise of them, too, for they were not able. Will you hear their own words? "Not wishing to make war because we cannot." What they themselves acknowledge to be due to weakness, do you, you hypocrite, attribute to religion?

Next with much ado you do nothing; for you endeavor to
20 prove out of the fathers what you had proved as superficially before, that kings are to be prayed for. That good kings are to be prayed for, no man denies; nay, and bad ones too, as long as there is any hope of them: nay and highwaymen, and our enemies. But how? not that they may lay waste our territory,
25 or slay us with slaughter, but that they may come to their right minds. We pray for both thieves and enemies, and yet who would forbid us to punish the one by law and the other by arms? I value not your "Egyptian liturgies"; but that priest

nil moror; sacerdos autem ille qui orabat, uti ai's, ut *Commodus patri succederet*, meo quidem iudicio non orabat, sed Romano imperio pessima imprecatus est. *Fidem*, ai's, *jregisse nos, de authoritate et majestate regis conservanda solenni*
5 *conventionem non semel interpositam*. Expecto te fusius ista de re infrè, illic te rursus conveniam. Redis ad patrum commentationes, de quibus hoc summam accipe: Quicquid illi dixerint, neque ex libris sacris, aut ratione aliqua satis idonea confirmaverint, perinde mihi esse, ac si quis alius e vulgo dixisset.
10 Primum adfers Tertullianum, scriptorem baud orthodoxum, multis erroribus notatum, ut si tecum sentiret, pro nihilo tamen hoc esset. Quid autem ille? damnat tumultus, damnat rebelliones; damnamus et nos, neque hinc statim de jure omni populorum, de privilegiis, et Senatusconsultis, de pote-
15 state magistratum omnium cæterorum præterquam unius regis, præjudicatum esse volumus: loquuntur isti de seditionibus temere conflatis, et multitudinis insania, non de magistratibus, non de Senatu, aut Parlamento ad legitima arma populum contra tyrannos convocante. Unde Ambrosius quern
20 citas, *Non repugnare, flere, gemere, hæc sunt munimenta Sacerdotis, et quis est qui potest vel unus vel inter paucos dicere Imperatori, Lex tua mihi non probatur? non permit-*

who prayed, you say, "that Commodus might succeed his father," was not praying at all, in my opinion, but did imprecate all the mischiefs imaginable upon the Roman state.

You say "that we have broken our word, which we pledged
5 more than once in solemn assemblies, to preserve the authority and majesty of the king." I wait for you further on, where you speak more fully upon this subject, and shall meet you there again.

You return then to the comments of the fathers; concerning whom take this in short. Whatever they say which is not warranted by the authority of the scriptures, or by good and sufficient reason, shall be of no more regard with me, than if any other and ordinary man had said it. The first that you quote is Tertullian, who is no orthodox writer, and is notorious for many errors; so that his authority, if he were of
15 your opinion, would yet stand you in no stead. But what says he? He condemns riots and rebellions. So do we. But in saying so, we would not have a premature decision rendered upon all the people's rights and privileges, all the acts and
20 resolutions of senates, and the power of all magistrates, the king alone excepted. The fathers are condemning seditions rashly kindled by the heat of a mad multitude; they speak not of magistrates, of senates, of Parliaments, summoning the people to lawful arms against their tyrants. Hence Ambrose, whom you quote: "Not to resist," says he, "but to weep and groan, these are the Priest's protection and defence. Who is there that, whether alone or among a little number, dare say to the Emperor, 'I do not like your laws'? This is

titur hoc diccre Sacerdotibus, permittetur Laicis? Vides jam plane de quibus hie loquatur; de Sacerdotibus, de Laicis privatis, non de Magistratibus: vides què in infirma tamen et præpostera ratione usus, dissensioni inter Lai'cos et Sacerdotes, 5 de legibus etiam civilibus postmodum futuræ facem prætulit. Sed quoniam primorum Christianorum exemplis urgeri nos maxime, et redargui putas, quod illi omnibus modis vexati *helium in Ccesares non moverent*, ostendam primo non potuisse, deinde quoties poterant movisse; postremo etiamsi, 10 ctim possent, non movissent, non esse tamen cæteroqui dignos quorum ex vita et moribus, tantis in rebus, exempla sumamus. Primum ignorare hoc nemo potest, ex quo Romana respublica nulla fuit, omnes imperii vires rerumque summam ad unum Cæsarem rediisse; omnes legiones sub uno Cæsare sti- 15 pendia meruisse: adeo ut Senatus ad unum omnis, totus ordo Equester, plebs universa, si novis rebus studuisset, poterant se quidem internecioni objecisse, ad libertatem tamen recuperandam nihil prorsus effecissent; nam imperatorem si forte sustulissent, imperium tamen mansisset. Jam vero Christiani, 20 innumeri licet, at sparsi, inermes, plebeii et plerunque infimi, quid potuerunt? quantam eorum multitudinem una legio in

not allowed the priests, and shall laymen pretend to it?" It is evident of whom he speaks, viz., of priests, and of private laymen, not of the magistrates; you see nevertheless by how weak and perverse an argument he carried his torch in the
5 van of the dissensions that were afterwards to arise betwixt the laity and the clergy concerning even civil laws.

But because you think you confute us and press hardest upon us with the examples of the primitive Christians, who, though they were harassed every way, yet "never took up
10 arms against the emperor," I will show in the first place that for the most part they could not; secondly, that whenever they could, they did; and thirdly, that even if they did not when they could, yet in other respects they deserve not that in so many matters we should take pattern after their lives
15 and conduct.

First, as everybody knows, when the republic of Rome ceased, the whole and sovereign power in the empire was settled in the Emperor alone; all the soldiers were under the pay of the Emperor alone; insomuch that if the whole body
20 of the senate, the equestrian order, and all the common people had endeavored a revolution, they might indeed have exposed themselves to massacre, but could accomplish absolutely nothing towards retrieving their lost liberty; for though they might perhaps have killed the emperor, the empire
25 would still have continued. This being so, what could the Christians do? It is true there were a great many of them, but they were scattered and unarmed, and were of the common people, generally of the lowest class. How many of

officio facile continuisset? Quod magni sæpe duces cum interim suo et veteranorum exercituum deletione incassum tentarunt, isti e plebecula ferè homuli posse se ad exitum perducere sperarent? cum annis è Christo nato prope trecentis, 5 ante Constantinum plus minus viginti, imperante Diocletiano, sola Thebæa legio Christiana esset; eoque ipso nomine a reliquo exercitu in Gallia ad Octodurum oppidum cæsa est. *Cum Cassio, cum Albino, cum Nigro* non conjurarunt: idne illis gratis vult apponi Tertullianus, quod sanguinem pro in- 10 fidelibus non profuderunt? Constat igitur Christianos ab imperatorum imperio liberare se non potuisse: cum aliis conjurare non Christianis nequaquam sibi expedivisse, quamdiu imperatores Ethnici regnabant. Bellum autem tyrannis postea intulisse Christianos, aut armis se defendisse, aut tyran- 15 norum facta nefaria sæpe ultos esse nunc ostendam. Primus omnium Constantinus jam Christianus consortem imperii Licinium Orientalibus Christianis gravem bello sustulit; quo facto illud simul declaravit, posse a magistratu in magistratum animadverti; cum is Licinium pari jure secum regnan- 20 tern subditorum ejus causa supplicio affecerit, nee Deo soli poenam reliquerit: poterat enim Licinius Constantinum, si Constantinus populum sibi attributum iis modis oppressisset, eodem supplicio affecisse. Postquam igitur à Deo ad homines

them might not one legion easily have kept in subjection? That which many great generals, at the price of their own deaths and the wiping out of armies of tried and seasoned troops attempted in vain, could those rabble manikins expect
5 to accomplish? About A.D. 300, more or less twenty years before Constantine, when Diocletian was emperor, only the Theban legion was Christian; and for no other reason it was slain by the rest of the army at Octodurum in Gaul.

The Christians, say you, conspired not "with Cassius, with
10 Albinus, with Niger"; and does not Tertullian count it creditable to them that they poured not out their blood for infidels? It is evident therefore that the Christians could not free themselves from the sway of the Emperors; and it could be no ways advantageous to their interest to conspire with infi-
15 dels as long as heathen emperors reigned.

That afterwards, however, the Christians did make war upon tyrants, and defend themselves by force of arms, and many times punish tyrants' abominations, I shall now make plain. First of them all, Constantine, after his conversion to
20 Christianity, made war upon Licinius his co-emperor, who oppressed the Eastern Christians, and destroyed him. By this act of his he made it clear that one magistrate might punish another, for he for his subjects' sake put to death Licinius, who was as absolute in the empire as himself, and did not
25 leave the vengeance to God alone; and Licinius might likewise have put to death Constantine if Constantine had likewise crushed the people committed to his government. So then, since the matter is referred by God to men, why did

redacta res est, quod Licinio Constantinus erat, cur non idem Carolo Senatus ? Constantinum enim milites, Senatam jura constituerunt regibus parem, imo superiorem. Constantio imperatori Arriano Byzantini, quoad poterant, armis restiterunt; 5 missum cum militibus Hermogenem, ad pellendum ecclesia Paulum orthodoxum episcopum, facto impetu repulerunt, et incensis ædibus, quò se receperat, semiustum et laniatum interfecerunt. Constans fratri Constantio bellum minatur, ni Paulo et Athanasio episcopis sedes suas restituat; 10 vidèsne ut istos sanctissimos patres, de episcopatu cum agitur, bellum fraternum in regem suum concitare non puduerit? Haud multo pòst Christiani milites, qui tune temporis quos volebant imperatores creabant, Constantem Constantini filium dissolutè et superbe regnantem interfecerunt, translate ad 15 Magnentium imperio. Quid ? qui Julianum nondum apostatam, sed pium et strenuum, invito Constantio imperatore suo imperatorem salutarunt, annon ex illis Christianis fuerunt, quos tu exemplo nobis proponis ? Quod factum Constantius cum suis literis ad populum recitatis acriter prohiberet, clamarunt omnes, fecisse se ut Provincialis, et miles, et reipublicæ 20 authoritas decreverat. lidem bellum Constantio indixe-

not Parliament stand to King Charles as Constantine to Licinius? The soldiers made Constantine what he was; but our laws have made our Parliament equal, nay, superior to our kings.

5 The inhabitants of Constantinople resisted Constantius, an Arian emperor, by force of arms, as long as they were able, and when he sent Hermogenes with troops to depose Paul the orthodox bishop, they charged him and repulsed him, fired the house whither he had betaken himself, mangled
10 and half-burned him, and at last killed him outright. Constans threatened to make war upon his brother Constantius unless he would restore Paul and Athanasius to their bishoprics. You see how those holy fathers, when their bishoprics were at stake, were not ashamed to stir up their king's own
15 brother to make war upon him. Not long after, the Christian soldiers, who then made whom they would emperors, put to death Constans the son of Constantine because he behaved himself dissolutely and proudly in the government, and turned the empire over to Magnentius. When Julian was
20 not yet apostate, but virtuous and valiant, certain persons saluted him as Emperor, against the will of Constantius their actual emperor. How now? Are they not amongst the number of those primitive Christians whom you place as a pattern for us? When Constantius, by letter openly read to the people,
25 sharply forbade this action of theirs, they all cried out that they had but done what their Provincial and the army and the authority of the commonwealth had decided. The same

runt, et quantum in se erat, imperio ac vita spoliarent. Quid Antiocheni, homines apprime Christiani ? orarunt credo pro Juliano jam Apostata, quem palam adire, et convitiis proscindere solebant, cujus barbam illudentes promissam, funes
 5 ex ea conficere jubebant. Cujus morte audita supplicationes, epulas, et lætitiã publice indixerunt, ejus pro vita et incolumitate preces fudisse censet ? Quid ? quod eundem etiam 4 Christiano commilitone interfectum esse ferunt. Sozomenus certè scriptor ecclesiasticus non negat; immo, si quis ita fecisset, laudat: &C.

*Non est mirum, inquit, aliquem ex militibus hoc secum cogitasse; non Græcos solum, sed omnes homines ad hanc usque
 15 militem reprehendat Dei et religionis causã tarn strenuum.*

Hæc Sozomenus ejusdem ætatis scriptor, vir bonus et sanctus; ex quo quid reliqui ea tempestate viri boni hac de re senserint, facile perspicimus. Ipse Ambrosius ab imperatore Valentiano minore jussus urbe Mediolano excedere, parere noluit, sed
 20 circumseptus armato populo se atque basilicam suam contra regios præfectos armis defendit; et summæ potestati resistere, contra quam docuit ipse, est ausus. Constantinopoli baud

persons declared war against Constantius, and, as much as in them lay, deprived him of his empire and his life.

What of the inhabitants of Antioch, who were Christians exceedingly? After Julian apostatized, I suppose they
5 prayed for him, when they used to brave him to his face, and defame and revile, and scoff at his long beard and bid him make ropes of it! Think you they used to pray for the health and long life of one upon the news of whose death they offered thanksgivings, made feasts, and gave public demon-
10 strations of joy? Nay, is it not reported that he was killed by a Christian soldier in his own army? Sozomen, a writer of ecclesiastical history, does not deny it, but commends him that did it, if the fact were so: "Tor it is no wonder," says he, "that some one of his own soldiers might think within
15 himself that not only the Greeks but all mankind hitherto had been wont to praise tyrant-killers, who go unhesitating to death to procure the liberty of all: so that that soldier ought not rashly to be condemned who in the cause of God and of religion was so zealous and valiant." These are die words of
20 Sozomen, a contemporary author, and a good and religious man; by which we may easily apprehend what the general opinion of good men in those days was upon this point. Ambrose himself being commanded by the emperor Valentinian the younger to depart from Milan, refused to obey him,
25 but, hedged about by his people in arms, defended himself and his basilica against the emperor's officers, and, contrary to his own doctrine, dared resist the higher powers. At Constantinople more than once there was great insurrection

semel propter exilium Chrysostomi contra Arcadium imperatorem seditio maxima commota est. In tyrannos igitur quid antiqui Christiani fecerint, non milites solum, sed populus, sed ipsi patres, vel resistendo, vel gerendo helium, vel concitando, usque ad Augustini tempora, quoniam tibi ulterius progredi non libet, breviter exposui. Valentinianum enim Placidiae filium interfectum a Maximo patricio, ob stuprum uxori ejus illatum, taceo: Avitum edam imperatorem dimissis militibus suis luxuria diffluentem a Senatu Romano confestim exutum imperio non commemoro: quia annos aliquot post Augustini obitum ista acciderunt. Verum dono tibi hoc omne, tu nihil horum exposuisse me finge, paruerint per omnia suis regibus veteres Christiani, quicquam contra tyrannos ne fecerint, aut fecisse voluerint, non esse tamen eos quorum
10
15
20
authoritate niti debeamus, aut a quibus exempla petere salutariter possimus, quod superest, nunc docebo. Jam diu ante Constantinum populus Christianus multum de primis illa sanctimonia et sinceritate cum doctrinae turn morum deperderat. Postquam immensis opibus ditata ab eo ecclesia, honores, dominatum, et potentiam civilem adamare coepit, statim omnia in praecipua ruere. Primo luxus et segnities, errorum deinde omnium et vitiorum caterva, veluti solutis aliunde carceribus, in ecclesiam immigravit; hinc invidentia, odium, discordia passim redundabat; tandem haud mitius inter se

against the emperor Arcadius, by reason of Chrysostom's exile. I have now briefly shown how the primitive Christians behaved themselves towards tyrants; how not soldiers only, but the people, yea the very fathers of the church, resisted
5 them, and made or incited war upon them, till Austin's time: for it suits you yourself to go no lower. Therefore I make no mention of Valentinian the son of Placidia, who was slain by Maximus a nobleman, for committing adultery with his wife: nor do I mention Avitus the emperor, whom, because he dis-
10 banded the soldiers, and gave himself wholly to his lusts, the Roman senate immediately deposed; because these things came to pass some years after Austin's death.

But I will make you a present of all this; pretend that I have not set forth any of it; suppose it conceded that the primitive
15 Christians obeyed their kings through thick and thin, and never took or wished to take any action against tyrants; yet as I will now show, they were not such that we ought to rely upon their authority, or can safely follow their example. Long before Constantine's time the generality of Christians had lost
20 much of the primitive sanctity and integrity both of their religion and of their conduct. Afterwards, the church, which he had vastly enriched, began to fall in love with offices, absolute rule, and secular power, and then the Christian religion went to wrack. First luxury and sloth, and then a crew of all
25 the heresies and vices, as if their dungeons had been set open from behind, trooped over into the church; thereupon envy, hatred, and discord overflowed everywhere, and at last they that were linked together into one brotherhood by that dear

charissimo religionis vinculo fratres quam hostes acerrimi dissidebant; nullus pudor, nulla officii ratio restabat; milites, et copiarum præfecti queries ipsis visum erat, nunc imperatores novos creabant, nunc bonos pariter ac malos necabant. Quid

5 Vetranniones et Maximos, quid Eugenios a militibus ad imperium subito evectos, quid Gratianum optimum principem, quid Valentinianum minorem non pessimum, occisos ab iis commemorem? Militum hæc quidem facinora et castrensi-um, sed tamen Christianorum illius ætatis, quam tu maxime

10 evangelicam et imitandam esse ai's. Jam ergo de ecclesiasticis pauca accipe: Pastores et Episcopi, et nonnunquam illi, quos admiramur, Patres, sui quisque gregis ductores, de episcopatu non secus quam de tyrannide certabant: nunc per urbem, nunc in ipsa ecclesia, ad ipsum altare sacerdotes, et Lai'ci promiscue

15 digladiabantur; cædes faciebant, strages utrinque magnas nonnunquam ediderunt. Damasi et Ursicini, qui cum Ambrosio floruerunt, potes meminisse. Longum esset Byzantinos, Antiochenos, et Alexandrinos illos tumultus, sub Cyrillo præsertim, quern tu laudas obedientiæ prædicatorem, duce ac

20 patre; occiso pene a monachis in illo urbico prxlio, Oreste Theodosii prxfecto. Jam tua quis vel impudentia vel supinitate non obstupescat? *Usque ad Augustinum, inquis, et infra ejus cetatcm, nulla cujusquam privati aut prajecti, aut flurium conjuratorum extat in historiis mentio, qui regem suum*

and gracious bond of religion were as much at variance and strife as the bitterest enemies. No reverence, no consideration of their duty was left: the soldiers and commanders of the army, as oft as they pleased themselves, now created new
5 emperors, now killed good ones and bad ones alike. I need not mention such as Vetrannio, Maximus, Eugenius, whom the soldiers all of a sudden lifted up to the imperial throne, or Gratian, an excellent prince, or Valentinian the younger, none of the worst, whom they put to death. True, these were the
10 deeds of soldiers and camp-followers,—but yet of Christians of that age which you call most evangelical and most to be imitated! Therefore you shall now hear a few words about the clergy. Pastors and Bishops, and sometimes those Fathers whom we admire, each a leader of his flock—those very men,
15 I say, would fight for a bishopric as if for a tyrant's throne; priests and laymen promiscuous would clash swords now throughout the city, now in the very church at the very altar, and keep up their carnage sometimes with great slaughter on both sides. You may remember Damasus and Ursinus, who
20 were Ambrose's contemporaries. Long it were to relate the notorious insurrections of the inhabitants of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, especially those instigated and conducted by Cyril, whom you extol as a preacher of obedience; when the monks in that city battle had almost slain Orestes,
25 Theodosius's deputy. Now who would not be stunned at your impudence or your negligence? "Till Austin," you say, "and later than his time, there is no mention extant in history, of any private person, of any commander, or of any number of

neceverint, aut contra cum armis pugndrint: nominavi ego ex historiis notissimis et privates, et proceres, qui non males tantum, sed vel optimos reges sua manu trucidaverint; totos Christianorum exercitus, multos cum iis episcopos, qui contra
 5 *suos imperatores pugnaverint. Adfers patres, obedientiam erga regem, multis verbis aut suadentes aut ostentantes; adfero ego partim eosdem, partim alios patres baud paucioribus factis obedientiam, etiam licitis in rebus detrectantes, armis se contra imperatorem defendentes, alios præsidibus ejus vim*
 10 *et vulnera inferentes, alios, episcopatus competitores, civilibus pradiis inter se dimicantes; scilicet de episcopatu Christianos cum Christianis, cives cum civibus conflagere fas erat, de libertate, de liberis et conjugibus, de vita, cum tyranno, nefas. Quern non poeniteat hujusmodi patrum? Augustinum indu-*
 15 *cis de potestate domini in servos, et regis in subditos idem pronuntiantem; respondeo, si ita pronuntiavit Augustinus, ea dixisse quæ neque Christus neque ejus Apostoli unquam dixerunt; cum eorum tamen sola autoritate rem alioqui aper-*
 20 *tissime falsam commendare videatur: deinde ut ita pronuntiet, nostræ tamen causæ non nocere: cum enim de potestate domini in servos ita dixerit, lib. 19. cap. 14 de Civitate Dei; In domo justi viventis ex fide, etiam qui imperant, serviunt*

conspirators, that have put their king to death, or taken up arms against him." Out of well-known histories I have named to you both private persons and officials that with their own hands slew not only bad but very good kings: whole armies
5 of Christians, many bishops among them, that fought against their own emperors. You produce some of the fathers who with a great multitude of words persuade or boast of obedience to kings, and I on the other side produce both these same fathers and others besides, that by no less multitude of
10 actions refused obedience, even in lawful matters, and defended themselves in arms against the emperor, others that opposed forcibly and wounded his deputies, and others that, being competitors for bishoprics, maintained civil wars against one another. So of course it was lawful for Christians to wage
15 war with Christians, and citizens with citizens, for a bishopric, but unlawful to fight against a tyrant, for our liberty, our wives and children, and our lives! Who would not be out of all patience with such fathers?

You bring in Austin, who, you say, asserts that "the power
20 of a master over his slaves, and of a king over his subjects," is one and the same. But I answer: if Austin has asserted any such thing, he has said what neither Christ nor his Apostles ever said. However, since he apparently recommends upon their authority alone something otherwise manifestly untrue,
25 then even though he say so, yet it hurts not my cause. For concerning a master's power over his slaves he has said, *de Civitate Dei*, Book 19, Chapter 14: "In the house of a righteous man who liveth by the faith, even they who command

its quibus videntur imperare; si dixit idem de potestate regis in subditos, ut tu ais, nee sibi contradixit, pronuntiavit etiam reges, præsertim bonos, quibus imperare videntur, revera servire: interim de potestate mali regis in subditos et latronis
5 *in obvios quosque idem certe pronuntiavit, lib. 4. cap. 4 de Civit. Dei; Remota justitia, quid sunt regna, nisi magna latrocinia; quia et ipsa latrocinia quid sunt, nisi parva regna? Vides quo deduxeris ex Augustino tuum istud jus magnificentum, jus regium quidlibet audendi; non ut pictorum aut poetarum, sed ut latronum æqualis atque eadem potestas sit. Quæ supersunt hujus capituli tres vel quatuor paginæ, aut mera esse mendacia, aut oscitationes identidem repetitas, ex iis quæ a nobis responsa jam sunt, per se quisque deprehendet. Nam ad Papam quod attinet, in quern multa gratis peroras, facile*
15 *te patior ad ravim usque declamitare. Quod tamen ad captandos rerum imperitos tam prolixè adstruis, regibus sive justis sive tyrannis subiectum fuisse omnem Christianum, donec potestas papa regali major agnosci cœpta est, et subiectos sacramento fidelitatis liberavit, id esse falsissimum plurimis exemplis et usque ad Augustinum, et infra ejus tetatem*
20

serve them whom they seem to command." So that if he said the very thing you quote him as saying about "the power of a king over his subjects," and did not contradict himself, then he asserted that even kings, good kings especially, do
5 actually serve whom they seem to command. Meanwhile he has assuredly asserted that the power of an ill king over his subjects, and the power of a highway robber over everyone he meets, is one and the same (*de Civitate Dei*, Bk. 4, Ch. 4): "If righteousness be put away, what are kingdoms but great
10 robbers' dens—for what are robbers' dens themselves but little kingdoms?"—You see how far you have succeeded in deriving out of Austin that grand and glorious right of yours, that royal right to dare do anything they please: so far indeed that the power of kings is found equal and identical not with
15 that of painters or poets, but with that of highway robbers!

That the three or four remaining pages of this fourth chapter are either mere lies or sleepy negligences oft repeated, everyone will perceive for himself from my previous refutations. For what concerns the Pope, against whom you declaim
20 so much without occasion, I am content you should bawl at him till you are hoarse. But as for your attempt to catch the ignorant with the long additional argument that "every Christian yielded entire obedience to kings, whether good or bad, till the papal power began to be acknowledged superior
25 to the royal, and absolved subjects from their oath of allegiance," I have sufficiently proved by many examples "both before and since the age of Austin," that nothing can be more false.

prolatis demonstravimus. Sed neque illud quod postremo
dicis, *Zachariam pontificem Gallos juramento fidelitatis ab-*
solvisse, multo verius esse videtur. Negat Franciscus Hoto-
manus, et Callus, et jurisconsultus, et vir dictissimus in Fran-
5 cogallia sua, *cap.* 13. abdicatum autoritate Papæ Chilperi-
cum, aut regnum Pipino delatum; sed in magno gentis con-
cilio pro sua pristina autoritate transactum fuisse id omne
negotium, ex annalibus Francorum vetustissimis probat. Solvi
deinde illo sacramento Gallos omnino opus fuisse, negant
10 ipsa Gallorum monumenta, negat ipse papa Zacharias. Mo-
numentis enim Francorum traditur, teste non solum Hoto-
mano, sed Girardo historiarum illius gentis notissimo scrip-
tore, veteres Francos ut eligendi, sic abdicandi, si videretur,
suos reges jus sibi omne antiquitus reservasse; neque aliud
15 sacramentum regibus, quos creabant, dicere consuevisse,
quam se illis hoc pacto fidem et officium præstituros, si vicis-
sim illi quod eodem tempore jurati etiam spondent, præsti-
terint. Si ergo Reges rempublicam sibi commissam male ge-
rendo, fidem jurisjurandi fregerint priores, nil opus est Papa,
20 ipsi sua perfidia populum sacramento solverunt. Papa de-
nique Zacharias, quam tu autoritatem sibi ai's arrogasse, earn
in epistola ilia ad Francos ab te citata ipse sibi derogavit, po-

Neither does that seem to have much more truth in it, which you say in the last place; viz., that "Pope Zachary absolved the Frenchmen from their oath of allegiãce to their king." For Francis Hotman, both a Frenchman and a lawyer
5 and a very learned man, in the i3th chapter of his *Franco-gallia*, says that it was not by the Pope's authority that Chilperic was deposed, or the kingdom translated to Pepin; and he proves out of very ancient chronicles of the Franks that the whole affair was transacted in the great national council
10 pursuant to its original authority. That thereafter there was any necessity of absolving the French from their allegiãce is contradicted by the French historical documents, and by Pope Zachary himself. The records of the Franks relate, according not only to Hotman, but to Gerard, a very eminent
15 historian of that nation, that the ancient Franks had reserved to themselves from of old an unimpaired right both to choose their kings, and to depose them if they thought fit; and that by custom they swore to the king whom they were putting in office no other oath than that they would perform their
20 word and duty upon condition that the kings for their part would perform what they too, by oath at the same time sworn, did pledge and promise. So that if kings, by misgoverning the state entrusted to their charge, have first broke their own oath, there needs no Pope; the kings themselves by their own
25 breach of faith have absolved their subjects. Finally Pope Zachary himself, in that very letter of his to the Franks, which you yourself quote, disclaimed for himself and ascribed to the people the authority which you say he assumed to himself.

pulo attribuit. Nam *si princeps populo, cujus beneficio regnum possidet, obnoxius est, si plebs regem constituit, et destituere potest*, quæ ipsius verba sunt Papæ, verisimile non est voluisse Francos de antiquo jure suo, ullo postmodum jure-
 5 jurando, præjudicium facere; aut unquam ita sese obstrinxisse, quin semper sibi liceret quod majoribus licuit, reges bonos quidem colere, malos amovere; nee cam præstare fidem tyrannis, quam bonis regibus sese dare arbitrati sunt. Tali obstructum juramento populum, vel tyrannus ex rege factus, vel
 10 ignavia corruptus, suo ipse perjurio solvit, solvit ipsa justitia, solvit naturæ lex ipsa: unde pontifex quod solveret, etiam ipsius pontificis judicio nihil prorsus erat.

CAPUT V.

15 **Q**UANTUAM in ea sum opinione, Salmasi, semperque fui, legem Dei cum lege naturæ optimè consentire, adeoque, si satis ostendi quid divina
 lege sit de regibus statutum, quid a populo Dei factum et Judaico et Christiano, ostendisse me eodem tempore eademque opera quid legi naturali maxime consentaneum sit, tamen
 quia *conjutari nos lege natures validissime nunc posse arbi-*
 20 *traris, quod supervacuum esse modo existimabam, id nunc ultrò necessarium fatebor; ut contra te hoc capite planum faciam, nihil congruentius naturæ etiam legibus esse, quam*

For "if a king be liable to punishment by the people through whose favor he holds his royalty; if the people have set up the king and have power to put him down" (the words of that very Pope), it is not likely that the Franks would afterwards
5 by any oath impair that ancient right, or ever tie their own hands so as not to have the same right that their ancestors always had to depose bad kings, as well as to honour and obey good ones; nor would they yield to tyrants that obedience which they thought they were yielding only to good
10 kings. When people are bound by such an oath, a king turned tyrant or rotted with cowardice releases them by breaking his oath; justice herself releases them; the very law of nature releases them; wherefore even by the Pope's own opinion there simply was nothing for the Pope to release.

●
CHAPTER V

15 **I** AM of opinion, Salmasius, and always have been, that the law of God does exactly agree with the law of nature, and that therefore, if I have shown what by God's law is established with respect to kings, and what has been the practice of the people of God, both Jews and Christians, I
20 have at the same time and by the same attempt shown what is most agreeable to the law of nature. Yet because you think that we "can now be most effectually confuted by the law of nature," I will be content to admit to be necessary, what before I had thought superfluous; so as in this chapter I
25 shall prove against you that nothing is more suitable to the law of nature than that tyrants be punished. Which if I do

tyrannos plecti. Id nisi evincam, non recuso quin Dei quoque legibus puniri non posse, è vestigio tibi concœdam. Non est consilium de natura jam, deque origine civilis vitæ longam orationem contexere; istud enim argumentum viri disertis-

5 simi cum Græci, turn Latini copiose pertractarunt; ipse et brevitati, quantum licet, studeo, et huic rei do operam, ut non tarn ego, qui labori huic parsissem libens, quam tute te redarguas, teque subvertas. Ab eo igitur quod ipse ponis, incipiam, et disputationis hujus futuræ fundamenta jaciam. *Lex, inquis,*

10 *natures est ratio omnium hominum mcntibus insita, bonum respiciens universorum populorum, quatenus homines inter se societate gaudent. Bonum illud commune non potest procurare, nisi etiam, ut sunt quos regi neæsse est, disponat quoque qui regere debeant.* Ne scilicet ut quisque fortior est,

15 debiliorem opprimat; atque ita quos mutua salus ac defensio unum in locum congregaverat, vis atque injuria distrahat, et ad vitam agrestem redire cogat, Estne hoc quod volebas, etsi verbosiiiiis? *Ex ipsorum itaque numero qui in unum convenere, deligi ai's oportuisse quosdam sapientia aut jortitudine*

20 *cæctrispræstantes, qui vel vi vel persuadendo mate morigeros in officio continuerent, sæpe unum id præstare potuisse, cujus excellens sit Virtus et Prudentia; interdum plures, qui mutuis*

not demonstrate, I will then not decline to grant you on the spot, that likewise by the law of God they are exempt. I do not purpose to frame a long discourse of nature, and the beginnings of man's political life; that subject has been handled
5 at large by many learned men, both Greek and Latin. But I shall endeavor to be as short as may be; and my design is not so much that I, who would willingly have spared this pains, may confute you, as that you shall confute yourself and destroy your own position.

10 I will begin therefore with what you yourself lay down, and shall make it the basis of the following discussion. "The law of nature," you say, "is a principle implanted in all men's minds, to regard the good of all mankind in so far as men are united together in societies. But it cannot procure that
15 common good unless, as there are people that must be governed, it also ascertain who shall govern them." To wit, lest the stronger oppress the weaker, and thus those whom their mutual safety and protection had brought together be disunited and divided by injury and violence, and reduced to a
20 savage life again. This I suppose is what you intended, though you take more words to say it. "Out of the number of those that united into one body," you say, "there must needs have been some chosen, superior to the rest in wisdom or courage, who either by force or by persuasion were to hold to
25 their duty those that were refractory. Often it would so fall out that one single person whose Valour and Discretion was extraordinary might be able to do this, and sometimes several, who would accomplish it together by interchange of advice

consiliis id jacent. Cæteriim cum unus omnia providere et administrare non possit, necesse est ut consilia cum pluribus participet, et in societatem regiminis alios admittat. Ita sive ad unum revocetur imperium, sive ad universum redeat populum, quia nec omnes simul rempublicam gubernare possunt, nec unus omnia, idcirco revera penes plures semper regimen consistit. Et infra. Ipsa autem regendi ratio sive per plures, sive per pauciores, sive per unum dispensetur, æquit naturalis est, cum ex naturæ ejusdem principiis descendat, qua non patitur ita unius singularitatem gubernare, ut non alios socios imperandi habeat. Hæc cum ex Aristotelis tertio Politicorum decerpisse potuissem, malui abs te decerpta transcriber, quæ tu Aristoteli, ut ignem Jovi Prometheus, ad eversionem monarchiarum, et perniciem ipsius tuam surripuisti. Jam enim prolatam a temetipso nature legem excute quantum voles; nullum juri regio, prout tu jus illud explicas, in natura locum, nullum ejus vestigium prorsus invenies. Lex, inquis, naturæ cum disponderet qui regere alios deberent, universorum populorum bonum respexit. Non igitur unius, non monarchal.

20 Est itaque rex propter populum: populus ergo rege potior et superior; superior cum sit et potior populus; nullum jus regis existere potest, quo populum is affligat, aut in servitute habeat, inferior superiorem. Jus mate faciendi cum sit regi nullum,

and counsel. Indeed since any one man cannot order and manage all things himself, he must consult with more, and let others into the governing company. So that whether the supreme power be confined to one person or reside in the body
5 of the people, in either case, since it is impossible that all should administer the affairs of the commonwealth, or that one man should do all, therefore the government does always actually lie upon the shoulders of many." And afterwards you say: "The form of government itself, whether plac'd in the hands
10 of many, or few, or a single person, is equally natural, for it is derived from the grounds of nature itself, which suffers not one man's single self so to rule that he have no sharers in the government."

Though I might have gathered all this out of the third
15 book of Aristotle's *Politics*, I chose rather to transcribe it out of your own book, for you stole it from him, as Prometheus did fire from Jupiter, to the overthrow of monarchs and destruction of yourself. For search all you will into the law of nature, as just now exhibited by you, you will not find a place
20 in nature for the royal right as you expound it—no, not so much as a trace of it. "The law of nature," you say, "in ordering who should govern others, regarded the good of all mankind." Not then of any one person—of a monarch. Hence the king exists for the people, and consequently the people are
25 above him and to be preferred to him; which being allowed, there can be no right of the king whereby he, the inferior, may oppress or enslave the people, the superior. Since the king has no right to do wrong, the right of the people remains

manet jus populi natura supremum; ut quo jure homines consilia et vires mutuse defensionis gratia, ante reges creatos, primo consociavere, quo jure ad communem omnium salutem, pacem, libertatem conservandam unum vel plures caeteris praefecerunt, eodem jure quos propter virtutem et prudentiam caeteris praeponerant, possent eosdem aut quoscunque alios rempub. male gerentes, propter ignaviam, stultitiam, improbitatem; perfidiam vel coercere vel abdicare: cum natura non unius vel paucorum imperium, sed universorum salutem respexerit semper et respiciat; quicquid de imperio vel unius vel paucorum fiat. Jam vero populus quosnam delegit? *sapientia* inquis *aut fortitudine caeteris praestantes*, nempe qui natura maxime regno idonei visi sunt, *cujus excellent virtus, et prudentia praestare id muneris potuit*. Jus igitur successionis natura nullum, nullus natura rex, nisi qui sapientia et fortitudine caeteris omnibus praecellit; caeteri vel vi, vel factione contra naturam reges sunt, cum servi potius esse deberent. Dat enim natura sapientissimo cuique in minias sapientes imperium, non viro malo in bonos, non stolido in sapientes: his igitur imperium qui abrogant, omnino convenienter naturae faciunt. Cui fini sapientissimum quemque natura constituat regem ex temetipso audi; ut vel naturae vel legibus *male morigeros in officio contineat*. Continere autem in officio potestne is alios, officium qui negligit, aut nescit,

by nature supreme; and therefore, by that right whereby, before kings were instituted, men first united their strength and counsels for their mutual defence, by that right whereby, for the preservation of all men's liberty, peace, and safety, they
5 appointed one or more to govern the rest, by the same right they may punish or depose, for cowardice or folly or dishonesty or treachery, those very persons whom for their valour or wisdom they had advanced to the government, or any others that rule disorderly; since nature hath regarded and
10 doth regard the good not of one, or of a few, but of all in general, whatever become of one man's or of a few men's power.

Now as to the sort of persons whom the people chose. You say they were "superior to the rest in wisdom or courage,"
15 to wit, such as by nature seemed fittest for government, "whose extraordinary valour and discretion was adequate" to such an office. Hence there is no right of succession by the law of nature, no king by the law of nature except him who excels all the rest in wisdom and courage; and all kings else
20 are such by force or faction, contrary to nature, being fit rather to be slaves. For unto the wisest man nature gives command over men less wise, not unto a wicked man over good men, a fool over wise men: and consequently they that take the government out of such men's hands, act quite according to the
25 law of nature. To what end nature appoints the wisest man king, you shall hear in your own words; viz., "that he may hold to their duty those that are refractory" against either nature or the laws. But how should he hold others to their

aut pervertit ipse suum? cædò jam quodvis naturae præceptum quo jubeamur instituta naturae sapientissima in rebus publicis et civilibus non observare, non curare, pro nihilo habere, cum ipsa in rebus naturalibus et inanimatis ne suo fine
5 frustretur, sæpissime res magnas atque miras efficiere soleat. Ostende ullam vel naturae vel naturalis justitiæ regulam, qua oporteat reos minores puniri, reges et malorum omnium principes impunitos esse, immo inter maxima flagitia coli, adorari, et Deo proximos haberi. Concedis *ipsam regendi rationem, sive per plures, sive per pauciores, sive per unum dispensat, æquit naturalem esse*. Non est ergo rex vel optimatibus vel populi magistratibus natura sanctor, quos cum puniri posse ac debere, si peccant, supra sis largitus, idem de regibus, eidem fini ac bono constitutis fateare necesse est. *Non enim*
15 *patitur natura, inquis, ita unius singularitatem gubernare, ut non olios socios imperandi habeat*. Minime ergo patitur monarcham, minime unum ita imperare, ut caeteros omnes sui unius imperii servos habeat. Socios autem imperandi qui tribuis regi, *penes quos semper regimen consistat*, das eidem col-
20 legas et aequales; addis qui punire, addis qui abdicare possint. Ita, uti semper facis, dum potestatem regiam, non jam ex-

duty, that neglects, or knows not, or turns against his own?

Allege now, if you can, any dictate of nature by which we are enjoined to disregard and neglect and hold of no account in matters of human state and polity the wise institutions of
5 the law of nature, when nature herself, rather than lose her end, continually produces great and admirable results in her own province of matters inanimate and non-human. Produce any rule of nature or natural justice by which inferior criminals ought to be punished, but kings and princes to go un-
10 punished for all their evil deeds—nay but, amid their monstrous crimes, be worshiped and revered and held in honor next to God. You grant that "the form of government itself, whether placed in the hands of many, or few, or a single person, is equally natural." So that a king is not by the law of
15 nature more sacred than nobles, or than magistrates chosen from amongst the common people, and as you have granted heretofore that those may be punished, and ought to be if they offend, consequently you must admit the same of kings, who are appointed to rule for the very same end and purpose. For,
20 say you, "Nature suffers not one man's single self so to rule that he have no sharers in the government." It does not therefore suffer a monarch; it does not suffer one single person so to rule as to hold all others in slavery to his single power. In giving the king such partners in his power "that the govern-
25 ment does always lie upon their shoulders," you give him colleagues and equals; more, you give them the power to punish, you give them the power to depose him.

So while you go about, not indeed to magnify royal power,

auges, sed tantummodd natura constituis, aboles: adeo ut nihil putcm inauspicatius accidre regibus potuisse, quam te defensorem. O infelicem ac miserum, quae te mentis caligo in hanc impulit fraudem, ut latentem antehac diu, et quasi
5 personatam improbitatem atque inscitiam tuam nunc tanto conatu insciens nudares ipse, et omnibus patefaceres: tuoque-
met opprobrio operam ipse tuam locares, tuo ipse ludibrio tarn gnauiter inservires? *Quæ* te ira numinis quasve poenas luen-
tem, in lucem et ora hominum evocavit, ut tanto apparatu
10 causam teterrimam impudentissime simul et stolidissime de-
fenderes, atque ita defendendo invitus perque inscitiam pro-
deres? Quis te pejus perditum vellet, quis miseriorem, cui jam sola imprudentia, sola vaecordia saluti esse potest, ne sis miserrimus, si tyrannos quorum causam suscepisti, imperita
15 ac stulta defensione tanto magis invisos ac detestabiles omni-
bus, contra quam sperabas, reddideris, quanto iis majorem malefaciendi et impune dominandi licentiam de industria at-
tribueris; eoque plures eorundem hostes inconsulto excitave-
ris? Sed redeo ad tua tecum dissidia. Cum tantum in te scelus
20 admiseris, ut tyrannidem natura fundare studeas, prae caeteris gubernandi rationibus monarchiam primo laudandam tibi

but just merely to establish it in nature, you destroy it, as you always do. No greater misfortune, consequently I think, could befall sovereign princes, than to have you to defend them. Poor unhappy wretch! what fog in your wits hath
5 driven you to such a pass of self-deception that you should unwittingly take all these pains to lay bare and open to all men your knavery and ignorance, which until now was long concealed and almost masked; that you should set your labor to hire at the price of your own ignominy, and devote your-
10 self so assiduously to making yourself a laughing-stock? What offence does the wrath of heaven punish you for, in making you appear in public, and with such parade undertake the defence of a hateful cause in the height of impudence and stupidity at once, and, by thus defending it, against your in-
15 tent and through your ignorance betray it? Who could wish you more forlorn and wretched than you are, when you can be saved from the depth of misery only by an act of short-sighted folly? Since by your unskilful and fatuous defence you have rendered the tyrants whose cause you undertook
20 just so much more odious and detestable (the opposite of what you were expecting) and have unintentionally roused up just so many more enemies against them,—as you have intentionally ascribed to them the greater liberty of doing mischief and tyrannizing with impunity.

25 But I return to your self-contradictions. Having resolved to be so wicked as to endeavor to found tyranny in nature, you saw yourself compelled to begin by extolling monarchy above other forms of government; which, as is your way, you can-

esse vidisti; id, uti soles, inceptare sine repugnantia nequis. *Cum enim modo dixisses, ipsam regendi rationem, sive per plures, sive per pauciores, sive per unum, æque naturalem esse, statim eam quæ per unum exerætur, ex his tribus, magis natura-*
5 *turalem esse ai's; immo qui etiam recens dixeras, non patitur natura unius singularitatem gubernantis.* Jam tyrannorum necem objicere cui voles, qui et monarchas omnes, et monarchiam ipsam tua fatuitate jugulasti. Verum quæ sit melior administrandi rempub. ratio, per unum an per plures, non est
10 nunc disserendi locus. Et monarchiam quidem multi celebres viri laudarunt, si tamen is qui solus regnat, vir omnium optimus, et regno dignissimus sit; id nisi contingat, nihil monarchia proclivius in eam tyrannidem, quæ pessima est, labitur. Jam quod ad unius *exemplar Dei expressam esse* dicis,
15 quis potentiam divine similem in terris obtinere dignus est, nisi qui caeterorum omnium longe præstantissimus, etiam bonitate ac sapientia est Deo simillimus; is autem solus, mea quidem sententia, expectatus ille Dei filius est. Quòd regnum in familiam rursus contrudis, ut patrifamilias regem assimi-
20 les, pater certe suæ familiae regnum meretur, quam omnem vel generavit, vel alit: in rege nihil est hujusmodi, sed plane contrà sunt omnia, Animalia deinde nobis gregalia, imprimis *aves*, et in iis *apes*, siquidem te Physiologo *aves istac sunt, imi-*

not go about without contradicting yourself. For having said but a little before, "that the form of government itself, whether by more, or by fewer, or by a single person, is equally natural," now you tell us that "of these three, that which is
5 wielded by one person is most natural": nay, though you had said in express terms but lately: "Nature suffers not one man's single self to govern." Now upbraid whom you will with the putting of tyrants to death; since you yourself by your own folly have cut the throats of all monarchs, nay even of mon-
10 archy itself. But this is not the place to dispute which form of government is best, by one single person or by many. Many eminent men have indeed extolled monarchy, yet only if the monarch be very excellent and best deserve to reign; without such supposition, no other form of government so easily slips
15 into the worst sort of tyranny.

As for your saying that "it is modeled upon the pattern of the One God"—I ask you who is worthy to hold on earth a power that shall resemble the divine power, save one who, as he far excels other men, is even in wisdom and goodness
20 likest unto God? and such a person, in my opinion, none can be but the Son of God we wait for. As for your forcing a *tyngdom* once more into the genus *family*, that you may liken a king to a paterfamilias: a father of course deserves to exercise dominion over his household, all of which he either
25 begot or supports; nothing of the sort with a king, but obviously quite the opposite. Next you set before us for our imitation those animals that live in communities, first birds, and among them bees, since these are birds, on your authority as

tandas proponis. *Apes regem habent.* Tridentinae scilicet, an non meministi? caeterarum, te teste, *respub. est.* Verum tu desine de apibus fatuari, musarum sunt, oderunt te scarabaeum, et ut vides, redarguunt. *Coturnices sub Ortygometra.*

5 Istos onocrotalis tuis tende laqueos; nos tarn stolido aucupio non capimur. Atqui jam tua res agitur, non nostra; *Callus gallinaeus*, inquis, *tarn maribus quhm jœminis imperitat.* Qui potest hoc fieri? Cum tu ipse Callus, et, ut ferunt, vel nimium gallinaeus, non tuae gallinae, sed ilia tibi imperitet,

10 et in te regnum exerœat: si gallinaeus ergo plurium foeminarum rex est, tu gallinae mancipium tuae, non gallinaeum te, sed stercorarium quendam esse Gallum oportet. Pro libris œerte nemo te majora edit sterquilinia, et gallicinio tuo stercoreo omnes obtundis; hoc unicum galli gallinaei habes. Jam

15 ego multa hordei grana daturum me tibi promitto, si totum hoc vertendo sterquilinium tuum, vel unam mihi gemmam ostenderis. Sed quid ego tibi hordeum? qui non hordeum, ut *Æsopicus* ille, simplex et frugi gallus, sed aurum, ut *Plautinus* ille nequam, scalpturiendo quaesisti; quamvis exitu ad-

20 hue dispari; tu enim œentum Jacobaeos aureos inde reperisti, cum *Euclionis* fuste potius, quo *misellus* ille *Plautinus*, obtruncari dignior sis. Sed pergendum est. *Eadem utilitatis et*

Physiologus! "The bees have a king." The bees of Trent, that is—do not you remember? All other bees, on your own admission, "have republics." But leave off playing the fool with bees; they belong to the Muses, and hate, and, you see, 5 confute such a beetle as you are. "The quails are under a 'Quail mother'." Lay such snares for your own bitterns; we are not caught by so foolish a fowler.

The next point, however, is not our affair, but yours. "*Gal-*
lus gallinæus, the cock," you say, "wields imperial power
10 over both males and females." How can that be, since you
yourself that are Gallic, and (they say) but too cocky, wield
not imperial power over your hen, but she over you? So that
if the gallinæous cock be king over many females, you that
are slave to your hen must needs be not *Callus gallinæus*,
15 but some sort of *Callus stercorarius*, or dunghill-cock. For
the matter of books, in fact, nobody publishes huger dung-
hills, and you deafen us all with your crowing over them; that
is the only point in which you resemble a true cock. I promise
to give you many barley-corns if in ransacking this whole
20 dunghill-book of yours you can show me but one jewel. But
why should I give barley to you, who, quite unlike the honest
plain cock in Aesop, scratched not for barley, but like the
good-for-nothing cock in Plautus, scratched eagerly for gold?
The outcome, to be sure, was different to this extent, that by
25 scratching you found a hundred gold Jacobuses, though you
more deserved to be struck dead with Euclio's club, like that
wretched bird in Plautus.

But let us go on: "That same motive—the advantage and

incolumitatis omnium ratio postulat, ut qui semel ad gubernandum constitutes est, conservetur. Quis negat, quatenus ejus conservatio cum incolumitate omnium consistit? ad perniciem autem omnium conservari unum, quis non videt alienissimum in natura esse? At *malum etiam regem conservari, immo pessimum omnino vis, eo quod non tantum mali civitati procurat mate gubernando, quantum creatur cladum ex seditionibus qua ad eum tollendum suscitantur.* Quid hoc ad jus regum naturale? An, si natura me monet, ut latronibus
10 diripiendum me permittam, ut captum me totis facultatibus redimam potius, quam ut dimicare de vita cogar, latronum tu inde jus naturale constitues? suadet natura populo, ut tyrannorum violentiae nonnunquam cedat, cedat temporibus; tu ista populi necessitate ac patientia jus etiam naturale tyranno-
15 rum fundabis? Quod illi jus populo sui conservandi causa dedit, tu illum tyranno perdendi populi causa jus idem dedisse affirmabis? Docet natura ex duobus malis, eligendum esse minus; et quamdiu necesse est, tolerandum; an tu hinc tyranno, utpote minori fortasse interdum malo, jus impune
20 malefaciendi exoriri naturale statues? Recordare saltem ea quae jampridem ipse de Episcopis contra Loiolitam scripsisti, a me supra tertio capite recitata his plane contraria; Illic *scdi-*

safety of all mankind — requires that whoever be once appointed to the sovereignty, be preserved in the possession of it." Who ever questioned this, as long as his preservation is consistent with the safety of all the rest? But can anyone fail
5 to see that the preservation of any one man to the destruction of all others is utterly contrary to nature? But you would at any cost have "even a bad king kept, nay the worst king possible, because the harm that his ill government does the state is less than the disasters produced by the revolts that are raised
10 to get rid of him." But what bearing has this upon the natural right of kings? If nature teaches me to suffer myself to be robbed by highwaymen, or, should I be taken captive, to purchase my liberty with all my estate, rather than fight with them for my life, will you thereupon set up a natural right of
15 robbers? Nature teaches subjects to give way now to the outrages of tyrants, now to times and circumstances; will you upon this forced patience of a nation, upon this compulsory submission, found a natural right even of tyrants? The very
20 right which nature gave to the people for their own preservation, will you affirm that she gave to tyrants for the people's destruction? Nature teaches us of two evils to choose the lesser; and to bear with it as long as needs must; and will you affirm that thence arises a natural right for a tyrant, who for the moment may be the lesser evil, to commit his crimes unpunished? Remember what you yourself formerly wrote
25 against the Loyolite concerning bishops; your words, of a tenor quite the opposite of these, I have quoted above in the third chapter: you there asserted "that seditions, dissensions,

*tioncs, dissensioncs, discordias optimatum ct populi, longt
levius esse malum, affirmabas, quam sub uno monarcha ty-
ranno ærtam miseriam ac perniciem. Et vera tu quidem af-
firmabas; nondum enim insaniebas, nondum Carolinis Jaco-
5 baeis deauratus, in hanc auriginem seu morbum regium inci-
deras. Dicærem fortasse, nisi is esses qui es, pudeat te tandem
pravaricationis tuae turpissimx; tibi vero dirumpi facilius est
quàm erubescere; qui ut rem faæres, pudorem jam diu ami-
sisti. Annon ipse memineras Romanes florentissimam et glo-
10 riosissimam Rempub. post exactos reges habuisse ? potuit fieri
ut Batavorum obliviscerere ? quorum respub. Hispaniarum
rege pulso post bella diutina, feliciter tamen gesta, libertatem
fortiter et gloriose consequuta est, teque grammaticastrum
Equitem stipendio alit suo, non ut juventus Batavica te prae-
15 varicatore et sophista tam nihil sapere discat, ut ad servitatem
Hispanicam redire mallet, quam paternae libertatis ac gloriae
haeres esse; istam doctrinae pestem ad Riphæeos ultimos, et gla-
ciale m oceanum, quo te in malam rem abire par est, tecum
auferas licèbit: Exemplo denique sunt Angli, qui Carolum
20 tyrannum bello captum, et insanabilem obtruncarunt. At *in-
sulam beatam sub regibus, et luxu afflucntem discordiis de-
formdrunt. Immo luxu pene perditam, quò tolerantior servi-
tutis esset, extinctis deinde legibus, et mancipata religione,**

and discords of the nobles and commons are a much lighter mischief than sure misery and destruction under the government of one monarch that plays the tyrant." And you said very true, for you were not yet going mad, and being ungilt
5 with Charles his Jacobuses, had not yet got this gold-itch or king's evil. I should tell you perhaps, if you were not who you are, that you ought at length to be ashamed of your disgraceful double-dealing. But you can sooner burst than blush, who long ago cast off shame for profit.

10 Did you not remember that the Romans had a most flourishing and glorious commonwealth after they had banished their kings? Could you possibly forget the Dutch, whose Republic, when it had shook off the king of Spain after long but successful wars, bravely and gloriously got its freedom, and
15 keeps you in its pay, knight grammaticaster!—yet with no design that the Dutch youth may learn from you, sophist and double-dealer, such unwisdom as to choose rather to return to the bondage of Spain than inherit their fathers' glorious liberty. Go take along with you your plaguy teaching to utmost
20 Siberia and the Arctic Ocean, and there, while you are about it, you may just as well go to the devil!

Your last example is the English, who put to death their tyrant Charles after he had been taken a prisoner of war, and found incurable. "With their quarrels they defaced and dis-
25 honored an island which under its kings was happy and swam in luxury." Yea, when its moral ruin through luxury was almost accomplished that it might the more indifferently bear with enslavement—when its laws were abolished, and

servientem liberarunt. En autem Epicteti cum Simplicio editorem, Stoicum gravissimum, cui *luxu affluent insula* beata esse videtur! Ex porticu Zenonis nunquam tale, sat scio, documentum prodiit. Quid refert? an te doctore quicquid libet
5 regibus licebit, tibi ipsi non licebit Lupi domino ex Lupanari tuo, tanquam ex novo quodam lyceo quamcunque libet emit-
tere philosophiam? sed resume nunc quam suscepisti personam. *Nunquam sub ullo rage tantum cruoris haustum est, tot jamiliæ desolate:* Hoc totum Carolo imputandum est, non
10 Anglis; qui exercitum Hibernicorum prius in nos paraverat, omnes Hibernos conjurare contra Anglos suo ipse diplomate jusserat; per illos ducenta circiter millia Anglorum una in provincia Ultonia occiderat; de reliquis nihil dico: binos exercitus in exitium Parlamenti Anglicani urbisque Londini sollicita-
15 verat; multa alia hostiliter fecerat, priusquam a populo aut magistratibus tuendae Reipub. causa vel unus miles conscriptus esset. Quae doctrina, quae lex, quae unquam religio sic homines instituit, ut otio consulendum, ut pecuniar, ut sanguini, ut vitae potius parcendum esse ducerent, quam hosti obviam
20 eundum? nam externo an intestino, quid interest? cum interims reipub. sive ab hoc, sive ab illo funestus aequae, et acerbus impendat. Vidit totus Israel non posse se sine multo sanguine Levitae uxorem stupro enectam ulcisci; num igitur quiescē-

its religion bought and sold—then they delivered it from slavery. Behold now a Stoic of the severest, editor of Epic-tetus with Simplicius's commentary, who considers "an island swimming in luxury" to be happy! I am sure no such
5 doctrine ever came from Zeno's porch. What of that? Shall kings, according to your teaching, have leave to do as they please, and shall not you yourself, Sire du Loup, have leave to send forth whatever philosophy you please from your wolf-bitch's den, as from some strange new Lyœum?

10 Now begin again to act your part. "Never in any king's reign was so much blood spilt, so many families ruined." All this is to be imputed not to the English nation but to Charles, who had first raised an army of Irishmen against us, had by his own warrant bidden the Irish nation unite in arms against
15 the English, and had by their means slain near two hundred thousand Englishmen in the single province of Ulster; to say nothing of his other crimes—of how he had incited two armies to destroy the Parliament of England and the City of London, and had committed many other acts of war, before the Parlia-
20 ment or the people had enlisted a single soldier to protect the realm.

What principles, what law, what religion ever taught men to consult their ease, to save their money, their blood, nay their very lives, rather than oppose the public enemy—
25 whether foreign or domestic what matter, since both alike threaten bitter calamity and ruin to the nation? All Israel saw that without great bloodshed they could not punish the outrage that had been done upon the Levite's wife; did they

dum sibi esse duxit, num bello civili, quamvis truculentissimo, supersedendum, num unam igitur mulierculam mori inultam est passus? certe si natura nos docet quamvis pessimi regis dominatum potius pati, quam in recuperanda libertate, plurimum civium salutem in discrimen adducere, doceret eadem non regem solum perferre, quem tamen solum perferendum esse contendis, sed optimatum, sed paucorum quoque potentiam; latronum etiam nonnunquam et servorum rebellantium multitudinem. Non Fulvius aut Rupilius bellum servile post caesos exercitus praetorios, non Crassus in Spartacum post deleta consularium castra, non Pompeius ad piraticum bellum exiisset. Romani vel servis, vel piratis, ne tot civium sanguis effunderetur, hortante scilicet natura, succubuissent. *Hunc itaque sensum*, aut huiusmodi ullum *gentibus impressisse naturam* nusquam ostendis: et tamen non desinis mate ominari, et vindictam divinam, quam in te augurem tuique similes avertat Deus, nobis denuntiare; qui nomine tantum regem, re hostem acerbissimum debito supplicio uli sumus; et innumerabilem bonorum civium caedem authoris poena expiavimus. Nunc magis naturalem esse monarchiam ex eo probari aïs, quod *plures nationes et nunc et*

therefore think they must be still, or refrain from civil war, though of the crudest? Did they on that account suffer one poor humble *petite femme* to die unavenged? certainly if nature teaches us to endure the despotism of a king, no matter how bad, rather than endanger the safety of a great many men in the recovery of our liberty, she must teach us likewise to endure not only a kingly government, which yet is the only one that you argue ought to be submitted to, but even an aristocracy and an oligarchy too—nay, and sometimes a gang of robbers and mutinous slaves! Fulvius and Rupilius must then not have engaged in the Servile War after the Praetorian armies were slain; Crassus must not have marched against Spartacus, after the camp of the ex-consuls was destroyed; nor must Pompey have gone to war against the pirates. Romans, at nature's behest, forsooth, Romans, lest the blood of so many citizens should be shed, must have knuckled down to slaves or to pirates! Nowhere do you show that "nature has imprinted this feeling upon the nations"—or any feeling of the sort; and yet you cannot forbear boding us ill, and denouncing God's vengeance upon us—which may heaven divert upon yourself and all such prognosticators as you!—denouncing it, I say, upon us, though we have done no more than inflict the death that was his due upon him that was our king only in name, but in fact our implacable enemy, and atone for the countless deaths of our good countrymen by punishing the author and cause of them.

Then you tell us that a kingly government appears to be more according to the laws of nature because "more nations,

olim regium statum rœperint, quam optimatem et popularem. Respondeo primum neque Deo neque natura suadente id factum esse; Deus nisi invitus, populum suum sub regio imperio esse noluit; natura quid suadeat et recta ratio, non ex
 5 pluribus, sed ex prudentissimis nationibus optime perspicitur. Graeci, Romani, Itali, Carthaginienses, multique alii suo ingenio vel optimatum vel populi imperium regio praetulerunt; atque *hæ* quidem nationes caeterarum omnium instar sunt. Hinc Sulpitius Severus, *rcgium nomen cunctis fert*
 10 *liberis gentibus semper invisum* fuisse tradit. Verum ista non jam huc pertinent, nee quae sequuntur multa, inani futilitate a te saepius repetita: ad illud festino, ut quod rationibus firmavi, id exemplis nunc ostendam, esse vel maxime secundum naturam, tyrannos quoquo modo puniri; id omnes gen-
 is tes, magistra ipsa natura, saepius fecisse; ex quo impudentia tua praedicanda, et turpissima mentiendi licentia omnibus innotescere dehinc poterit. Primos omnium inducis -egyptios; et certe quis te per omnia Ægyptizare non videat? *Apud hos inquis, nusquam mentio extat ullius regis a po-*
 20 *pulo per seditiones occisi, nullum helium illatum, aut quicquam factum b populo quo è solio dejiceretur.* Quid ergo Osiris rex Ægyptiorum fortasse primus? annon a fratre Typhone, et viginti quinque aliis conjuratis interemptus est?

both in our days and of old, have adopted monarchy than aristocracy and democracy." I answer first that this was not done at the behest of either God or nature. It was only unwillingly that God allowed his own people to be under a king; and what
5 nature and right reason dictates, is best ascertained from the practice not of most nations, but of the wisest. The Grecians, the Romans, the Italians, the Carthaginians, and many others, have in accordance with their own natural temper preferred a government by their aristocracy or by their people rather than
10 by a king; and these nations are proper examples to stand for the rest. Hence Sulpitius Severus reports that "the name of king has always been hateful to nearly all free nations."

But these things concern not our present purpose, nor do the many that come after, which in your empty folly you re-
15 peat again and again. I hasten to make plain by examples what I have established already by reason; viz., that it is in the highest degree agreeable to the law of nature, that tyrants should be punished anyhow; and that all nations, taught by nature herself, have punished them; which will expose
20 your impudence, and make it evident to all men that you take a shameful liberty to publish lies. You begin with the Egyptians; and indeed who does not see that you play the gipsy throughout? "In their history," say you, "there is no mention of any king that was ever slain by the people in a
25 popular insurrection, no war made upon any of their kings by their subjects, no attempt made to depose any of them." What think you then of Osiris, perhaps the first king of the Egyptians ? Was not he slain by his brother Typhon and five-and-

quos et magna pars populi secuta magnum cum Iside et Oro, regis conjuge, et filio praelium commisit? praetereo Sesostrin a fratre per insidias pene oppressum; Chemmin et œphrenem, quibus populus merito infensus, quos vivos non poterat, mortuos se discerpturum minatus est. Qui reges optimos obtruncare sunt ausi, eosne putas naturae lumine, aut religione aliqua retentos, a pessimis regibus manus abstinuisse? qui reges mortuos, et turn demiim innocuos, sepulcro eruituros se minitabantur, ubi etiam pauperculi cujusque corpus
 10 inviolatum esse solet, vivosne illi et nocentissimos propter naturae legem punire, si modo viribus valerent, vererentur? Affirmares haec, scio, quamlibet absurda; verum ego ne affirmare audeas elinguem te reddam. Scito igitur multis ante œphrenem seculis regnasse apud Ægyptios Ammosin; et ty-
 15 rannum, ut qui maxime, fuisse; eum Ægyptii aequo animo pertulerunt. Triumphas; hoc enim est quod vis. At reliqua audi vir optime et veracissime, Diodori enim verba sunt quae recito; etc. *tolerabant aliquandiu oppressi, quia resistere potentioribus nullo*
 20 *modo potcrant.* Quamprimum vero Actisanes ^Ethiopum rex bellum gerere cum eo cœpit, nacti occasionem plerique defecerunt, eoque facile subacto, Ægyptus regno Æthiopum ac-

twenty other conspirators? And did not a great part of the body of the people side with them, and fight a great battle with Isis and Orus, the king's wife and son? I pass by Sesostris, whom his brother had well-nigh put to death by treachery, and Chemmis and Chephren, against whom the people were deservedly enraged, and threatened to tear them in pieces after they were dead, being unable to do it while they were alive. Do you think that a people that durst cut off their best kings were restrained either by the light of nature or by any religious scruple from laying hands upon their worst ones? A people that repeatedly threatened to tear their kings, though dead and now at last beyond the power to do harm, from the tomb, where the body of any the meanest pauper is wont to be inviolable—would they, if they had the power, stand back in awe, and fear to punish according to the law of nature kings alive and noxious? I know you would not stick to answer me in the affirmative, how absurd soever it be; but that you may not dare, I will silence you. Know then that many centuries before Chephren's time Ammosis was king of Egypt, and was as great a tyrant as any the greatest; him the people patiently bore with. You exult: this is what you like. But hear what follows, my honest Telltruth. I quote Diodorus: "Weighed down, they bore with him for some while, for they were nowise able to resist them that were more powerful." But as soon as Actisanes king of Ethiopia began to make war upon him, most of them took the opportunity to revolt, and when he was easily subdued, Egypt was added to the kingdom of Ethiopia.

cæssit. Vides hie Ægyptios, quamprimum poterant, arma
 contra tyrannum tulisse, copias cum externo rege conjunxisse,
 ut regem suum ejusque posteros regno privarent, bonum et
 moderatum regem, qualis erat Actisanes, maluisse externum,
 5 quàm tyrannum domesticum. lidem ^Egyptii consensu om-
 nium maximo Aprien tyrannum suum, conductitiis copiis
 praesidentem, duce Amasi praelio victum strangularunt;
 Amasi viro nobili regnum dederunt. Hoc etiam advertete;
 Amasis captum regem ad tempus in ipsa regia honeste asser-
 10 vabat: incusante demum populo, injuste eum facere qui suum
 et ipsorum hostem aleret, tradidit populo regem; qui eum
 praedicto supplicio affecit. *hæc* Herodotus et Diodorus. Quid
 amplius tibi quaeris? ecquem tyrannum censes non maluisse
 vitam securi quàm laqueo finire? Postea sub Persarum impe-
 15 rium *redacti* Ægyptii, *fideles*, inquis, *cxstiterc*: Quod falsissi-
 mum est; in fide enim Persarum nunquam permansere; sed
 quarto post anno quam subacti a Cambyse fuerant, rebella-
 runt, Domiti deinde à Xerxe, haud multo post ab ejus filio
 Artaxerxe defecerunt, regem Inarum quendam sibi adscive-
 20 runt. Ciim eo victi iterum desciscunt, et constitute rege Tacho
 Artaxerxi Mnemoni bellum indicunt. Sed neque suo regi fide-
 liores, ablatum patri regnum filio Nectanebo tradunt: donee

You see here that the Egyptians, as soon as they could, took up arms against a tyrant, joined forces with a foreign prince to depose their own king and disinherit his posterity, and preferred a moderate and good king, as Actisanes was, though a
5 foreigner, to a tyrant of their own. These same Egyptians by the hearty consent of them all took up arms against Apries their tyrant, who relied upon his mercenary troops. Under the command of Amasis they conquered and afterwards strangled him, and gave the kingdom to Amasis, who was a
10 noble gentleman. And note this too: Amasis kept the captive king a good while in the palace, and treated him well; at last, when the people complained that he did wrong in maintaining his enemy and theirs, he delivered him over to the people, who put him to death in the manner I have mentioned. These
15 things are related by Herodotus and Diodorus. What more do you want? Do you think that any tyrant would not choose the axe rather than the noose?

Afterwards, you say, when the Egyptians were "brought into subjection" by the Persians, they "continued loyal to
20 them"; which is utterly false, for they never remained loyal to the Persians, but in the fourth year after Cambyses had subdued them, they rebelled. Afterwards, when Xerxes had tamed them, within a short time they revolted from his son Artaxerxes, and set up one Inarus to be their king. With him
25 they were conquered, but rebelled again, and created Tachus king, and made war upon Artaxerxes Mnemon. Neither were they better subjects to their own king, for they deposed Tachus, and conferred the government upon his son Nee-

tandem ab Artaxerxe Ocho rursus in ditionem Persarum rediguntur. Sub Mædonum etiam imperio, quantum in se erat, tyrannos coerendos esse factis indicarunt; statuas et imagines Ptolemae Physconis deiecerunt, ipsum mercenario exercitu
5 nepollentem interficere nequiverunt. Alexander ejus filius ob caedem matris concursu populi in exilium agitur: filium item ejus Alexandrum insolentius dominantem Alexandrinus populus vi abreptum ex regia in gymnasio publico interfecit: Ptolemaeum denique Auleten ob multa flagitia regno expulit.
10 Hæc tam nota cum non possit nescire vir doctus, non debuerit qui Hæc docere profiteatur, qui fidem tantis in rebus haberi sibi postulet, quis non pudendum et indignissimum esse dicat, hunc, vel tam rudem et indoctum tanta cum infamia bonarum literarum pro doctissimo circumferre se tumidum, et
15 stipendia regum et civitatum ambire, vel tam improbum et mendacem, non insigni aliqua ignominia notatum, ex omnium communitate et consortio turn doctorum turn bonorum exterminari. Postquam Ægyptum lustravimus, ad Æthiopes jam proximos visamus. Regem a Deo electum, ut credunt,
20 quasi Deum quendam adorant: quoties tamen eum Sacerdotes damnant, ipse mortem sibi consciscit. Sic enim, Dio-

tanebus, till at last Artaxerxes Ochus brought them again under subjection to the Persian empire. Even under the Mædonian empire they declared by their actions, as far as in them lay, that tyrants ought to be punished: they
5 threw down the statues and images of Ptolemy Physco, but were unable to kill him, for his mercenary army was too strong. His son Alexander was forced by a popular uprising to leave his country because he had killed his mother. *His* son Alexander likewise, when he lorded it too insolently, the
10 people of Alexandria dragged out of the palace, and killed in the public gymnasium. The same people, finally, deposed Ptolemy Auletes for his many crimes. Now since a learned man cannot be ignorant of such notorious facts, and a man whose profession it is to teach them, and who asks to be be-
15 lieved in matters of such moment, is in duty bound not to be ignorant of them; who would not pronounce it a shame and a disgrace that this person, if so ignorant and illiterate, should to the scandal of true scholarship puff himself about as a great scholar, and solicit pay from kings and commonwealths, or,
20 if such a knave and liar, should not be branded with some special mark of infamy, and banished out of the company and fellowship of all scholars and gentlemen ?

Having examined the Egyptians for examples, let us now look at the Ethiopians their neighbors. Their king, chosen, as
25 they think, by God, they worship as a sort of God, and yet whenever the priests condemn him, he kills himself; and on that manner, says Diodorus, they punish all their other crim-

doro teste, omnes alios maleficos puniunt; non ipsi morte afficiunt, sed ipsos reos lictore misso mori jubent Ad Assyrios deinde et Medos et Persas regum observantissimos accedis: *Jus illic regium summa cum Uæntia quidlibet jaciendi con-*
5 *5 junctum fuisse* contra omnium Historicorum fidem affirmas. Narrat imprimis Daniel ut regem Ncbuchadnezzarem plus nimio superbientem homines a se depulerint, et ad bestias ablegauerint. Jus eorum non regium, sed Medorum et Persarum, id est populi jus appellatur; quod cum irrevocabile esset, reges
10 edam obligavit. Darius itaque Medus eripere manibus satraparum Danielelem, quanquam id maxime agebat, non potuit. *Populi, inquis, nefas esse turn credebant regem repudiare qubd illo jure abuteretur.* Inter ipsa tamen Hæc verba adeò miseri obtorpes, ut dum istorum populorum obedientiam et
15 modesdam laudas, ereptum Sardanapalo regnum ab Arbæc tua sponte commemoras. Eripuit autem is non solus, sed partim a Sacerdotibus juris peritissimis, partim a populo adjutus, atque hoc præsertim nomine eripuit, quòd is jure regio, non ad crudelitatem, sed ad luxuriam tantummodo et mollitiem
20 abuteretur. Percurre Herodotum, Ctesiam, Diodorum, intelliges omnino contra esse quam dicis, *a Subditis ut plurimum ea regna destructa fuisse non ab externis:* Assyrios reges à

inals: they put them not to death, but send an officer of justice to bid the guilty die.

Next you come to the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, who most revere their kings; and you affirm, contrary
5 to the authority of all historians, that "the royal power there had an unbounded liberty annexed to it of doing what the king listed." In the first place, the prophet Daniel tells us how, when Nebuchadnezzar grew proud beyond excess, they drove him from men, and sent him away to the beasts. The
10 law of those countries was not entitled royal law, but the law of the Medes and Persians, that is, of the people; which law, being irrevocable, bound the kings themselves; insomuch that Darius the Mede, though he earnestly labored to deliver Daniel from the hands of the presidents and princes, yet could
15 not effect it. "Nations in those days," say you, "thought it an impiety to reject a king because he abused that royal right." But in the very writing of these words you are so abjectly stupid that while you are commending the obedience and submissiveness of those nations, you go out of your way to mention that Arbaces deprived Sardanapalus of the crown. Not
20 single-handed, however, for he was helped partly by the priests, who were very well versed in the law, and partly by the people; and he deposed him chiefly upon the ground that he abused his royal right, by way not of cruelty, but only of lust and
25 effeminacy. Run over the histories of Herodotus, Ctesias, Diodorus, and you will find, clean contrary to your assertion, the fact to be "that those kingdoms were destroyed for the most part by *subjects*, and *not* by *foreigners*"; you will find

Medis, Medos à Persis, utrisque turn *Subditis*, sublato fuisse. *Cyrum ipse rebelldsse, et arreptas tyrannides in diversis imperii locis fateris. Hoccine est jus regium apud Medos et Persas, et observantiam eorum in reges, quod instituisti, asserere ?*

5 *quæ te Anticyra tarn delirum sanare potest? Persarum reges quali jure regndrint ex Herodoto, inquis, liquet. Cambyses, etim sororem in matrimonio habere cuperet, judicæs regies consulit, delectos ex populo viros, legum interpretes, ad quos omnia referri solebant. Quid illi ? negant se invenire legem*

10 *quæ jubeat fratrem secum in matrimonium sororem jungere; aliam tamen invenisse, quâ liceat Persarum regi facere quæ libeat. Primum si rex omnia pro suo jure poterat, quid alio legum interprete quim ipso rege opus erat? supervacanei isti judicæs ubivis potius quam in regia mansissent. Deinde si Regi*

15 *Persarum quidvis licuit, incredibile est id adeo nescivisse Cambyssem dominationis cupidissimum, ut quid licitum esset, judicæs illos percontaretur. Quid ergo ? vel gratificari volentes regi, ut fateris ipse, vel a tyranno sibi metuentes, ut ait Herodotus, facilem quandam se reperisse legem simulant, palpum*

20 *regi obtrudentes: quod in judicibus et legum peritis hac etiam aetate novum non est. At verò Artabanus Persa dixit ad The-*

that the Assyrians were deposed by the Medes their subjects, and the Medes by the Persians likewise their subjects. You yourself admit that "Cyrus rebelled, and that in divers parts of the empire despotic governments were seized." Is this how
5 you vindicate the royal right among the Medes and Persians, and their reverence for their kings, which you have set up? What Anticyra can medicine thee thus raving?

You say: "With what power the Persian kings ruled is apparent from Herodotus." Cambyses being desirous to marry
10 his sister, consulted the royal judges, "eminent men chosen from among the people," interpreters of the laws, to whom all difficulties were submitted. What answer had he from them? They told him that they found no law which bids a brother marry his sister, but that they did find another law whereby
15 the king of Persia may do as he likes. Now to this I answer, if the king of Persia were really so absolute, what need was there of any other interpreter of the laws than the king himself? Those superfluous unnecessary judges would have remained anywhere you will but in the palæ! Again, if the
20 king of Persia might do whatever he would, it is not credible that Cambyses, eager for power as he was, should be so ignorant as to interrogate those judges concerning his liberties. What was the matter then? Either they designed "to humor the king," as you admit, or they were afraid of what the tyrant
25 might do to them, as Herodotus says, and feigned that they had found a law that would do, and fooled him, which even nowadays is no new thing with judges and gentlemen learned in the law. "But," say you, "Artabanus a Persian told The-

mistoclem, nullam legem apud Persas esse meliorem Hid quod sancitum fuerat; re gem esse honorandum et adorandum.

Praeclaram tu quidem legem de .adoratione regum introducis etiam à patribus antiquis damnatam; praeclarum etiam legis
 5 commendatorem Artabanum, qui ipse haud multo post sua manu Xerxem regem suum trucidavit. Probos regum defensores regicidas nobis adfers: suspicor te regibus insidias quasdam moliri. Claudianum citas poetam, Persarum obedientiae testem. At ego te ad res eorum gestas et annales revoco, de
 10 fectionibus Perfarum, Medorum, Bactrianorum, Babyloniorum, etiam caedibus regum refertissimos. Proximus tibi auctor est Otanes Persa, ipse etiam Smerdis interfector sui regis, qui cum odio potestatis regime, injurias et facinora regum exponat, violationes legum, caedes indemnatorum, stupra, adul-
 15 teria, hoc tu jus regium vis appellari, et Samuelis iterum calumniandi in mentem tibi venit. De Homero qui reges esse ab Jove œcinit, supra respondi: Philippo regi jus regium interpretanti tarn credam quam Carolo, Ex Diotogenis deinde Pythagorft fragmento quædam producis, at quali is de rege
 20 dicat taces, Accipe igitur quo ille usus est exordio; ad quod referri quæ sequuntur cuncta debent.

etc. Rex ille juerit, qui justissimus est; justissimus

mistocles there was no better law in Persia than the one which enacted that kings were to be honored and worshiped.¹ An admirable law for you to cite—a law enjoining king-worship!—a law long ago condemned by even the early Fathers! And
5 an admirable person to recommend this law too—Artabanus, who himself a litde while after with his own hand slew Xerxes his king! Right king-defenders these you cite—these king-killers! I suspect you have some secret design upon kings!

In the next place, you quote the poet Claudian to prove how
10 obedient the Persians were. But I refer you to their histories and annals, which are stuffed full of the revolts of the Persians, the Medes, the Bactrians, and the Babylonians, and with the murders of their kings. Your next authority is Otanes the Persian, who likewise killed Smerdis his king. While he, out
15 of his hatred of royal government, sets forth the impieties and injurious actions of kings, their violation of the laws, their putting men to death without legal conviction, their rapes and adulteries, you will have all this called the right of kings, and slander Samuel again. You quote Homer, who says that
20 kings derive their authority from Jupiter; to which I have already given an answer. For king Philip of Mædon as an expounder of the right of kings, I had as lief take his interpretation as King Charles's!

Then you quote some sentences from a fragment of Di-
25 otogenes the Pythagorean, but you do not tell us what sort of king he speaks of. Observe therefore how he begins, for whatever follows must be understood to have relation to it: "Let him be king," says he, "that of all is most just, and most

304 DEFENSIO PRIMA

- autem, qui maxime legitimus; nam sine justitia nullus rex esse poterit, neque justitia sine lege. Hæc cum jure tuo regio e regione pugnant. Eadem abs te recitatus Ecphantas philosophatUl. dec etc. oportet*
- 5 *qui regnum suscipit purissimum et lucidissimum naturd esse: et infra, etc. file qui imperat secundum virtutem, nominatur rex, et est. Quem tu igitur regem vocas, Pythagoreorum judicio rex non est. Jam tu vicissim Platonem audi in Epistola octava, 'Apyy -rrrveatia)*
- 10 *fareutfuws fiarnkxy, etc. Sit regia potestas reddendæ rationi obnoxia; leges dominantur et aliis civibus et ipsis etiam re gibus, si quid prater leges feærint. Addo Aristotelem Polit. 3. , etc. inter similes et æquales neque utile est neque jus turn, esse unum*
- 15 *omnium dominum, neque ubi leges non sunt neque ut ipse lex sit, neque ubi sunt leges; neque bonum bonorum, neque non bonum non bonorum dominum esse. Et lib. quinto, Quem populus non vult, statim is non rex, sed tyrannus est, c. 10. Hem tibi etiam Xenophontem in Hierone dm rov*
- 20 *, etc. tantum abest ut tyrannorum necem civitates ulciscantur, tit magnis honoribus afficiant cum, qui tyrannum interjeærit, imagines etiam tyrannicidarum in templis statuunt. Testem oculatum adjiciam Marcum Tullium pro Milone. Greed homines deorum honores tribuunt Us*
- 25 *viris qui tyrannos necaverunt: quæ ego vidi Athenis, qua aliis in urbibus Græciæ, quas res divinas talibus institutas viris,*

just is he that acts most according to law"; for without justice no man "can be king, and without law there can be no justice." This is directly opposite to that royal right of yours. And Ecphantas, whom you likewise quote, reasons to the
5 same effect: "Whosoever takes upon him to be king, ought to be naturally most pure and clear from all imputation.¹ And a little after: "He that governs according to virtue is called, and is, a king." He whom you call a king is therefore, in the judgment of the Pythagoreans, no king at all. Hear now, in
10 your turn, what Plato says in his Eighth Epistle: "Let the royal power be liable to be called to account. Let the laws control not only the people but kings themselves, if they do anything not warranted by law." I will mention what Aristotle says in the Third Book of his *Politics*: "Among likes and
15 equals it is neither profitable nor just that any one should be lord and master over all the rest, or should himself be the law, either where there are no laws, or where there are laws; or that a good man should be lord over other good men, or a bad man over other bad men." And in the Fifth Book, says he,
20 "That king whom the people do not wish, is no longer a king but a tyrant." Hear what Xenophon says in Hiero: "Cities are so far from punishing the killing of tyrants, that they confer great honor upon him that kills one, and erect statues of tyrannicides in their temples." Of this I can produce an
25 eye-witness, Marcus Tullius, in his oration *Pro Milonc*: "The Greeks," says he, "ascribe divine worship to men who have killed tyrants. What have I myself seen at Athens and in other cities of Greece—what religious observances instituted

quos cantus, quæ carmina? propè ad immortalitatem, et religionem, et memoriam consecrantur. Polybius denique author gravissimus, Historiarum sexto,

,ctc. cum principes, inquit, cupiditatibus obsequi cæ-

5 *perunt, turn de regno jacta est tyrannis, et conspiratio in caput dominantium inibatur; cujus quidcm authorcs crant non deterrimi civium, sed generosissimi quique et maximi animi.*

Longè plura cum mihi suppeterent, hæc pauca delibavi: ob-
ruor enim copia. A philosophis ad poetas jam provocas, eo te
10 libentissime sequimur. *Potestatem nullis legibus, nullis judiciis obnoxiam in Græcia reges obtinuisse vel unus, inquis, Æschylus potest docere; qui in tragoedia, Supplicæ, Regem Argivorum* , *non judicabilem rectorem.*

Verum tu scito, (praecipitem enim te et nullius judicii esse,
15 quocunque te vertis, eò magis perspicio) scito, inquam, non quid poeta, sed quis apud poetas quidque dicat, spectandum esse: variae enim personae inducuntur, nunc bonae, nunc malae, nunc sapientes, nunc simplices, non semper quid poets videatur, sed quid cuique personae maxime conveniat
20 loquentes. Danaï filiae quinquaginta ex Ægypto profugae ad Argivorum regem supplices se contulerant; orant uti se contra

in their honor — what poems, songs, and hymns in their praise! They are almost consecrated to immortality in adoration and remembrance." And lastly, Polybius, a weighty authority, in the Sixth Book of his History, says thus: "When
5 princes began to indulge their own lusts and avarice, then royal government turned into tyranny, and conspiracies against the lives of the despots were entered into; nor were the instigators the dregs of the citizenry, but the most noble and magnanimous." These few passages I have picked out to
10 taste, for I have store far greater, and am overwhelmed with plenty.

From the philosophers you now appeal to the poets, and I am very willing to follow you. "Aeschylus by himself is enough to inform us," you say, "that kings in Greece held a
15 power not liable to any laws or any judicature; for in the tragedy of *The Suppliants* he calls the king of the Argives a ruler not subject to judgment'." Know you (for the greater the variety of your arguments, the more I discern how recklessly uncritical you are), know then, I say, that we must not
20 regard the poet's words as his own, but consider who it is that speaks in the play, and what that person says; for different persons are introduced, sometimes good, sometimes bad, sometimes wise men, sometimes fools, and they speak not always the poet's own opinion, but what is most fitting to
25 each character. The fifty daughters of Danaus, being banished out of Egypt, betook themselves to the king of the Argives as suppliants, and begged him to protect them against the violence of the Egyptians, who were pursuing them with a fleet

vim Ægyptiorum classe insequentium defendat; respondet rex non posse se, nisi rem prius cum populo communicet.

πάρος

5 Mulieres peregrinae et supplices incerta populi suffragia veritæ, regem denuo blandius compellant.

ιμον,

Ἡρώτανες ἄκριτος ὤν.

Tu instar urbis es et populi,

10 *Prcetor injudicatus.*

Rursus rex,

Ἐἶπον δὲ καὶ πρὶν, οὐκ ἄνευ δήμου τάδε

Ἡράξαι,

Dixiantea, non sine populo hacjaærem,

15 *Ne si possem quidem.*

De re itaque tota ad populum refert,

Ἐγὼ δὲ λαούς συνακλῶν ἐγγωρίους

Ἡείσω τὸ κοινόν.

Populus itaque decernit opem Danai filiabus ferendam; unde
20 iliasenis Danai laetantis,

θαρσεῖτε παῖδες, εἶ τὰ τῶν ἐγγωρίων

Δήμου δέδοκται παντελῆ ψηφίσματα.

of ships. The king told them he could not without first imparting the matter to the people.

*Ἐγὼ δ' ἂν οὐ χραίνοιμι ὑπόσχεσιν πάρος
Ἄστῶν δὲ πᾶσι τοῖσδε κοινώσας πέρι.*

5 The women, being strangers and suppliants, and fearing the uncertain suffrages of the people, urge him anew, this time with more flattery:

*Σὺ δὲ στήθεσσι θεῶν ἰσχυροῦσθε
Πρύτανης ἀκριτοῦ ἄν.*

10 "Thou standest for city and people, a ruler not to be judged." The king answers:

κρατῶν ---

"I told you before that I could not do it without the people's
15 consent; nay, and though I could, I would not." So he brings the whole matter before the people.

*Ἐγὼ δὲ λάους συγκαλῶν ἐγχωρίους
Πείσω τὸ κοινόν.*

The people decrees therefore that aid is to be given the daughters of Danaus; whence these words of Danaus in his joy:
20

*Θαρσεῖτε παῖδες, εὐ τὰ τῶν ἐγχωρίων
Δήμου δέδοκται παντελῆ ψηφίσματα.*

*Bono estote animo filite, bene decrcvcrunt
Indignarum, in conventu populari, prjectissima
suffragia.*

Hæc nisi protulissem, quam temere statuisset sciolus iste de
5 jure regio apud Graecos ex ore mulierum, et peregrinarum, et
supplicum; cum et ipse rex, et ipsa res gesta longe aliud nos
doceat. Idem etiam docet Euripidis Orestes, qui, mortuo
patre, Argivorum ipse rex, ob eadem matris a populo in ju-
diciu[m] vocatus, ipse causam dixit, et suffragiis populi capite
10 damnatus est. Athenis regiam potestatem legibus obnoxiam
fuisse testatur idem Euripides etiam in Supplicibus, ubi Hæc
Theseus Athenarum Rex

15 *Ἐνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρα πόλις,
Δῆμος δ' ἀνάσσει—
non regitur
Ab uno viro, sed est liber a hæc civitas,
Populus autem regnat -*

Sicæjusfilius Demophon Rex item Atheniensium apud eun-
20 dem poetam in Heraclidis.

*Ὅτι γὰρ τυραννίδ' ὥστε βαρβάρων ἔγω,
'Ἄλλ' ἦν δίκαια δριῶ, δίκαια πείσομαι.
Non enim Us tyrannic^ tanquam barbaris impero,
Sed si jacio justa qua sunt, justa mihi redduntur.*

25 Non aliud Thebis jus regium antiquitus fuisse testatur Sopho-
cles in Oedipo tyranno, unde et Tiresias et Creon Oedipo fero-
citer responsant, ille,

"Be of good cheer, daughters, for the all-accomplished votes of the people of the country in popular assembly have decided well." Had I not related the whole thing, how rashly would this smatterer have laid down the law concerning the right of
5 kings among the Grecians, out of the mouths of women that were both strangers and suppliants, though both the king himself and the very action of the drama lead us to a far different conclusion!

The same conclusion appears from the story of Euripides' Orestes, who being after his father's death himself king of the
10 Argives, was yet brought to trial by the people for the slaying of his mother, pleaded his own cause, and by the people's vote was condemned to die. That at Athens the kingly power was subject to the laws, the same Euripides bears witness in his
15 play likewise called *The Suppliants*, where Theseus, king of Athens, says: "Not ruled by one man, but free, is the city; yet the people reigns." In the same poet's *Heraclidae*, Theseus' son Demophon, likewise king of the Athenians, says: "For I do not exercise tyrannical power over them, as if they
20 were Barbarians: but if I do right, right is done me." Sophocles in his *Oedipus Tyrannus* shows that anciently in Thebes the right of kings was even so. Hence both Tiresias and Creon answer back courageously to Oedipus. The former says, "I am not your slave"; the latter, "I have some right in this city
25 as well as you." And in the *Antigone*, Haemon tells Creon: "That is no city which belongs to one man."

All men know that the kings of Laœdaemon have been brought to trial, and sometimes put to death judicially. And

Θὸ γὰρ τι σοὶ ζῶ δοῦλος

Non servus tibi sum.

Hie,

Κάμοι πόλεως μέτεσσι τῆς δ' οὐ σοὶ μόνῳ.

5 *Est et mihi jus in hac civitate non tibi soli.*

Et Æmon Creonti in Antigone:

Πόλις γὰρ οὐκ ἔσθ', ἦτις ἀνδρὸς ἔσθ' ἐνός.

Non est civitas, quæ unius est viri.

Jam verò Lacedæmoniorum reges in judicium sæpe adductos,
 10 et interdum morte multatos nemo ignorat: nee mirum; quan-
 do ipse Lycurgus, qui eorum scripsit leges, non alio fuisse
 jure heroicis etiam temporibus reges, ab Homero, quem stu-
 diose perlegerat, didicisse potuit. Apud eum Achilles Aga-
 memnonem, postquam eum ipsum esse pestem populi pesti-
 15 lentia turn laborantis comperisset, non dubitavit, in concione
 frequentissima Graecorum, rex ipse regem suo populo judi-
 candum his verbis subjicere:

Δημοβόρος βασιλεὺς, ἐπεὶ οὐτεῖδανοῦσιν ἀνάσσεις.

Ἡ γὰρ ἄν' Ἀτρεΐδῃ νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσωιο. *Iliad. α.*

20 *Populi vorator rex, quoniam hominibus nihili imperas.
 Alioqui enim Atrida, nunc postremum injuriam jacercs.*

Sensisse idem quod heroes de jure regio etiam omnium ordi-
 num homines, testis esse potest Lyricorum princeps Alcaeus;
 cujus carmina, tametsi per se gratissima, eo tamen acceptiora
 25 populo fuisse refert Horatius, quòd eorum continerent laudes
 qui tyrannos ex civitatibus ejecerant:

no wonder, when Lycurgus himself, their lawgiver, might have learned from Homer, whom he had read attentively from beginning to end, that even in the heroic times kings were subject to the very same laws. Homer's Achilles, having found
5 that Agamemnon was himself a pestilence unto his people, who were then suffering under a pestilence, did not, though himself a king, hesitate, in an assemblage of the Greeks frequent and full, to submit a king to his own subjects for judgment. These are his words (*Iliad* I.):

10 King, devourer of the people, since thou rulest over men
of naught,
For else, Atrides, hadst thou now committed outrage for
the last time.

That men of all ranks felt as the heroes did about the royal
15 right, Alcaeus may witness, chief of lyric poets; whose poems, most delightful in themselves, were all the more popular, says Horæ, in that they sang the praises of those who had cast out tyrants from their cities:

"The shades look on in wonder while the one and the
20 other sing things that deserve to be listened to in reverent silence; but the populace, crowded shoulder to shoulder, drink in yet more with eager ear tales of battles and of tyrants driven out." *Odes* 2.13.29.

To these, in support of the same opinion, let me join
25 Theognis, who was in his prime not so long before the Persian Wars, at a time when there flourished in every part of Greece many worthies distinguished for their wisdom. The teach-

Utrumque sacro digna silentio

Mirantur umbræ diæ c: sed magis

Pugnas et exactos tyrannos

Densum humeris bibitaure vulgus: Od. 2. 13. 29.

5 Addam his in eandem sententiam Theognidem; qui nee ita multo ante adventum in Graeciam Medorum floruit, quo tempore per omnem Graeciam multi sapientia insignes viri flourerunt, et ipse quæ versibus præcepta tradidit, a sapientibus acceperit se profiteretur:

10 *Δημοφάγον δὲ τύραννον ὅπως ἐθέλει κατακλίνω.*

ἢ τῆς νέμεσις πρὸς θεῶν γίγνεται οὐδεμία.

Populi voratorem regem ut libet dejice.

Ira h diis inde existit nulla.

Atque hæc quidem antiquum in Græcia jus regum quale
15 fuerit satis declarant. Ad Romanes veniamus. Tu ad illud imprimis recurris non Sallustianum, sed C. Memmii apud Sallustium, *impunit quidvis jacere*: cui supra responsum est. Sallustius ipse disertis verbis author est, *Romanes imperium Icgitimum, nomen imperii regum habuisse*; quod cum *se in*
20 *dominationem convertit*, ut nosti, expulerunt. Sic M. Tullius in Pisonem, ego Consulem esse putem, qui Senatam esse in repub. non putavit? et sine eo consilio consulem numerem, sine quo Romæ ne reges quidem esse potuerunt? Audin' regem Romæ sine Senatu nihil fuisse? *At Romulus, ut libitum,*
25 *Romanis imperitaverat, ut ait Tacitus.* Nondum enim fundata legibus colluvies potius convenarum quam respub. erat: omnes olim mortales sine legibus vivebant, cum respublicæ

ings which he handed down in his verses he himself avows that he had got from the Wise Men.

Cast down how thou wilt a king that devours his people:
For this the gods have no resentment—none.

5 These instances make clear enough what was the royal right in Greece. Let us consider now the Romans.

First you return to that phrase not of Sallust but of C. Memmius quoted in Sallust, "to do with impunity what you list." This I have answered already. Sallust himself says ex-
10 pressly that "the government of Rome was a government by law, though its name was regal," and when "it grew into a tyranny," you know they thrust it out. Cicero likewise in his oration against Piso, "Shall I," says he, "reckon as consul one who reckoned not upon the Senate's existencœ in the common-
is wealth? Shall I count as consul him who consults not that without which there could not even be kings at Rome?" Do you hear? At Rome the very king was naught without the Senate. "But," you say, "Romulus, according to Tacitus, had governed the Romans exactly as he pleased." Yes, for, having
20 as yet no foundation of laws, they were a rabble concourse of strangers rather than a state. Of old, before states came into being, all men lived lawless. But, as Livy informs us, when Romulus was dead, though all the people desired a king, not having yet tasted the sweets of liberty, "Yet the sovereign
25 power was allowed to remain in the hands of the people; so that they gave not up more right than they kept." The same author tells us: "That right was afterwards extorted from

nondum essent. Post Romulum autem, authore Livio, etsi regem omnes volebant, libertatis dulcēdine nondum experta, *Pofulo tamen summa potestas permissa est, ut non plus darent juris quam detinerent; jus illud è Caesaribus vi ademp-*
 5 *turn juisse* idem ait. Servius Tullius dolo primum quasi Tarquinii Prisci vicarius regnabat; postea vero ad populum ipse retulit, *vellent juberentne se regnare*; tandem, ut ait Tacitus, *sanctorum legum juit queis etiam reges obtemperarent*. Fecissetne hanc sibi et posteris injuriam, si supra leges antea fuisse
 10 jus regum cēnsisset? Ultimus illorum regum Tarquinius superbus *morem de omnibus Senatuum consulendi primus solvit*; ob hæc et alia flagitia populus L. Tarquinio regi imperium abrogavit; exulemque esse cum conjuge ac liberis jussit. Hæc fere ex Livio et Cicerone; quibus alios juris regii apud
 15 Romanes haud tu interpretes attuleris meliores. Ad dictaturam quod attinet, temporaria tantum fuit, nunquam adhibita nisi difficillimis reipub. temporibus, et intra sex menses deponenda. Jus autem imperatorum quod vocas, non jus illud, sed vis plane erat; imperium nullo jure præterquam armis par-
 20 turn. At Tacitus, inquis, *qui sub imperio unius floruit*, ita scripsit. *Principi summum rerum arbitrium dii dedcrunt, subditis obsequii gloria relicta est*. Nee dicis quo loco; tibi conscius nimirum insigniter lectoribus imposuisse; quod mihi quidem statim suboluit, etsi locum illum non statim reperi.

them" by the Caesars. Servius Tullius at first reigned by indirection, and as it were a deputy of Tarquinius Priscus; but afterwards he referred it to the people "whether they would have him and bid him reign."⁵ At last, says Tacitus, "he became the author of laws such as even the kings obeyed." Do you think he would have done such an injury to himself and his posterity, if he had deemed that the right of kings before he did so had been above all laws? Their last king, Tarquinius Superbus, "was the first that put an end to the custom of consulting the Senate about everything"; and for this and other enormities the people annihilated the power of king Lucius Tarquinius, and banished him with his wife and children. To this effect speak Livy and Cicero, than whom you will hardly produce any better expositors of the right of kings among the Romans. As for the dictatorship, that was but temporary, was never applied but in the state's extremities, and was to be laid down within six months.

What you call the right of the Roman emperors was no right, however, but downright force, a power gained through no law but that of arms. "But Tacitus," say you, "that lived under the government of a single person," writes thus: "The gods have given the sovereign power in human affairs to princes; what has been left to subjects is the honor of submitting," "But you tell us not where Tacitus has these words, doubtless because you were conscious that you had egregiously put upon your readers; which I smelt out at once, though I could not at once find the place. For those words are not Tacitus's own, who is an approved writer, and the greatest possible enemy to

Non enim Taciti Hæc vcrba sunt, scriptoris boni, et tyrannis adversissimi, sed apud Taciturn M. Terentii cujusdam equitis Romani, qui capitis reus, inter alia, quæ metu mortis ab eo dicta sunt, sic Tiberium adulatur, annalium 60. *Tibi sum-*
5 *5 mum rerum judicium dii dederunt, nobis obsequii gloria relicta est.* Hanc tu quasi Taciti sententiam prefers, qui sententias tibi commodas non ex pistrina solum, aut tonstrina, sed ex ipsa carnificina oblatas non respueres: ita omnia vel ostentationis causa, vel imbecillitatis conscientia undecunque cor-
10 radis. Taciturn ipsum si legere maluisses, quam alicubi decerptum negligentius transcribere, docuisset te is, jus illud imperatorum unde ortum sit. *Post Actiacam victoriam, verso civitatis statu, nihil usquam prisca aut integri moris; omnes exuta aequalitate jussa principis aspectare;* docuisset idem an-
15 naliū tertio, unde tuum omne jus regium: *Postquam exui æqualitas, et pro modestia ac pudore ambitio et vis inædebat, provenere dominationes, multòsque apud populos æternum mansere.* Idem ex Dione poteras didicisse, si innata levitas et inconstantia tua quicquam te altius percipere pateretur. Nar-
20 rat enim is 1. 53. abs te citato, ut partim armis, partim dolo et

tyrants, but are quoted by Tacitus as the words of M. Terentius, a gentleman of Rome, who being charged with capital crime, amongst other things that he said in fear of death, flattered Tiberius in this manner, *Annals* VI: "The gods have
5 entrusted you with the ultimate judgment in all things; what has been left to us is the honor of submitting." And this you cite as if it were Tacitus's opinion! Whatever your motive—whether you would show off, or are conscious of your weakness—so indiscriminately do you scrape together everything
10 from everywhere, that you would not reject opinions to suit your argument though they were the sweepings of a baker's shop or a barbershop—yes, or of the very gallows! Had you chosen to read Tacitus himself rather than copy too carelessly an extract you found somewhere, he would have taught you
15 whencœ that imperial right had its origin. "After the victory of Actium," says he, "the whole state of our affairs was turned upside down; nothing of our ancient or uncorrupted manners anywhere; all men put off political equality and began to attend to the orders of the chief of state." This you might have
20 learned out of the third Book of his *Annals*, whencœ you have all your regal right. "When equality was laid aside, and instead of moderation and self-restraint factiousness and violence stepped in, tyrannical forms of government started up, and fixed themselves in many countries." The same thing
25 you might have learned out of Dio, if your natural levity and unsettledness of judgment would have suffered you to apprehend anything above you. He tells us in his fifty-third Book, from which you have quoted, that partly by the violence and

simulatione Octaviani Caesaris, effectum sit, ut imperatores legibus soluti essent; dum enim pro concione pollicetur se principatu abiturum, legibus et imperiis etiam aliorum obtemperaturum, per causam belli in provinciis suis gerendi, 5 retentis apud se semper legionibus, dum simulate renuit imperium, sensim invasit. Non est hoc legibus rite solutum esse, sed legum vincula, quod gladiator ille Spartacus potuit, vi solvere; nomen deinde principis aut imperatoris et sibi arrogare, quasi Deus aut naturae lex omnes et homines et 10 leges illi subjecisset. Vis altius paulo juris Caesarei originem cognoscere? Marcus Antonius, jussu Caesaris, qui armis in rempublicam nefarie sumptis turn plurimum poterat, Consul factus, cum Lupercalia Romae celebrarentur, ex composite, ut videbatur, diadema capiti Caesaris cum gemitu et plangore 15 populi imposuit: ascribi deinde jussit in fastis ad Lupercalia, C. Caesari Antonium Consulem, jussu populi, regnum detulisse. Qua de re Cicerone in secunda Philippica; *Ideone L. Tarquinius exactus, Sfurius Cassius, Sp. Melius, M. Manlius necati, ut multis post seculis h. M. Antonio, quod fas non est,* 20 *rex Romae constitueretur?* Tu vero omni malo cruciatu atque

partly by the fraud and hypocrisy of Octavianus Caesar, things were brought to that pass that the emperors were loosed from the laws. For though Octavianus promised before the popular assembly that he would lay down the principate, and obey
5 the laws, and even the commands of others, yet under pretence of making war in his provinces he still kept the legions at hand, and so, while in appearance he declined power, he gradually entered upon the possession of it. This was not being duly released from the laws, but breaking forcibly
10 through their bonds, as Spartacus the gladiator might have done; and then assuming to himself the style of *princeps* or *imperator* and (*wroxpdtwp*, as if God or the law of nature had put all men and all laws into subjection under him.

Would you inquire a little further back into the origin of
15 the right of the Caesars? Mark Antony had been made consul at the bidding of Caesar, who by impiously taking up arms against the commonwealth had got all the power into his hands. Now at the celebration of the Lupercalia at Rome, Antony, by previous arrangement it seems, set a crown upon
20 Caesar's head, amid the people's groans and lamentations. Thereupon he caused it to be entered upon the Calendar as a record of the events at the Lupercalia that Marcus Antonius had offered Caesar royal power at the people's instance! Of which action Cicero in his second *Philippic* says: "Was it for
25 this that Lucius Tarquinius was expelled, and Spurius Cassius, Spurius Melius, and Marcus Manlius put to death—that after many generations Mark Antony against the law should make a king in Rome?" Truly you deserve every form of

infamia sempiterna etiam ipso Antonio dignior, quanquam noli hinc superbire, non enim te hominem despicatissimum, ulla re alia qu^m scelere cum Antonio confero, qui in hisce tuis Lupercalibus nefandis non uni tantum, sed omnibus ty-

5 rannis diadema cunctis legibus solutum, nulla solvendum Lupercus dissolutissimus imponere studuisti. certe si ipsorum Caesarum oraculo credendum est, sic enim appellant Christi-

ani imperatores Theodosius et Valens edictum suum cod. 1.1. tit. 14. de authoritate juris imperatorum pendet authoritas.

10 Majestas ergo regnantis, vel ipsorum Caesarum sive iudicio sive oraculo, submittenda legibus est, de quibus pendet. Hinc adulta jam potestate imperatoria ad Trajanum Plinius in Panegyrico; *Diversa sum naturd, dominatio, et principals. Trajanus regnum ipsum aræet ac summovet, sedemque obti-*

15 *net principis, ne sit domino locus.* Et infra, *Omnia quæ de aim principibus à me dicta sunt, cb pertinent ut ostendam, quhm longa consuetudine corruptos, depravatòsque mores principals parens noster reformet, et corrigat.* Quod depravatos principals mores Plinius, id tene pudet jus regium per-

20 petuo vocitare? Verumhactenus de jure regio apud Romanos breviter. Quid illi in tyrannos suos, sive reges, sive Imperatores fecerint, vulgo notum est. Tarquinius expulerunt; et

torture and everlasting disgrace even more than Antony himself. Yet be not therefore puffed up, for I compare you not, most contemptible of men, with Antony in aught but wickedness: you that in these unspeakable Lupercalia of yours, most
5 loose-lived Lupercus, or Scare-Wolf, have taken pains to bind about the head not of one tyrant only, but of all tyrants, a diadem loosed from all laws, but never to be loosened by any!

Indeed if we must believe the "oracle" of the emperors themselves—for so the Christian emperors Theodosius and
10 Valens call their edict, Cod. lib. i. tit. 14—the authority of the emperors depends upon that of the law. So that the majesty of the person that reigns, even by the judgment or the oracle of the emperors themselves, must submit to the laws on which it depends. Hence Pliny tells Trajan in his Panegyric,
15 when the power of the emperors was grown to its height: "A principate and a despotism are quite different in their nature. Trajan restrains and puts far from him power that is actually royal, and holds the throne as a princē, that there may be no room for a despot." And afterwards: "Whatever I have said
20 of other princēs, I said that I might show how our prince moulds anew and straightens the way of principates, which by long custom have been corrupted and perverted." What Pliny calls the corrupt and depraved customs of principates, are you not ashamed still to keep on calling the right of kings ?
25 So much, then, briefly, concerning the right of kings among the Romans.

How they dealt with their tyrants, whether kings or emperors, is generally known. They expelled Tarquin, yes and

more quidem majorum: aut enim expulsi civitate Agyllina Mezentii tyranni antiquissimum exemplum Hetruria vicina prae-
buit, aut ea fabula summus artifex decori Virgilius, quo
5 reges, regnanti etiam tunc Romae Octaviano Caesari voluit ostendere, Æneid. 1. 8.

*At fessi tandem civcs injanda furentem
Armati circumstant, ipsumque, domitumque:
Obtruncant socios; ignem adjastigia jactant.*

10 *Ille inter cades, Ruturum elapsus in agros
Confugere, et Turni defendier hospitibus armis.
Ergo omnis furibus surrexit Etruria justis:
Re gem ad supplicium praesenti Marie repossunt.*

Vides hic justa ira inflammatos cives tyrannum non solum ad
15 necem repentino impetu quiescisse, non regno tantum expul-
sisse, sed profugum et exulem ad judicium, immo ad suppli-
cium, bello suscepto, repetisse. *Sed quomodo, inquis, Tar-
quinius expulerunt? an in jus vocarunt? nequaquam; portas
venienti clauderunt.* Ridiculum caput, quid ni clauderent ad-
20 volanti cum parte copiarum? quid refert exulare jussus fuerit
an mori, si modo poenas dedisse constat? C. Caesarem tyran-
num excellentissimi illius aetatis viri in Senatu interfecerunt;

by ancestral custom even then; for either their neighbor Etruria offered a very ancient precedent in the expulsion of the tyrant Mezentius from the city of Agylla, or Virgil, past master of the fitting and beautiful, meant by that tale in the 5 eighth Aeneid to show even Caesar Octavianus, who then ruled in Rome, what rights kings had among all nations—and this from the utmost antiquity.

"But while the madman yet meditates crimes unspeakable, the citizens, wearied out at last, in armed bands press round 10 both him and his house, and slay his train, and hurl fire upon his rooftree. Slipping away from amid the slaughter, he betakes him to the territory of the Rutuli for refuge, and is defended by the arms of Turnus a stranger. Twas for this that all Etruria rose up in righteous rage: in open war they claim 15 the king for execution,"

Here you see that subjects, fired with righteous wrath, not only sought their tyrant upon a sudden violent impulse to murder him, not only drove him from his kingdom, but when he was a fugitive and an exile made war to get him back again 20 for trial, yea for capital punishment.

"But," say you, "*how* did the Romans expel Tarquin? Did they bring him to trial? No such matter: when he would have come into the city, they shut the gates against him." Ridiculous fool! what could they do but shut the gates, when 25 he was hurrying thither with part of the army? Banished or put to death—what odds, so long as he surely was punished?

Gaius Caesar the tyrant was killed in the senate by the choice and master spirits of that age. This action Marcus Tul-

id factum M. Tullius et ipse vir optimus, et pater patriae publice dictus, miris laudibus, ciim alibi passim, turn in secunda Philippica œlebravit. Pauca recitabo. *Omnes boni, quantum in ipsis juit, Cæsarem occiderunt; aliis consilium, aliis animus, 5 diis occasio defuit, voluntas nemini.* Et infra, *Qua enim res unquam, proh sancte Jupiter, non modò in hac urbe, sed in omnibus terris est gesta major, qua gloriosior, qua commendatior hominum memories sempiterna? in hujus me consilii societatem, tanquam in equum Trojanum, includi cum prin- 10 cipibus non recuso.* Illud Senecae tragici et ad Graecos referri potest, et ad Romanes:

— *Victima haud ulla amplior
Potest, magisque opima mactari Jovi
Quam rex iniquus—*

15 Nam si ad Herculem spectes, cujus Hæc sententia inducitur, quid senserint ilia aetate Graecorum summi viri ostendit: Si ad poetam, qui sub Nerone floruit (et sensum fere suum poetae personis optimis affingere solent) significabat et quid ipse, et quid omnes viri boni, aetate etiam Neronis, faciendum tyranno 20 œnsuerint; quamque pium, quamque diis gratum esse duxerint tyrannicidium. Sic optimi quique Romanorum, quantum in se erat, Domitianum occiderunt. Palam hoc profitetur Plinius secundus in illo ad Trajanum imperatorem Panegy-

lius, himself an excellent man, and publicly entitled the father of his country, extols wonderfully in many passages of his works, particularly in his second *Philippic*. I will repeat some of his words: "All good men killed Caesar as far as in them
5 lay. Some lacked the plan, others the courage, others the opportunity; none the wish." And afterwards: "What action ever was performed, oh venerable Jove! not in this city only but in all the world, that was greater, more glorious, and more to be commended to the everlasting remembrance of man-
10 kind? Not loath am I to be included in the fellowship that planned it, as with the band of chieftains in the Trojan horse."

That familiar passage of Seneca the tragedian may relate both to the Romans and to the Greeks:

There can be slain
15 No sacrificæ to God more acceptable
 Than an unjust and wicked king.

For if this be taken as the sentiment of Hercules, who speaks the words, it shows what was the opinion of the most eminent Greeks in that age; if it be taken as the sentiment of the poet,
20 who flourished under Nero (and poets generally put something like their own opinions into the mouths of their best characters), then this passage betokened what both Seneca himself and all good men, even in Nero's time, thought should be done to a tyrant, and how virtuous an action, how
25 acceptable to the gods, they thought it to kill one. So every good man of Rome, as far as in him lay, killed Domitian. Pliny the Younger owns it openly in that Panegyric to the

rico: *Juvabat illidere solo suferbissimos vultus, instare ferro, savire securibus, ut singulos ictus sanguis dolorque sequeretur: Nemo tarn temperans gaudii, quin instar ultionis videtur ærnere læeros artus, truncata membra, postremb truæs hor-*
 5 *renddsque imagines abjectas excoctdsque flammis. Etdeinde, non satis amant bonos principes, qui malos satis non oderint.*
 Turn inter flagitia Domitiani ponit, quod is Epaphroditum Neronis utcunque interfectorem trucidaverit, *An excidit do-*
lori nostro modb vindicatus Nero, permetteret credo fa-
 10 *mam vitdmque ejus carpi, qui mortem ulcisæbatur?* Plane quasi sæleri proximum esse judicaret, non interfecisse Neronem, scelus gravissimum vindicasse interfectum. Ex his manifestum est, Romanorum praestantissimos quosque viros non solum tyrannos quoquo modo, quoties poterant, occidisse, sed
 15 factum illud, ut Graeci olim, in maxima laude posuisse: Vivum enim tyrannum quoties judicare non poterant viribus inferiores, mortuum et judicabant, et lege Valeria damnabant. Valerius enim Publicola Junii Bruti collega cum videret non posse stipatos suis militibus tyrannos ad judicium per-
 20 duci, legem tulit, qua indemnatum quovis modo occidere liceret; deinde facti rationem reddere. Hinc C. Caligulam,

emperor Trajan: "There was pleasure in dashing those overweening looks against the ground, in piercing him with swords, in mangling him with axes, as if he bled and felt pain at every stroke. No man could so moderate his joy, but
5 that he counted it as good as revenge to behold his mangled limbs, his members torn asunder, and at last his grim and horrid statues thrown down and melted in the fire." And afterwards: "They cannot love good princæes enough, that cannot enough hate bad ones." Then amongst the enormities
10 of Domitian he reckons this, that he put to death Epaphroditus, who in a way had killed Nero: "Have we œased to grieve at the vengeance taken but just now for Nero's death? Is it likely that one who was avenging Nero's death would let his life and reputation be ill spoken of?" Pliny actually seems to
15 have thought it almost a crime not to kill Nero, and a very grievous crime to punish his murder.

By what has been said, it is evident that the most exœllent of the Romans did not only kill tyrants however and whenever they could, but like the Greeks before them thought the
20 deed most praiseworthy. For whenever they could not proceed judicially against a tyrant in his lifetime, being less powerful than he, yet after his death they would both judge him and by the Valerian Law condemn him; and Valerius Publicola, Junius Brutus his colleague, perœiving that as
25 tyrants were guarded by soldiers they could not be brought to trial, proposed a bill making it lawful to kill them uncondemned any how, and give an account afterwards. Hence, when Cassius had killed Gaius Caligula with a sword, and

quern Cassius ferro, omnes votis interfecerunt, Valerius Asiaticus, vir consularis, cum non adesset, ad milites tamen ob necem ejus tumultuantes exclamat, *utinam ego interjecissem*; Senatus eodem tempore abolendam Caesarum memoriam, ac
5 diruenda templa censuit; tantum abfuit ut Cassio irasceretur; Claudium a militibus imperatorem mox salutatum vetant per tribunum plebis principatum capessere; vis autem militum vicit. Neronem Senatus hostem judicavit, et ut puniretur more majorum, quærebat; id genus poenae erat, ut nudi cervice
10 insereretur furcae, corpus virgis ad necem caederetur. Vide quanto mitius et moderatius Angli cum tyranno egerint suo, qui multorum judicio plus ipso Nerone sanguinis fundendi author fuerat. Sic Domidanum mortuum Senatus damnavit; quod potuit, imagines ejus coram detrahi, et solo affligi jussit.
15 Commodus a suis interfectus, non vindicatus a Senatu aut Populo, sed hostis judicatus est, qui etiam cadaver ejus ad supplicium querebant. Ea de re Senatusconsultum extat apud Lampridium; *Hosti patria honores detrahantur, Parricida trahatur, in spoliario lanietur, hostis deorum, carntifex Sena-*
20 *tAs unco trahatur, &c.* lidem Didium Julianum imperatorem

everybody else had done it with prayers and desires, Valerius Asiaticus, a governor of consular rank, then absent, cried out to the soldiers that began to mutiny because of the Emperor's death, "Would I had been the one to kill him!" The Senate
5 at the same time were so far from being displeased with Cas-
sius that they resolved to extirpate the memory of the em-
perors, and to raze their temples. When Claudius soon after
was saluted Emperor by the soldiers, the Senate forbade him
by the tribune of the people to take the government upon him;
10 but the power of the soldiers prevailed. The Senate declared
Nero a public enemy, and searched him out to have him pun-
ished after the way of their anæstors, which required that he
should be stripped naked, his neck thrust beneath the fork,
and with rods be whipped to death. Consider now how much
15 more mildly and moderately the English dealt with their
tyrant, though many are of opinion that he caused more
bloodshed than Nero himself. So the Senate condemned
Domitian after his death; they commanded his statues to be
publicly pulled down and dashed to pieces, which was all they
20 could do. Commodus, slain by his own officers, was not
avenged, but adjudged a public enemy, by both the Senate and
the people, who sought out even his dead corpse for mutila-
tion. The Senate's resolution upon this matter is extant in
Lampridius: "Let the enemy of his country be deprived of
25 all his titles; let the parricide be drawn, let him be torn in
pieces in the gladiators' stripping-place; let the enemy of the
gods, the executioner of the senate, be dragged with a hook,"
etc. The same persons in a very full session of the Senate con-

frequentissimo Senatu capitis damnarunt; et misso Tribune, occidi in Palatio jusserunt. Idem Maximino imperium abrogarunt, hostemque judicarunt. Juvat ipsum Senatusconsultum ex Capitolino recitare. *Consul retulit; Patres Conscripti,*
 5 *dc Maximinis quid placet?* responsum est, *hostes, hostes, qui eos Occident, premium merebitur.* Vis scire populus Romanus et provincial Maximino imperatori an Senatui paruerint? audi eundem Capitolinum. *Literas mittit Senatus* ad omnes provincias, ut communi saluti, libertatique subveniant; quæ auditæ
 10 sunt ab omnibus. Ubique amici, administratores, duces, tribuni, milites Maximini interfecti sunt: Paucae civitates fidem hosti publico servaverunt. Eadem tradit Herodianus. Quid plura de Romanis? Jam apud finitimas nationes quale jus regum ilia state fuerit videamus. Apud Gallos rex eorum Ambiorix
 15 *sua ejusmodi esse imperia* fatetur, *ut non minus haberet in se juris multitudo, quam ipse in multitudinem.* Judicabatur ergo non minus quam judicabat. Rex item Vercingetorix prodicionis insimulatus est a suis; tradit Hæc Caesar bellum Gallicum scribens. *Nee Germanorum regibus infinita aut libera*
 20 *potestas erat, dc minoribus rebus principes consultant, de majoribus omnes. Rex aut prinæps auditur autoritate suadendi*

demned the emperor Didius Julianus to death, and sent a tribune to slay him in the palæ. The same Senate deposed Maximin, and declared him a public enemy. It will be well to read from Capitolinus the Senate's resolution concerning
5 him: 'The consul put the question: 'Conscript Fathers, what is your pleasure concerning the Maximins?' They answered: "They are enemies, they are enemies; whoever kills them shall be rewarded.'" Would you know whether the Roman people and the provinœs obeyed the Senate, or obeyed Maximin the
10 emperor? Hear what the same author says: "The Senate sent letters" to all the provinœs, requesting them to come to the rescue of the common safety and liberty; the letters were publicly read. Everywhere the friends, the deputies, the generals, the tribunes, the soldiers of Maximin, were slain. Very
15 few cities kept their allegiance to the public enemy. Herodian relates the same thing. What need of more instances from Roman history?

Let us now see what manner of thing the right of kings was in those days among the neighboring nations. Ambiorix
20 king of the Gauls confesses "the nature of his dominion to be such that the people had as much right over him as he over them." Consequently he was always subject to judgment as much as he exercised judgment. Vercingetorix, king likewise, was accused of treason by his own people. These things Caesar
25 relates in his history of the Gallic wars. Nor was "the power of the German kings absolute and unbounded: lesser matters are ordered and disposed by the chiefs, greater matters by all the people. The king or prinœ is heeded more through the

magis quhm jubendi potestate; si displicuit sententia, jremitu aspernantur. Hæc Tacitus. Tu vero quod inauditum prorsus esse modò exclamabas, nunc saepiis factum conœdis, *quinquaginta* nimirum *Scotorum reges aut expulsos aut incarœratos, aut necatos, quosdam etiam in publico capitali supplicio affectos.* Quod in ipsa Britannia factitatum est, cur tu, tyrannorum vespillo, infandum, inauditum esse tanta ejulatione vociferaris? Pergis Judæorum et Christianorum erga tyrannos suos religionem extollere, et mendacia ex mendaciis serere, 10 quæ jam toties refutavimus. Modò Assyriorum et Persarum obedientiam late prædicabas, nunc eorum rebelliones enumeras; et quos nunquam rebellasse paulò ante dixeras, nunc cur iidem toties rebellaverint multas causas afflers. Ad narrationem deinde sumpti de rege supplicii tandiu intermissam re- 15 vertis, ut, si tune fortè satis sedulo ineptus et ridiculus non eras, nunc esses. *Per aulae sua membra ductum* narras. Quid per aulae membra intelligas scire gestio. Romanorum calamitates ex regno in rempub. verso recenses, in quo te tibimet turpissime mentiri suprà ostendimus. Qui ad Loiolitam, *scdi-*

influence of his persuasions than through his power to command. If his opinion has not pleased them, they reject it with a murmur." So says Tacitus. Indeed you yourself now confess that what but of late you exclaimed against as absolutely
5 unheard of has been often done, to wit, that "no less than fifty Scottish kings have been either banished or imprisoned or put to death, nay, and some of them publicly executed." Which having been done over and over again in Britain itself, why do you, who spirit your tyrants away like paupers, hug-
10 ger-mugger, for burial at dusk to conceal their violent deaths, how can you, I say, cry out upon it with so lamentable a voice as a thing unheard of?

You proceed to commend the Jews and Christians for their reverent obedience to tyrants, and with lies to sow a harvest
15 of more lies, which I have so often confuted. A while ago you were praising far and wide the obedience of the Assyrians and Persians, and now you reckon up their rebellions; a little while ago you said they never rebelled at all, and now you give us a great many reasons why they rebelled so often! Then
20 you resume your long-suspended narrative of our king's execution, in order that if perhaps you had not taken care enough to be a ridiculous fool then, you may do it now. You say, "He was led through the members of his court." What you mean by the members of the court, I yearn to know. You enumerate
25 the disasters that the Romans underwent through changing their kingdom into a commonwealth; in which I have shown above how grossly you give yourself the lie. You, who when you wrote against the Loyolite, used to point out that "in an

*tioncs tantum sub optimatibus et populo, ærtain sub tyranno
perniciem esse demonstrabas, nunc, hominum vanissime et
corruptissime, ob reges olim cjectos seditionum ilia mala tan-
quam supplicia illos hausisse audes dicere ? scilicet quia cæn-
5 turn Jacobaeis donavit te postea rex Carolus, idcirco reges ex-
pulsos luerunt Romani. At male cæssit Julii Caesaris interfec-
toribus. Sane si cui unquam tyranno, huic parcitum vellem:
quamvis enim regnum in repub. violentius invadebat, erat ta-
men regno fortasse dignissimus: nee ideo quenquam magis
10 putem interfecti Caesaris poenas pependisse, quam deleti
Catilinae Cajum Antonium Ciceronis collegam: quo postea
de aliis criminibus damnato, ut inquit Cicerò pro Flacco,
sepulchrum Catilina floribus ornatum est. Fautores enim
Catilinae exultabant, *justa Catiline turn jacta esse dictitabant*
15 ad invidiam caeteris conflandam, qui Catilinam sustulerant.
Hae sunt improborum artes, quibus viros praestantissimos a
supplicio tyrannorum, et puniendis etiam saepe facinorosissi-
mis deterreant. Dicerem ego contra, quod facile esset, quoties
bene cæssit, et prospere tyrannorum interfeutoribus, si quid
20 cærti de eventu rerum inde statuere quis posset. Objectas,
quòd *regem hæreditarium Angli non illo affecerint supplicio**

aristocracy or a democracy there could be seditions and tumults only, whereas under a tyrant destruction was sure," dare you now say, you empty-headed and thoroughly corrupt mortal, that "they drank the cup of the ills that arose from
5 their seditions as punishments for banishing their kings aforetime" ? To wit, because King Charles afterwards made you a present of a hundred Jacobuses: that is the reason why the Romans expiated the banishing of their kings!

You say it went ill with the murderers of Julius Caesar.
10 Indeed, if I would have had any tyrant spared, it should have been he. He did, to be sure, though a citizen of a republic, forcibly enter upon the exercise of royal power; yet he perhaps more than anyone else deserved it. Nor do I for this reason suppose anyone to have been punished for killing Caesar, any
15 more than Gaius Antonius, Cicerò's colleague, was punished for destroying Catiline. Afterward, when he was condemned for other crimes, says Cicerò in his oration *pro Flacco*, "Catiline's tomb was decked with flowers," for they that favored Catiline then rejoiced, and "gave out then that Catiline's
20 deeds were righteous," to kindle hatred against those that had cut him off. These are the artifices of wicked men to deter most excellent men from cutting off tyrants, and often from punishing even the most atrocious criminals. I might easily tell against you how often it hath gone well and prosperously
25 with them that have killed tyrants, if from such cases any certain inference might be drawn concerning the outcome of human affairs.

You object further, "that the English put their hereditary

quo tyranni solent mactari, scd eo, quo latrones ct proditionis rei Primum haereditas ad maleficiorum impunitatem quid conferat nescio: conferre quicquam ut credat sapiens fieri vix potest. Quod tu deinde ad *immanitatem* refers, in eo lenitas
5 potiis Anglorum, et moderatio praedicanda erat; qui, cum tyrannum esse, omnes in patriam impietates, latrocinia, proditiones, perduelliones in se complectatur, satis habebant supplicium haud gravius de tyranno sumere, quam de simplici latrone quovis, aut proditore vulgari sumere solebant. Speras
10 *exorturos esse aliquos Harmodios et Thrasybulos qui, nostrorum caede, tyranni manibus parcent.* At tu citius animum despondebis, et vitam te dignam, omnibus bonis execrandus, ante suspendio finieris, quam Harmodios Harmodiorum sanguine litantes tyranno videas. Tibi enim illud accidere
15 verisimillimum est, deque te tarn scelerato quis augurari rectius possit: alterum est impossibile. Tyrannorum triginta mentionem facis qui sub Gallieno rebellarunt. Quid si tyrannus tyrannum oppugnat, an omnes ergo qui oppugnant tyrannum, aut tollunt, tyranni erunt ipsi? haud tu id persua-
20 seris, mancipium equestre; neque is qui author tibi est, Trebellius Pollio, historicorum prope ignobilissimus. *Si qui ho-*

king to death not as tyrants use to be sacrificèd, but as robbers and traitors are executed." In the first place I do not know what heredity should contribute to impunity for crimes; that it contributes anything is scarcely possible for a wise man to
5 believe. Next, in the conduct which you ascribe to "savage cruelty" there commendably appeared rather our English clemency and moderation; for, though to be a tyrant comprises within itself all sorts of enormities, robberies, treacheries, and treasons, against the whole nation, yet they were
10 content to inflict no greater punishment upon a tyrant than they used of course to do upon any plain highwayman or common traitor!

You hope "that some Harmodius and Thrasylulus will rise up and make expiation" to the tyrant's manes by the slaughter
15 of my fellow-countrymen. But sooner will you run mad with despair, and, as you deserve all good men's curses, will first put an end to a life worthy of yourself by hanging yourself, ere you see Harmodiuses offer the blood of Harmodiuses in atonement to a tyrant! That you will come to such an end is
20 most probable (for who could foretell a more suitable fortune for such a rascal ?) but the other thing is an utter impossibility. You mention thirty tyrants that rebelled in Gallienus's time. And what if one tyrant opposes another, must therefore all they that resist or destroy a tyrant be accounted such them-
25 selves? You cannot persuade men into such a belief, you slave-knight, nor can your authority Trebellius Pollio, well-nigh the most inconsiderable of historians. "If any of the emperors were declared enemies by the Senate," you say, "it

stes, inquis, à Senatu judicati sunt, jactio id fecit, non jus.
 Nobis in memoriam revocas quid fecit Imperatores; factio
 nempe, et vis, et ut planiis dicam, furor Antonii, non jus fecit,
 ut contra Senatum populūque Romanum ipsi prius rebella-
 5 rent. *Dedit, inquis, fœnas Galba, qui contra Neronem insur-*
rexit. Die etiam quas poenas dedit Vespasianus, qui contra
 Vitellium. *Tantum, inquis, abjuit Carolus à Nerone, quan-*
tum isti laniones Anglicani ci Senatoribus illius temporis Ro-
manis. Trifurcifer! a quo laudari vituperatio est, vituperari
 10 laus magna: Faucis modo periodis interpositis hac ipsa de re
 scribens, *Senatum sub imperatoribus togatorum mancipio-*
rum consessum fuisse ai'ebas, nunc eundem *Senatum* ai's *con-*
sessum regum fuisse: hoc si ita est, quid obstat quin reges, te
 authore, togata mancipia sint? Beatos hoc laudatore reges!
 15 quo inter homines nihil nequius, inter quadrupedes nihil
 amentius: nisi si hoc illi peculiare dicam esse, quod nemo lite-
 ratius rudit. Senatum Angliae Neroni vis esse similiorem
 quam Senatui Romano: Cogit me cacoethes hoc tuum inep-
 tissimas conglutinandi similitudines, ut corrigam te; et quam
 20 similis Neroni fuerit Carolus, ostendam. *Nero, inquis, ma-*
trem suam ferro necavit. Carolus et patrem et regem veneno;
 nam ut alia omittam indicia, qui Ducem veneficii reum legi-

was done by faction, not law." You put us in mind what it was that first made emperors: it was faction and violence, and to speak plainer, the madness of Antony, and not any law or right, that originally made the emperors themselves take
5 the start in rebelling against the Senate and the people of Rome. "Galba," you say, "was punished for taking up arms against Nero." Tell us likewise how Vespasian was punished for taking up arms against Vitellius! "There was as much difference," you say, "betwixt Charles and Nero, as betwixt
10 those English butchers and the Roman Senators of that age." Gallows-bird! by whom it is scandalous to be commended, and a praise to be evil spoken of: but a few sentences before, discoursing of this very thing, you said: "The Senate under the emperors was in effect but an assembly of toga'd slaves";
15 and now you say: "the Senate was an assembly of kings." If this be so, why should not kings, according to your own opinion, be considered to be toga'd slaves? Blessed are kings in such a praiser! than whom no man is more a rascal, nor four-footed beast more void of sense, unless this may be said
20 to be his singular property, that none brays more learnedly.

You make out that the Parliament of England is more like to Nero than to the Roman Senate. This itch of yours to paste together utterly inappropriate comparisons forces me to set you right: and I will let you see how like King Charles was to
25 Nero. "Nero," you say, "slew his own mother" with a sword. But Charles murdered with poison one that was both his father and his king. For to omit other evidences: he that snatched from the law the Duke that was charged with the poisoning

bus cripuit, fieri non potuit quin ipse reus quoque fuerit. Nero multa millia Christianorum occidit, Carolus multo plura. Non defuerunt, teste Suetonio, qui Neronem mortuum laudarent, qui desiderarent, qui per longum tempus, *vernīs cæsti-*
5 *visque floribus tumulum ejus ejus ornarent*, ejus inimicis omnia mala ominarentur: non desunt qui Carolum eadem insania desiderent, et summis laudibus extollant, quorum tu, patibularis eques, chorum ducis *Militcs Angli molossis suis*
ferociores novum et inauditum tribunal instituerunt. En acu-
10 tissimum Salmasii sive symbolum sive adagium, jam sexies inculcatum, *Molossis suis ferociores*; adeste rhetores, vosque ludimagistri, delibate, si sapitis, flosculum hunc elegantissimum, qui tarn Salmasio in deliciis est; codicillis vestris et capsulis mandate copiosissimi hominis pigmentum, ne intereat.
15 Adeone etiam verba tua consumpsit rabies, ut cuculi in modum eadem identidem occinere cogaris? Quid hoc monstri esse dicam? Rabies, ut fabulantur, vertit Hecubam in canem; te Sancti Lupi dominum vertit in cuculum. Jam novas exordiris repugnantias: supra *p. 113. affirmaveras Principem*
20 *legibus solutum esse, non cogentibus solum, sed dirigentibus, nullas esse omninb quibus teneatur*; nunc dicturum te aîs *injrct de regum differentia quatenus potestate alii minore alii*

cannot but have shared the guilt. Nero slew many thousands of Christians, but Charles slew many more. There were those, says Suetonius, that praised Nero after he was dead, that longed to have had him again, that for a long time "used to
5 deck his tomb with spring and summer flowers," and that boded all evils to his enemies. And some there are that with the like frenzy wish for king Charles again, and exalt him with the highest praise; you, Knight of the Halter, lead their troop.

10 "The English soldiers, more savage than their own mastiffs, erected a new and unheard-of court of justice." Observe this ingenious symbol or adage of Salmasius, now obtruded six times over: "more savage than their own mastiffs." Come all ye orators and schoolmasters; pluck, if you are wise, this
15 elegant flower, which Salmasius is so very fond of; commit to your tablets and cabinets this rhetorical cosmetic of this most eloquent man, lest it perish. Has your madness so destroyed your words that, cuckoo-fashion, you must needs sing the same ill-omened song over and over again? What
20 sort of monstrosity shall I call this? Madness, says the tale, turned Hecuba into a dog; you, Seigneur of St. Wolf, it has turned into a cuckoo.

Now you come out with fresh inconsistencies. You had said before, page 113, that "the prince was loosed from the
25 laws,—not from laws coercive" only, but as well "from laws directory; that there are none at all by which he is held." Now you say that "you will discourse further on of the difference betwixt some kings and others, in so far as some have had

*majorc in regnando juerunt. Vis probare, regcs non potuisse
judicari, nee damnari ci subjctis suis argumento, ut ipse aï's,
firmissimo, revera stolidissimo; nihil, inquis, aliud inter ju-
dices et reges discrimen fuit: atqui Judcsi judicum tædio
5 odidque adducti reges postulabant. An quia judices illos
magistratum male gerentes judicare et damnare poterant,
ideone putas tædio odioque eorum adductos postulasse reges
quos jura omnia violantes punire, aut in ordinem cogere non
possent? quis, excepto te uno, tarn fatue argumentari solet?
10 Aliud igitur quiddam erat cur regem peterent, quam ut ha-
berent dominum legibus superiorem; de quo nunc divinare
nihil attinet: quicquid erat, haud prudenti consilio factum et
Deus et Propheta ejus testatus est. Iterum Rabbinis tuis, ex
quibus probasse te supri asserebas regem Judseorum non ju-
15 dicari, nunc litem acerrimam intendis, quod regem et judicari
et verberari posse tradiderint: quod idem plane est acsi fate-
rere ementitum te tune esse, quod ex Rabbinis probasse dix-
eras. Eo demum descendis ut de numero equilium Solomonis,
quot *is cquorum præsepia habuerit*, oblitus regiae defensionis,
20 controversias putidulas concites. Tandem ab agasone ad equi-
tem redis aretalogum et tautologum, vel potius ad id monstri*

more power, some less." By what you call "a most solid argument" you would prove "that kings cannot be judged or condemned by their own subjects"; but it is a very stupid one. You say: "There was no other difference betwixt judges and
5 kings; and yet the reason why the Jews kept asking for a king was that they were weary of the judges, and hated them." Do you think that because they *could* judge and condemn judges for malfeasance in office they were therefore led by hatred and weariness of them to ask for kings, whom they
10 could *not* punish or restrain though they should break through all laws? Who but you ever argued so idiotically? They desired a king, then, for some other reason than that they might have a master whose power should be superior to that of the law; to guess what it was is not to our present
15 purpose. Whatever it was, both God and his Prophet have witnessed that it was ill-advised in the people to desire a king. Once more you fall foul of your rabbins, out of whose writings you said before you had proved that a king of the Jews could
20 judged, but condemned as well to undergo stripes;—which is tantamount to confessing that you had made up out of the whole cloth what you said you had proved out of their writings. Nay, you come at last to forgetting the king's defence, and raising wretched quibbles about the number of Solomon's
25 stables, and how many "mangers he had for his horses."

Finally from a horse-boy you become once more the Knight of the Virtuous Preachments and Identical Repetitions, or rather the sort of monster you were before, a raving distracted

quod priiis eras, cuculum rabiosum. Quereris enim *postremis hisccseculis discipline vigorem laxatum, regulam corruftam*; quòd uni scilicet tyranno cunctis legibus soluto disciplinam omnem laxare, mores omnium corrumpere impune non liceat.

- 5 Hanc doctrinam *Erunistas inter rejornatos* introduxisse ai's. Ita Lutherus, Calvinus, Zuinglius, Buærus et Orthodoxorum quotquot celeberrimi Theologi fuere, tuo iudicio Brunistae sunt. Quo aequiore animo tua maledicta perferunt Angli, cum in ecclesise doctores praestantissimos, totamque adeo ecclesiam
10 reformatam, iisdem prope contumeliis debacchari te audiant.

CAPUT VI.

- P**OST legem Dei et naturae agitatum abs te frustra, et pessime tractatum, unde nihil praeter ignorantiae simul et improbitatis ignominiam retulisti, quid deinde, in
hæc causa regia, praeter nugas agere possis, non video. Cum
15 autem omnibus et bonis et doctis viris, huic etiam causae nobilissimae abunde me satisfacisse sperem, etiamsi hoc loco finem respondendi facerem, tamen ne interea videar aliis varietatem potius et acumen tuum, quam immodicam loquacitatem defugisse, quòd voles usque progrediar: ea tamen bre-
20 vitate, ut facile appareat, me iis omnibus perfunctum, si minus quæ dignitas, at saltern quæ neccessitas causae requirebat, nunc

cuckoo. You complain that in these "latter ages, the force of order has been slackened, and its rule destroyed"; because forsooth one tyrant loosed from every law is not allowed with impunity to slacken all order, and destroy all men's morals!

5 This doctrine, you say, was introduced by "the Brownists amongst those of the reformed religion"; so that Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Bucer, and all the most celebrated orthodox divines, are Brownists in your opinion. The English bear your reproaches the more calmly because they hear you rave

10 with nearly the same slanders against the most eminent doctors of the Church, and in effect against the whole Reformed Church itself.

CHAPTER VI.

15 **A**FTER your fruitless and futile mishandling of the law of God and nature, from which you have brought off nothing but the reproach of ignorance and knavery combined, I do not see what you can farther allege in your royal cause but mere trifles. Though I for my part hope that even should I end my answer here, I have done enough to satisfy fully all men that are neither ignorant nor knavish,—

20 yes, done enough for this noble cause itself,—yet lest others should think that I am retreating from what they suppose your manysidedness and keenness, rather than your immeasurable talkativeness, I will go on as far as you like, but with such brevity as shall make it appear that after having per-

25 formed all that if not the dignity, yet the urgency of the cause

hominum quorumvis expectation!, vel etiam curiositati morem gerere. *Hinc alius, inquis, et major argumentorum mihi surget ordo.* An major eo argumentorum ordine quem lex Dei et Naturae suppeditabat? Per opem, Lucina, parturit
5 Mons Salmasius; non de nihilo nupsit uxori; foetum aliquem ingentem exspectate mortales. *Si is qui rex est ac dicitur, postulari posset apud aliam potestatem, eam omnino regid majorem csse oporteret; qua autem major statuatur, hanc vert regium did et esse ncasse esset. Sic enim definienda*
10 *potestas regia: Qua summa est in repub. et singularis; et supra quam nulla alia agnoscitur.* O murem vere montanum, et ridiculum! Succurrite grammatici grammatico laboranti; actum est non de lege Dei, aut naturae, sed de glossario. Quid si sic responderem tibi? cædant nomina rebus; non est nostrum
15 nomini cavere, qui rem sustulimus; curent id alii quibus cordi sunt reges; nos nostra utimur libertate; responsum sane haud iniquum auferres. Verum ut me per omnia ex aequo et bono tecum agere intelligas, non ex mea solum, sed ex optimorum olim et prudentissimorum virorum sententia respondebo, qui
20 et nomen et potestatem regiam cum potestate legum et populi majore, posse optime consistere judicarunt. Lycurgus imprimis, vir sapientia clarissimus, cum vellet maxime potestati regiae consulere, ut author est Plato, nullam aliam ejus con-

demanded, I now do but comply with some people's expectation or, perhaps, curiosity.

"From now on," say you, "there rises before me another and a grander order of arguments." What! grander arguments than what the law of God and nature afforded? Help, 5 Lucina! Mount Salmasius is in labor! It is not for nothing that he was married by a he-wife. Mortals, expect some huge and monstrous birth. "If he that is and is called king might be impeached before another power, this must of necessity be 10 greater than the royal power. But the power that is constituted the greater must be called and be indeed the royal power, for royal power is to be thus defined: the power which is supreme in the state, and unique, and above which no other is acknowledged." A mountainous mouse, and a ridiculous! 15 Help, grammarians! help this grammarian in travail! the law of God and nature is safe; but 'tis all up with the dictionary!

What if I should answer you thus? Let names give way to things; to be cautious about the name is not our affair, who have got rid of the thing; let others, who are in love with 20 kings, look to that; we are content with the enjoyment of our liberty. Such would be no unfair answer. But to let you see that I deal fairly and justly with you throughout, I will give you an answer based not upon my own opinion alone, but upon that of the best and wisest men of old, who have thought 25 that both the name and the power of a king are entirely consistent with a greater power in the people and the law. In the first place, Lycurgus, a man very eminent for wisdom, designing, as Plato says, to provide in the highest degree for the in-

servandae rationem invenire potuit, quam ut Senatus et Ephorum, id est, populi potestatem regia majorem in sua patria constitueret. Idem sensit Theseus Euripideus, qui cum Athenarum rex esset, populo tamen Atheniensi in libertatem cum
 5 magna sua gloria vindicate, et potestatem popularem extulit supra regiam, et regnum nihilo secius in ilia civitate suis posteris reliquit. Unde Euripides in Supplicibus ita loquentem inducit.

Δῆμον κατέστησ' αὐτὸν εἰς μοναρχίαν
 10 ' Ἐλευθερώσας τήνδ' ἰσόψηφον πόλιν.

*Populum constitui ipsum in monarchiam,
 Liberans hanc Urbem æquale jus suffragii habentem.*

Etrursus ad praeconem Thebanum.

Ἡρώτων μὲν ἤρξω τοῦ λόγου φευδῶς ξένης
 15 Ζητιῶν τύραννον ἐνθικόδ', οὐ γὰρ ἀρχεταί
 ' Ἐνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρῶς, ἀλλ' ἔλευθέρα πόλις,
 Δῆμος δ' ἀνάσσει —

*Primum incoepisti orationem falsb hospes,
 20 Qucerens tyrannum hie; non enim regitur
 Ab uno viro, sed est libera hcec civitas,
 Populus autem re gnat——*

Haec ille; cum tamen rex in ilia civitate et esset et dictus esset. Testis est etiam divinus Plato in epistola octava. *Induxit Lycurgus senatum et Ephorum potestatem. τῆς βασιλικῆς ἀρχῆς σωτήριον* potestati regiae maxime salutarem, quae hac
 25 ratione per tot saecula magna cum laude conservata est; postquam lex domina, rex facta est hominum. Lex autem rex esse non potest, nisi sit qui in regem quoque, si usus venerit, lege

terests of kingly government, could find no other expedient to preserve it than by making the power of the senate and of the Ephors, that is, of the people, superior to it in his own country. Theseus in Euripides was of the same opinion; for 5 he, though king of Athens, yet to his great honor restored the Athenian people to liberty, and advanced the power of the people above that of the king, and left the regal power in that city none the less to his posterity. Whence Euripides, in *The Suppliants*, introduces him speaking on this manner: "I have 10 established the people themselves in sovereignty, having freed this city, which hath an equal right of suffrage." And in another place, to the herald of Thebes: "In the first place you begin your speech, stranger, with a thing that is not true, in asking for the monarch here; for this city is not governed by 15 a single person, but is free; the people is its lord." These were his words, though in that city he yet both was, and was called, king. Another authority on the same point is the divine Plato in his eighth epistle: "Lycurgus introduced the power of the senate and of the Ephors, τῆς βασιλικῆς ἀρχῆς σωτήριον, a 20 thing very preservative of kingly government, which by this means has been kept in great honor for so many ages, because mistress law was made king." Now the law cannot be king, unless there be somebody who, if there should be occasion, may enforce it against the king too. A kingly government so modified and limited, he himself commends to the 25 Sicilians: "Let there be liberty together with royal power; let royal power be ὑπεύθυνος, liable to give account; let law prevail even against kings, if they shall act contrary to law."

possit agere. Sic temperatam potestatem regiam Sicilensibus commendat, *ἐλευθερία γινέσθω μετὰ βασιλικῆς ἀρχῆς*, etc. *sit libertas cum regia potestate; sit regia potestas ὑπεύθυνος reddendcerationi obnoxia; dominetur lex etiam regibus si-*
5 *quid prater legem jecerint.* Aristoteles denique politicorum tertio, *In repub. Spartanorum videtur*, inquit, *regnum esse maximZ, eorum regnorum qua sunt secundiam legem*: omnes autem regni species secundum legem fuisse ai't, praeter unam quam vocat *παμβασιλείαν*, neque talem usquam extitisse
10 meminit. Tale itaque regnum maxim£ omnium proprie et dici et esse regnum sensit Aristoteles, quale apud Spartanos fuit; talem proinde regem non minus proprie et dici et esse regem, ubi tamen populus supra regem erat, negare non potuit. Cum tot tantique authores et nomen et rem regiam
15 sua fide salvam regi praestiterint, etiam ubi populus penes se summam potestatem, tametsi exercere non solet, tamen, quoties opus est, obtinet, noli tarn angusto animo summae rerum Grammaticalium, hoc est vocabulorum, sic timere, ut potius quam glossarii tui ratio turbetur, aut detrimenti quid capiat,
20 prodere libertatem omnium, et rempub. velis. Scito etiam dehinc, nomina rebus servire, non res nominibus; ita plus sapies, nee *in in finitum*, quod metuis, *ibis*. *Frustra ergo Seneca tria ilia genera statuum ita describit.* Frustratur Seneca, nos liberi simus; et nisi fallor, non ii sumus quos Flores Sene-

Finally Aristotle says, in the third book of his *Politics*: "Of all royal powers that are governed by laws, that in the Spartan commonwealth seems to be most truly and properly royal."

All forms of kingly government, however, he says, were according to laws, but one which he calls *xappaffdeiw*, or Absolute Monarchy, and he does not mention that this existed anywhere. Aristotle, then, thought such a kingdom as that of the Spartans to be and deserve the name of a kingdom *par excellenæ*, and consequently could not deny that such a king as theirs, though the people were above him, none the less was, and was to be called, *far excellenæ* a king. Now since authors so many and great do upon their faith and credit warrant unto the king that both the name and the substance of his royalty shall be unimpaired, and vouch it safe, even where the supreme power, though generally unused, yet for times of need is kept by the people in their own possession; do you cease with so petty a mind to fear so much for the State of Grammar—of Words, to wit—that rather than the public weal of your word-list should be disturbed, or suffer ought of harm, you would willingly betray the liberty and common weal of mankind. And for the future know that words are subordinate to things, not things to words. By this means you will have more discernment, and not run on "into the infinite and undefined" as you fear!

"In vain then does Seneca," you say, "thus describe those three forms of government." Let Seneca describe in vain, so we enjoy our liberty; and if I mistake not, we are not the sort of men to be enslaved by Seneca's Flowers. Yet Seneca, though

cae in servitutem reducant. Seneca autem, si summam in uno potestatem esse dicit, *populi* tamen *cam* dicit *esse*, commissam videlicet regi ad salutem omnium, non ad perniciem; nee mancipio, sed usu duntaxat a populo datam. *Non jam ergo*
5 *per Deumreges regnant, sed per populum.* Quasi vero Deus non ita regat populum, ut cui Deus vult, regnum tradat populus; cum in ipsis institutionibus Imperator Justinianus palam agnoscat, exinde Caesares regnasse, ex quo *lege regia populus*
Us et in eos omne imperium suum, et potestatem concessit. Sed
10 quousque ista recoquemus, quæ jam toties refutavimus? Rursum, quod ingenium tuum importunum et agreste, mores odiosissimos indicat, id nostra repub. quæ ad te nihil pertinet, alienigena et peregrinus curiosum te infers. Accede igitur, ut te tanto ardelione dignum est, cum insigni soloecismo. *Quic-*
15 *quid, inquis, illi perditii homines dicunt, ad populum decipiendum pertinent.* O scelerate! hocine erat, quòd deminutus capite Grammaticus in nostram rempub. te ingerere cupiebas, ut soloecismis nos tuis et barbarismis oppleres? Verum tu die populum quo modo decipimus? *Forma regiminis quam in-*
20 *troducere non popularis est, sed militaris.* Ista scilicet grex ille perfugarum mercedula conductum jussit te scribere: non tibi igitur, qui ea blatis, quorum nihil intelligis, sed iis qui te pre-

he says that the sovereign power resides in a single person, says withal that "the power is the people's," and by them given to the king in trust for the welfare of the whole, not for their ruin and destruction, and that the people have not given
5 him a property in it, but the use of it. "Kings at this rate," you say, "do not reign by God but by the people." As if God did not so overrule the people that they give the kingdom to whom God wills. The Emperor Justinian in his Institutes themselves openly acknowledges that the Caesars' reign be-
10 gan when "by the Lex Regia the people granted unto them and vested in them all their own power and authority."

But how long shall I keep warming over and over again that stuff of yours which I have so often rejected and refuted? Now once more you push yourself—and it is a thing which
15 reveals your boorish unmannerly nature and odious ways—you, a foreign-born outsider, push yourself inquisitively into our state affairs, which are none of yours! Come on, then, with an egregious solecism, worthy of such a busybody. "Every single thing," quotha, "every single thing that those desper-
20 does say, are only to deceive the people." Rascal! was it for this that you, an outlawed grammarian, were so forward to intermeddle with the affairs of our government—that you might stuff us with your solecisms and barbarisms? But say, how have we deceived the people? "The form of government
25 which they have set up is not popular, but military." This is what that gang of renegades hired you—and hired you cheap—to write; so that I shall not trouble myself to answer you, who babble what you know nothing of, but I will answer

tio conduxcrunt respondebitur. Quis *ordinem procerum è Parlamento ejecit? an populus?* Immo populus; eoque facto servitutis jugum a cervicibus suis baud ferendum dejecit. Ipsi milites, a quibus hoc factum dicis, non exteri, sed cives, et
5 magna pars populi fuere; idque caetero ferè consentiente populo et cupiente, nee sine Parlamenti etiam autoritate fecerunt. *An populus, inquis, plebeium ordinem domus inferioris mutilavit, alios fugando, &c.* Populus inquam; quod enim Senatus pars potior, id est sanior, fecit, in quo vera po-
10 puli potestas residebat, quid ni id populum fecisse dicam? Quid si servire, quid si varnum rempub. dare, in Senatu plures maluerint, annon id impedire, et libertatem retinere, si in manu est sua, paucioribus licebit? *At duces hoc fecerunt cum militibus suis.* Habenda igitur gratia est ducibus, quod operas
15 et tabernarios Londinenses qui paulo ante, veluti faex ilia Clodiana, ipsam curiam obsederant, ferocientes repulerint, reipub. non defuerint. Tunc idcirco jus Parlamenti primarium ac proprium, ut libertati imprimis populi sive pacè sive bello prospiciat, *militarem dominationem* appellabis? Verum hoc
20 a perduellibus dici, qui tibi ista dictarunt, non est mirum; sic enim perditissima olim Antoniorum factio Senatum Romanum contra hostes patriæ ad saga euntem, *Castra Pompeii*

them that hired you. Who "excluded the Lords from Parliament—was it the people?" Ay, it was the people; and in so doing they threw an intolerable yoke of slavery from off their necks. Those very soldiers who you say did it were not
5 foreigners, but our own countrymen, and a great part of the people, and they did it with the consent and at the desire of almost all the rest of the people, and not without the authority of Parliament itself. "Was it the people that maimed the House of Commons by driving away some of the members,
10 etc.?" Yes, I say, it was the people. For whatever the better, that is, the sounder, part of the legislature did, in which the true power of the people resided, why may not the people be said to have done it? What if the majority of the legislature should choose to be slaves, or to set the government to sale—
15 ought not the minority prevent this, and keep their liberty, if it be in their power? "But the officers of the army with their soldiers did it." And thanks are due those officers for that they failed not the state, but repelled the riotous workmen and shopkeepers of London, who, like that rabble that ap-
20 peared for Clodius, had but a little before beset the very parliament house. The original and proper right of Parliament to look out before all else for the people's liberty both in peace and in war—is this what you therefore call "a military despotism"? It is no wonder indeed that the trai-
25 tors who dictated these passages to you should talk in this strain, for so did that profligate crew of Antony and his adherents use to call the Roman Senate when they took arms against the enemies of their country, "Pompey's Camp." And

appellate solebat. Jam *verb* fortissimo nostri exercitus ductori Cromuello, quòd is amicorum læto agmine stipatus, non sine favore populi secundo, votis etiam bonorum omnium prosequentibus, in bellum Hibernicum Deo gratissimum profi-
5 cisæretur, invidisse tuos gaudeo; auditis enim postea tot ejus victoriis, jam arbitror eos livore contabuisse. Multa praetereo quæ de Romanis militibus prolixè nugaris: quod sequitur a veritate remotissimum esse quis non videt? *Populi*, inquis, *potestas esse desinit ubi regis esse incipit*. Quo tandem jure?
10 cum satis constet, omnes fere ubique gentium reges sub ærtis conditionibus traditum sibi regnum a populo accipere: quibus si rex non steterit, cur illa potestas, quæ fiduciaria tantum fuit, ad populum redire non debeat, tarn a rege quam a consule, vel ab alio quovis magistrato, tu velim doceas: nam quod *sa-*
15 *lutem reipub. id ai's postulare*, ineptias dicis; cum salutis ratio eadem omninò sit, sive a rege, sive ab optimatibus, sive a triumviris imperio sibi tradito perperam utentibus *potestas illa ad populum revertatur*; posse autem a magistratibus quibus-
cunque praeterquam a rege solo ad populum reverti ipse con-
20 ædis. Sane si neque regi, neque ullis magistratibus imperium in se populus mentis compos dederit, nisi tantummodo communis omnium salutis causa, nihil potest obstare quo minus ob causas plane contrarias ne interitus omnium sequatur,

now I am glad that they of your party looked grudgingly upon Cromwell, that most valiant general of our army, for undertaking the Irish campaign (so acceptable to Almighty God), surrounded with a joyful crowd of his friends, and
5 followed up by the well-wishes of the people and the prayers of all good men; for I question not but at the news of his many victories there they are by this time rotted with spite.

I pass by your quantities of long-winded nonsense about the Roman soldiers. What follows is most notoriously false:
10 "Power œases to belong to a people," you say, "where it begins to belong to a king." By what law or right is that? For it is very œertain that kings in general, throughout the world, receive from the people an authority entrusted to them subject to œertain conditions; which if the king abide not
15 by, pray tell us why that power, which was but a trust, should not return to the people, as well from a king as from a consul or any other offiœer of government. For what you say about "the public safety requiring it" is not to the point; the requirements of safety are identical whether "that power re-
20 verts to the people" from a King, or from an Aristocracy, or from a Triumvirate, in case any of them abuse the power entrusted to them; and yet you yourself grant that it may so revert from offiœers of every sort, a king only excepted. œertainly, if no people in their right wits ever gave power over
25 themselves either to a king or to any magistrates for any other purpose than the common good of all, there can be no reason why, for exactly the inverse purpose, to prevent the utter ruin of them all, they may not take back again the power they

haud secus regi quam aliis magistratibus, quod dedit imperium adimere possit: quid quod uni etiam facilius quam pluribus ademerit? et potestatem in se plusquam fiduciarium cuiquam mortalium tradere summae esset insania?: neque ereditabile est ullum ab orbe terrarum condito populum, qui quidem suae spontis esset, adeo miserè desipuisse, ut vel omnem prorsus potestatem ab se alienaret, aut suis magistratibus concreditam sine causis gravissimis ad se revocaret. Quod si discordiae, si bella intestina indè oriantur, regium certe jus nullum inde oritur illius potestatis per vim retinendae, quam populus suam sibi vendicat. Ex quo efficitur, quod ad prudentiam populi, non ad jus regis referendum est, quodque nos non negamus, *rectorem non facile mutandum esse*: nunquam ergo aut nulla prorsus de causa, nullo modo sequitur: neque tu adhuc quicquam allegasti, neque jus ullum regis expromsisti, quo minus liceat consentienti populo, regem haud idoneum regno privare; siquidem id, quod etiam in Gallia tua saepius factum est, sine tumultu ac civili bello fieri possit. Cum itaque salus populi suprema lex sit, non salus tyranni, ac proinde populo in tyrannum, non tyranno in populum prodesse debeat, tu, qui tam sanctam legem, tarn augustam tuis praestigiis pervertere es ausus, qui legem inter homines supremam, et populo maxime salutarem ad tyrannorum duntaxat impunitatem valere voluisti, tu inquam scito, quandoquidem Angli

gave, and this as well from a king as from other magistrates; nay, and it may with far greater ease be taken from one than from many. And to commit to any mortal creature a power over themselves on any other terms than upon trust were
5 extreme madness; nor is it credible that any people since the creation of the world, who had freedom of will, were ever so miserably silly as either to part with the power absolutely and entirely, or, having oncè entrusted it to their magistrates, to recall it unto themselves without weightiest reasons. But
10 though dissensions, though civil wars, arise thencè, surely no royal right arises thencè to withhold by forcè of arms that power which the people reclaims unto itself for its own.

Whencè it follows that what you say, and we do not deny, that "the ruler ought not lightly to be changed," is true with
15 respect to the people's prudencè, not the king's right; but it nowise follows that therefore a ruler ought not to be changed ever or for any cause whatsoever. Nor have you hitherto adducèd any reason, or producèd any right of kings, which ought to hinder the people, when they all concur, from depos-
20 ing an unfit king, provided it may be done, as it has been often done in your own country of France, without tumult or civil war. Since therefore the safety of the people, not the safety of a tyrant, is the supreme law, and consequently should advantage the people against a tyrant, and not a tyrant against the
25 people; you that have dared invert so sacred and so glorious a law with your jugglings, you who would make this supreme law, which of all laws is most beneficial to mankind, serve only for the impunity of tyrants; let me tell you (since to you

Enthusiastæ, et Enthei, et Vates toties tibi sumus, me vate scito, Deum tibi atque homines tanti piaculi ultores imminere: quanquam universum genus humanum subjicere tyrannis, id est, quantum in te fuit, ad bestias damnare, hoc ipsum scelus
5 tarn immane sua partim in te ultio est, suis te furiis quocunque fugis terrarum, atque oberras, vel, citius vel ferius insequetur; et pejore etiam eâ, quam nunc insanis, insania agitabit. Venio nunc ad alterum argumentum tuum, prioris baud dissimile; si populo resumere liceret potestatem suam, *Nihil tum esset*
10 *discriminis inter popularem et regalem statum, nisi quod in hoc singuli rectores constituuntur, in illo plures: quid si nihil aliud interesset, nunquid inde respub. detrimenti caperet?* Ecce autem aliae differentiae a temetipso allatae, *temporis* nimirum *et successions; cum populares magistratus annui fere*
15 *sint, reges, nisi quid committant, perpetui; et in eadem plerunque familia.* Differant ergo inter se aut non differant, de istis enim minutiis nihil laboro, in hoc certe conveniunt, quod utrobique populus quoties id interest reipub. potest quam alteri potestatem salutis publicæ causa tradiderat, eam ad se
20 rursus nee injuria eandem ob causam revocare. *At lege regia*

we Englishmen so often are "Enthusiasts," "Inspired," and "Prophets") let me, I say, be so far a prophet as to tell you that the vengeance of God and man hangs over your head for so horrid a crime; although your casting down the whole
5 human race under the feet of tyrants, which is naught else than, as far as in you lies, condemning them to be thrown to the beasts of the amphitheatre,—this monstrous wickedness is itself part of its own vengeance upon you; and whitherso-
ever on earth you flee, and wheresoever you wander, will
10 pursue you with its furies soon or late, and drive and harass you with madness yet worse than now you rave with.

I come now to your second argument, which is not unlike the first. If the people may resume their power, "there would be no difference," say you, "betwixt a democracy and
15 a kingdom; but that in a kingdom the appointed governor is one man and in a democracy many." And what if that were true—would the state take any harm of it? But here are some other differences which you yourself bring forward, of "time and succession," to be sure, for "the magistrates in a democ-
20 racy are generally chosen yearly," whereas kings, if they behave themselves well, are perpetual; and in most kingdoms there is a succession in the same family. But let them differ from one another, or not differ, I regard not those trifles: in this they surely agree, that in either a democracy or a king-
25 dom, when the public good requires it, that power which the people had entrusted to another for the public safety may for the same reason, and without violation of right or law, be recalled by the people unto itself.

Roma sic appellata, de qua in institutis, populus Romanus principi et in cum omne imperium suum, et potestatem concessit. Nempe vi Cæsarum coactus, qui honesto legis titulo suam tantummodo violentiam sanxerunt; de quo supra, id
5 quod ipsi jurisconsulti in hunc locum non dissimulant. Quod igitur legitime, et volente populo concessum non est, id revocabile quin sit non dubitamus. Veruntamen rationi maxime consentaneum est, populum Romanum non aliam potestatem transtulisse in principem, atque prius concesserat suis magi-
10 stratibus; id est imperium legitimum et revocabile, non tyrannicum et absurdum; quocirca et consularem, et tribunitiam potestatem Caesares reœpere; dictatoriam nemo post Julium; populum in Circo adorare etiam solebant, ut ex Tacito et Claudiano supra meminimus. Verum ut *multi olim privati*
15 *sc in servitute alteri vendiderunt, sic potest populus universus.* O equitem ergastularium et mangonem, patris etiam tui aeternum opprobrium! quern servitutis tarn foedum procuratorem ac lenonem publicum etiam servitia infima cujusvis catastae detestari atque conspuere deberent! Sane si po-
20 pulus hunc in jnodum se regibus mancipasset, possent et reges eundem populum alteri cuivis domino mancipare, aut pretio addicere; et tamen constat regem ne patrimonium quidem coronae posse alienare. Qui igitur coronæ, quod aiunt, et patri-

"According to the Lex Regia, however, or royal law, so called by the Romans, which is treated in the Institutes, the people of Rome granted all their power and authority to and for the chief of state." certainly—upon compulsion by the
5 Caesars, who under the honorable pretence of law ratified what was merely their own violence. But of this we have spoken before; and their own lawyers, commenting upon this passage in the Institutes, do not disguise the fact. Doubtless therefore what was not granted by right law or by true con-
10 sent of the people is revocable. But most reasonable it is to suppose that the people of Rome transferred no other power to the prince than they had before granted to their own magistrates, that is a power to govern according to law, and a power revocable, not unreasonable or tyrannical. Hence it was that
15 the Caesars took over the powers of the Consuls, and of the Tribunes of the People, but after Julius not one pretended to those of a Dictator; in the Circus they used even to adore the people, as I mentioned before, quoting Tacitus and Claudian.

But "as heretofore many a private person has sold himself
20 into slavery to another, so may a whole nation." Jailbird knight from the slaves' prison-house! Slave dealer thyself! Everlasting reproach even to thy native country! The most degraded band of slaves exposed for sale at the block ought to abhor and spit upon so foul a slave-procurer, such a public
25 pander! certainly if a people had so enslaved themselves to kings, then might kings turn them over to any other master you like, or put them up for sale; and yet certain it is that kings cannot so much as alienate the demesnes of the crown. He then who holds as a grant from the people only the use and

monii regii usum fructum solum a populo concessum habet, is populi ipsius maniceps erit? Non si pertusis auribus utrisque perforatus eques, non si gypsatis pedibus prostares, tarn esses omnium servorum vilissimus, quam nunc es, hujus tarn pu-
5 dendae author sentential Perge poenas tuorum scelerum in-
vitus, quod nunc facis, de temetipso sumere. Multa postremo de jure belli balbutis, quæ hie locum non habent; nam neque Carolus nos bello vicit; et majores ejus, tametsi maxime vicissent, isti tamen juri sarpius renuntiaverant; nee vero tarn un-
10 quam victi fuimus, ut nos in eorum nomen, illi in nostras leges non vicissim jurarent; quas cum Carolus insigniter violasset, vel olim victorem, vel nunc regem perjurum prius ab ipso laessiti armis debellavimus: ex tua autem sententia *quod armis quaritur, transit in ejus dominium qui acquisivit*. Sis
15 itaque deinceps hac in parte quam voles verbosus, sis quod in Solino dudum fuisti, exercitator Plinianus, blateronum omnium verbosissimus, quicquid exinde argutaris, quicquid turbas, quicquid rabbinicaris, quicquid rauces ad finem usque hujus capitis, id totum non jam pro rege devicto, sed pro nobis
20 divina ope victoribus contra regem desudare te scias.

enjoyment of the crown (as the phrase is) and of the royal demesne, shall he be owner, as if by purchase, of the people itself? Though you stood forward, a riddled knight with both ears bored and gypsum-whitened feet, exposed for sale, you
5 would not be so much the most contemptible of slaves as now you are, being the author of such a shameful doctrine.

Go on and punish yourself against your will for your rogueries, as now you do. Toward the last you stammer out quantities of things about the right of war and conquest,
10 which have no place here. For on the one hand never did Charles conquer us (and for his ancestors, though it were never so much granted that they did, yet have they again and again renounced their title as conquerors), nor on the other hand were we ever so conquered but that as we swore
15 allegiance to them, so they swore to maintain our laws. When Charles had notoriously violated these, and had first provoked us, we subdued him by force, take him in what capacity you will, as formerly king conqueror or as now king perjurer. But according to your own opinion, "Whatever is
20 acquired by war becomes the property of him that has acquired it." And so in this your argument begin again and be as wordy as you will, be what you were not long ago upon Solinus, a Plinian carping controversialist, of all babblers the wordiest:—whatever you chatter next, whatever uproar you
25 make, whatever you quote from the rabbins, however you shout yourself hoarse even to the end of this chapter, be assured that in the sweat of your brow you have been doing it all, not for the conquered king, but for us, by God's help his conquerors.

CAPUT VII.

PROPTER duo incommoda sane maxima, et pro tuo pondere gravissima, potestatem populi esse regia majorem proximo capite negasti: quippe, si concederes, quærendum regi aliud nomen esset, translato in populum
5 regis vocabulo; et partitiones quædam politicae conturbarentur: quorum alterum vocabularii dispendium foret; alterum, tuorum Crux politicorum. Ad ea sic à nobis responsum est, ut primum salutis et libertatis nostrae, deinde etiam nomenclature tuæ et politice habitæ nonnulla ratio esset. Nunc *aliis*
10 *rationibus evinendum esse ai's, regem a sibi subjectis judicari non posse, quarum hæc erit maxime potens et valida, quod rex parem in suo regno non habeat.* Quid ais? non habet rex in suo regno parem? quid ergo illi duodecim vetustissimi Franciæ Pares? an Turpini fabulæ sunt et nugæ? an frustra et
15 ad ludibrium sic nominati? Cave istam viris Galliæ Principibus contumeliam dixeris. An quia inter se pares? quasi vero nobilitatis totius Gallicæ duodecim tantum inter se pares esse; aut dicendos idcirco Francis Pares existimandum sit. Quod nisi revera sint regis Franciæ Pares, propterea quod cum eo

CHAPTER VII.

TO avoid two great inconveniencæs, and, considering your own weight, very weighty ones indeed, you denied in the foregoing chapter that the people's power was greater than the king's; for if you granted that, 5 then kings must look about for some other name, the appellation "king" being turned over to the people, and certain classifications in your system of politics would be confounded. The first of these consequencæs would spoil your dictionary, and the second be the death of your Politics. To these I have 10 answered in such wise that a certain consideration might be given first to our own safety and liberty, and after even to your terminology and Politics! Now, say you, " 'Tis to be proved by other arguments that a king cannot be judged by his own subjects; of which arguments this shall be the most 15 powerful and most convincing, that a king hath no peer in his kingdom." What? A king hath no peer in his kingdom? What then is the meaning of those old Twelve Peers of France? Are they fables and trumpery stuff of Turpin's invention? Are they called so in vain and in mockery? Have 20 a care how you insult those Princes and Paladins of France! Or is it because they are equal among themselves? As if, forsooth, it were thinkable that of the whole French nobility only twelve were each other's peers, or that this were a reason for calling them Peers of *France!* Nay, if they are not in very 25 truth the Peers of the *King* of France, and this because with him they govern the State by equal right and by conference

rempub. pari jure atque consilio administrent, vide ne in Franciae regno potius quàm in nostra repub. quod unicum tua interest, glossario illudatur. Age vero, fac planum, non esse regi in regno suo parem. *Quia, inquis, populus Romanus*
5 *post reges exactos, duos constituit Consuls, non unum; ut si unus peccaret, coeræri a collega posset. Vix fingi quicquam potuit ineptius: cur igitur unus duntaxat Consulum fasces apud se habuit, non uterque, ad alterutrum coerendum alter datus erat? quid si etiam uterque contra repub. conjurasset,*
10 *an meliore loco res fuisset, quam si collegam alteri nullum dedissent? Constat autem et ambos Consules et Magistratus omnes obtemperare Senatui semper debuisse, quoties id e repub. esse, patribus et plebi visum est. Hujus rei Marcum Tullium in oratione pro Sestio locupletissimum testem habeo:*
15 *a quo simul brevissimam Romanae civitatis descriptionem accipe; quam is et sapientissime constitutam, et omnes bonos cives nosse earn oportere dicebat, quod idem et nos dicimus. Majores nostri cum regum potestatem non tulissent, ita magistratus annuos creaverunt, ut consilium Senatus reipub. præ-*
20 *ponerent sempiternum: deligerentur autem in id consilium ab universo populo; aditusque in ilium summum ordinem*

with him as his equals—look to it lest the dictionary, which is the only thing you are concerned for, be more mocked in the Kingdom of France than in the Commonwealth of England!

But go to, let us hear your demonstration that a king has no
5 peer in his own kingdom. "Because," you say, "the people of Rome, when they had banished their kings, appointed not one, but two Consuls, that if one of them should transgress, he might be checked by his colleague." A sillier argument could hardly have been invented: how came it to pass then
10 that but one of the Consuls kept the Fasces, and not both, if each had been appointed to check the other? And what if both had conspired against the commonwealth, would the case have been better than if the Romans had not given one Consul a colleague? What is certain, however, is that the
15 Consuls both, and all other magistrates, were bound to obey the Senate, whenever the Senate and the people decided that the interest of the commonwealth so required. For this I have abundant authority in Marcus Tullius's oration for Sestius. Listen at the same time to his concise account of the Roman
20 constitution, which, he always said, was "very wisely framed," and that it behooved all good citizens to be well acquainted with it. And so say I.

"Our ancestors, when they had thrown off the power of
25 the kings, created offices to last one year, but in such wise that over the commonwealth they set the deliberative assembly of the Senate to last forever; that members, however, were to be elected into this assembly by the people as a whole; and that entrance into that exalted body should stand open to the in-

omnium civium Industrie ac virtuti pateret: Senatū reipub. custodem, præsidem, propugnatorem collocaverunt: Hujus ordinis auctoritate uti magistrates, et quasi ministros gravissimi consilii esse voluerunt. Exemplo illustri esse poterunt

5 Decemviri; qui cum potestate consulari, et summa præditi essent, eos tamen omnes simul, etiam renitentes, patrum auctoritas in ordinem coëgit; Consules etiam nonnullos, antequam magistratum deposuerant, hostes judicatos et contra eos sumpta arma esse legimus: hostilia enim facientem, esse con-

10 sulem nemo putabat. Sic bellum contra Antonium Consulem Senatus auctoritate est gestum: in quo victus poenas capitis dedisset, nisi Octavianus Caesar regnum affectans evertendae reipub. consilium cum eo iniisset. Jam quod *hoc proprium esse ai's Majestatis regalis, ut inferium penes unicum sit, haud*

15 minus lubricum est, et a te quidem ipso statim refellitur: *Judices, enim Hebræcorum et singuli, et toto vite spatio imperium obtinebant; Scriptura quoque reges eos vocat; et tamen a Synedrio magno judicabantur. Ita fit, dum dixisse omnia vis videri, ut nihil fere nisi pugnancia loquaris. quæro*

20 deinde qualem tu formam regiminis esse dicas, cum Romanum imperium duo simul tresve imperatores habuerunt; an

dustry and worth of all citizens. They stationed the Senate as the guardian, protector, and champion of the State. This body's authority it was that they would have the magistrates employ, and would have them be, as it were, servants of this
5 most weighty assembly."

The Decemvirs may serve as a shining example: though they were invested with the power of Consuls, and were the chief magistrates, yet the authority of the Senate reduced them all together and at once to order, against their strug-
10 gles. Nay, we read that some Consuls, before they laid down their office, had been declared public enemies, and arms taken up against them; for in those days no man accounted him a Consul who carried on open war against his country. So, by authority of the Senate, war was waged against Antony,
15 though a Consul; in which being worsted he would have been put to death, but that Octavianus Caesar, grasping after empire, joined with him in a conspiracy to subvert the commonwealth.

Your assertion that "it is a property peculiar to kingly
20 majesty that the power resides in a single person" is not less slippery, and is at once contradicted by yourself. "The Hebrew judges," you say, "ruled as long as they lived, and there was but one of them at a time: the Scripture also calls them kings; and yet they were accountable to the Sanhedrim." So
25 it happens that while wishing to be thought to have said all that can be said, you say hardly anything but contradictions. Then I ask what kind of government you call it when sometimes two, sometimes three emperors at once held the Roman

imperatores tibi, id est reges, an optimates, an triumviri videntur fuisse? An vero dices Romanum imperium sub Antoino et Vero, sub Diocletiano et Maximiano, sub Constantino et Licinio, non unum imperium fuisse? Jam ista tua
 5 *statuum tria genera* tuis ipsius argutiis periclitantur, si reges isti non fuere: si fuere, non est ergo proprium imperii regii, ut penes unicum sit. *Alter*, inquis, *horum si delinquat, potest alter de eo rejerre ad populum vcl ad senatum, ut accusetur et condcmnetur*. Annon ergo judicat vel populus vel Senatus ad
 10 quos alter ille refert? Si quid igitur ipse tribuis tibi, collega opus non erat ad judicandum collegam. Heu te defensorem, nisi execrabilis potius esses, plane miserandum! undiquaque ictibus adeò opportunum, ut si forte per lusum destinare quis vellet, quovis te loco punctim ferire, vix esse credo ubi temere
 15 possit aberrare. *Ridiculum* esse statuis, *regem in se judicæs dare velle a quibus capite damnaretur*. Atqui ego non ridiculum sed optimum tibi oppono imperatorem Trajanum; qui praefectum prætorio Saburanum, cum ei insigne potestatis, uti mos erat, pugionem daret, crebro sic monuit. *Accipe hunc*
 20 *gladium pro me, si recte agam; sin aliter, in me magis, qubd moderatorem omnium vel errare minus fas sit*. Hæc Dion et Aurelius Victor. Vides ut judicem in se statuerit imperator

Empire ? Do you reckon them to have been emperors, that is, kings, or members of an aristocracy, or a triumvirate ? Or will you say that the Roman Empire under Antoninus and Verus, under Diocletian and Maximian, under Constantine
5 and Licinius, was not one empire ? If these were not kings, your "three forms of government" are endangered by your own cleverness; if they were kings, then it is not an essential property of royal power to reside in a single person. "If one of these offend," say you, "then may the other report upon
10 him to the people, or to the Senate, that he may be accused and condemned." And is it not an act of judging that is performed by the Senate and the people, to whom that second colleague reports ? So that if you give any weight to your own statement, there was no need of a second colleague to judge
15 the first. Alas, what a defender!—really to be pitied if you were not rather to be cursed! You lie every way so open to blows that if one were minded for sport's sake to thrust at any part of you, he could hardly miss, were his aim never so ill.

You call it "ridiculous that a king should be supposed
20 willing to appoint judges empowered to condemn him to death." But against you I cite the nowise ridiculous but most excellent Emperor Trajan, who when, as the custom was, he delivered to Saburanus, Captain of the Praetorian Guard, the dagger which was the badge of his office, frequently thus ad-
25 monished him: "Take this sword, and use it for me, if I do as I ought; if otherwise, against me; because for the governor and guide of all to go astray is especially unlawful." This Dion and Aurelius Victor say of him. You see here that an admirable

egregius quamvis non parem. Hoc idem Tiberius per simulationem et vaniloquentiam fortasse dixisset; Trajanum autem virum optimum et sanctissimum non id ex animo dixisse quod verum, quod jus et fas esse sentiebat, scœlestus penè sit qui arbitretur. Quanto justius ergo Senatui, cum viribus superior potuerit non parere, plane ex officii ratione paruit; et jure superiorem est fassus. De quo Plinius in Panegyrico: *Senatus ut suscipere quartum Consulatum et rogavit et jussit; imperil hoc verbum, non adulationis esse, obsequio tuo crede:* et paulò post, *hæc nempe intentio tua ut libertatem revoæes ac reducas.* Quod Trajanus de se, idem Senatus de Trajano sensit, sudmque authoritatem revera esse supremam; nam qui imperatorem jubere potuit, potuit eundem et judicare. Sic Marcus Aurelius imperator, cum præfectus Syriæ Cassius regnum ei eripere conaretur, obtulit se in judicium vel Senatui vel Populo Romano; paratus regno cedere, siquidem iis ita videretur. Jam verò quis rectius aut melius de jure regio existimare et statuere queat, quam ex ore ipso regum optimorum? Profectò jure naturali rex quisque bonus vel senatum vel populum habet sibi semper et parem et superiorem: Tyrannus autem cum natura infimus omnium sit, nemo non illi par atque superior existimandus est, quicumque viribus plus valet.

emperor appointed one, though not his peer, to be his judge. Tiberius perhaps might have said such words as these out of vanity and hypocrisy; but it is almost a crime to imagine that Trajan, a man most virtuous and blameless, did not speak in
5 all sincerity what he thought true and right and just. Superior to the Senate in power, he might have refused them obedience; how much the more righteous was it that he actually did obey them purely out of consideration for his duty, and acknowledge that they were by law set above him. Pliny tells
10 us in his Panegyric: "The Senate both desired and commanded you to be Consul a fourth time; this, you may trust your own submissiveness, is no word of flattery, but of command"; and a little after: "What you strive for is this,—namely, to recall and restore our liberty." And what Trajan
15 thought of himself, the Senate thought of Trajan, and were of opinion that their authority was indeed supreme, for they who might command their emperor might judge him. So the emperor Marcus Aurelius, when Cassius governor of Syria endeavored to get the empire from him, submitted himself
20 to the judgment of either the Senate or the Roman people, and declared himself ready to lay down the government if they would have it so. How indeed could anyone appraise and determine the right of kings better or more truly than out of the very mouths of the best kings ?
25 Indeed by the law of nature every good king always accounts the senate or the people not only his peers but his betters. But a tyrant being by nature inferior to all men, whoever is stronger than he ought to be accounted equal and superior

Quemadmodum enim è vi olim ad leges duæ natura deven-
tum est, ita, ubi leges pro nihilo habentur, necessario, eadem
etiam duæ, ad vim est redeundum. *Hoc sentire*, inquit Cicerò
pro Sestio, *prudentiæ est; facere, fortitudinis; et sentire verb*
5 *et facere, perfectæ cumulatesque virtutis*. Maneat hoc igitur
in natura, nullis parasitorum artibus concutiendum, rege sive
bono, sive malo, vel senatum vel populum esse superiorem.
Quod et ipse confiteris, cum potestatem regiam a populo in
regem transiisse dicis. Quam enim regi potestatem dedit, earn
10 natura, ac virtute quadam, vel, ut ita dicam, virtualiter, etiam
cum alteri dederit, tamen in se habet: Etenim quæ causæ na-
turales isto modo per eminentiam quandam quidvis efficiunt,
plus semper suæ retinent virtutis quam impertiunt; nee im-
pertiendo se exhauriunt. Vides, quo propius ad naturam acce-
15 dimus, eò evidentius potestatem populi supra regiam eminere.
Illud etiam constat, populum, modo id ei liberum sit, potesta-
tem regi suam simpliciter et mancipio nunquam dare, neque
natura posse dare; sed tanturn salutis et libertatis publicæ
causâ, quam cum rex procurare destiterit, intelligitur popu-
20 lum nihil dedisse; quia certo fini tantummodò dedit, monente

to him. For even as nature of old taught men from force and violence to betake themselves to law, so wherever the law is set at naught, the same dictate of nature must necessarily prompt us to betake ourselves to force again. "To be convinced of this," says Cicero *pro Sestio*, "is the part of wisdom; to practice it, the part of courage; but both to think and do it too belongs to manly excellence accomplished in full measure." Let this stand then as a settled maxim of the law of nature, never to be shaken by any tricks or sleights of kings' toadies, that the senate or the people are superior to kings good or bad. This is what yourself do in effect confess, when you tell us that the authority of kings was derived from the people. For that power which they gave the king, they do yet, by nature and a sort of virtue, or, as I may say, *virtually*, even though they have given it to the other party, hold in themselves; for whatever natural causes produce any effect in such outstanding degree still retain more of their own virtue than they impart; nor do they, by imparting to others, exhaust themselves. You see, the closer we approach nature, the more evidently does the people's power stand out above that of the king.

And this is likewise certain, that the people, so the choice be but left free to them, never grant their power to a king in absolute and unconditional ownership, nor by nature can do so; but only for the public safety and liberty, which when the king ceases to take care of, then it is understood that the people have given him nothing at all: for, being warned by nature herself, they gave it him for a certain purpose only; so that if

ipsa natura; quern finem si neque natura, neque populus assequitur, non erit magis ratum quod dedit, quam pactum quodvis aut foedus irritum. His rationibus firmissime probatur superiorem rege esse populum; unde argumentum hoc tuum
5 *maximè potens et validum, non posse regem judicari, quia parem in suo regno non habet, nee superiorem*, diluitur. Id enim assumis quod nullo modo concedimus. *In populari statu*, inquis, *Magistrates a populo positus ab eodem ob eumen plecti potest; In statu Aristocratico optimates, ab us quos*
10 *habent collegas; sed pro monstro est, ut rex in regno suo cogatur causam capituli dicere*. Quid nunc aliud concludis quam miserimos esse omnium et stultissimos, qui regem sibi constituunt? Sed quamobrem, quæso, non poterit populus tam regem punire reum, quam popularem Magistratum, aut opti-
15 mates? An putas omnes populos qui sub regibus vivunt, amore servitutis usque eo deperisse, ut, liberi cum essent, servire maluerint, seque omnes, seque totos in unius dominium viri saepe mali, saepe stulti ita tradere, ut contra dominum, si sors ferat, immanissimum, nullum in legibus, nullum
20 in natura ipsa presidium salutis, aut perfrugium sibi reliquerint? cur ergo regibus primo regnum ineuntibus condiciones ferunt, cur leges etiam dant regnandi, an ut sperni se eò magis

neither nature nor the people can attain this, then their gift or grant will be no more valid than any other void covenant or agreement. These reasons establish unshakably the people's superiority to the king; and so your "most powerful and convincing argument that a king cannot be judged by his people, because in his kingdom he has no peer or superior" melts away. For you take for granted that which we do not grant by any means.

"In a democracy," you say, "the magistrates, being appointed by the people, may likewise be punished by the people for crime; in an aristocracy the nobles may be punished by their colleagues; but it is monstrous that a king in his own kingdom should be forced to plead for his life." What can you conclude but that they who set up a king over them are the most wretched and foolish of mankind? But pray what is the reason why the people may not punish a guilty king as well as a popularly appointed magistracy or the nobility? Do you think that all peoples who live under kings were so desperately in love with slavery that when they were free they chose vassalage, and to put themselves all and entirely under the despotism of one man—often an evil man, often a fool—and all this in such wise that against a most outrageous tyrant, if such fall to their lot, they have not left themselves in the laws or in nature herself any protection whatever for their safety, or asylum for themselves? Why then do they tender conditions to their kings when these first come to the throne, and even prescribe laws for them to govern by? Is it that they may suffer themselves to be the more trampled upon and

atque irrideri paterentur ? adeone populum universum se abjicere, se deserere, sibi deesse, spem omnem in uno homine, eoque fere vanissimo, collocare ? cur item jurant reges nihil se contra legem facturos ? ut discant nempe miseri mortales suo

5 maximo malo, solis licere regibus impunè pejerare. Id quod hæc tua nefanda consecraria demonstrant. *Si rex qui eligitur, aliqua vel cum sacramento promiserit, qua nisi promississet, jortasse nee sumptus esset, si stare nolit conventis, h populo judicari non potest. Immb si subditis suis juraverit in elec-*

10 *tione, se secundum leges regni justitiam administraturum, et nisi id facial, eos sacramento fidelitatis fore solutos, ct facto ipso abiturum esse potestate, h Deo non ab hominibus pæna in jallentem exposænda est.* Descripsi Hæc, non ob elegantiam, sunt enim incultissima, nee quod amplius refutationis

15 indigeant, etenim ipsa se refutant, se explodunt, se damnant apertissima falsitate sua, atque turpitudine; sed eò feci, ut ob merita tua egregia commendarem te regibus: qui inter officia aulae tarn multa aliquem dignitatis locum, aut munus idoneum tibi prospiciant: cum enim alii sint a rationibus, alii a

20 poculis, alii a ferculis, alii a voluptatibus, tu iis commodissime sanè eris a perjuriis; tu rex non elegantiae, ut Petronius ille,

laughed to scorn? Would a whole people ever so vilify themselves, so forsake their own interest, and fail their own cause, as to place all their hopes in one man, usually a most empty insubstantial one? Why, likewise, do kings swear an oath
5 not to act anything contrary to law? In order, of course, that wretched mortals may learn to their deep sorrow that only kings may perjure themselves with impunity! This is the plain import of your wicked conclusions: "If a king that is elected promise even upon oath any thing which if he had not
10 promised perhaps they would not have chosen him, yet if he refuse to abide by the agreement he cannot be judged by the people. Nay, though at his election he have sworn to his subjects that he will administer justice according to the laws of the realm, and that if he do not they shall be discharged of their
15 oath of allegiance and he shall *ipso facto* abdicate, yet if he break his oath it is God and not man that must exact the penalty." I have transcribed these lines, not for their elegance, for they are barbarously expressed, nor because I think there needs any additional answer to them, for they answer them-
20 selves—they explode and damn themselves—by their barefaced falsehood and loathsomeness, but to recommend you to kings for your distinguished merits, in order that among so many places as there are at court they may procure for you some preferment or office that may be fit for you. Some are
25 Chancellors of the Exchequer, some are cup-bearers, some seneschals and stewards, some Masters of the Revels: you will most fittingly be their Master of the Perjuries. You shall not be, like the famous Petronius, Master of the Royal Lit-

nam incitus minium es, sed perfidiæ summus arbiter eris. Verum ut summam in te stultitiam summa improbitate conjunctam esse omnes fateantur, expendamus paulo accuratius praeclara ilia, quæ proxime affirmasti: **Rex**, inquis, *etsi sub-*
5 *ditis juraverit in electione, se secundum leges regnaturum, et ni faciat, eos sacramento fidelitatis solutos fore, et se facto ipso abiturum potestac*, abdicari tamen aut puniri ab iis non poterit Qui minus, quæso, rex quam popularis magistrates? quia in eo regimine populus non omnem transfundit potesta-
10 tern suam ad magistratum. An hie igitur in regem, cui regnum in se non diutius tradunt, quam id bene gesserit? Tam itaque rex juratus in leges, reus abjici aut puniri poterit, quam popularis magistrates. Nam argumento illo Pancratico omnis in regem translate potestatis, amplius uti non potes, quod te
15 ipse machinis imprudens arietasti. Cognoscite nunc *aliam potentissimam et invictam ejus rationem cur subditi regem judicare nequeant, quia legibus solutus est, quia leges solus rex omnes jert*; quæ cum falsissima esse jam toties probaverim, Hæcetiam invicta tea ratio cum priore ad nihilum recidit.
20 Caeterum rex ob delicta quævis privata, utpote stuprum, adulterium, et similia, si interdum non plectitur, non tam justitià

erary Graces—you are too ignorant for that—but you shall be Lord High Master of the Royal Treacheries.

Yet, that all men may acknowledge how in you extreme folly is joined with extreme knavery, let us weigh a little more
5 carefully those brilliant propositions which you have just asserted. "A king," say you, "though at his election he have sworn to his subjects that he will govern according to law," and that if he do not "they shall be discharged of their oath of allegiance, and he shall *if so facto* abdicate," yet cannot be de-
10 posed or punished by them. Why not a king, pray, as well as a magistrate in a democracy? Because in a democracy the people do not transfer all their power to the magistrate. But do they then vest it all in a king, to whom they convey royal power over themselves for no longer than he uses it well?
15 Therefore a king sworn to observe the laws, may, if he transgress them, be punished and deposed as well as a democratic magistrate. So you can make no more use of your all-powerful argument that the entire power has been transferred to the king, for it is hoist with your own petard.

20 Hear now another "most powerful and invincible reason why subjects" cannot judge their king, viz. "because he is bound by no law, being himself the sole lawgiver." But as I have so often proved this to be utterly false, even this invincible argument of yours, as well as the former, comes to nothing.
25 For the rest, if a king is sometimes left unpunished for personal and private crimes, as fornication, adultery, and the like, this is not because the people feel that he ought not in justice be punished, but because they are long-suffering—

quàm patientia populi id accidit, ne plus turbarum ex morte regis, et rerum mutatione populo eveniat, quàm boni ex uno atque altero vindicate. Ex quo verò omnibus gravis et intolerandus esse incipit, turn quidem, quoquo possunt modo, judicatum vel injudicatum omnes nationes tyrannum occidere fas esse semper credidere. Unde Marcus Tullius in secunda Philippica de Caesaris interfectoribus, *Hi frimi cum gladiis non in regnum appetentem, sed in regnantem impetum jecerunt: quod cum if sum jactum per se prædar um atque divinum est,*

5 *turn est positum ad imitandum.* Quam hujus tu dissimilis! *Homicidium_f adulterium, injuria, non hæc crimina regia sunt, sed privata.* Euge parasite, lenones jam omnes et propudia aulica hac voce demeruisti; O quam lepid[^] simul et parasitaris, et eadem opera lenocinaris! *Rex adulter bene potest*

15 *regnare, et homicida, idedque vitd privari non debet, quia cum vita regno quoque exueretur; at nunquam hoc juit probatum legibus divinis aut humans, ut duplex vindicta de uno emine sumeretur.* Os impurum et infame! eadem ratione ne populares magistratus, ne duplici pœna afficæ-

20 *rentur, ne judex quidem, aut senator flagitiosus poenas capite ullas persolvere debebit; cum vita enim et ipsi suo magistratu privarentur. Ut potestatem, sic majestatem etiam populo adi-*

lest they be more hurt through disturbances occasioned by the king's death and the change of state, than profited by the vindication of individual rights. But when he begins to be injurious and insufferable to everybody, then indeed all
5 nations have believed it lawful to slay the tyrant any how, condemned or uncondemned. Hence Marcus Tullius in his Second Philippic says of those that killed Caesar: "They were the first that ran through with their swords, not a man who affected to be king, but one who was actually settled in the
10 government; which, as it was a glorious and godlike action, so it is set before us for our imitation." How unlike are you to him!

"Murder, adultery, injustice, are not regal and public, but private and personal crimes." Well said, toady! you have
15 obliged all pimps and profligates at court by this expression. How charmingly by a single act do you play at once both parasite and pimp! "A king that is an adulterer or a murderer may yet govern well, and consequently ought not to be put to death, for with his life he must lose his kingdom; and it was
20 never approved by God's laws or man's that for one and the same crime a man was to be punished twice." Shameless disreputable foulmouth! By the same reason the magistrates in a democracy or in an aristocracy ought never to be put to death, for fear of double punishment, nor any corrupt judge
25 or senator, for with their lives they must lose their magistracy too.

As you have endeavored to take all power out of the people's hands, and vest it in the king, so you would all majesty

mere et in regem conferre studes; vicariam si vis et translaticiam, primariam certe non potes, uti nee potestatem. *Crimen, inquis, majestatis non potest committere rex ad versus populum suum; potest autem populus adversus regem.* Et tamen
5 rex propter populum duntaxat rex est, non populus propter regem. Populus igitur universus aut pars major plus semper rege debet posse: negas, et calculos ponis; *plus potest quàm singuli, bini, terni, deni, centeni, milleni, decies milleni.* Esto. *Plus quàm dimidia pars populi.* Non repugno. *Quid si alterius dimidia pars altera accedat, annon adhuc plus poterit?*
10 Minime. Progredere; quid auferis ab acum, peritissime Logista, an progressionem Arithmeticam non calles? Vertit rationes, et *annon rex cum optimatibus plus potestatis habeat,* quærit; iterum nego, Vertumne, si pro optimatibus proceres
15 intelligas; quoniam accidere potest, ut nemo inter eos optimatis nomine sit dignus: fit etiam saepius, ut multo plures de plebe sint, qui virtute et sapientia proceres antecellant; quibus cum pars populi major vel potior accedit, eos universi populi instar esse baud verear dicere. *At si plus quam universi non*
20 *potest, ergo rex erit tantum singulorum, non omnium universim sumptorum;* recte; nisi ipsi voluerint. Rationes jam sub-

too: a delegated transferred majesty if you will, but surely not their original primary majesty, any more than their original primary power. "A king," you say, "cannot commit treason against his people, but a people can against their king." And
5 yet a king is what he is for the people only, not the people for him. Hence I infer that the whole body of the people, or a majority of them, must needs have greater power than the king. This you deny, and begin to cast up accounts. "He has more power than any one, than any two, than any three, than
10 any ten, than any hundred, than any thousand, than any ten thousand." So be it. "More power than half the people." I will not deny that. "Add now half of the other half, will he not have more power than all those?" By no means!

Go on, o skilful logician, why do you take away the counting-board; do you not understand arithmetical progression? He begins to reckon after another manner, and asks "whether the king together with the nobility have not more power"? No, good Master Chapman Chop-and-Change, I deny that too, if by the nobility you mean the Lords only, because it may
20 happen that among them there may be not one man deserving the name of noble: for it often falls out that among the Commons there are many far better and wiser men than among the Lords. When the majority or the better part of the people joins these, I should not scruple to say that they represent and
25 stand for the whole people. "But if the king is not superior in power to all the people together, he is then king but of single persons, not of all taken together." True; no more he is, unless they are content he should be. Now balance your

ducito; comperies te imperite supputando sortem perdidisse. *Dicunt Angli penes populum jus majestatis ex origine et natura residere; hoc verò est omnium statuum eversionem inducere.* Etiamne Aristocratic, et Democratise? Credibile
5 sane narras: quid si etiam Gynaecocratise, sub quo statu ferunt te domi propemodum vapulare, annon bearent te Angli, 0 perpusilli homo animi? sed hoc frustra speraveris; aequissime enim est comparatum, ut qui tyrannidem foris imponere omnibus cupias, ipse domi tux servitutum servias turpissimam, et
10 minime virilem. *Doceamus te oportet*, inquis, *quid nomine populi intelligi velimus.* Permulta sunt, quæ te doceri potius oporteret; nam quæ te propius attingunt, videris ea penitiis nescire, et praeter literulas nihil unquam didicisse, ne percipere quidem potuisse. Hoc tamen scire te putas, nos populi
15 nomine plebem solum intelligere quod *optimatum consessum abrogavimus.* At illud est ipsum quod demonstrat nos populi vocabulo omnes ordinis cujuscunque cives comprehendere; qui unam tantummodo populi curiam supremam stabilivimus, in qua etiam proceres, ut pars populi, non pro sese quidem
20 dem solis, ut antea, sed pro iis municipiis, a quibus electi fuerint, suffragia ferendi legitimum jus habent. Inveheris deinde

accounts, and you will find that by miscasting you have lost your principal.

"The English say that the right of majesty by its origin and its nature resides in the people; this would indeed bring
5 on the overthrow of all states." What, of an aristocracy and of a democracy? But you say well, after all, for what if it should overthrow a gynæcocracy too, under which state, they say, you go near to being beaten at home? Would not the English do you a kindness in that, Master Faint-heart? But
10 there is no hope for that; for it is most justly so ordered that since you would impose tyranny upon all mankind abroad, you yourself should live in a shameful impotent unmanly slavery at home.

"It behooves us English to tell you," you say, "what we
15 mean by the word People." There are a great many things which it would more behoove you to be told; for of things that more immediately concern you, you seem altogether ignorant, and never to have learnt or even been able to understand more than the alphabet. But this you suppose you know,
20 that by the word people we mean the common people only, because we "have abolished the House of Lords." And yet this is the very thing that shows that under the word people we comprehend all our citizens, of what order and degree soever; in that we have established a single supreme Com-
25 mons' House only, in which the lords also have by law the right to vote as a part of the people, not in their own right as they did before, but as representing those constituencies by which they have been chosen.

in plcbcm, *cacam earn et brutam, regendi artem non habere, nilflebc vcntosius, vanius, levius, mobilius*; Conveniunt in te optimiHæcomnia; et de infima quidem plebc sunt etiam vera, de media non item; quo ex numero prudentissimi fere sunt
5 viri, et rerum peritissimi: caeteros hinc luxus et opulentia, inde egestas et inopia i virtute et civilis prudentiae studio ple-
runque avertit. *Plures nunc esse modos asseris regum consti-
tuendorum, qui nihilpopulo debent hoc nomine, et imprimis
illi, qui regnum habent hareditarium.* At verò servae sint istae
10 nationes oportet, et ad servitutem natae, quæ talem agnoscant
dominum, cui se sine assensu suo hacreditate obvenisse cre-
dant: pro civibus cært^, aut ingenuis et liberis haberi non pos-
sunt; nee rempub. habere ullam cæsendae; quinimmo inter
facultates, et possessiones quasi heri sui, et herilis filii nume-
15 randx sunt: nam quod ad jus domini, quid distent ^ servi-
tiis et pecoribus non video. Secundò, *qui armis sibi regnum
fecit, populum, inquis, non potest authorem agnoscere im-
perii prolati vel usurpati.* At nobis non de victore, sed de sub-
acto rege sermo nunc est; quid victor possit, alias disputabi-

Then you inveigh against the common people as being "blind and dull, ignorant of the art of governing"; you say there is "nothing more empty and changeable than they, nothing more fickle and excitable." All which is very true
5 of yourself, and it is true likewise of the rabble, but not of the middle sort, amongst whom the wisest men and most skilful in affairs are generally found; the rest are most commonly diverted, on the one hand by luxury and wealth, on the other by want and poverty, from achieving excellence, and from
10 the study of laws and government.

"There are many ways" now, you say, "by which kings are established, so as not to be beholden to the people at all on that score," and first "those who hold their kingdom by inheritance." But those nations must certainly be slaves, and
15 born to slavery, who acknowledge a lord and master so absolute that they believe themselves to have fallen to his lot by inheritance, without any consent of their own. Surely they cannot be held to be citizens, or freemen, or freeborn, nor are they to be accounted as having a body politic, but must be
20 reckoned among the goods and chattels, estates and properties of their owner and his son and heir; for as to ownership I see no difference betwixt them and slaves or cattle. Secondly, you say: "He that carves out a kingdom with his sword cannot acknowledge the people as the originator of the
25 power he has extended or usurped." But what we are talking about now is not a conquering king, but a conquered king; what a conqueror may do, we will discourse elsewhere; do you keep to your subject.

mus, tu hoc age. Quod autem regi jus patrisfamilias antiquum toties attribuis, ut inde *absolute potestatis in regibus exemplum* petas, dissimillimum id esse jam saepius ostendi: Aristoteles etiam ille quern crepas vel initio politicorum, si
5 legisses, idem te docuisset: ubi ait male cos judicare, qui inter patremfamilias et regem parum interesse existimant; *regnum enim a familia, non numero solum, sed specie differre*. Postquam enim pagi in oppida et urbes crevere, evanuit paulatim jus illud regale familiar, et agnosci desitum est. Hinc scribit
10 Diodorus, lib. I. regna antiquitus dari non regum filiis, sed iis quorum maxima in populum beneficia extiterunt. Et Justinus, *Principio rerum, gentium, nationumque imperium penes reges erat; quos ad jastigium hujus majestatis, non ambitio popularis, sed spectata inter bonos moderatio provehebat*.
15 Unde perspicuum est, in ipso gentium principio, imperium paternum et hreditarium virtuti, et populari statim juri cessisse. Quac origo impcrii regii et ratio et causa maxime naturalis est. Ob earn enim ipsam causam prim& homines in unum convenere, non ut unus omnes insultaret, sed ut quocunque
20 alterum tadente, ne lex deesset, neve judex inter homines, quo tasus aut defendatur aut saltern vindicetur. Disperses

Whereas you repeatedly ascribe to kings the ancient right of the paterfamilias, in order to fetch thence 'a model of the unlimited power of kings,' I have shown already over and over that there is no likeness at all betwixt them. And that
5 very Aristotle whom you keep prating about would have taught you as much even at the beginning of his *Politics*, if you had read it. There he says that they judge amiss who think there is but little difference betwixt a king and the head of a household: "For a kingdom is different from a household,
10 not in number only, but in kind." For when villages grew to be towns and cities, that right of the king as head of the household vanished by degrees, and was recognized no more. Hence Diodorus in his first book says that anciently kingdoms were transmitted not to the former kings' sons, but to those
15 whose services to the people were most eminent. And Justin says: "Originally the government of peoples and races was by kings, who were exalted to that pinnacle of majesty, not by soliciting the people's support, but for a moderation well-regarded among good men."

20 Whence it is manifest that in the very beginning of nations, paternal and hereditary government was soon replaced by personal worth and the people's right. This is the most natural reason and cause, and was the true rise of royal power. For it was for this very reason that at first men entered into
25 societies: not that any one might insult over all the rest, but that in case any should injure another, law might not be wanting, and a judge between man and man, whereby the injured might be protected or at least avenged. When men

olim homines et dispalatos disertus aliquis, et sapiens ad vitam civilem traduxit; tu *hoc maxime consilio*, inquis, *ut in congregates imperium haberet*. Nimbrotum fortasse intelligis, qui tyrannorum primus fuisse dicitur: vel Hæc tua solius malitia
5 est, quæ in illos olim magnos et excelsi animi viros cadere non potuit, tuum solius commentum, à nemine, quod sciam, ante te traditum; cum utilitatem et salutem generis humani, non sua commoda, suumque dominatum respexisse illos primos urbium conditores, antiquorum omnium monumentis pro-
10 ditum sit. Unum præterire non possum, quo tu veluti emblemate quodam exornare credo caetera hujus capitis voluisti: si *consulem*, inquis, *in judicium venire oportuisset, proutquam magistrate abisset, dictator ad hoc creandus juisset*, cum initio dixeris, *ideo collegam ei fuisse datum*. Sic tua semper
15 inter se congruunt, et quid de quaque re dicas, quidve scribas, quam nullius momenti sit, paginis fere singulis declarant. *Sub antiquis regibus Anglo-saxonicis plebem, ai's, ad comitia regni nunquam vocari solitam esse*. Si quis nostrorum hoc affirmasset, possem eum haud multo negotio erroris arguere; tua ista
20 peregrina affirmatione res nostras hallucinante minus mo-

were at first scattered asunder and straying about, some wise and eloquent man brought them over into civil life; "chiefly," say you, "that when he had got them gathered together he might exercise dominion over them." Perhaps you meant this
5 of Nimrod, who is said to have been the first tyrant, or else it is your own wickedness only, which could have no application to those great and high-souled men of yore—a mere fiction of yours, not asserted, as far as I know, by anyone before you. For it is delivered by the memorials of all the
10 ancients that those first founders of cities had in view not any profit or power of their own, but the advantage and safety of mankind.

One thing I cannot pass by, with which I suppose you intended to decorate the rest of this chapter as with some motto
15 in mosaic inlay. "If a Consul," say you, "had been required to come to trial while still in officœ, there must have been a Dictator created for that purpose;" though at the beginning you had said that "for that very purpose the Consul's colleague was provided." Just so your statements always agree
20 with one another, and reveal on almost every page how whatever you say or write upon any subject is of no weight or importance. "Under the ancient Anglo-Saxon kings," you say, "it was never the custom to call the people to the national councils." If any of our own countrymen had asserted such a
25 thing, I could without much trouble have convinced him that he was in error. But I am not so much concerned at this assertion of yours, which wanders about in foreign parts, and wanders in its mind too about our affairs. This in effect is

veor. Et de communi regum jure quae habuisti hsec fere sunt. Reliqua multa, nam et saepissime devius esse soles, praetermitto, vel quae fundamento nituntur nullo, vel quae extra causam posita sunt: Non enim id operam do, ut tibi par esse lo-
5 quacitate videar.

CAPUT VIII.

SI de communi regum jure, Salmasi, quae sentires, ea sine contumelia cujusquam protulisses, quamvis in hac rerum apud Anglos mutatione, tamen, cum libertate scribendi uterere tua, neque erat cur quisquam Anglorum tibi
10 succenseret, neque in asserenda, quam tueris, sentiâ minus effecisses. Nam si hoc et Mosis et Christi præceptum est, *Omnes regibus suis tarn bonis quam malis subjici, sive Hispanos, sive Gallos, sive Italos, sive Germanos, sive Anglos, sive Scotos*, quod supra (p. 127.) affirmabas, quid attinebat te
15 exterum et ignotum jura nostra balbutire, edque velle nobis e cathedra quasi schedulas tuas, et miscellanea pradegere, quae utcunque legibus divinis debere cedere multis antea verbis docueras. Nunc satis constat non tarn tuopte ingenio ad causam regiam adjecisse te animum, quam partim pretio, pro
20 ejus qui te conduxit copia, maximo, partim spe praemii cujus-

all you say of the right of kings in general. The many things that remain—for you much too often digress—I omit: things that either rest on no foundation or are nothing to the purpose; for it is not my design to be thought your equal in
5 talkativeness.

CHAPTER VIII.

IF YOU had published your own opinion, Salmasius, concerning the right of kings in general, without insulting anyone, albeit amid this revolution in England, yet while you did but use your own liberty to write,
10 there was no reason why any Englishman should be displeased with you, nor would you have been less successful in establishing the opinion you maintain. For if it be a positive command both of Moses and of Christ "That all men whatsoever, whether Spaniards, French, Italians, Germans, Eng-
15 lish, or Scots, should be subject to their kings, whether good or bad," as you asserted before (page 127), what business had you, a foreigner, and unknown, to babble about our *laws*, and read us professorial lectures out of them as if they were your own papers and miscellanies, when all the while you had
20 taught us already in a great many words that our laws, be they how they will, ought to give way to the laws of God?

But now it is apparent that you have undertaken the defence of this royal cause not so much out of your own inclination as because you were hired, partly for payment—and a
25 good round payment too, considering your employer's finances,—and partly by hope of some greater reward hereafter;

dam majoris conductum fuisse, ut Anglos vicinorum nemini molestos, rerum tantummodo suarum arbitros libello infami lacerares. Hoc nisi esset, quenqudmne tanta credibile est impudentia esse aut insania, ut longinquus et extraneus immergere se gratis in res nostras, ad partes etiam se adungere non dubitaret? Nam quid tua malum refert, quid rerum Angli inter se gerant? Quid tibi vis, Ole, quid tibi quæris? nihilne domi habes quod ad te pertineat? Utinam eadem haberes quæ habuit ille notissimus in epigrammate Olus; et fortasse habes; 5 dignus profectò es. An uxor tua stimulatix ilia, quæ ut in gratiam exulis Caroli hæc scriberes etiam currentem incitasse fertur, ampliores forte in Anglia professiones, et honoraria nescio quæ, redeunte Carolo, ominata tibi est? At scitote foemina Virque, non esse locum in Anglia neque lupo neque 15 Lupi Domino. Unde mirum non est te toties in molossos nostros tantam rabiem effudisse. Quin redis ad illustres illos in Gallia titulos tuos, et imprimis ad famelicum ilium Lupi dominatum, deinde ad consistorium illud regis Christianissimi sacrum; nimis longo intervallo consiliarius peregrè abes 20 a patria. Verum ilia, quod plane video, neque te desiderat neque consilia tua; ne cum redires quidem paucis abhinc annis, et culinam Cardinalitiam olfacere et sectari cœpisses: Sapit mehercule, sapit, tèque oberrare semivirum Gallum cum

hired, I say, to rend and tear with your disreputable book the English, who trouble none of their neighbors, and meddle with their own matters only. Were it not so, is it credible that any man should be so shameless and so mad as not to hesitate,

5 though he be a stranger far away, to plunge into our affairs for nothing, and even attach himself to a party? What the devil is it to you what the English do amongst themselves? What would you have, *Olus*? what do you mean? Have you no concerns of your own at home? I wish you had the same

10 concerns that the much celebrated *Olus* had in the Epigram; and perhaps so you have; you thoroughly deserve them. Or did that hotspur your wife, who is said to have spurred you—willing horse!—to write all this stuff to please the exiled Charles,—did she bode you some more profitable professor-

15 ship in England, and God knows what fees, at Charles's return? But assure yourselves, *Madame la jemme et Monsieur le mari*, that England has no place for a wolf or for the Seigneur of a wolf. No wonder, then, that you have so often spit so much venom at our English mastiffs! It were better

20 for you to return to those illustrious titles of yours in France: first to that hungerstarved Seigneurie of St. Loup, and next to that *sacre* Council of the Most Christian King; you are too far abroad from your own country for a counsellor. But I see full well that France desires not either you or your counsel,

25 and did not, even when you were back a few years ago, and were beginning to smell out and hunt after a Cardinal's kitchen. She is right, by my troth, she is right, and can willingly allow you, you French capon, with your mankind wife

uxore viro, et refertissimis inaniarum scriniis facile sinit; do-
 nee stipem sive equiti grammatastae, sive illustri Hippocritico
 satis largam alicubi gentium inveneris; si cui fert animus regi
 vel civitati, doctorem erraticum et venalem mercede maximā
 5 liceri. Sed eccum tibi licitatore; vendibilis necne sis, et
 quanti, jam statim videbimus. *Pertendunt*, inquis, *Parricides*,
regni Anglicani statum mixtum esse, non meti regium. Per-
 tendit idem sub Eduardo Sexto Smithus noster, juris consul-
 tus idem bonus, et politicus, quern fuisse parricidam non
 10 dices, ejus libri ferè initio, quern de repub. Anglicana scripsit;
 neque id de nostra solum, sed de omni pene repub. idque ex
 Aristotelis sententia verum esse affirmat; neque aliter ullam
 rempub. stare posse. At eaim quasi piaculum esse crederes
 quicquam dicere sine repugnantiis, ad priores illas et jam tri-
 15 tissimas foede revolveris. *Nullam gentem ai's esse nee juisse*
unquam qua regis appellatione non intellexerit earn potesta-
tem quæ solo Deo minor est, qucsque solum Deum judicem
haberet; et tamen paulo post fateris, nomen regis datum vel
olim fuisse ejusmodi potestatibus et magistratibus qui plenum
 20 *et liberum jus non haberent, sed a populi nutu dependens, ut*
sujetes Carthaginiensium, judices Hebræorum, reges Lace-
dæmoniorum, et postremo Aragonensium. Satisne bellè tibi
 constas? Turn quinque monarchiæ species ex Aristotele re-

and your desks chock-full of emptiness, to wander about, till somewhere in creation you light upon a dole bountiful enough for a grammarian-cavalier or illustrious hippo-critic,—always supposing any king or state has a mind to bid highest for a
5 vagabond pedant that is on sale. But here am I that will bid for you; whether you are a merchantable commodity or not, and what you are worth, we shall see at once.

You say: "The parricides assert that the kingdom of England is of a composite kind, not purely royal." In the time
10 of Edward the Sixth, Sir Thomas Smith, a countryman of ours, a good lawyer and statesman, whom you will not call a parricide, asserts the same thing near the beginning of his book on the commonwealth of England. He states that it is true not of our government only, but of almost all others—this upon
15 the opinion of Aristotle; and that otherwise no government can subsist. But as if you thought it a sin to say anything without unsaying it, you repeat your former threadbare contradictions. You say: "There neither is nor ever was any nation that did not understand by the name of king that
20 power which is inferior to God alone, and which has God for its sole judge." And yet, a little after, you confess that "The name of king was formerly given to such powers and magistrates as had not a full and unlimited right, but one depending upon the people's will," for example "the sufetes of the
25 Carthaginians, the judges of the Hebrews, the kings of the Lacedaemonians," and, lastly, "of Aragon." Isn't this a pretty piece of self-consistency?

Then you muster out of Aristotle five several sorts of

censes, quarum una tantum jus illud obtinuit quod tu regibus commune omnibus esse dicis. De qua haud semel jam dictum est, nullum ejus exemplum vel ab Aristotele allatum, vel usquam extitisse: Quatuor reliquas, et legitimas, et legibus fuisse

5 minores dilucidè ostendit Primum horum erat regnum Læconicum, et maxime quidem ejus sententia regnum, eorum quatuor quæ legitima erant. Secundum erat Barbaricum, hoc solo diuturnum quia legitimum, et volente populo: nolente autem, omnis rex continue non erit rex sed tyrannus, si

10 invito populo regnum retinuerit, eodem teste Aristotele. 1. 5. Idem de tertia regum specie dicendum est, quos ille Æsymnetas vocat, electos a populo, et ad certum plerunque tempus, certèque causas, quales fere apud Romanes fuere Dictatores. Quarta species eorum est, qui Heroicis temporibus regnabant,

15 quibus ob egregia merita regnum ultro a populo delatum erat, sed legitimum tamen; neque verò hi nisi volente populo regnum tenebant, nee alia re magis differre has quatuor regni species è tyrannide ai't, quam quod illic volente, hic invito populo regnetur. Quinta denique regni species, quæ *xa, 'jtpaffdsla*

20 dicitur, et est cum summa potestate, quale tu jus regum omnium esse vis, a philosopho plane damnatur, ut neque utile, neque justum, neque naturale, nisi sit ut populus ferre possit

monarchies, only one of which possessed that right which you say is common to all kings. Concerning this I have said already more than once that no instance of it, either cited by Aristotle or anywhere else, has existed. The other four king-
5 ships, he clearly shows, were limited by laws, and subject to them. The first of these was that of the Lacedaemonians, which of the four limited monarchies did in his opinion best deserve the name of kingship. The second, of a kind foreign to the Greeks, was lasting only in that it was limited, and that
10 the people willingly submitted to it; for according to Aristotle's own opinion in his fifth book, once the people are unwilling, whatever king retains the throne against their will, will instantly be no king, but a tyrant. The same is to be said of his third sort of kings, which he calls Aesymnetes, who
15 were chosen by the people, most commonly for a certain time only, and for certain purposes; such, or nearly such, were the Roman dictators. The fourth is the kind that reigned in the heroic days, upon whom for their extraordinary merits the people of their own accord conferred the government,
20 but yet limited; nor yet did these retain the throne unless the people were willing. And these four sorts of kingship, he says, differ from tyranny in no respect more than in this: that these governments are with the consent of the people, and tyranny against their will. The fifth sort of royal government,
25 finally, called *παρβασιλεία*, and endowed with the supreme power, which you pretend to be the right of all kings, is utterly condemned by the philosopher, as neither profitable nor just nor natural—unless some people should be able to

istiusmodi regnum, iisque deferat qui virtute aliis omnibus longè praducent. Hæc tertio politicorum, cuius obvia sunt. Verum tu, credo, ut vel semel ingeniosus et floridus esse videre, *has quinque monarchies species quinque zonis mundi*
5 *assimilare gestiebas; Inter duo extrema potentiae regalis tres alia species interposite magis temperate videntur, ut inter zonas torridam et frigidam, quæ medici jaent.* Festivum caput! quam pulchras nobis similitudines concinnare semper soles! Tu igitur, quò regnum *absolute potestatis* ipse damnas,
10 *ad zonam frigidam hinc ocyus amolire; quæ post adventum illic tuum plus duplo frigebit: nos interim a te novo Archimede sphaeram illam, quam describis, mirabilem expectamus, in qua dux sint extreme zonae, una torrida, altera frigida, tres mediae temperatae.* *Reges, inquis, Laedæmoniorum in vincula conjici fas erat, morte multari fas non erat.* Quare? an quia damnatum capite Agidem lictores et peregrini milites rei novitate perculsi, regem ducere ad mortem non esse fas existimabant? Et populus quidem Spartanus ejus mortem segre tulit, non quòd rex capitali supplicio affectus fuerit, sed
20 *quod bonus, et popularis, factione divitum iudicio illo circumventus esset.* Sic itaque Plutarchus, *primus rex Agis ab ephoris est morte multatus;* quibus verbis non quid fas, sed quid

endure a government of this kind, and withal should confer it upon such as outshine all others in virtue. These things lie open and accessible to anyone in the third book of the *Politics*.

But you, that for once in your life you might appear witty
 5 and florid, I suppose, pleased yourself by likening "these five
 sorts of monarchy to the five zones" of the world. "Between
 the two extremes of royal power three more temperate kinds
 appear to be interposed, even as those which lie in the midst
 between the torrid and the frigid zones." Pretty wit! what
 10 lovely comparisons you always make us! Away with you,
 doublequick, whither you banish "absolute monarchy," to
 the frigid zone, which after your arrival will be more than
 doubly frigid. Meanwhile we await from you, our modern
 Archimedes, that wondrous globe which you describe, in
 15 which there be two extreme zones, one torrid and the other
 frigid, and three temperate ones between.

"The kings of the Laœdaemonians," you say, "might law-
 fully be imprisoned, but it was not lawful to put them to
 death." Why not? Is it because the officers of justice and
 20 some foreign soldiers, being surprised at the novelty of the
 thing, thought it not lawful to lead King Agis to his execution,
 though condemned to die? Yea, even the Spartan people
 took his death ill, not because it was a king that was con-
 demned to die, but because he was a good man and beloved
 25 by them, and had been hunted to his death by a faction of
 wealthy men. Says Plutarch: "Agis was the first king that
 was put to death by the ephors"; in which words he tells us
 only what actually was done, not what lawfully might be

factum sit, tantummodo narrat. Nam qui regem in jus ducere, vel etiam in vincula possunt, illos non posse eundem supplicio ultimo afficere, puerile est credere. Accingeris jam tandem ad jus regum Anglicorum. *Rex, inquis, in Anglia*
5 *unus semper fuit.* Hoc eo dicis, quia modo dixeras, *rex non est nisi unus sit et unicus.* Quod si ita est, aliquot sane quos credebam Angliae reges fuisse, non erant: Nam ut multos omittam Saxoniorum, qui consortes imperii vel filios vel fratres habuere, constat Henricum Secundum e stirpe Nor-
10 manica cum filio regnâsse. *Ostendant, inquis, aliquod regnum sub unius imperio, cut non potestas absoluta adjuncta fuerit, in quibusdam tamen magis remissa, in aliis magis intenta.* Ostende tu potestatem absolutam remissam, asine; annon absoluta est summa? Quomodo ergo summa et remissa
15 simul erit? quoscunque fateberis reges cum remissa potestate esse, eos non esse cum absoluta facile vincam, inferiores proinde esse populo natura libero, qui et suus ipse legislator est, et potestatem regiam vel intendere, vel remittere potest. Britannia, an tota olim regibus paruerit, incertum: Verisimilius
20 est, prout tempora ferebant, nunc hanc nunc illam reipub. formam adhibuisse. *Hinc Tacitus, Britannii olim regibus parebant,*

done. For it were childish to imagine that they who may lawfully bring a king to trial, and imprison him, may not also lawfully put him to death.

At last you gird yourself up to tackle the law of English
5 kings. "In England," you say, "there was always one king
at a time." This you say because you had said before that
"unless a king be sole in the government, he cannot be a
king." If so, some who I used to think had been kings of
England were not really kings; for—to omit many of our
10 Saxon kings, who had either sons or brothers partners with
them in the government—it is not disputed that King
Henry II, of the Norman stock, reigned jointly with his son.

"Let them show," say you, "any kingdom under the gov-
ernment of a single person who has not absolute power, in
15 some kingdoms, however, more loosened, in others more
tightened." Ass, do you show us any absolute power that is
loosened; is not that power that is absolute the supreme
power? How can it then be both supreme and loosened?
Whatsoever kings you shall acknowledge to be invested with
20 a loosened power, those I will clearly prove to have no abso-
lute power; and consequently to be inferior to a people free
by nature, which, as it is its own lawmaker, can loosen or
tighten the power of the king.

Whether the whole of Britain was anciently governed by
25 kings or no is uncertain; it is most likely that they employed
now one form of government, now another, according to the
exigencies of the time. Whencœ Tacitus says: "The Britons
anciently were under kings; now their chiefs distract them

410 DEFENSIO PRIMA

nunc per principes jactionibus et studiis trahuntur. Descripta a Romanis, quadraginta circiter annos sine regibus fuere: *regnum* itaque *perpetuum*, quod affirmas, antiquitas non fuit; fuisse autem haereditarium praecise nego; quod et regum
5 scies, et mos creandi eorum demonstrat: disertis enim verbis petuntur populi suffragia. Postquam enim rex consuetum juramentum dedit, accedens archiepiscopus ad quatuor partes exstructi suggesti, toties rogat populum universum his verbis, *consentire vultis de habendo ipsum regem?* plane ac si Ro-
10 mano more dixisset, vultis, jubetis hunc regnare? quod opus non foret, si regnum jure esset haereditarium; verum apud reges usurpatio pro jure saepissime obtinet. Tu Caroli bello toties victi jus regium jure belli fundare adniteris: Gulielmus scilicet cognomento *conquistor* nos subjugavit. At sciunt qui
15 in nostra historia peregrini non sunt, Anglorum opes uno illo praelio Hastingsensi non adeo attritas fuisse, quin bellum facite instaurare potuissent. Sed regem accipere, quam victorem et tyrannum pati malebant. Dant itaque jusjurandum Gulielmo, se fidem ei servaturos; dat pariter Gulielmus juramentum
20 illis, admotus altari, se omnia, quae par est bonum regem, iis esse vicissim praestitutum. Cum falleret fidem, et rursus Angli arma caperent, diffisus ipse suis viribus juravit denuo, tactis

into parties and factions." When the Romans left them, they were about forty years without kings; that "perpetual kingship" which you allege had therefore no existence in ancient times. I positively assert that their kingship was not hereditary, which is evident both from the succession of their kings, and from their way of creating them; for the approval of the people is asked in express words. When the king has taken the accustomed oath, the archbishop, stepping to the four sides of the platform erected for the purpose, asks the body of the people four several times in these words, "Will ye consent to have this man your king?" Just as if he said, Roman fashion, "Do ye desire, do ye command, this man to reign?" Which would be needless if the kingdom were by law hereditary.

But with kings usurpation passes very frequently for law and right. You strive to ground Charles's royal right, who was so often conquered himself, upon the right of conquest. William, surnamed "the Conqueror," forsooth, subdued us. But they who are not strangers to our history know full well that the strength of the English nation was not so broken in that one fight at Hastings but that they might easily have renewed the war. Yet they chose rather to accept a king than to endure a conqueror and a tyrant: they swear therefore to William to be his liegemen, and he likewise swears to them at the altar to conduct himself towards them in all respects as a good king ought. When he broke his word, and the English betook themselves again to their arms, William, mistrusting his strength, renewed upon the Gospels his oath to keep the

Evangeliiis, antiquas se leges Angliae observaturum. Si postea igitur Anglos miserè afflixit, non id jure belli, sed jure perjurii fecit. cœrtum est praeterea jam multis ab hinc seculis victos et victores in unam gentem coaluisse; ut jus illud belli, 5 si quod unquam fuit, antiquari jam diu necesse sit. Ipsius verba morientis quæ ex libro Cadomensi fide dignissimo descripta reddimus, omnem dubitationem tollunt. *Neminem, inquit, Anglici regni constituo hæredem.* Qua vocè jus illud belli, simiilque illud haereditarium, cum ipso mortuo Guli- 10 elmo conclamatum atque sepultum est. Video nunc aliquam te in aula dignitatem, quod pradixi fore, esse adeptum, summus nimirum aulicae astutiae quæstor regius et procurator es factus. Unde hoc quod sequitur videris ex officio scribere, *Vir magnificæ. Siquis pccdeæssorum regum jactionibus pro-* 15 *is ærum, vd seditionibus plebis coactus, aliquid de suo jure remiserit, id non potest sucæssor! obesse, quin id iterum sibi vindiciæt.* Rectè mones: itaque si quo tempore majores nostri aliquid de jure suo per ignaviam amisere, an id oberit nobis, eorum posteris? Pro se illi quidem servitutem spondere, si 20 vellent, pro nobis cœrte non poterant; quibus idem semper jus erit nosmet liberandi, quod illis erat in servitutem se cuilibet tradendi. *Miraris quid jaciæt, ut rex Britannia hodie*

ancient laws of England. Therefore, if after that he miserably oppressed the English, he did it not by right of conquest, but by right of perjury. Besides, it is certain that many ages ago the conquerors and conquered coalesced into one and the
 5 same people; so that that right of conquest, if any such there ever were, must needs have been long ago barred by antiquity. His own words at his death, which I report as transcribed from the Caen Book—a thoroughly trustworthy document—remove all doubt. "I appoint no man," says he, "heir of the
 10 kingdom of England." By which words that right of conquest and that right of inheritance were at once and together officially bewailed as dead, and buried together with the dead Conqueror.

I see now that you have got a place at court, as I foretold:
 15 you are become High Treasurer and Steward of Court Craft; and the following passage you seem to write as if by virtue of your office, magnificent Sir. "If any among preceding kings, being thereunto compelled by factions of great men or seditions among the common people, have remitted somewhat of
 10 his right, that cannot hinder a successor from reclaiming it unto himself." A proper reminder! If therefore at any time our ancestors have through neglect lost any thing that was their right, will that hinder us their posterity? If they were willing to promise for themselves to be slaves, they could
 5 make no such promise for us, who shall always retain the same right of setting ourselves free that they had of enslaving themselves to any whomsoever.

You wonder "how it comes to pass that a king of Great

*debeat haberi pro magistrate tantum regni, qui autem alia regna in Christianitate obtinent, plend et liberâ potestate pol-
 leant. De Scotia remitto te ad Buchananum; de Gallia etiam
 tua, ubi hospes esse videris, ad Francogalliam Hotomani, et
 5 Girardum Franciæ Historicum; de caeteris ad alios, quorum
 nulli quod sciam Independentes erant: ex quibus de jure regio
 longe alia poteras didicisse, quam quæ docēs. Cum jure belli
 tyrannidem regibus Angliæ asserere nequiveris, facis jam
 periculum in jure parasitico. Edicunt reges se regnare *Dei*
 10 *gratid*: quid si Deos se esse edixissent? te credo flaminem facile
 erant habituri; sic Pontifex Cantuariensis *Dei providentid*
 archiepiscopari prae se tulit. Tune ista fatuitate Papam non vis
 esse regem in Ecclesia, ut regem constituere plusquam Papam
 in repub. possis? At in regni statutis appellatur *Rex Dominus*
 15 *noster*. Mirus tu quidem statutorum nostrorum nomenclator
 repente evasisti; nescis tamen multos dici dominos qui non
 sunt; nescis quam iniquum sit ex titulis honorariis, ne dicam
 adulatoriis, de jure et veritate rerum statuere. Eodem refer
 quod *Parlamentum regis* dicitur: nam et frænum regis voca-*

Britain must nowadays be looked upon as merely a magistrate of the kingdom, whereas they who govern other kingdoms in Christendom wield plenary and unlimited authority." For Scotland I refer you to Buchanan; for your native
 5 France (where you seem a stranger), to Hotman's *Franco-Gallia* and Gerard the historian of France: for the rest, to other authors, of whom none as far as I know were Independents: out of whom you might have learned concerning the right of kings a quite other lesson than what you teach.

10 Not being able to claim for the kings of England a tyrannical power by right of conquest, you now make trial by right of toadyism. Kings proclaim openly, you say, that they reign "by the Grace of God." What of it? What if they were to proclaim that they *are* Gods? They might, I believe, easily
 15 get you for a priest! So the Pontiff of Canterbury made public pretence to archbishop it "by the Providence of God." Are you such a fool that you refuse to acknowledge the Pope as king in the Church in order to establish the king a more than Pope in the State? But in the statutes of the realm, you say,
 20 the king is called "our Lord the king." Flunkey, doorkeeper slave at the king's levee, you are turned out on a sudden marvelous skilled in the names in our statutes that you call out to your royal owner! But what you know not is that many are called lords who are not lords; you know not how unfair it
 25 is to determine of the right and truth of things from titles of honor, not to say of flattery. Make the same inference from the Parliament's being called "the King's Parliament"; for it is called the king's bridle too, and the king is not on that

tur; adeoque non magis rex Parlamenti est dominus, quam equus est sui dominus fræni. At *cur non regis Parliamentum, cum ab eo convocetur?* Dicam tibi; quia convocatur etiam senatus a Consule, neque propterea dominus illius concilii
 5 erat. Quod itaque rex Parliamentum convocat, id facit pro officio suo ac munere quod a populo acceperat, ut etiam quos convocat, eos de arduis regni negotiis consuleret, non de suis: aut si qua dici sua possunt, de iis postremo semper loco agi solitum erat; ad arbitrium etiam Parlamenti, non suum. Nee
 10 verò ignorant, quorum id interest scire, Parliamentum sive vocatum, sive non vocatum, bis intra vertentem annum antiquitus ex lege potuisse convenire. At *regis etiam leges nuncupantur.* Sunt istae quidem ad regem phalerae; rex autem Angliae legem ferre per se potest nullam; neque enim ad leges
 15 ferendas, sed ad custodiendas a populo latas constitutus erat. Tuque hie fateris *congregari idcirco Parliamentum ut leges conderet.* Quapropter et lex Terræ vocatur, et lex populi: Unde Ethelstanus rex in praefatione legum, ubi omnes alloquitur, *vobis*, inquit, *lege vestra* omnia largitus sum: et in
 20 formula iuramenti quo reges Angliæ antequam crearentur obstringere se solebant, sic populus a rege stipulatur. *Concedis justas leges quas vulgus elegerit?* respondet rex, *conæde.*

account any more master of his Parliament than a horse is master of his bridle. But "why is it not a fair inference that Parliament is the king's, since he summons it?" I will tell you. The Roman Senate's being summoned by a Consul did
 5 not make him master of that assembly either. And so, too, when the king summons Parliament, he does it by virtue and in discharge of his duty and of the office which he has received from the people, that he may advise even with them he summons, about the difficult business of the kingdom, not
 10 his own; or if any can be called his own, this they have always been wont to move last, and not at the king's pleasure, but even at the pleasure of Parliament. And they whom it concerns to know this, know very well that Parliament anciently might by law meet twice in the course of a year, whether sum-
 is moned or not. But "the laws too are called the king's laws." These phrases, to be sure, are trappings and gewgaws for a king, but a king of England can of himself make no law, for he was appointed not to make laws, but to keep the laws which the people have made.

20 And you yourself here admit that "Parliament meets to make laws." Wherefore the law is also called the Law of the Land, and the Common Law. Whence king Aethelstan in the Preamble to his laws, speaking to all the people, says: I have bestowed all things "upon you according to your own law."
 25 And in the form of the oath whereby the kings of England were wont to bind themselves before they were made kings, the people formally demand of them: "Do you grant those just laws which the people shall choose?" The king answers,

Erras etiam tota Anglia, qui *regem quo tempore Parliamentum non habetur, plene planeque totum regni statum regio jure gubernare* ai's. Nam neque de bello, neque de pæce quod magni sit momenti, quicquam decernere, ne in jure quidem
5 dicundo curiarum decretis intercedere potest. Jurant itaque judicæ nihil se in judiciis exercendis nisi ex lege facturos, etiamsi rex ipse dicto, aut mandate, vel etiam literis proprio annulo obsignatis aliter imperaret. Hinc saepius in nostro jure rex *injans* dicitur; nee sua jura aut dignitates, nisi pueri aut
10 pupilli in modum, possidere. Spec. Just. c. 4. sect. 22. hinc etiam illud apud nos crebro dici solitum, *rex non potest jaerc injuriam*. Quod tu hoc modo scelerate interpretaris, *non est injuria quam jacit rex, quia in eo non punitur*. Admirabilem hominis impudentiam et improbitatem vel hoc solo interpre-
15 tamento quis non perspiciat? *Capitis est imperare*, inquis, *non membrorum; rex Parliamenticaput est*. Siccine nugarere, si cor tibi saperet? erras iterum (sed quis finis errorum est tuorum) in quo regis consiliarios a Parlamenti ordinibus non distinguis; nam neque illos quidem omnes, horum vero nullos
20 reliquis non probatos eligere debebat rex; in plebeium autem

"I grant." And when you say: "While Parliament is not in session, the king governs the whole state of the kingdom fully and entirely by royal right," you again stray wide of the truth by the length and breadth of all England. For he can deter-

5 mine nothing of much moment with respect to either peace or war; nor even in administering justice can he interfere with the decisions of the courts. It is on this account the judges swear that in performing their judicial functions they will do nothing but according to law, even though the king himself

10 by word, or injunction, yes, or letter under his own seal, should command otherwise. Hence it is that the king is often said in our law to be "an infant," and to possess his rights and dignities only as a child or a ward does his: see the *Mirror of Justices*, Chapter 4, Section 22. Hence too that common say-

15 ing amongst us, "The king can do no wrong"; which you interpret in this rascally fashion: "That is no wrong which the king does, because he is not liable to be punished for it." From this single interpretation would not anyone see through the man's astonishing impudence and villainy ?

20 "It belongs to the head," you say, "to command, and not to the members; the king is the head of the parliament." Would you argue so flippantly if you were wise in heart or had any gust or savor of wit?

You are mistaken again (but there is no end of your mis-

25 takes) in not distinguishing the king's Councillors from the Houses of Parliament; for the king was so bound that he might choose not even all of his Council, and none to be of the House of Lords unless approved by the rest, while as for

ordinem ut quenquam eligeret, id sibi ne sumebat quidem unquam. Quibus id muneris populus delegabat, per municipia singuli suffrages omnium eligebantur; notissima loquor, eoque brevior sum. *Falsum autem esse ai's, quod sanctce*
5 *Independents cultores asserunt, Parlamentum à populo fuisse institutum.* Video jam quid sit cur papatum tanto impetu evertere contendas: alium ipse papatum in alvo, quod aiunt, gestas: quid enim aliud uxor uxoris, lupus ex lupa gravidus, nisi aut portentum, aut papatum aliquem novum parturire
10 debebas? Certè Papa germanus quasi jam esses, sanctos et sanctas pro arbitrio facis; reges etiam omni peccato absolvis, et, quasi strato jam hoste papa, ejus exuviis opimum te ornas. Veriim, quia papa nondum per te plane cecidit, dum libri illius tui *de Primatu*, secunda et tertia, et fortasse quarta et
15 quinta pars prodierit, qui multos mortales tædio prius enecabit, quam tu papam eo libro subegeris, sit satis interea, quæso, ad Antipapatum saltern posse adsændere; est altera, quam tu, præter illam Independentiam abs te irrisam, sanctorum in numerum seriò retulisti, Tyrannis regia: sanctæ ergo
20 Tyrannidis regie tu Pontifex eris Maximus; et nequid desit tibi ad Papales titulos, *Servus etiam servorum* eris, non Dei sed aulæ; quoniam ilia Chenaani maledictio adhæsisse tibi ad præcordia videtur. *Bestiam* appellas *populum*. Quid interim

choosing anyone to the House of Commons, he never so much as pretended to it. They whom the people appointed to that service were chosen severally for their respective constituencies by the votes of all; I speak now of things universally known, 5 and therefore I am the shorter. But you say: "It is false that Parliament was instituted by the people, as the worshippers of Saint Independency assert." Now I see why you strive with so much violence to subvert the papacy: you carry another papacy in your belly, as we say. For what else should 10 you be in labor of, you wife of your wife, you he-wolf pregnant by a she-wolf, but either a monster or some new sort of papacy? At least you make he-saints and she-saints at your pleasure, as if you were a genuine Pope; you absolve kings too, of sin; and as if you had laid low the Pope your enemy, 15 you deck and enrich yourself with his spoils. But whereas you have not yet quite prostrated the Pope till the second and third and perhaps the fourth and fifth part of your book *de Primatu* come out, and whereas this will bore many poor mortals to death ere you shall put down the Pope by it, let it suffice you 20 in the meantime, I beseech you, to climb up to only an Anti-papacy. For besides that Independency that you deride, there is another she-saint that you have canonized in good earnest, that is, Royal Tyranny; you shall therefore be Supreme Pontiff of Saint Tyranny Royal; and that you may want none of the 25 Papal tides, you shall be even "a Servant of the Servants," not of God, but of the court; for that curse pronounced upon Canaan seems to stick as close to you as your shirt.

You call the people "a beast." What are you then yourself?

es ipse? Non enim sacrum illud consistorium, neque sanctus ille Lupus te dominum suum aut populo exemerit aut vulgo; neque effecerit, quin sicuti es, teterrima ipse bestia sis. certe libri sacri prophetici magnorum regum monarchiam et dominationem immanis Bestiae nomine ac specie adumbrare solent. *Sub regibus ante Guilidmum*, inquis, *nulla Parlamenti mentio exstat*. De vocabulo Gallicano altercari non libet: res semper fuit: et Saxonice temporibus *Concilium Sapientum* vocari solitum concedis. Sapientes autem tarn sunt 5 plebis, quam procerum ex numero. At *in statute Mertonensi, vigesimo Hen. Tertii comitum et Baronum tantum fit mentio*. Ita te semper nomina decipiunt, qui tantum in nominibus aetatem omnem contrivisti; nobis enim satis constat, et Quinque-portuum curatores, et decuriones urbicos, nonnunquam et mercatores illo seculo baronum nomine appellatos 15 fuisse; neque dubium omnino est, quin Parlamenti quosque Senatores quantumvis plebeios, aetas ilia jure multo potiore barones nuncupaverit: nam et anno ejusdem regis quinquagesimo secundo tarn nobiles, quam plebeios fuisse convocatos, 20 Marlbrigii statutum, sicut et reliqua fere statuta omnia disertis verbis testantur: quos etiam plebeios, comitatum magnates Edouardus tertius in prarfatione Statuti Stapli, quam perdoctè pro me recitas, vocavit; eos nimirum *qui de singulis*

For neither that Sacre Council nor your Holy Wolf can exempt you, its Sire and Seigneur, from being one of the people, nay, of the rabble rout; nor can make you other than the loathsome beast you are. Indeed the Prophets in Holy Scripture shadow forth to us the monarchy and dominion of great kings by the name and under the figure of a great beast.

You say: "There is no mention of a Parliament held under the kings before William." It is not worth while to quibble about a French word; the thing was always in being, and you yourself admit that in Saxon times it used to be called "Concilium Sapientum," Witena-gemot, or Meeting of the Wise Men. And there are wise men among the common people as well as among the nobility. But "in the statute of Merton, in the twentieth of Henry the Third, mention is made of earls and Barons only." Thus you are always imposed upon by words, who yet have frittered away your whole life in nothing else but words. For we know very well that in that age the word Baron was applied not only to the Wardens of the Cinque Ports, and to members from cities, but sometimes even to tradesmen; and doubtless all members of Parliament, though commoners never so much, might then with all the greater reason be called Barons. For the Statute of Marlbridge and most of the other statutes declare in express words that in the fifty-second year of the same king the commoners as well as the lords were summoned. These commoners King Edward the Third, in the Preamble of the Statute Staple, as you very learnedly quote it for me, calls "Comitatum Mag-nates," the great men of the counties, those, to wit, "that had

civitatibus pro toto comitatu vnerant; qui quidem plebeium ordinem constituebant, neque erant proceres, aut esse poterant: Tradit etiam liber statutis illis vetustior, qui inscribitur, Modus habendi Parlamenta, licere regi cum plebe sola Parla-
5 *mentum habere, legèsque ferre, quamvis Comites et Episcopi non adsint; non itidem licere regi cum comitibus et episcopis, si plebs non aderit. Hujus rei ratio quoque adjicitur; quia cum nondum Comites aut episcopi constituti essent, Reges cum populo tamen Parlamenta, et Concilia peragebant: deinde*
10 *comites pro se tantum veniunt; plebei pro suo quisque municipio. Ex quo iste ordo universi populi nomine adesse intelligitur; eoque nomine et potioem, et nobiliorem ordine patricio, omnique ex parte anteponendum esse. Sed judicandi potestas, inquis, penes domum plebeiam nunquam fuit. Ne-*
15 *que penes regem Angliae fuit unquam: illud tamen meminere, principio omnem potestatem à populo fluxisse, et etiamnum proficisci. Quod et Marcus Tullius de lege Agraria pulcherrimè ostendit. Cum omnes potestates, imperia, curationes ab universo populo proficisci convenit, turn eas profecto maxi-*
20 *mè, quæ constltuuntur ad populi fructum aliquem, et commodurn; in quo et universi deligant quern populo maxime consulturum putent, et unusquisque studio et suffragio suo viam sibi ad beneficium impetrandum munire possit. Vides Parla-*

come out of the several cities to serve the whole county." And these it was that constituted the House of Commons, and neither were lords, nor could be. Again, a book more ancient than those statutes, called *Modushabendi Parlamenta*, or *The*
5 *Manner of Holding Parliaments*, tells us that the King and the Commons may hold a Parliament and enact laws though the Earls and the Bishops are absent, but that the King with the Earls and the Bishops cannot do so in the absence of the Commons. And there is a reason given for it, viz., that before
10 any Earls or Bishops were made, kings yet held Parliaments and Councils with their people; then, too, the Earls serve for themselves only, the Commons each for his constituency. Therefore the Commons are felt to be present in the name of the whole nation, and in that name to be more powerful and
15 more noble than the Lords, and altogether to be preferred.

But "the power of judicature," you say, "never was vested in the House of Commons." Nor was it ever vested in the King of England. Remember, though, that originally all power proceeded, and yet does proceed from the people.
20 Which Marcus Tullius excellently well shows in his oration *Of the Agrarian Law*: "As it is fitting that all powers, authorities, and commissions proceed from the people as a whole, this is especially true of those which are ordained and appointed for the people's benefit and interest. In such a case
25 on the one hand the people as a whole pick out whoever they think will best advance their interests, and on the other hand each individual by electioneering and by his vote may pave the way to receiving the appointment."

mentorū veram originem, illis Saxonis archivis longe
vetustiore. Dum in hac luce veritatis et sapientiae versari
licēbit, frustra nobis obscuriorū aetatum tenebras offundere
conaris. Quod non eō dici â me quisquam existimet, quasi
5 ego de authoritate et prudentia majorū nostrorū detrahi
quicquam velim; qui in legibus bonis ferendis plus sane prae-
stiterunt, quam vel ilia secula, vel illorū ingenium et cultus
tulisse videatur: et quamvis leges raro non bonas irrogarent,
ignorantiae tamen, et imbecillitatis humanae sibi consci, hoc
10 veluti fundamentum legum omnium posteris tradi voluerunt,
quod et nostri Jurisperiti omnes agnoscunt, ut si qua lex aut
consuetudo legi divinae aut naturali, aut rationi denique re-
pugnaret, ea ne pro lege sancita habeatur. Unde tu, etiamsi
edictum fortasse aliquod aut statutum in jure nostro, quo regi
15 tyrannica potestas attribuatur, invenire posses, id, cum et
divinae voluntati, et naturae, et rationi contrarium sit, intelli-
gito, ex generali et primaria ista lege nostra quam attuli, re-
scindi apud nos, et ratum non esse; verum tu jus nullum tale
regium apud nos invenies. Cum enim judicandi potestas pri-
20 mitus in ipso populo fuisse constet, Anglos autem earn ab se in
regem nulla lege regia unquam transtulisse, (neminem enim
judicare aut solet aut potest rex Angliæ, nisi per leges provisas
jam et approbatas, Fleta 1. i. c. 17.) sequitur eandem adhuc
integram atque totam in populo sitam esse; nam parium do-

Here you see the true origin of Parliaments—one much more ancient than the Saxon chronicles. Whilst we may dwell in such a light of truth and wisdom, you labor in vain to spread around us the gloom of the Dark Ages. Let no one think I
5 say this as if I would derogate in the least from the authority and prudence of our ancestors, who certainly went further in the enacting of good laws than either those ages or their own wit and learning seem to have been capable of. And though they seldom imposed laws that were not good, yet, being con-
10 scious of the ignorance and infirmity of human nature, they chose to hand down to posterity as the foundation of all laws, this principle, which likewise all our lawyers recognize: that if any law or custom be contrary to the law of God or of nature, or, in fine, to reason, it shall not be held a valid law.
15 Whence you may learn that even though you shall perchance succeed in finding in our law some proclamation or statute whereby tyrannical power is ascribed to the king, yet this, since it would be repugnant to the will of God, to nature, and to reason, is repealed among us by that general and primary
20 law of ours which I have cited, and is null and void. But indeed you will find in our law no such right of kings. Since it is plain therefore that the power of judicature was originally in the people themselves, and that the English never did by any *Lex Regia* part with it to the king (for the kings of Eng-
25 land neither use to judge any man, nor can do it, otherwise than according to laws already provided and approved: *Fleta*, Book i, Chap. 17), it follows that this power remains yet whole and entire in the people themselves. For that it was

mui aut nunquam traditam, aut recuperari jure posse non negabis. At, *regis est, inquis, de vico municipium, de eo civitatem facere, ergo illos creat qui constituunt domum inferior cm.* At inquam, oppida et municipia regibus antiquiora sunt; etiam in agris populus est populus. Jam Anglicismis tuis magnopere delectamur; *County Court, The Turn, Hundreda;* mirâ nempe docilitate cœtenos Jacobseos tuos Anglicè numerare didicisti.

- Quis expedit Salmasio suam Hundredam,*
 10 Picàmque *docuit nostra verba conari?*
Magister artis venter, et Jacob ad
cœntum, exulantis viscera marsupii regis.
Quod si dolosi spes rejulserit nummi,
 Ipse Antichristi qui modo primatum Papæ
 15 Minatus uno est dissipare sufHatu,
Cantabit ultro Cardinalitium melos.

Longam deinde de comitibus et Baronibus dissertationem sub-
 texit; ut ostendas regem esse eorum omnium creatorem, quod
 facile concedimus, eoque nomine regibus plerunque servie-
 20 bant; ideoque ne gentis liberæ deinceps judicēs essent, rectè
 providimus. *Potestatem convocandi Parlamentum quoties*

either never conveyed away to the House of Peers, or if it were, that it may be recovered from them again by law, you yourself will not deny.

But "it is in the king's power," you say, "to make a village
5 into a borough, and that into a city, and consequently the king does appoint those that constitute the Lower House." But I say towns and boroughs are more ancient than kings, and the people are the people, though they should live in the open fields.

10 And now we take huge delight in your Anglicisms, "County Court," "The Turn," "Hundred": you have learnt with amazing docility to count your hundred Jacobuses in English!

"Who provided" Salmasius with his *Hundred*,
15 And "taught the magpie to attempt our words ?
His Master of Arts was his guts," and Jacobuses
One *Hundred*, the guts of the exiled king's money-bag.
"For if the hope of treacherous coin shall gleam,"
The very man who but now threatened to puff away
20 With a single breath the Primacy of the Pope as Antichrist
Will of his own accord "sing a tune" to praise a Cardinal.

Next you subjoin a long discourse of the Earls and the Barons, to show that the king created them all; which we readily grant, and for that reason they were most commonly
25 at the king's beck; wherefore we have done well to take care that for the future they shall not be judges of a free people. You affirm that "the power of calling parliaments as often as

*libet et quando vult dissolvendi ex omni temporis memoria
pents regem esse affirmas. Tibine igitur balatroni mercenario
et peregrino, perfugarum dictata exscribenti, an disertis le-
gum nostrarum verbis fides habenda sit, infra videbimus. At,
5 inquis, reges Anglia Parlamento majus imperium habuisse
alio argumento probatur, eoque invincibili; regis potestas per-
petua est et ordinaria, quæ per se sine Parlamento regnum
administrat; Parlamenti extraordinaria est autoritas, et ad
certas tantum res, nec sine rege quicquam validi statuere
10 idonea. Ubinam dicamus vim magnam latere hujus argu-
ment! ? an in ordinaria et perpetua? Atqui minores multi magi-
stratus habent potestatem ordinariam et perpetuam, quos Ire-
narchas vocamus; an summam ergo habent? supra etiam dixi
potestatem regi idcirco traditam a populo fuisse, ut videret
15 autoritate sibi commissa ne quid contra legem fiat; utque
leges custodiret nostras, non ut nobis imponeret suas: regis
proinde potestatem nisi in regni curiis et per eas, esse nullam:
imo populi potius ordinaria est omnis, qui per duodecim viros
de omnibus judicat. Atque hinc est quod interrogatus in
20 curia reus, *Cui te permittis judicandum?* respondet semper
ex more atque lege, *Deo et populo*, non Deo et regi, aut regis
vicario. Parlamend autem autoritas, quæ re et veritate, sum-*

he pleases, and of dissolving them when he pleases, has belonged to the king time out of mind." Whether you, mercenary foreign buffoon, who transcribe what some fugitives dictate to you, or the explicit words of our own laws are more
5 to be trusted in this matter, we shall inquire hereafter. "But," say you, "there is another argument, and an invincible one, to prove the power of the kings of England superior to that of the Parliament. The king's power is continuous and of course, and by itself administers the government without the
10 Parliament; that of the Parliament is out of course, and limited to particulars only, and incapable of enacting anything valid without the king." Where should I say the great force of this argument lies hid? In the words "of course and continuous"? Why, many inferior magistrates, whom we call
15 justices of the peace, have a power of course and continuous. Have they therefore the supreme power? And I have said already that the king's power was committed to him by the people for the definite purpose that by the authority entrusted to him he should see that nothing were done contrary to law,
20 and that he might watch over our laws, not lay his own upon us; and consequently that the king has no power but in and through the courts of the realm; nay, all the ordinary power is rather the people's, who determine all controversies themselves by juries of twelve men. And hence it is, that when a
25 defendant is asked in court, "How will you be tried?" he answers always, according to law and custom, "By God and my country"—not by God and the King or the King's deputy. But the authority of the Parliament, which indeed and in

ma populi potestas in ilium senatum collata est, si extraordinaria est dicenda, id tantum propter ejus eminentiam dicitur; alioqui, ut notum est, ipsi ordines appellantur, non extra ordinem ergo; et si non actu, quod aiunt, virtute tamen perpetuum habent in omnes curias et potestates ordinarias jus atque authoritatem; idque sine rege. Offendunt nunc limatulas, opinor, aures tuas nostrorum barbarae locutiones: cujus ego si vacaret, aut operae pretium esset, tot barbarismos hoc uno libro notare possem, quot si pro merito luces, profectò omnes
5 tuum habent in omnes curias et potestates ordinarias jus atque authoritatem; idque sine rege. Offendunt nunc limatulas, opinor, aures tuas nostrorum barbarae locutiones: cujus ego si vacaret, aut operae pretium esset, tot barbarismos hoc uno libro notare possem, quot si pro merito luces, profectò omnes
10 puerorum ferulas in te frangi oporteret, nee tot aureos tibi dari, quot illi quondam pessimo poetac; colaphos longe plures. *Prodigium esse ai's, omnibus portentis opinionum monstruosius, quod fanatici personam regis h polestate ejus sejungant.* Equidem dicta singulorum non præstitero; personam autem
15 si pro homine vis did, separari a potestate ejus nee absurde posse Chrysostomus haud fanaticus docere te potuit; qui præceptum Apostoli de potestatibus ita explanat, ut potestatem ibi et rem, non hominem intelligi asserat. Quidni dicam regem, qui contra leges quid facit, id agere ut privatum vel tyrannum, non ut regem legitima potestate præditum ? Tu si
20

truth is the supreme power of the people committed to that senate, this power, I say, if it may be called extraordinary, out of order, or out of course, must be so called by reason of its eminence only. And another reason: our Estates in Parliament, as everybody knows, are called *Orders*, and therefore
5 cannot properly be said to be out of order; and they have a continuous control and authority, if not in act, or actually, as the phrase goes, yet potentially and virtually, over all courts and ordinary powers,—and this without the king.

10 And now it seems our barbarous terms grate upon your critical ears, forsooth! whereas, if I had leisure, or it were worth the trouble, I could reckon up so many barbarisms of yours in this one book that if you were to be whipped for them as you deserve, all schoolboys' ferules must surely be broken
15 upon you; nor would you receive so many pieces of gold as that worst of poets did aforetime, but many more boxes on the ear. You say: "It is a prodigy more monstrous than all the most absurd opinions in the world put together, that the madmen should make a distinction betwixt the king's person
20 and his power." I will not quote what every author has said upon this subject; but if by *person* you mean the *man*, then Chrysostom, who was no madman, might have taught you that the person might without absurdity be distinguished from the power; for he explains the apostle's command to be sub-
25 ject to the higher powers, as meant of the thing, the power itself, and not of the man. And why may not I say that a king who acts any thing contrary to law, acts so far forth as a private person or a tyrant, and not as a king invested with

uno in homine posse plures esse personas, casque ab ipso homine, sensu et cogitatione separabiles non intelligis, et sensus communis et latinitatis plane expers es. Sed hoc eò dicis, ut reges peccato omni absolvas, utque erepto Papae primatu indutum te esse existimemus: *Rex, inquis, non fosse peccare intelligitur, quia peccatum ejus poena non consequitur.* Quisquis ergo non punitur, non peccat; non furtum sed poena facit furem: Salmasius Grammaticus non facit soloecismos, quia manum ferulae subduxit; post eversum a te Papam sint isti sane Pontificatus tui canones, vel certe indulgentiae tuæ, sive sanctae Tyrannidis, sive sanctae Servitutis Pontifex dici mavis. Congesta in extreme capite maledicta tua in *Anglicans reipub. et Ecclesia statum* prætereò: hoc enim habent tui similes, homo contemptissime; ut quidque plurima dignum est laude, id solent per calumniam maxime vituperare. Sed de jure regio apud nos, seu potius de jure populi in regem ne quid temere affirmasse videar, proferre ex ipsis monumentis non gravabor, quamvis pauca quidem de multis, ea tamen quibus liquido satis constabit, Anglos ex lege et instituto, et more etiam majorum suorum, regem nuper judicavisse. Post Romanorum

legal authority? If you do not know that there may be in one and the same man more persons or capacities than one, and that those capacities may in thought and conception be severed from the man himself, you are altogether ignorant both of
5 Latinity and of common sense. But this you say to absolve kings from all sin, and to make us believe that you are invested with that Primacy you have snatched from the Pope.

"The king," you say, "is supposed incapable of crime, because no punishment follows upon any crime of his." Who-
10 ever therefore is not punished offends not: it is not the theft but the punishment that makes the thief! Salmasius the Grammarian commits no solecisms now, because he has pulled his hand from under the ferule! When you have overthrown the Pope, let these, then, be the canons of your pon-
15 tificate, or at least your indulgences, whether you shall choose to be called the High Priest of Saint Tyranny, or of St. Slavery.—I pass by the foul abusive language which at the last of your chapter you have heaped upon "the state of the English Commonwealth and Church"; it is common to such
20 as you, contemptible varlet, to rail most at those things that are most praiseworthy.

But that I may not seem to have asserted anything rashly concerning the right of the king among us, or rather concerning the people's right over the king, I will not grudge the
25 task to cite from our records themselves a few things indeed of many, yet such as will make it evident that the English lately tried their king according to the settled laws of the realm and the customs of their ancestors. After the Romans

ex insula discessum sui juris Britanni circiter annos 40. sine regibus fuere; quos primes crearunt, eorum nonnullos supplicio affecere. Britannos ob id Gildas, longe alio, atque tu facis, nomine reprehendit; nempe non quòd reges necavissent, 5 sed quòd injudicatos, vel ut ejus verbis utar, *non fro vcri examinatione*. Vortigernus ob incestas cum filia nuptias, teste Nennio historicorum nostrorum post Gildam antiquissimo, damnatur *h beato Germano, et omni concilia Britonum,* ejiisque filio Guorthemiro regnum traditur. Haud multo Hæc 10 post Augustini obitum gesta sunt: unde vanitas tua facile redarguitur, qui supra asseruisti, primum omnium Papam, et nominatim Zachariam docuisse, judicari reges posse. Circa annum Christi 600. Morcantius, qui tune temporis in Cambria regnabat, propter caedem patruī ab Oudoceo Landaviae 15 Episcopo in exilium damnatur; quamquam is exilii sententiam latifundiis quibusdam ecclesiae donatis redemit. Ad Saxones jam veniamus; quorum jura cum reperiantur, facta praetermittam. Saxones Germanis oriundos memineris; qui nee infinitam aut liberam potestatem regibus dedere, et de 20 rebus majoribus consultare omnes solebant; ex quibus intelligere est, Parlamentum, si solum nomen excipias, etiam apud Saxonum majores summa autoritate viguisse. Et ab iis quidem Concilium Sapientum passim nominatur ab ipsis usque Ethelberti temporibus, quern *decreta judiciorum juxta ex-*

quitted this island, the Britons for about forty years were *sui juris*, and without kings; of those whom they first set up, some they put to death. Gildas reprehends them for that, upon a very different ground from yours,—not for killing
5 their kings, but for killing them without trial, or, to use his own words, "without an inquiry into the truth." Vortigern, as Nennius informs us, the most ancient of all historians next to Gildas, was for his incestuous marriage with his own daughter condemned "by St. Germain and a general council
10 of the Britons," and his son Vordmer set up in his stead. This came to pass not long after St. Augustine's death; which easily disproves your unfounded statement that it was a Pope, namely Zachary, who first asserted the lawfulness of judging kings. About the year of our Lord 600, Morcantius, who
15 then reigned in Wales, was by Oudoœus, bishop of Llandaff, condemned to exile for the murder of his uncle, though he bought off the sentence by bestowing certain landed estates upon the church.

Come we now to the Saxons; since their laws are extant I
20 shall quote none of their deeds. Remember that the Saxons were sprung from Germans, who never gave their kings absolute or unlimited power, and who used to hold a council of the whole tribe upon the more weighty affairs of government; whence we may perceive that Parliament, the name itself only
25 excepted, flourished in high authority even among the ancestors of the Saxons. By these it is called, in fact, Council of the Wise Men, all the way from those very times down to the time of Ethelbert, who, says Bede, "with a Council of Wise

empla Romanorum cum Concilia Sapientum constituisse
 memorat Beda. Sic Edwinus Northanybrorum, Inas occi-
 dentalium Saxonum rex, *habito cum sapientibus et Seniori-*
bus concilia, novas leges promulgavit: alias Aluredus edidit
 5 *ex concilio item prudentissimorum; atque Us*, inquit, *omnibus*
placuit edict earum observationes. His atque aliis multis hu-
 jusmodi locis luce clarius est, delectos etiam ex plebe concilii
 maximis interfuisse; nisi siquis Procæres solos sapientes esse
 arbitratur. Extat etiam apud nos perantiquus legum liber
 10 cui titulus *Speculum Justiciariorum*, in quo traditur primos
 Saxones, post Britanniam subactam, cum reges crearent, ab
 iis jusjurandum exigere consuevisse, se, ut quemvis alium è
 populo, legibus ac judiciis subjectos fore: cap. i. sect. 2.
 ibidem ait jus esse et æquum ut rex suos in Parlamento habeat
 15 pares, qui de injuriis quas vel rex vel regina, fecerit, cogni-
 scerent; regnante Aluredo sancitum legibus fuisse, ut singulis
 annis Parlamentum bis Londini, vel eo sæpius, si opus esset,
 haberetur. quæ lex cum pessimo juris neglectu in desuetu-
 dinem abiisset, duabus sub Edouardo Tertio sancionibus re-
 20 novata est. In alio etiam antique manuscripto, qui Modus
 Parlamenti inscribitur, Hæc legimus; si rex Parlamentum
 prius dimiserit, quam ea omnia transigantur quorum causa
 concilium indictum erat, perjuria reus erit; et juramentum
 illud quod regnum initurus dederat, violâsse censebitur.
 25 Quomodo enim, quod juratus est, justas leges conædit, quas
 populus elegerit, si earum eligendi facultatem petenti populo

Men made decrees patterned upon those of the Romans." So Edwin king of the Northumbrians, and Ina king of the West Saxons, made new laws, "having held a Council with their wise men and the elders of the people." Other laws king
5 Alfred likewise promulgated "from an assemblage of his wisest men," and he says: "All of these decreed their observance." From these and many other like passages it is clear as day that chosen men, even from amongst the common people, were members of the supreme councils—unless we must be-
10 lieve that no men but the nobility are wise.

We have likewise a very ancient law-book, called *the Mirror of Justiaes*, in which we are told that the early Saxons, when they had subdued Britain and set up kings, required an oath of them to submit to the judgment of the law as much as any
15 of their subjects, Chap, i, Sect. 2. In the same place it is said that it is but just and right that the king have his peers in Parliament to take cognizance of wrongs done by the king or the queen; and that a law made in king Alfred's time required Parliament to be holden twice a year at London,
20 or oftener if need were: which law, when through neglect it grew into disuse, was renewed by two re-enactments in King Edward III's time. And in another ancient manuscript, called *The Manner of Parliament*, we read: "If the king shall dissolve Parliament before it have disposed of all those things
25 wherefore the council was summoned, he is guilty of perjury, and shall be deemed to have broken his coronation oath." For how does he grant, as he is sworn to do, those good laws which the people chose, if he hinders the people from choos-

non dat, vel rarius Parlamentum convocando, vel citiis dimittendo quam res populi ferunt? Jus autem illud jurandum, quo rex Angliae se obligat, nostri jurisperiti pro sanctissima lege semper habuere. Quod autem maximis reipub. periculis
5 remedium inveniri potest (qui solus convocandi Parlamenti finis erat) si conventus ille magnus, et augustissimus ad regis libitum stultissimi saepe et pervicacissimi dissolvetur? Posse a Parlamento abesse, proculdubio minus est, quam Parlamentum dissolvere: at rex per leges nostras illo Modorum libro
10 traditas, abesse a Parlamento, nisi planè aegrotaret, neque potuit, neque debuit: et ne turn quidem nisi inspecto ejus corpore a duodecim regni paribus, qui de adversa regis valetudine testimonium perhibere in senatu possent: solentne servi cum domino sic agere? Contra vero plebeius ordo, sine quo
15 Parlamentum haberi non potest, etiam a rege convocatus potuit non adesse, et secessione factâ, de repub. male gesta cum rege expostulare: quod et prædictus liber testatur. Verum, quod caput est, inter leges Edouardi regis vulgo Confessoris, una est eximia, quæ de regis officio tractat; cui rex
20 officio si desit, *nomen regis in eo non constabit*. Hoc quid esset, ne non satis intelligeretur, Chilperici Francorum regis exemplum subnectit, cui idcirco regnum a Populo abrogatum erat. Puniri autem malum regem ex legis hujus sententia oportere, significabat ille S. Edouardi gladius cui nomen Cur-

ing them, either by summoning Parliaments seldomer, or by dissolving them sooner, than the people's business requires? That oath which the kings of England take at their coronation has always been looked upon by our lawyers as a most
 5 sacred law. And what remedy can be found for greatest dangers to the state (which is the very end of summoning Parliaments) if that great and august assembly may be dissolved at the pleasure (oftentimes) of a silly and headstrong king?

To absent himself from Parliament is certainly less than to
 10 dissolve it; and yet by our laws, as the aforementioned *Manner* reports them, the King neither can nor ought to absent himself from Parliament unless he be quite ill, nor even then unless his body have been inspected by twelve peers of the realm, who may present in Parliament the evidencœ of his
 15 indisposition. Do slaves behave thus to a master? On the other hand the House of Commons, without which Parliament cannot be held, may, though summoned by the King, absent itself, and, having withdrawn, expostulate with the king concerning maladministration, as the same book has it.
 20 But—and this is the greatest thing of all—among the laws of King Edward commonly called the Confessor there is a very excellent law relating to the kingly duty: which if the king do not discharge as he ought, then, says the law, "he shall not retain the name of king." Lest these words should
 25 not be sufficiently understood, it subjoins the example of Chilperic king of the Franks, whom the people for that cause deposed. That by this law a wicked king is liable to punishment was betokened by that sword of Saint Edward, called

tana erat, quem in regum creatione et pompa gestare Comes Palatii solebat; *in signum*, inquit noster Matthauis Paris, *qubd et regem, si oberret, habeat de jure potestatem cohibendi*: gladio autem nemo fere nisi capite punitur. Hanc
5 legem, cum aliis boni illius Edouardi, Gulielmus ipse con-
quæstor anno regni quarto ratam habuit: et frequentissimo
Anglorum Concilio prope Verulamium religiosissime juratus
confirmavit: quo facto non solum jus omne belli, si quod in
10 nos habuit, ipse extinxit, sed etiam hujus legis judicio atque
sententiae se subjecit. Ejus etiam films Henricus cum in
omnes Edouardi leges, turn in hanc quoque juravit; atque iis
duntaxat conditionibus, vivente adhuc fratre Roberto natu
majore, in regem est electus. Jurarunt eadem omnes deinceps
reges, antequam insignia regni acciperent. Hinc celebris ille
15 et antiquus noster jurisconsultus Bractonus. 1. i.e. 8. *Non
est rex, ubi dominatur voluntas, et non lex.* Et. 1. 3. c. 9. *rex
est dum bene regit; tyrannus, dum populum sibi creditum
violentd opprimit dominatlone.* Et ibidem, *exerære debet rex
potestatem juris, ut vicarius et minister Dei: potestas autem
20 injuries diaboli est, non Dei: cum declinat ad injuriam rex,
diaboli minister est.* Eadem ferme habet vetustus alter ju-

Curtana, which the Earl Palatine used to carry in the procession at a coronation, "in token," says our historian Matthew Paris, "that he has authority by law to restrain and control even the king if he go astray": but punishment with a sword is
5 hardly other than capital. This law, together with the other laws of good King Edward, did William the Conqueror himself ratify in the fourth year of his reign, and in a very full council of the English held at Verulam did with a most solemn oath confirm. By so doing he not only extinguished his right of
10 conquest, if he ever had any over us, but even subjected himself to judgment according to the tenor of this very law. His son Henry also swore to the observance of king Edward's laws—this among the rest, and upon those terms only was he chosen king while his elder brother Robert was alive. The
15 same oath was taken by all succeeding kings before they were crowned. Hence, saith our ancient and famous lawyer Bracton, in his first book, Chapter viii,

"There is no king in the case

Where will rules and law takes not place."

20 And in his third book, Chapter ix. "A king is a king so long as he rules well; he becomes a tyrant when he crushes with despotic violence the people that are trusted to his charge." And in the same chapter, "The king ought to use the power of law and right as God's servant and vicègerent; the power
25 to do wrong is the Devil's, and not God's; when the king turns aside to do wrong, he is the servant of the Devil." Almost these very words hath another ancient lawyer, the author of

risconsultus, libri illius author qui Fleta inscribitur, memor nempe uterque et legis illius Eduardinae vere quidem regiae, et regular illius in jure nostro primariae a me supra dictae, qua nihil Dei legibus et rationi contrarium haberi pro lege potest;

5 uti nee tyrannus pro rege, nee minister diaboli pro ministro Dei. Cum itaque lex maxime ratio recta sit, siquidem regi, siquidem Dei ministro obediendum est, eadem prorsus et ratione et lege, tyranno et diaboli ministro erit resistendum. Et quoniam de nomine saepius quam de re ambigitur, tradunt

10 iidem, regem Angliæ, etiamsi nomen regis nondum perdidit, judicari tamen, ut quilibet è vulgo, et posse et debere. Bracton. 1. i. c. 8. Fleta. 1.1. c. 17. *Non debet esse rege major quisquam in exhibitione juris; minimus autem esse debet in judicio suscipiendo, si peccat; alii legunt, si petat.* Judicari

15 igitur cum debeat rex noster, sive tyranni sub nomine, sive regis, quos habeat item judices legitimos dictu difficile non debet esse. Eosdem consulere authores haud pejus erit. Bracton. 1. 2. c. 16. Fleta. 1. i.e. 17. *In populo regendo rex habet superiores, legem, per quam jactus est, rex, et curiam suam,*

20 *videlicet Comites et Barones: Comites dicuntur quasi socii regis; et qui habet socium, habet magistrum; et ideb si rex*

the famous book called "Fleta." Both of them in fact remembered that true *Lex Regia*, that truly royal law of King Edward, as well as that fundamental maxim in our law which I mentioned before, by which nothing that is contrary to the
5 laws of God and to reason can be accounted a law, any more than a tyrant can be said to be a king, or a servant of the Devil a servant of God. Since therefore the law is right reason above all else, then if we are bound to obey a king and a servant of God, by the very same reason and the very same law
10 we ought to resist a tyrant and a servant of the Devil.

Now because controversies arise of tener about names than about things, the same authors tell us that a king of England, though he have not yet lost the name of king, yet can be judged and ought to be judged like anyone of the common
15 people. Bracton, Book I, Chapter viii; Fleta, Book I, Chap, xvii: "No man ought to be greater than the king in the administration of justice; but he himself ought to be as little as the least in receiving justice, if he offends." Others read: "if he require."

20 Since our king therefore is liable to be judged, whether by the name of tyrant or of king, it ought not be difficult to say who are his lawful judges. Nor will it be amiss to consult the same authors upon that point. Bracton, Book II, Chap, xvi; Fleta, Book I, Chap, xvii: "The king has his superiors in the
25 government: the law, which made him king, and his court, to wit, the Earls and the Barons. *Comites* (earls) are as much as to say the king's fellows; and he that has a fellow has a master; and therefore, if the king will be without a bridle,

juerit sine fræno, id est sine lege, debent ei jranum ponere.
 Baronum autem nomine plebeium ordinem comprehendi
 supra ostendimus; quin et Pares etiam Parlamenti eosdem
 fuisse dictos, libri legum nostrarum antiqui passim tradunt:
 5 et imprimis liber ille cui titulus, Parlamenti modus; *Eliguntur*
inquit de omnibus regni paribus 25, quorum erunt quinque
milites, quinque cives id est urbium delegati, quinque muni-
cipes: et duo milites pro comitatu majorem voæm habent in
conædendo et contradicendo quam major comes Angliæ; et
 10 meritò quidem; illi enim pro tota aliqua provincia, aut muni-
 cipio suffragia ferunt, isti pro se quisque duntaxat. Comites
 autem illos *Codicillares*, quos vocas, et *rescriptitios*, cum feu-
 dales jam nulli sint, ad judicandum regem a quo creabantur
 minimè omnium idoneos esse, quis non videt? Cum itaque
 15 jus nostrum sit, ut est in illo speculo antiquo, regem habere
 pares, qui in Parlamento cognoscant et judicent, *si quid rex*
in aliquem populism peccaverit, si notissimum sit licere apud
 nos cui vis è populo in minoribus quibusque curiis injuriarum
 actionem regi intendere, quanto justius est, quantoque magis
 20 necessarium, si rex in universes peccaverit, ut habeat qui eum
 non refrænare soltim et coerere, sed judicare et punire pos-
 sint. Pessime enim et ridicule institutam esse earn necesse est
 rempub. in qua de minimis regum injuriis etiam private cuivis
 cautum sit, de maximis nihil in commune provisum, nihil de

that is, lawless, they ought to bridle him." That the Commons are comprehended in the word Barons has been shown already; nay, our old law-books tell us quite generally that they were called Peers of Parliament: the *Manner of Parliament*, 5 especially, says: "From all the peers of the realm there shall be chosen five and twenty," of whom there shall be "five knights, five citizens," that is, representatives of cities, "and five burgesses. Two knights of the shire, furthermore, have a greater vote in granting and rejecting than the greatest Earl 10 of England." And it is but reasonable they should, for they vote for some whole county or borough or other constituency, the Earls for themselves only. And who can fail to see that those Earls "by Patent" as you call them, and Earls "by Writ," since we have now none that hold by ancient feudal tenure, 15 are less fit than anyone else to try the king who conferred their honors upon them? Since therefore by our law, as appears by that old book, *The Mirror*, the king has his peers, who hi Parliament have cognizance and jurisdiction "if the king have done wrong to any of his people"; and if it is noto- 20 rious, as it is, that any individual subject may even in inferior courts sue the king for damages, how much more just, how much more necessary is it that if the king have done wrong to his whole people, there should be such as have authority not only to bridle him and keep him within bounds, but to 25 judge and punish him? For that government must needs be very ill and very ridiculously constituted, in which remedy is provided for even private persons in case of the least injuries done by the king, and no remedy, no redress for the greatest,

salute omnium, quo minus liceat ei universos sine lege perdere, qui ne unum quidem laedere per legem poterat. Comites autem esse regis iudices, cum ostensum sit neque decere neque expedite, sequitur iudicium illud totum ad plebeium ordinem, qui et Pares regni, et Barones, et populi totius potestate sibi delegata praediti sunt, jure optimo pertinere. Cum enim (ut in nostro jure scriptum est, quod supni attuli) plebs sola cum rege sine comitibus aut episcopis Parliamentum constituat, quia rex cum sola plebe, etiam ante comites aut episcopos, Parliamentum peragere solebat, eadem prorsus ratione plebs sola supremam et sine rege, et regem ipsum iudicandi potestatem habebit, quod etiam ante ullum regem creatum, ipsa universi populi nomine concilia et parlamenta peragere, iudicare, ferre leges, ipsa reges creare solita erat; non ut populo dominarentur, sed ut rem populi administrarent. Quern si rex contra injuriis afficere, et servitute opprimere conatus fuerit, ex ipsa legis nostrae sententia nomen regis in eo non constat, rex non est; quod si rex non sit, quid est quod ei pares amplius quaeramus? Tyrannum enim jam re ipsa ab omnibus

no care taken for the safety of the whole; no provision made but that the king, who by law could not hurt even one of his subjects, may, without any law to the contrary, ruin all of them together!

5 Yet since I have shown that it is neither fit nor proper for the Earls to be the king's judges, it follows that that jurisdiction does wholly, and by the best possible right, belong to the Commons, who are Peers of the realm, and Barons as well, and are vested with the power and authority of all the
10 people committed to them. Now as we find it expressly written in our law, which I have already cited, that the Commons alone, together with the king, made a good Parliament without the Lords or the Bishops, because Kings used to hold Parliaments with their Commons alone before either Lords or
15 Bishops came into existencē; by the very same reason the Commons apart shall have a power that is sovereign, and independent of the king, and capable of judging the king himself; because before there ever was a king, they in the name of the whole body of the nation had been wont to hold Councils and
20 Parliaments, to judge, to pass laws, yea to make kings: not that these might lord it over the people, but that they might manage the people's business. But if the king instead shall try to do them wrong and crush them into servitude, then by the express tenor of our law the name of king remains not in him;
25 he is no king; and if he be no king, why should we have his Peers far to seek? For being then by all good men adjudged already and actually a tyrant, there are none but who are

bonis iudicatum nulli non satis pares atque idonei sunt, qui supplicio mactandum esse pro tribunal! iudicent. *hæc cum* ita sint, tot testimoniis, tot legibus prolatis, abundè hoc demum, quod erat propositum, evicisse arbitror, *cum* iudicare
 5 regem penes plebem jure optimo sit, cumque plebs regem de repub. deque ecclesia, sine spe ulla sanitatis, pessime meritum supplicio ultimo affecerit, recte atque ordine, exque repub. sudque fide, dignitate, legibus denique patriis fecisse. Neque
 10 possum hie non gratulari mihi de majoribus nostris, qui non minore prudentiâ ac libertate, quam Romani olim, aut *Græcorum* præstantissimi, hanc rempub. instituerunt; neque poterunt illi, siquid nostrarum rerum sentiunt, non sibi etiam gratulari de posteris suis; qui tarn sapienter institutam, tanta libertate fundatam ab impotenti regis dominatione, cum re-
 15 dacti pene in servitatem essent, tarn fortiter, tamque prudenter vindicarunt.

CAPUT IX.

SATIS jam arbitror palam esse, regem Angliæ etiam Anglorum legibus iudicari posse; suos habere iudices legitimos, quod erat probandum. Quid tu porro? (nam
 20 quæ tua repetis, ad ea non repetam mea) *ex rebus nunc ipsis* *fropier quas comitia indict solent, proclive, inquis, est osten-*

Peers good enough for him, and a court capable enough to pronounce sentence of death upon him.

These things being so, I think that by means of the many authorities and laws which have been cited I have sufficiently
5 proved what I undertook, to wit, that since authority to try the King is by very good right lodged with the Commons, and since they have actually put the king to death for the mischief which without any hope of amendment he had done both in church and in state,—in view of all this, they have acted
10 justly and regularly, for the interest of the State, and in the discharge of their trust, in a manner becoming their dignity, and, finally, according to the law of the land. And here I cannot but congratulate myself upon our ancestors, who founded this State with no less prudence and liberty than did
15 the most excellent of the ancient Romans or Grecians; and they likewise, if they have any knowledge of our affairs, cannot but congratulate themselves upon their posterity, who, when almost reduced to slavery, yet with such wisdom and courage reclaimed that state, so wisely founded upon so much
20 liberty, from a king's outrageous despotism.

CHAPTER IX.

I THINK it by this time sufficiently evident that the king of England may be judged even by the laws of England, and that he has his lawful judges; which was the thing to be proved. How do you go on?—for to your mere repetitions I shall not repeat my answers. "Now even from the
25 very business for which Parliaments are wont to be sum-

dere re gem esse supra Parlamentum. Sit sane proclive quantum voles, in quo praecipitem te dari jam statim senties. *Parlamentum*, inquis, *congregari solet ad majoris momenti negotia in quibus regni solus et populi versatur.* Si rex Parliamentum convocat ad procurandas res populi, non suas, neque id nisi assensu eorum atque arbitrio quos convocat, quid aliud est, obsecro, nisi minister populi et procurator? cum, sine suffrages eorum quos populus mittit, ne tantillum quidem, neque de aliis, neque de seipso decernere possit. Quod etiam
5
10 argumento est, officium esse regis, toties Parliamentum convocare, quoties populus id petit: quandoquidem et res populi, non regis, iis comitiis tractantur, idque populi arbitrio. Quamvis enim regis quoque assensus honoris causa peti soleret, quern in rebus minoris momenti ad privatorum duntaxat
15 commoda spectantibus poterat non praebere, poterat pro illa formula dicere, *rex deliberabit*, de iis tamen, quæ ad salutem omnium communem et libertatem pertinebant, prorsus abnuere nullo modo poterat, cum id et contra juramentum regium esset, quo veluti lege firmissima tenebatur, et contra
20 praecipuum magnæ Chartæ articulum, c. 29. *Non negabimus non differemus cuiquam jus aut justitiam.* Non negabit rex

moned, it appears that the king is above the Parliament. The way to this demonstration," you say, "slopes down steep and easy ahead." Let it slope as steep as you will, for you shall instantly feel yourself hurled down it headlong. "The Parliament," you say, "is wont to be assembled upon affairs of un-
5 common weight, wherein the safety of the realm and of the people is concerned." If therefore the king call Parliament to attend to the people's business, not his own, nor to settle even that but by the consent and at the discretion of those he
10 has called, what is he more than the people's servant and agent? For without the suffrages of them that are delegated by the people he cannot resolve the least thing with relation either to others or even to himself. Which also goes to show that it is the king's duty to call Parliaments whenever and as
15 often as the people ask, since it is the people's business, and not the king's, that is to be treated of by that assembly, and to be ordered as the people wish.

For although the king's assent also were asked customarily out of respect, and although in lesser matters, concerning the
20 welfare of private persons only, he might refuse it, and use that form, "The king will advise," yet in affairs that concerned the public safety and the liberty of all the people he had no negative voice whatsoever; for this would have been both against his coronation oath, which was as binding upon
25 him as the most rigorous law, and against the chief article of Magna Charta, chap. 29: "We will not refuse, nor will we delay, right and justice to any man." Shall it be out of the king's power to refuse right and justice, and shall it therefore

jus aut justitiam, negabit ergo justas leges? non cuiquam, an ergo omnibus? ne in ulla quidem Curia minori, num ergo in Senatu supremo? an vero rex ullus tantum sibi arrogabit, ut quid justum sit, quid utile, se unum universo populo scire
5 melitis existimet? Cum *ad hoc creatus et electus sit, ut justitiam jaciat universis*, Bracton. 1.3. c. 9. per eas nimirum leges *quas vulgus elegerit*. Unde illud in archivis nostris 7 H. 4. Rot. Parl. num. 59. *non est ulla regis prærogativa, quæ ex justitia et æquitate quicquam derogat*. Et reges olim acta Par-
10 lamenti confirmare recusantes, Chartam videlicet magnam et hujusmodi alia, majores nostri saepenumero armis coegerunt; neque propterea minus valere illas leges, aut minus legitimas esse jurisperiti nostri statuunt; quandoquidem assensum rex iis decretis coactus præbuit, quibus jure atque sponte
15 assentiri debebat. Tu dum contendis aliarum etiam gentium reges in potestate vel Synedrii vel Senatus, vel Concilii sui aequo fuisse, non nos in servitutem, sed illas in libertatem asseris: in quo idem facere pergis quod ab initio fecisti, quodque faciunt pragmaticorum stultissimi, ut incauti seipsos in
20 lite sæpius contra veniant. At nos scilicet fatemur *regem, ubicunque absit, in Parlamento tamen censeri præsentem vi potes-*

be in his power to refuse the enacting of just laws ? Shall it be out of his power to refuse justice to any man, and shall it therefore be in his power to refuse it to all men ? Shall it be out of his power to refuse it in any inferior court, and therefore be
5 in his power to refuse it in the highest court of all ? Or can any king be so arrogant as to suppose that he—one person—knows what is just and profitable better than the whole body of the people ? Especially, since "he is created and chosen for this very end and purpose, to do justice to all," as Bracton says,
10 lib. iii. c. 9—that is, according to those laws which "the people" have chosen. Hence this passage in our records, 7 H. IV, Rot. Parl. num. 59: "There is no royal prerogative that derogates aught from justice and equity." And formerly when kings have refused to confirm Acts of Parliament, to wit,
15 Magna Charta, and others the like, our ancestors often have brought them to it by force of arms; nor yet are our lawyers of opinion that those acts are on that account any less valid, or any less the law of the land, since the king was forced to assent to decrees which he ought in justice to have assented to volun-
20 tarily. Again, while striving to prove that kings of other nations have been as much under the power of their Sanhedrim or Senate or Council as our kings were, you do not argue us into slavery, but them into liberty. In which you keep on doing over again what you have done from the very beginning
25 of your discourse, and what incompetent practitioners do—argue unawares against their own side of the case.

We grant, you think, that "the king, wherever he absent himself, yet is supposed still to be present in his Parliament by

tatis: ergb quodcunque illic agitur h rege ipso actum intelligi.
Turn quasi bolum aliquem nactus esses aut mercedulam, illo-
rum recordatione Caroleorum delinitus, *accipimus*, inquis,
quod dant: accipe igitur, quo dignus es, magnum malum;
5 non enim damus, quod sperabas, inde sequi *curium illam non*
alia potiri potestate quam a rege delegata. Si enim dicitur,
potestas regis, quæcunque ea sit, a Parlamento abesse non
potest, an suprema continue dicitur? annon potiis transferri
in Parlamentum potestas regia videtur, utque minor majore
10 contineri? sane si Parlamentum potest, nolente et invito rege,
acta ejus et privilegia quibusvis data revocare atque rescindere,
si ipsius regis praerogativas, prout videtur, circumscribere, si
proventus ejus annuos et impensas aulæ, si famulitium ipsum,
si totam denique rem domesticam regis moderari, si vel inti-
15 mos ejus consiliarios atque amicos amovere, vel etiam e sinu
abriperere ad supplicium potest, si cuivis denique de plebe a
rege ad Parlamentum quacunque de re provocatio est lege
data, non itidem a Parlamento ad regem, quæ omnia et posse
fieri, et fuisse saepiis facta, cum monumenta publica, turn
20 legum nostrarum consultissimi testantur, neminem esse arbi-
tror, modò mens ei sana sit, qui Parlamentum supra regem
esse non fateatur. Nam in interregno etiam Parlamentum

virtue of his power, insomuch that whatever is transacted there is supposed to be done by the king himself." Then as if you had made a great haul, or, for that matter, a pittance either, and tickled as you are with the remembrance of your
5 gold-pieces from Charles, "We take," you say, "what they give us." Take what you deserve, then, a malediction. For we grant not what you were hoping we granted, viz., that thence this follows: "That court possesses no other power than is delegated from the king." For if it is said that the
10 king's power, be it what it will, cannot be absent from Parliament, is it necessarily and immediately said that that power is supreme? Does not the royal power rather appear to be transferred to Parliament, and, as a lesser, to be comprised in its greater? certainly, if Parliament may rescind the king's acts
15 without his consent and against his refusal, and revoke privileges granted by him to whomsoever; if they may set bounds to the king's own prerogative, as they see cause; if they may regulate his yearly revenue, and the expenses of his court, his very retinue, and, in sum, all the concerns of his household;
20 if they may remove even his bosom friends and counsellors, nay, pluck them from his lap to the scaffold; finally, if unto any soever of the people there is granted by law an appeal in any cause from the king to Parliament, but not so from Parliament to the king—all of which both our public records and
25 the most learned of our lawyers assure us not only can be done, but have been frequently done—I suppose no man in his right wits but will confess Parliament to be above the King. Even in an interregnum the authority of the Parliament is in

viget; et quod historiis nostris testatissimum est, nulla haereditatis ratione habita, saepe, quem sibi visum est, suffrages liberrimis regem creavit. Ut summatim dicam quod res est, Parlamentum est supremum gentis Concilium, ad hoc ipsum
5 è Populo planè libero constitutum, et potestate plena instructum, ut de summis rebus in commune consulat; rex ideo erat creatus, ut de consilio et sententia illorum Ordinum consulta omnia exequenda curaret. Quod cum Parlamentum ipsum edicto nuper suo publicè declararet, neque enim pro aequitate
10 sua recusabat vel externis gentibus actionum suarum rationem ultro ac sponte reddere, ecce tibi e gurgustio nullius homo auctoritatis, aut fidei, aut rei, Burgundus iste Verna, qui summum Angliae Senatum, jus patrium atque suum scripto asserentem, *dctestandæ et horribilis impostures* insinulet. Patriam
15 mehercule tuam pudebit, verbero, se tantae impudentiæ homuncionem genuisse. Sed habes fortasse quæ salutariter monitos nos velis; agedum, auscultamus. *Quas, inquis, leges sancirc fotcst Parlamentum, in quo nee prasulum ordo comparet?* Tune ergo, furiose, præsules ex ecclesia extirpatum
20 ibas, ut in Parlamenta induceres? O hominem impium, et

being, and—than which nothing is more clearly attested in our histories—they have often, without any regard to hereditary descent, appointed by free choice whomever they pleased to be king.

5 To sum up the whole truth, Parliament is the supreme council of the nation, constituted and appointed by an absolutely free people, and armed with ample power and authority, for this end and purpose: viz., to consult together upon the most weighty affairs; the king was created to take care
10 that there should be executed, obedient to their vote and resolution, all the acts and decrees of those Orders, Estates, or Houses.

Which things after the Parliament themselves had lately declared in a public edict of theirs,—for such is the justice of
15 their proceedings that of their own accord they have been willing to give an account of their actions,—look! here from his hovel appears this man of no standing or influence or property or credit, this home-born Burgundian slave, and accuses the supreme Senate of England, when it is asserting
20 by a public instrument its own and its country's right, "of a detestable and horrible imposture!" Your country shall be ashamed, you rascal, to have brought forth so prodigiously impudent a midget.

But perhaps you have somewhat to tell us that may be for
25 our good: go on, we are listening. "What laws," say you, "can be enacted by a Parliament in which not even the order of Bishops is present?" Did you then, you madman, go about to uproot the Bishops out of the Church, that you might trans-

Satanae tradendum, quem neque ecclesia non ejicere hypocritam et atheum, neque ulla respub. recipere communem libertatis pestem atque labem deberet; quin etiam quod solo ex Evangelio probandum erat, id ex Aristotele et Hali-
5 carnassaeo, deinde ex statutis papisticis pravissimorum temporum probare adnititur, regem Angliæ caput esse Anglicanæ Ecclesiae, ut episcopos compransores suos et necessaries nuper factos, quos ipse Deus exturbavit, novos iterum praedones et tyrannos, pro virili sua parte, sanctae Dei ecclesia imponat,
10 quorum universum ordinem, tanquam religioni Christians perniciosissimum, eradicandum esse stirpitiis, editis antea libris clamose contenderat. Quis unquam Apostata, non dico è sua, quæ nulla certa est, sed a Christiana doctrina, quam ipse asseruerat, defectione tam foeda atque nefaria descivit? *Epis-*
15 *copis de media sublatis, qui sub rege, et ex ejus arbitrio de causis ecclesiae cognoscebant, quæ ad eos redibit ea cognitio.* O perditissime, verere tandem vel conscientiam tuam; memineris dum licet, nisi si hoc sero nimis te moneo, memineris quam non impune tibi erit, quam inexpiabile demum
20 sit, sanctum Dei Spiritum sic illudere. Collige te aliquando, et pone aliquem furori modum, ne te accensa ira numinis

plant them into Parliaments ? A wicked wretch! who ought to be delivered over to Satan, and whom the church ought not fail to excommunicate as a hypocrite and an atheist, and no civil society of men to take in, being a common plague-sore to
 5 the liberty of mankind. Nay, and besides he struggles to prove out of Aristotle and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and next from papistical statutes of the most corrupt ages, that the King of England is the head of the Church of England, a thing not to be proved at all if it be not proved from the Gospel:—
 10 all this to the end that he may once more, as far as in him lies, set up over God's holy Church those bishops, grown of late his intimates and boon-companions, whom God himself thrust out; set up them, I say, to be robbers and tyrants anew, whose whole order, as in his formerly published books he had noisily
 15 maintained, ought to be exterminated root and branch as the bane of the Christian religion. What apostate did ever so shamefully and wickedly desert as this man has done, I do not say his own doctrine, for he has none that is settled, but the Christian doctrine which he had formerly asserted ?

20 "The Bishops being removed, who under the king and by his permission had jurisdiction of ecclesiastical causes, upon whom," ask you, "will that jurisdiction devolve?" O villain! have some regard at least to your own conscience; remember before it be too late, unless indeed this admonition
 25 of mine be already too late, remember that this mocking of God's Holy Ghost is the unpardonable sin, and will not be left unpunished. Stop at last, and set bounds to your madness, lest the wrath of God that you have provoked lay hold

repente corripiat; qui Christi gregem, unctosque Dei minime tangendos, iis hostibus et saevissimis tyrannis obterendos iterum et persultandos tradere cupis, & quibus elata modò et mirifica Dei manus eos liberavit; tuque ipse, nescio eorumne
5 ad fructum ullum, an ad perniciem et obdurationem tuam, liberandos esse docuisti. Quod si jus nullum dominandi in ecclesiam est episcopis, certe multo minus est regibus; quicquid hominum statuta edicunt. Sciunt enim qui labris aliquanto plusquam primoribus Evangelium gustarunt, ecclesiae
10 gubernationem divinam esse totam ac spiritualem, non civilem. *In secularibus* autem, quòd aîs *supremam juris dictionem habuissc regem Angliæ*, id falsum esse jura nostra ubertim declarant. Curias omnes ubi judicia exercentur, non rex, sed Parlamenti autoritas vel constituit, vel tollit; in quibus
15 tamen minimo cuivis e plebe licebat regem in jus vocare; neque rarò judicēs contra regem pronuntiare solebant; id si rex vel interdicto, vel mandato, vel scriptis literis impedire conaretur, ex juramento et lege non parebant judicēs, sed ejusmodi mandata rejiciebant, et pro nihilo ha-
20 bebant: non poterat rex quenquam in vincula conjicere, aut ullius bona in publicum addicere; poterat neminem supplicio punire, nisi in aliquam curiam prius citatum, ubi non rex, sed consueti judices sententias tulere; idque sæpe,

upon you suddenly,—you that are fain to deliver Christ's flock, and God's untouchable anointed, to be crushed and trampled again by those same enemies and cruel tyrants from whom God's wonder-working hand did lately stretch out and
5 set them free. Yes, and from whom you yourself maintained that they ought to be set free, I know not whether for any good of theirs, or to the hardening of your own heart and the furthering of your own damnation. If the bishops have no right to lord it over the church, certainly much less have kings,
10 whatever human statutes may be to the contrary. For they that have tasted the Gospel more than lip-deep know that the government of the church is altogether divine and spiritual, not civil.

Whereas you say that "in secular affairs, the king of Eng-
15 land has always had the highest jurisdiction," our laws do abundantly show this to be false. Our courts of justice are erected and suppressed, not by the King's authority, but by that of the Parliament, and yet in them the meanest subject might go to law with the King. Nor did the judges seldom
20 give judgment against him, which if the King should endeavor to obstruct by any prohibition, charge, or letter, the judges were bound by law and by their oaths not to obey him, but rejected such charges, and held them for naught. The king could not imprison any man, or seize his estate as forfeited; he could not inflict the penalty of death upon any man
25 who had not first been summoned to appear in some court where not the king but the ordinary judges gave sentence; and this, frequently, as I have said, against the king. Hence our

ut supii dixi, contra regem. Hinc noster Bractonus 1. 3. c. 9.
regia potestas juris est, non injuriet; et nihil aliud potest
rex, nisi id solum quod de jure potest. Aliud tibi suggerunt
 Causidici tui, qui nuper solum verterunt; ex statutis nempe
 5 quibusdam haud antiquis sub Edouardo Quarto, Henrico
 Septimo, Edouardo Sexto promulgatis: neque viderunt,
 quamcunque regi potestatem statuta illa concedunt, earn a
 Parlamento concessam esse omnem et quasi precariam, quam
 et eadem autoritas poterit revocare. Cur sic passus es nasuto
 10 tibi imponi, ut quo maxime argumento regis potestatem ex
 decretis Parlamenti pendere demonstratur, eo absolutam esse
 et supremam probare te crederes? Nam et monumenta nostra
 sanctiora testantur, reges nostros non hæreditati, non armis,
 non successioni; sed populo suam omnem potestatem debere.
 15 Talis potestas regia Henrico Quarto, talis ante eum Richardo
 Secundo a plebeio ordine concessa legitur; Rot. Parlament. i
 Hen. 4. num. 108, haud secus atque rex aliquis praesidibus
 suis praefecturas et provincias edicto et diplomate solet con-
 cedere. Id nempe literis publicis consignari diserte jussit
 20 Communium Domus, *concessisse se regi Richardo, ut tali*
bond libertate frueretur, qualem ante eum reges Angliæ ha-
buere; qua cum rex ille contra fidem Sacramenti sui ad ever-
sionem legum abuteretur, ab iisdem orbatus regno est. lidem

Bracton, book 3, ch. 9: "The royal power is a power according to law, not a power to do wrong; and the king cannot do anything else than what he can do lawfully." Those pettifoggers you have consulted, men that have lately fled their country, 5 insinuate something else to you—something, to be sure, based upon certain statutes, not very ancient ones, made in the reigns of Edward IV, Henry VII, and Edward VI. But they overlooked the fact that what power soever those statutes granted the king was granted all by Parliament—begged for as a 10 favor, so to speak—and revocable by the same power that conferred it. How could sagacious you let yourself be so put upon that you thought you were proving the king's power to be absolute and supreme by the very argument which most convincingly proves that it depends upon Acts of Parliament? 15 Also our records of great authority declare that our kings owe all their power, not to any right of inheritance, of conquest, or of succession, but to the people. So in the Parliament Rolls of the first of Henry IV, number 108, we read that such a kingly power was granted by the Commons to Henry IV, 20 and before him to Richard II, just as any king customarily grants to his commissioners their governorships and official charges by edict and patent. Thus the House of Commons ordered expressly to be entered upon record "that they had granted to King Richard" to use "the same good liberty that 25 the Kings of England before him had." And because that king abused it to the subversion of the laws, and "contrary to his oath at his coronation," he was by these same Commons bereft of his kingdom. The Commons, as also appears by the

etiam, quod et eadem rotula testatur, in Parlamento edicunt, sc prudentia et moderations Henrici Quarti confisos, *vclle ac jubere ut in eadem magnd libertate regid sit quam ejus progenitores obtinueret*. Illia autem nisi fiduciaria plane fuisset, 5 quemadmodum hec fuit, necesse est profecto et Parlamenti illius ordines, qui conœderent quod suum non erat, ineptos ac vanos, et reges illos qui, quod suum jam erat, concessum ab aliis voluerint accipere, et sibi et posteris injurias nimis fuisse: quorum utrumvis credible non est. *Tertia pars, inquis, regies 10 potestatis versatur circa militiam; hanc partem reges Angliæ sine pari et amulo tractdrunt*. Neque hoc verius quam caetera quæ perfugarum fide scripsisti. Primum enim pacis et belli arbitrium penes magnum regni senatum semper fuisse, et historiae passim nostrae, et exterorum, quotquot res nostras paulo 15 accuratiiiis attigere, testantur. Sancti etiam Edouardi leges, in quas jurare nostri reges tenebantur, œrtissimam fidem faciunt, capite de Heretochiis, *fuisse quasdam potestates per provincias etsingulos comitatus regni constitutas, qui Heretoches vocabantur, latine ductores exercitus, qui provincialibus copiis 20 prseerant, non ad honorem corona solum, sed ad utilitatem regni*. Isti vero eligebantur *per commune concilium, et per singulos comitatus in pleno conventu populari, sicut et vicecomites eligi debent*. Ex quo facile perspicitur, et copias regni

same Roll, publish in Parliament that, having confidence in the prudence and moderation of Henry IV, "they will and enact that he be in the same great royal liberty that his ancestors possessed." Had the former, however, been other than
 5 wholly a trust, as the latter was, then indeed not only must those Houses of Parliament have been foolish and vain to grant what was none of their own, but those Kings too that were willing to receive as a grant from others what was already theirs, must have been too injurious both to themselves and to
 10 their posterity; neither of which can be believed.

"A third portion of the royal power," say you, "concerns the forces; this portion the kings of England have handled without peer or competitor." This is no truer than the rest that you have written in reliance upon what the renegades told
 15 you. In the first place, both our own histories and those of foreigners that have been in the least exact touching our affairs declare that the making of peace and war always did belong to the Great Council of the realm. And the laws of St. Edward, which our kings are bound to swear that they will
 20 maintain, put this beyond dispute in the chapter "De Here-tochiis," viz. "That there were certain officers appointed in every province and county of the realm, that were called Here-tochs, in Latin *ductores exercitus*, commanders of the army," that were to command the forces of the several counties, not
 25 "for the honor of the crown" only, but "for the good of the realm." And they were chosen "by the common council, and by the several counties in full public assemblies of the inhabitants, as sheriffs ought to be chosen." Whence it is evident that

et copiarum ductores in potestate populi, non regis et antiquitus fuisse, et esse oportere: illimque legem aequissimam nostro in regno haud minus valuisse, quam olim in populari Romanorum statu valuit. De qua et M. Tullium audire non abs re
5 fuerit. Philipp. 10. *Omnes legiones, omnes copias quæ ubique sunt, Populi R. sunt. Neque enim legiones, quæ Antonium Consulem reliquerunt, Antonii potius quam reipub. fuisse dicuntur.* Sancti autem Edouardi legem illam, cum aliis illius legibus Guilielmus ille conquæstor dictus, populo sic volente
10 ac jubente, juratus confirmavit; sed et hanc insuper adjecit, c. 56. *Omnes civitates, burgos, castella, singulis noctibus ita custodiri, prout vicecomes, et Aldermanni, cæterique præpositi per commune concilium ad utilitatem regni melius providebunt;* et lege 62, *ideo castella, burgi, civitates ædificata sunt*
15 *ad tuitionem gentium et populorum regni, idcirco et observari debent cum omni libertate, integritate, et ratione.* Quid ergo? custodientur arces et oppida in pæce contra fures et maleficos non nisi per commune Concilium ejusdem loci, non custodientur in maximo belli metu contra hostes sive externos
20 sive intestines per commune concilium totius gentis? sanè illud nisi concædatur, neque *libertas*, neque *integritas*, nee *ratio* denique in iis custodiendis ulla esse poterit; neque earum rerum quicquam assequemur, quarum causa fundari primum

the forces of the kingdom, and the commanders of those forces, were anciently, and ought to be still, not at the king's command, but at the people's; and that this most just law obtained in this our kingdom no less than heretofore it did in
5 the Roman republic. Concerning which it will not be amiss to hear what Cicero says, *Philipp.* 10: "All the legions, all the forces, wheresoever they are, belong to the Roman people. For not even those legions that deserted Antony when he was
10 Consul are said to have belonged to Antony rather than to the Commonwealth." That law of St. Edward, together with the rest of his laws, did William, called the Conqueror, at the desire and command of the people, confirm by oath, yes and added over and above, chap. 56: "All cities, boroughs, and castles to be so guarded every night, as the Sheriff, the Alder-
15 men, and the other officers placed in command by the Common Council shall think meet for the safety of the realm," And in the ðad law, "Castles, boroughs, and cities were built for the protection of the folks and peoples of the realm, and therefore ought to be maintained free, entire, and unimpaired,
20 by all ways and means." How then? Shall towns and places of strength in times of peace be guarded against thieves and evildoers no otherwise than by the Common Council of each place; and shall they not be defended in dangerous times of war, against enemies both domestic and foreign, by the Com-
25 mon Council of the whole nation? If this be not granted, they surely cannot be guarded and maintained "free" or "unimpaired" or "by all ways and means"; nor shall we obtain any of those ends for which the law itself tells us that towns and

urbes et arcæ lex ipsa dicit. Majores certè nostri quidvis pottos regi quam sua arma et oppidorum praesidia tradere solebant; idem esse rati acsi libertatem ipsi suam ferocitati regum et impotentiae proditum irent. Cujus rei exempla in historiis
5 nostris uberrima *cum* sint, et jam notissima, inserere huic loco supervacaneum esset. At *protectionem rex debet subditis; quomodo eos protegere potent, nisi arma viròsque habeat in sua potestate?* At, inquam, habebat hæc omnia ad utilitatem regni, ut dictum est, non ad civium interitum et regni disper-
10 ditionem: quod et Henrici tertii temporibus, prudenter Leonardus quidam vir doctus in episcoporum conventu respondit Rustando Papse nuntio et regis procuratori: *omnes ecclesiæ sunt Domini Papæ, ut omnia principis esse dicimus, ad tuiti-
onem, non ad fruitionem vel proprietatem, quod ai'unt; ad*
15 *defensionem, non ad dispersionem:* Eadem et prædictæ legis Edouardi sententia erat; quid est hoc aliud nisi potestate fiduciaria, non absoluta? qualem cum imperator bellicus fere habeat, id est delegatam, non plane propriam, non eò segnius populum, à quo eligitur, sive domi sive militiae defendere
20 solet. Frustra autem Parlamenta, et impari sane congressu de legibus Sancti Edouardi et libertate olim cum regibus contendissent, si penes regem solum arma esse oportere existi-

fortresses are founded in the first place. Indeed our ancestors were willing to put anything into the king's power rather than their arms and the garrisons of their towns; conceiving that that would be as if they went about to hand over their
 5 liberty to the unrestrained cruelty of their kings. Of which there are so very many instances in our histories, and those so generally known, that it would be superfluous to mention any of them here.

But "the king owes protection to his subjects; and how can
 10 he protect them unless he have men and arms at command?" But, say I, he had all this for the good of the kingdom, as has been said, not for the destruction of his people and the ruin of the realm. In Henry III's timej one Leonard, a learned man, in an assembly of the Bishops, wisely answered Rustand, the
 15 Pope's Nuncio and the king's Chanœllor, in these words: "All churches belong to My Lord the Pope, as we say all things belong to a prinœ, for protection, not for his use and enjoyment or his property," as the phrase is; for defence, "not for destruction." The aforementioned law of St. Edward is to the
 20 same purpose; and what is this but a power in trust—not a power absolute? Now, though the commander of an army in the field has much this same sort of power—delegated, that is, and not absolutely his own—yet he is generally none the slower to defend both at home and abroad the people that
 25 chose him. Vainly had our Parliaments contended of old with our kings about liberty and St. Edward's laws, and surely it had been an unequal match, had they been of opinion that the power of the sword must belong to the king alone; for how

massent; nam et leges quamlibet iniquas ipse dare si voluisset, frustra se *Charta* quantumvis *Magna* contra ferrum defendissent. At quid proderit, inquis, *Parlamento militia magisterium habere, cum ne teruncium quidem ad earn sustincenda* queat, nolente rege, de populo cogere. Ne siteat ibi cura: primum enim hoc falso ponis, *Parlamenti ordines non posse sine rege tributa populo imponere*, a quo et ipsi missi sunt, et cujus causam suscipiunt. Deinde non potest te fugere tarn sedulum de alienis rebus percontatorem, sua sponte populum, 10 vasis aureis atque argenteis conflatis, magnam vim pecuniae in hoc bellum contra regem impendisse. Amplissimos exinde regum nostrorum annuos redditus recensens; nil nisi *millies quingenties quadragies* crepas; ex patrimonio regis maximas largitiones fieri solitas ab iis regibus qui liberalitatis laudibus 15 emicuerunt, avidus audieras: hac te illecebra veluti Bileamum ilium infamem proditores patriae ad suam causam perduxere; ut Dei populo maledicere, et divinis judiciis obstrepere auderes. Stulte, quid tandem regi injusto ac violento tarn immensae opes profuere? Quid etiam tibi? ad quern nihil pro- 20 sus eorum, quae spe ingenti devoraveras, pervenisse audio,

unjust laws soever the king would have imposed upon them, in vain would they have defended themselves against his sword by a "Charter," however "Great"!

But, you ask, "What shall it profit Parliament to have com-
 5 mand of the forces, since towards the maintenance of them they cannot without the king's assent raise a farthing from the people?" Let not that trouble you! In the first place you go upon the false supposition that the Estates in Parliament "cannot without the king's assent impose taxes upon the
 10 people"—the very people who send them, and whose side they are taking! In the next place it cannot have escaped you—so busy an inquirer into other people's business—that the people by melting down their gold and silver vessels raised a great sum of money of their own accord toward the carrying
 15 on of this war against the king.

Then you recount the large annual revenues of our kings; you rattle on about nothing less than "five hundred and forty thousands"; you have heard, and greedily, that "those of our kings that have been eminent for their bounty and liberality"
 20 have used to give "large boons out of their own patrimony." Greedily you heard this; it was by this allurements that those traitors to their country enticed you to their side, as the wicked Balaam was enticed of old, so that you dared to curse the people of God and to clamor against the divine judgments.
 25 Fool! what, pray, did such boundless wealth profit that unjust and violent king? What did it profit you? For I hear that nothing whatever of all you had been devouring with your huge expectations did reach you, beyond that one paltry purse

praeter unam illam crumenulam vitreis globulis vermiculata-
tam, et centum aureolis confertam. Cape istam Balaame,
quam adamasti, iniquitatis mercedem, ac fruire. Pergis enim
desipere: *Erectio standards, id est vexilli, ad Re gem solum*
5 *pertinet.* Quapropter Quia

—*Belli signum Laurenti Turnus ab arce*
Extulit.

Tunc vero nescis, Grammatice, hoc idem cujusvis impera-
toris bellici munus esse? At ait Aristoteles, *necesse est regi*
10 *presidium adsistere, quo leges tueri possit; ergo oportet re gem*
plus armis posse quam populum universum. Tales hic homo
consequentias torquere solet, quales Ocnus funes apud inferos;
quae nulli sunt usui, nisi ut comedantur ab asinis: aliud enim
est presidium & populo datum, aliud armorum omnium po-
15 *testas, quam Aristoteles hoc ipso, quem protulisti, loco a re-*
gibus abjudicat. Oportet, inquit, habeat rex tantam circa se
manum armatorum, quanta singulis vel compluribus fortior
sit, populo verb minor; εἶναι δὲ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ὥστε ἐκάστου
μὲν καὶ ἐνὸς καὶ συμπλειόνων κρείττω, τοῦ δὲ πλῆθους ἥττω.
20 *Polit. 1.3. c. 11.* Alioqui sane, sub specie tuendi, possit statim
et populum et leges sibi subjicere. Hoc autem rex et tyrannus
interest; rex a senatu et populo volente, ac libente, quod satis
est praesidii circa se habet contra hostes, et seditiosos: Tyran-

wrought with glass beads and stuffed with a hundred gold pieces. Balaam, take your wages of unrighteousness that you loved, and much good may it do you!

You go on playing the fool. "The setting up of the stand-
5 ard," that is, "of the signal of battle, is a prerogative that belongs to the king only." Why? Why because

"Turnus set up an ensign of war on the top of the tower of Laurentum."

Do you really not know, Grammarian, that this very thing is
10 the office of any commander of an army in the field? But "Aristotle says that the king must always have a guard to help him defend the laws, and therefore it behooves the king to have greater military strength than the whole body of the people." This man twists conclusions as Ocnus does ropes in
15 Hell; which are of no use but to be eaten by asses. For a guard given by the people is one thing, and the control of all the forces is quite another thing; the latter, Aristotle judges, in the very passage which you have cited, should not belong to kings. It behooves the king, says he, to have so many armed
20 men about him "as to make him stronger than any one man, or many men together, but not stronger than the people." *Pol.* Book 3, ch. ii. Else, under show of protecting them, he could subject both people and laws to himself. This indeed is the difference betwixt a king and a tyrant: a king, by con-
25 sent of the senate and the people, has about him a sufficient guard against public enemies and seditious persons. A tyrant, against the will of the senate and the people, strives to get as

nus invito senatu ac populo, vel hostium, vel perditorum civium presidium sibi quam maximum comparare studet, contra senatum ipsum et populum. Concessit itaque Parliamentum regi, ut alia omnia, sic *standards crectioncm*; non ut

5 infesta patriae signa inferret, sed ut populum contra eos defenderet, quos Parliamentum hostes judicâsset; si secus fecisset, ipse hostis judicandus erat: cum juxta ipsam Sancti Edouardi, vel quod sanctius est, ipsam naturae legem, nomen regis perdidit. Unde in praedicta Philippica, *amittit is omne exerci-*

10 *ids et imperil jus, qui eo inferio et exercitu rempub. oppugnat.* Neque licebat regi *jeudales* illos equites ad *helium* evocare, quod Parlamenti autoritas non decrevisset; id quod ex statutis pluribus manifestum est. Idem de vectigalibus et cœnsu navali cœsendum; quem imperare civibus sine sena-

15 tusconsulto fas regi non erat: atque ita gravissimi legum nostrarum interpretes annis abhinc plus minus duodecim, turn cum adhuc firmissimum erat regium imperium, publicæ stauerunt. Sic diu ante eos Fortescutius Henrici Sexti cancellarius juris nostri consultissimus; rex Angliae, inquit, neque leges

20 mutare potest, neque tributa, nolente populo, imponere. Sed nee probaverit quisquam ullis testimoniis antiquorum *regni Angliæ statum mere esse re golem.* Habet rex, inquit Bractonus, *jurisdictionem super omnes.* Id est in curia; ubi regis

great a guard as he can, either of public enemies, or of profligate subjects, against the senate and the people. Parliament therefore granted the king, as they granted whatever he had besides, the "setting up of the standard"; not that he might
 5 give hostile signals to attack his own people, but that he might defend them against such as the Parliament should declare enemies to the state. If he acted otherwise, he was to be accounted an enemy himself, for according to that same law of St. Edward, or, what is more sacred, the very law of nature, he
 10 lost the name of king. Whence Cicero in his *Philippic* afore-said: "He who attacks the state with an army and his official powers forfeits all right to the command and to his office."

As for "tenants by knight-service," the King was not allowed to summon them to a war which the authority of Parliament had not resolved upon; as is evident from many statutes. The same is true of Tonnage and Poundage and Ship Money; these the king could not exact from his subjects without an Act of Parliament; as was publicly resolved by the ablest of our lawyers about twelve years ago, when the king's
 20 authority was at its height. And, long before them, Fortescue, an eminent lawyer, and chancellor to Henry the Sixth, was of the same opinion. The king of England, says he, can neither alter the laws, nor lay taxes without the people's consent.

Nor can any testimonies be brought from antiquity to prove
 25 "the government of the realm of England an unmixed monarchy." "The king," says Bracton, "has jurisdiction over all his subjects"; that is, in his courts of justice, where justice is administered in the king's name indeed, but according to our

quidem nomine, nostris autem legibus jus redditur. *Omnis sub rege est*; id est singuli: atque ita se explicat ipse Bractonus locis a me supra citatis. Ad ea quæ restant, ubi eundem volvis lapidem, in quo vales ipsum, credo, Sisyphum delassare, ex
5 supri dictis abunde respondetur. De cætero, si quando Parla-
menta suum regibus bonis obsequium amplissimis verbis citra
assentationem et servitatem detulere, id quasi eodem modo
tyrannis delatum esset, intelligi, aut populo fraudi esse non
debet; neque enim justo obsequio libertas imminuitur. Quod
10 autem ex Edouardo Coco et aliis citas, *Angliæ regnum abso-
lutum est imperium*, id est si ad ullum regem externum, aut
Csesarem respicias; vel, ut Cambdenus ait, *quiet in imperii
dientela non est*: alioqui adjicit uterque imperium hoc con-
sistere non *ex rege* solo, sed *ex corpore politico*. Unde Forte-
is scutius, de laud, legum Angl. c. 9. *rex*, inquit. *Anglia popu-
lum gubernat non merd potestate regid, sed politicd; populus
enim Us legibus gubernatur quas ipse fert*. Externos hoc etiam
scriptores non latebat. Hinc Philippus Cominaeus author gra-
vissimus commentariorum quinto; *inter omnia or bis terræ
20 regna, quorum ego notitiam habeo, non est med quidem sen-
tentid, ubi publicum moderatius tractetur, neque ubi regi
minus licæat in populum, quam in Anglia*. Postremò ridicu-

own laws. "Everyone is subject to the king"—that is, every private individual; and so Bracton explains himself in the passages that I cited before.

What follows is but turning the same stone over and over
 5 again—a sport at which I believe you able to tire out Sisyphus
 himself—and is sufficiently answered by what has been said
 already. For the rest, if our Parliaments have sometimes offered
 deference to good kings with expressions as generous
 as they could be this side of flattery and servility, this should
 10 not be understood as offered in like measure to tyrants, or in
 prejudice of the people; for liberty is not impaired by proper
 deference. As for what you cite out of Sir Edward Coke and
 others, "that the realm of England is an absolute power," so
 it is with regard to any foreign king, or to the Emperor, or,
 15 as Camden says, "because it is not among the dependents of
 the Empire": but each of them adds, besides, that this power
 dwells not "in the king" alone, but "in the body politic."
 Whence Fortescue says, *de Laud. Leg. Aug.* ch. 9: "The king
 of England" governs his people "not by an unmixed royal
 20 power, but by the power of a State; for the English people is
 governed by those laws which" it makes. Foreign authors
 were not ignorant of this: hence Philippe de Comines, a
 weighty authority, says in the Fifth Book of his *Commentaries*:
 "Of all the kingdoms of the earth that I have any
 25 knowledge of, I think there is none where government is
 carried on under more restraint, or where the king is allowed
 less power against his people, than in England."

Finally you say: "Ridiculous is the argument they adduce

lum est, inquis, argumentum, quodaflerunt, regna ante reges fuisse, quasi dicas lucem ante solem extitisse. At nos, ò bone vir, non regna, sed populum ante reges fuisse dicimus. Quem interim te magis quam teipsum ridiculum dicam, qui lucem
5 *ante solem extitisse, quasi ridiculum, neges. Ita dum in alienis curiosus esse vis, elementa dedidicisti. Miraris denique, eos qui regem in comitiis regni viderunt solio sedentem, sub aureo et serico coelo, potuisse in dubium vocare utrum penes regem an penes Parlamentum majestas sit. Incredulos pro-*
10 *fecto homines narras, quos tam lucidum argumentum e coslo, praesertim aureo et serico, petitum nihil moverit. Quod tu coelum aureum homo Stoi'cus adeo es religiose et unice contemplatus, ut et coeli Mosai'ci et Aristotelici oblitus esse penitus videare: cum in illo lucem ante solem extitisse negaveris, in*
15 *hoc tres Zonas temperatas esse supra docueris. Quot Zonas in illo regis aureo et serico coelo observaveris, nescio: hoc scio, te Zonam unam centum stellis aureis bene temperatam ex ilia tua coelesti contemplatione abstulisse.*

—that kingdoms existed before kings; which is as much as to say there was light before the sun was created." But, my good Sir, we do not say that kingdoms, but that the people, were before kings. In the mean time, whom shall I call more
5 ridiculous than you, in denying (as if, ' were ridiculous) that light came into being before the sun? Thus while you would be inquisitive in other men's matters you have unlearned your very rudiments! You wonder, in the last place, "how they that have seen the King at a session of Parliament sitting upon
10 his throne under the golden and silken heaven of his canopy of state, should so much as make a question whether the majesty resided in him or in the Parliament." Hard of belief indeed are they, whom so brilliant an argument, prayed down from "heaven," especially a "golden and silken heaven," can
is not convince. Which golden heaven, you, like a Stoic, have so devoutly and singly gazed upon, that you seem to have quite forgot the heaven of Moses and the heaven of Aristotle; for you have denied that in Moses's heaven "there was any light before the sun"; and in Aristotle's you have exhibited three
20 temperate zones. How many zones you observed in that golden and silken heaven of the king's I know not, but so much I know: you got one money-belt—one zone well tempered with an hundred golden stars—by this your heavenly contemplation!

CAPUT X.

CUM haec omnis controversia de jure, sive generatim regio, sive separatim regis Angliæ, obstinatis partium contentionibus, quim ipsa rei natura difficilior facta sit, spero, qui studium veritatis factionibus anteponunt, 5 iis ea me ex lege Dei, jureque gentium, ex institutis denique patriis, copiose attulisse, quae regem Angliae judicari posse, atque etiam capite puniri indubitatum reliquerint. Cum ceteris, quorum animos aut superstitio occupavit, aut mentis aciem anticipata regii splendoris admiratio ita perstrinxit, ut nihil in 10 virtute ac libertate vera illustre ac splendidum videre possint, sive ratione et arguments pugnemus, sive exemplis, frustra contendimus. Tu vero, Salmasi, ut reliqua omnia, ita hoc etiam absurde admodum facere videris, qui cum omnes independentes omnibus probris onerare non desinas, regem ipsum 15 quern defendis, maxime omnium independentem fuisse statuis: neque *rcgnum populo, sedgeneri debuisse*: deinde quern *capitis causam dicere coactum* initio graviter dolebas, eum nunc *inauditum periisse* quereris. At vero totam causae dictionem ejus, fide summa Gallice editam, inspicere si libet, per-

CHAPTER X.

SINCE this whole controversy, whether concerning the right of kings in general, or that of the king of England in particular, has been rendered more difficult by partisan obstinacy than by the nature of the thing itself, I
5 hope that for those who prefer the pursuit of truth before the interest of faction I have produced out of the law of God, the laws of nations, and the municipal laws of my own country, such abundance of proofs as shall leave it beyond question that a king of England may be brought to trial and put to
10 death. With the rest, whose minds fanaticism possesses wholly, or whose wit has been so blunted by premature admiration of royal splendor that they can see nothing glorious or magnificent in true magnanimity and liberty—with these whether we strive either by reason and arguments or by examples, we strive in vain.

In fact, Salmasius, absurdly as you seem to do all else, you seem to fill up the measure of absurdity in this, that while you cannot give over heaping all manner of abuse upon all Independents, you assert that the very king you defend was the
20 most Independent of all, for that he did not "owe his sovereignty to the people, but to his descent."

Next, whereas in the beginning of your book you vehemently bewailed him for being "forced to plead for his life," now you complain "that he perished unheard." But if you
25 have a mind to look into his whole defence, which is very correctly published in French, it may be you will be of another

suasum tibi aliud fortasse erit. Carolo œrtc cum per aliquot
 dies continues amplissima loquendi facta copia esset, non ille
 quidem est ea usus ad objecta sibi crimina diluendum, sed ad
 iudicium illud ac iudicēs omnino rejiciendum. Qui autem
 5 reus aut tacet, aut aliena semper respondet, eum non est in-
 juria, si manifestus criminum sit, vel inauditum condemnari.
 Carolum si *mortem aîs plane egisse vitæ respondentem*, as-
 sentior: si dicis piè et sanctè et *secure* vitam finiisse, scito
 aviam ejus Mariam, infamem foeminam, pari in speciem pi-
 10 etate, sanctitate, constantia in pegmate occubuisse: ne animi
 praesentiae, quæ in morte quibusvis e vulgo maleficis per-
 magna ssepe est, nimium tribuas: sxpe desperado aut obfir-
 matus animus fortitudinis quandam speciem et quasi perso-
 nam induit, saepe stupor tranquillitatis: videri se bonos, intre-
 15 pidos, innocentes, interdum et sanctos pessimi quique non
 minus in morte quam in vita cupiunt; inque ipsa scelerum
 suorum capitali poena solent ultimam simulationis suae et frau-
 dum, quam possunt speciosissime, pompam ducere; et, quod
 poetae aut histriones consueverunt insulsissimi, plausum in
 20 ipso exitu ambitiosissime captare. Nunc *ad istam qucsstionem*
pervenisse te aîs, qud tractandum est quinam fuerint illius
regia condemnations præcipui authores. Cum de te potius

opinion. Whereas Charles certainly was afforded for some days together the fullest opportunity to say what he could for himself, he made no use of it—not he—to clear himself of the crimes laid to his charge, but utterly to spurn his judges and
5 their jurisdiction. Now whenever the accused either is mute, or always says nothing to the purpose, then, if his guilt is evident beyond all doubt, there is no injustice in condemning him even unheard.

If you say that Charles "died a death fully answerable to
10 his life," I agree with you; if you say that he died piously, holily, and "composedly," remember that his grandmother Mary, an infamous woman, died on the scaffold with as much outward show of piety, holiness, and constancy as he did. And lest you should ascribe too much to that very strong impres-
15 sion of courage which any common malefactors often give at their death, let me tell you that despair or a hardened heart many times puts on a certain look and mask, as it were, of fortitude, and stupidity many times a show of tranquillity of mind. The worst of men desire to appear good, undaunted,
20 innocent, and sometimes holy, not only in their life, but at their death as well. In going to their death for very villainies, they are wont to make a last parade of their hypocrisy and deception as handsomely as they can, and, as is the way of foolish poets or stageplayers, hanker after applause even when
25 the play is over.

Now you say you are "come to that part of the inquiry where you must discuss who were the chief movers of the king's condemnation." Whereas it ought rather to be in-

inquirendum sit, quomodo tu, homo exterus, et Gallicanus erro, ad quæstionem de rebus nostris, tibi tarn alienis, habendam perveneris ? quo pretio emptus ? verum de eo satis constat. Te verò percontantem de rebus nostris quis demum docuit ?
 5 ipsi nimirum perfugae, et perduelles patriæ, qui te hominem vanissimum nacti, mercede ad maledicendum facile adduxerunt. Data deinde tibi est aliqua aut furibundi cujuspiam sacellani semipapistae, aut servientis aulici de statu rerum scriptiuncula; eam ut latine verteres negotium tibi dabatur:
 10 hinc istæ narrationes confectæ, quas, si videtur, paulum excutiamus. *In hanc condemnationem non centena millesima pars fofuli consensit.* Quid ergo caeteri, qui sese nolentibus tantum facinus fieri sunt passi ? an stipites, an trunci hominum, an verò quales illi in scena Virgiliana ignavissimi,

15 *Purpurea intexti tollunt aulæa Britanni?*

Non enim veros tu quidem Britannos, sed pictos nescio quos, vel etiam acu pictos videris mihi velle dicere. Cum itaque incredibile sit gentem bellicosam a tarn paucis, iisque infimis de plebe sua, sub jugum mitti, quod in narratione tua primum
 20 occurrit, id esse falsissimum apparet. *Ordo ecclesiasticus erat ab if so senatu ejectus.* Eo miserior itaque tua est insania, nee-

quired into how you, a foreigner and a French vagabond, came to hold an inquiry into our affairs, so strange to you? And bought with what price? That, however, is well enough known. But who at last satisfied your curiosity about our affairs? Even those deserters and traitors to their country that got hold of your eminent emptiness and easily hired you to speak ill of us. Then there was handed you some paltry account of the state of our affairs, written either by some crazy half papist chaplain or by some cringing courtier, and you were given the job of turning it into Latin. Out of that you took those made-up stories of yours, which, if you please, we will examine a little.

"Not the hundred thousandth part of the people consented to this sentence of condemnation." What were the rest of the people then, that suffered so great a deed to be done against their will? Were they stocks and stones, were they mere trunks of men only, or such utterly inert creatures as those in Virgil's tapestry?

Britons interwove hold up the purple hangings.

For methinks you mean to describe no true Britons, but some sort of painted Picts, or even gentlemen embroidered in needlework! Since therefore it is a thing incredible that a warlike nation should be subdued by so few, and these of the dregs of the people, which is the first thing that occurs in your narrative, that is manifestly quite false.

"The Lords Spiritual were turned out by the Parliament itself." The more deplorable is your madness therefore—for

dum enim te sends insanire, qui eos e Parlamento quereris ejectos, quos tute ex ecclesia ejiciendos esse, libro longissimo scribis. *Senates alter ordo qui in proæribus consistebat, ducibus, comitibus, viæcomitibus, statione sua delectus est.* Et
5 meritò; a nullo enim municipio missi pro se tanturn sedebant, nihil juris in populum habebant, juri tamen ejus et libertati, suo quodam institute, adversari in plerisque consueverant: erant a rege constituti, ejus comites, et famuli, et quasi umbræ, quo amoto, ipsos necesse est ad plebem, unde orti sunt, redigi.
10 *Una et deterrima fortio Parlamenti potestatem sibi vindicare non debuit reges judicandi.* At plebeius ordo, quod te supra docui, non solum Parlamenti pars erat potissima, etiam sub regibus, sed per se ipse Parlamentum omnibus numeris absolutum et legitimum, etiam sine Comitibus, nedum Ecclesi-
15 asticis, constituebat Atqui *ne tota quidem hæc ipsa pars ad sententiam de regis capite jerenda admissa est.* Pars ilia nempe non admissa, quern verbo regem, re hostem toties judicaverat, ad eum animis atque consiliis palim defecerat. Parlamenti ordines Anglicani cum iis qui a Scoriae itidem Parla-
20 mento missi erant legati, idibus Januarii 1645. rescripserant

you are not yet sensible that you rave—to complain that Parliament turned out those who, as you yourself say in a lengthy book, ought to be turned out of the Church. "A second Estate of Parliament, to wit, the Lords Temporal, consisting of 5 dukes, earls, and viscounts, was cast down from its place.' And deservedly, for, not being returned by any constituency, they represented themselves only. They had no right over the people, but by a sort of old-established custom of their own used for the most part to oppose the people's rights and liber- 10 ties. Created by the king, they were his companions, his servants, and, as it were, his shadows; and, the king once got rid of, they must needs be reduced to the body of the people, from whom they rose.

"One part of the Parliament, and that the worst of all, 15 ought not to have assumed unto itself that power of judging kings," But I have shown you already that the House of Commons was not only the chief part of our Parliament, even while we had kings, but made in and by itself a Parliament in all respects perfect and lawful, even without the Lords 20 Temporal, much more the Lords Spiritual. But "not even the whole House of Commons itself was admitted to vote at the king's trial." True, for the part that was not admitted had in sentiment and counsel openly revolted to Charles—to one whom, though they deemed him their king in words, they 25 had yet in their deeds so often deemed an enemy. The Estates of the Parliament of England, and the deputies sent from the Parliament of Scotland, had written to the king on the 13th of January, 1645, in answer to his request for a deceitful truce

regi, dolosas inducias et habenda secum Londini colloquia petenti, non posse se eum in urbem admittere, donec is de bello civili tribus jam regnis ejus opera excitato, de caedibus tot civium ejus jussu factis reipub. satisfacisset; deque pæce firma
5 atque sincera iis conditionibus cavisset, quas ei utriusque regni Parlamenta et tulerant saepius, et latura essent: ipse e contrario postulata eorum aequissima jam septies humillime oblata, responsionibus aut surdis repudiaverat, aut ambiguis eluserat. Ordines tandem post tot annorum patientiam ut ne fraudu-
10 lentus rex, quam debellare rempub. in acie non valebat, earn in vinculis per dilationes everteret, et jucundissimum ex nostris dissidiis fructum capiens, de victoribus etiam suis restitutus hostis inspiratum sibi triumphum ageret, deœrnunt, se regis deinceps rationem non habituros; nullas se ei postula-
15 tiones amplius esse missuros, aut ab eo acœpturos. Post Hæc tamen decreta reperti sunt ex ipso Ordinum numero, qui invictissimi exercitfis odio, cujus maximis rebus gestis invadebant, quemque post ingentia merita, dimittere cum ignominia cupiebant, ministris aliquot seditiosis, quibus misere servie-
20 bant, morem gerentes, tempusque sibi opportunum nacti, cum eorum multi, quos a se longe dissentire sciebant, ad sedandos Presbyterianorum glisœntes jam tumultus, missi ab

and for a conference with them at London, that they could not admit him into the City till he had made satisfaction to the state for the civil war that he had raised in the three kingdoms, and for the deaths of so many of his subjects slain by his
5 order, and till he had in writing provided and taken order for a true and firm peace upon such terms as the Parliaments of both kingdoms had offered him so often already, and should offer him again. He for his part had either rejected their very just requests by answering that he refused to listen, or by
10 ambiguous answers had evaded them, though most humbly presented to him seven times over. After so many years' patience, the Houses at last, lest the deceitful king, even in prison, should by his temporizings ruin that Commonwealth which he had not the strength to subdue in the field, and
15 by gathering the sweet fruit of our divisions be restored, though a public enemy, and triumph unexpectedly over his conquerors,—this to prevent, the Houses resolve that for the future they will pay no attention to the king, send him no more requests, and receive no more from him. After this
20 resolution there were yet found even some members of Parliament who hated that invincible army, envied its glorious deeds, and, after it had deserved so well of the nation, desired to disband it in disgrace. They were under the thumb of a certain number of seditious ministers, by whom they were
25 governed like miserable slaves. They found their opportunity when many whom they knew to be far otherwise minded than themselves were absent in the provinces, sent by the House itself to put down the Presbyterian rising which had already

ipso ordine, in provinciis abessent, mira levitate, ne dicam perfidia, decernunt, inveteratum hostem, verbotenus duntaxat regem, nulla pene ab eo satisfactione prius accepta, aut cautione facta, ad urbem esse reducendum; in summam digni-

5 tatem atque imperium aequè esse restituendum, ac si de repub. preclarè meritis esset. Ita religioni, libertati, foederi denique illi è se toties jactato regem anteponebant. Quid illi interea qui integri tam pestifera agitari consilia videbant? An ideo deesse patriae, saluti suorum non prospicere debuerant, eo quod

10 istius mali contagio in ipsorum Ordinem penetraverat? At quis istos exclusit male sanos? *Exercitus*, inquis, *Anglicanus*, id est, non externorum, sed fortissimorum et fidissimorum civium; quorum tribuni plerique, Senatores ipsi erant, quos illi boni exclusi patria ipsa excludendos, et in Hiberniam pro-

is cul ablegandos esse censuerant; Scoti interim dubia jam fide quatuor Angliae provincias suis finibus proximas magnis copiis insidebant; firmissima earum regionum oppida praesidiis tenebant; regem ipsum in custodia habebant: ipsi etiam factiones suorum atque tumultus, Parlamento ipsi plusquam

20 minaces, et in urbe et in agris passim fovebant, qui tumultus pauò post in bellum non civile solum, sed et Scoticum illud

begun to spread. With a strange levity, not to say perfidy, they vote that that inveterate enemy of the state, king in name only, though he had given scarce any security or satisfaction, should be brought back to the City and restored to his throne
5 and sovereignty, exactly as if he had deserved exœllently well of the nation. So that they preferred the king before their religion, their liberty, and that Covenant of theirs which so often they had vaunted. Meantime what of those who were sound themselves, and saw such pestilent councils on foot?
10 Ought they to have been wanting to their country, and have failed to provide for the safety of their countrymen, because the infection had spread even into their own House?

But who excluded those unsound members? "The English army," you say. So it was not an army of foreigners, but of
15 most valiant and faithful citizens, officered for the most part by the very members of Parliament whom those excluded Honorable Members had thought fit to exclude from their very country, and send far away into Ireland! The Scots, meanwhile, acting in what had by now become very dubious
20 good faith, were occupying with large forces the four English counties nearest their border, were keeping garrisons in the strongest towns of those parts, and were holding the king himself in custody. They also encouraged here and there in both city and country factions and uprisings of their own
25 countrymen, which were more than threatening to Parliament, and which soon after broke out into not only our Civil War but the Scottish War as well.

If it has been always counted praiseworthy in private men

erupere. Quod si privatis etiam consiliis aut armis subvenire reipublice laudatissimum semper fuit, non est certe cur exercitus reprehendi possit, qui Parlamenti autoritate ad urbem accersitus imperata fecit; et regionum factionem atque tumultum ipsi curiae saepe minitantem facile compressit. In id autem discrimen adducta res erat, ut aut nos ab illis, aut illos a nobis opprimi necesse esset. Stabant ab illis Londinensium plerique institores atque opifices, et ministrorum factiosissimi quique; a nobis exercitus magna fide, modestia, virtute cognitus. Per hos cum retinere libertatem, reipub. salutem liceret, an Hæc omnia per ignaviam et stultitiam prodenda fuisse censes? Debellati regiarum partium duces arma quidem inviti, animum hostilem non deposuerant: omnibus belli renovandi occasionibus intend ad urbem se receperant. Cum his, quamvis inimicissimis, Presbyteriani, postquam non permitti sibi in omnes tam civilem quam ecclesiasticam dominationem viderunt, clandestina consilia, et prioribus tum dictis tum factis indignissima consociare cœperant: eoque acerbiter processere, ut mallent se regi denuo mancipare, quam fratres suos in partem illam libertatis, quam et ipsi sibi suo sanguine acquisiverant, admittere; mallent tyrannum tot civium cruore perfusum, ira in superstites, et conceptâ jam ultione ardentem rursus experiri dominum, quam fratres, et amicissi-

to succour the state by adviœ or arms, there surely is no reason why our army can be blamed, who being by authority of Parliament summoned to the City, obeyed orders, and quelled with ease an uprising of the royalist faction which more than
5 onœ threatened the House itself. Things had been brought to such a pass indeed, that of necessity either we must be crushed by them, or they by us. On their side were most of the London hucksters and handicraftsmen, and generally the most factious of the ministers; on ours an army known for its great
10 loyalty, moderation, and courage. It being in our power by their means to keep the liberty, the safety, of our state, do you think that all ought to have been surrendered and betrayed by negligence and folly ?

The leaders of the Royalist party, when subdued, had un-
15 willingly laid down their arms indeed, but not their hatred; and they had flocked to town, watching all opportunities of renewing the war. With these men (though their greatest enemies) the Presbyterians, seeing themselves not admitted to civil as well as ecclesiastical despotism over everybody, had
20 begun to make common cause, secret and most unworthy of what they had formerly both said and done. They went on to such a degree of bitterness that they would rather enthrall themselves to the king again than admit their own brethren to that portion of liberty which they too had purchased with their
25 own blood, and would rather try being lorded over onœ more by a tyrant dyed in the gore of so many of his own subjects, and burning with rage and with the vengeance he already imagined against the survivors, than endure their brethren

mos aequo jure ferre sibi pares. Soli Independentes qui vocantur, et ad ultimum sibi constare, et suâ uti victoria sciebant: qui ex rege hostem se feœrat, eum ex hoste regem esse amplius, sapienter, meo quidem judicio, nolebant: neque pacem
5 idcircò non volebant, sed involutum pacis nomine aut bellum novum, aut aeternam servitatem prudentes metuebant. Exercitum autem nostrum quo prolixiiiis infamare possis, narrationem quandam rerum nostrarum inconditam et strigosam exordiris: in qua tametsi multa falsa, multa frivola reperio,
10 multa abs te vitio data, quæ laudi duœnda essent, huic tamen alteram ex adverse narrationem opponere nihil arbitror attingere. Rationibus enim hie non narrationibus certatur; atque illis utrobique, non his fides habebitur. Et sane sunt ejusmodi res istae, ut nisi justa historia dici pro dignitate nequeant.
15 Melius itaque puto, quod de Carthagine Sallustius, silere tantis de rebus, quam parum dicere. neque committam ut non solum virorum illustrium, sed Dei praecipue maximi laudes, in hac rerum serie mirabili saepissime iterandas, tuis hoc libro intexam opprobriis. Ea igitur duntaxat, quæ argumenti ha-
20 bere speciem videntur, pro more deœrpam. *Anglos et Scotos*

and friends to share and share alike with them. Only those who are called Independents knew from first to last how to be true to their cause, and what use to make of their victory. They would not—and wisely, in my opinion—that he who when
 5 he was king had made himself the state's enemy should ever, from being the state's enemy, be king any more; nor were they on this account averse to peace, but they very prudently dreaded either new war or perpetual slavery wrapped up in the name of peace.

10 To slander our army the more fully, you begin a dry disorderly narrative of our affairs; in which though I find many things false, many things frivolous, many things laid to our charge which ought rather to be credited in our praise, yet I think it will be to no purpose for me to set over against it
 15 another narration from the opposite side. For our contest is by reasonings, not by narrations, and both sides will believe the former, but not the latter. And indeed the nature of the things themselves is such that for their weight and worth they cannot be related as they deserve but in a right history; so that
 20 I think it better, as Sallust said of Carthage, rather to say nothing at all about things of such weight and importance than to say too little. Nor will I so much offend as to interweave in my book the praises not of great men only, but above all of Almighty God, which in this wonderful course of affairs
 25 ought to be most often repeated, to interweave these, I say, amongst your slanders and reproaches. I will therefore, as is my wont, pick out only such things as seem to have any color of argument.

quod ai's *solenni conventione promississe, se regis majestatem conservaturos*, omittis quibus id conditionibus promiserint; si salva nimirum religione et libertate id fieri posset: quibus utrisque ad extremum usque spiritum iniquus adeo et insidi-

5 osus rex iste erat, ut, vivente illo, et religionem periclitaturam, et libertatem interituram esse facile appareret Sed redis jam ad illos regii supplicii auctores. *Si res ipsa ponderibus suis, et momentis rectè æstimetur, exitus facti nefandi ita Independentibus imputari debet, ut principii et progressus gloriam*

10 *Presbyteriani sibi possent vindicare.* Audite Presbyteriani, ecquid nunc juvat, ecquid confert ad innocæntiæ et fidelitatis opinionem vestrae, quod a rege puniendo abhorre tantopere videremini? Vos isto regis actore verbosissimo, accusatore vestro, *plusquam dimidium itineris conjecistis; vos ad quar-*

15 *turn actum et ultra in dramate hoc desultando frigultientes spectati estis;* At interim reconditissimæ homo eloquentiar, quos tam laboriosè accusas, cur tam facile imitaris, *spectatus* toties in hac regia defensione *desultando ipse frigultiens?* vos *meritb regis occisi crimine notari debetis; ut qui viam ad ip-*

20 *sum occidendum munistis; vos nefariam illam securim cervicibus ejus inflixistis, non alii.* Væ vobis imprimis, si un-

You say: "The English and the Scots by solemn covenant promised to preserve the majesty of the king." But you omit upon what terms they promised it—to wit, if it might consist with the safety of their religion and their liberty; to both of
5 which that king was so hostile and treacherous, even unto his last breath, that it was evident their religion would be endangered, and their liberty would perish if he lived.

But now you come back to the movers of the king's execution: "If the thing be considered according to the influences
10 that decided it, the conclusion of this abominable action must be imputed to the Independents in such a way that the Presbyterians may justly claim the glory of its beginning and progress." Hark, ye Presbyterians, how does it help, how does it profit your reputation for innocēce and loyalty that ye
15 seemed so much to abhor putting the king to death? According to this everlasting talkative advocate of the king, your accuser, ye "went more than half-way"; "to the fourth act and beyond ye were beheld twittering and stammering while ye turned this tragedy into a circus feat of jumping or strad-
20 dling two horses at oncē." But meanwhile, o wielder of far-fetched rhetoric, why imitate so readily those whom you accuse so toilsomely—being yourself so often "beheld" in this *Royal Defenæ* "twittering and stammering" while you "straddle two horses at oncē!"
25 But, oncē more, O Presbyterians! ye "may justly be charged with the crime of killing the king, since ye paved the way to killing the same." "Ye, and no others, struck the accursed axe upon his neck." Woe to you before all others, if ever

quam stirps Caroli regnum posthac in Anglos recuperabit: in vos, mihi credite, cudetur Hæc faba. Sed Deo vota persolvite, fratres diligite liberatores vestros, qui illam calamitatem, atque certam perniciem ab invitis etiam vobis hactenus prohibere. Postulamini vos item, quod *aliquot annos antè per varias petitiones jus regis imminuere moliti estis, quòd voæs contumeliosas regi illis ipsis libellis quos nomine Senatus regi porrexistis, insertas publicdstis; videlicet in ilia declaratione dominorum et communium, Maii 26. 1642. aferte quid sistis de regis autoritate aliquot perduellionem spirantibus et insanis positionibus fassi estis. Hullæ oppidi portas Hothamus, tali mandato a senatu acèpto, venienti regis oclusit; vos quid rex pati posset, hoc primo rebellionis experimento cognosære concupivistis. Quid hoc dici potuit accommoda-*

15 *tius ad conciliandos inter se Anglorum animos, atque a rege penitus abalienandos? Cum intelligere hinc possint, si rex revertatur, se non solum regis mortem, sed etiam petitiones quondam suas, et frequentissimi Parlamenti acta de liturgia et episcopis abolendis, de triennali Parlamento, et quæcunque*

20 *summo populi consensu ac plausu sancita sunt, tanquam seditiosas atque insanas Presbyterianorum positiones luituros. Sed repente mutat animum homo levissimus; et quod modo rem ipsam recte æstimanti sibi videbatur solis Presbyterianis deberi, id nunc rem eandem ab alto revolventi Independent!*

Charles's stock recover the crown of England; upon my word, ye are like to pay the piper! But make your prayers to God, and love your brethren your deliverers, who have hitherto kept that calamity and sure destruction from you, though
5 against your wills. Ye are accused likewise for that "some years ago ye endeavored by sundry petitions to lessen the king's authority; that in the very papers ye presented to the king in the name of Parliament, ye inserted and published some expressions abusive of the king": to wit, "in that Decla-
10 ration of the Lords and Commons of the 26th of May, 1642, ye declared openly, in some mad proposals that breathed rebellion, what ye thought of the king's authority. Hotham, by order of Parliament, shut the gates of Hull against the king": ye "aimed by this first act of rebellion to make trial how much
15 the king would bear." What could be said more perfectly adapted to reconcile the minds of all Englishmen to one another, and estrange them wholly from the king? For hereby they may understand that if ever the king come back, they shall be punished not only for his father's death, but for peti-
20 tions they made long ago, and Acts passed in full Parliament for putting down the Bishops and the Book of Common Prayer, and for the Triennial Parliament, and what was else enacted with the people's fullest consent and applause—all these as seditious and "mad proposals of the Presbyterians!"
25 But this slight fickle fellow changes his mind all of a sudden; and what but of late "when he reckoned the thing itself aright" he thought was due wholly to the Presbyterians, this, now that "he turns over from on high" the very same "thing,"

bus totum deberi videtur. Modò Presbyterianos *vi aperta atque armis contra regem grassatos esse, eumque ab iis hello victum, captum, in carærem coniectum* affirmabat, nunc omnem *hanc rebellionis doctrinam* Independentium esse scribit.

- 5 O hominis fidem et constantiam! quid aliam jam opus est narrationem comparare contra tuam, quæ ipsa sibi tarn turpiter decoxit? Verum de te siquis dubitat, albusne an ater homo sis, tua legat quæ sequuntur. *Tempus est, inquis, pandere unde et quando promperit inimica regibus secta: belli*
- 10 *isti sant Puritani sub regno Elisabetha prodire tenebris Orci, et Ecclesiam inde turbare primum cæperunt, imo rempub. ipsam: non enim sunt minores reipub. pestes quam ecclesia.* Nunc te verè Balamum vox ipsa sonat; ubi enim virus omne acerbitatis evomere cupiebas, ibi insciens atque invitus bene-
- 15 dixisti. Hoc enim tota Anglia notissimum est, si qui ad exemplum ecclesiarum vel Gallicarum vel Germanicarum, ut quasque reformatiores esse judicabant, puriorem cultus divini rationem sequi studebant, quam pen[^] omnem Episcopi nostri caeremoniis et superstitionibus contaminaverant, si qui tan-
- 20 dem pietate erga Deum, aut vitæ integritate caeteris praestabant, cos ab Episcoporum fautoribus Puritanos fuisse nominates. Hi sunt quorum doctrinam regibus inimicam esse cla-

he thinks is due wholly to the Independents. A moment ago he was averring that the Presbyterians "advanced against the king with overt force of arms," and that by them the king was "defeated, taken, and put in prison." Now he says this whole
5 "theory of rebellion" belongs to the Independents. Such trustworthiness and consistency in the man! What need is there now of a counter-narrative to this of yours, that has so shamefully failed to meet its own obligations ?

But if anyone should question whether you are an honest
10 man or a knave, let him read these following lines of yours: "It is time to explain whence and at what time this sect of enemies to kingship first broke out. Why truly these charming Puritans began in Queen Elizabeth's time to issue forth out of the darkness of Hell, and thenceforward to disturb the
15 Church, yea and the State itself too; for they are no less plagues to the State than to the Church." Now your very speech betrays you right Balaam; for where you designed to vomit out all the venom of your bitterness, there unwittingly and against your will you have pronounced a blessing. For it is notorious
20 throughout all England that if any endeavored, after the pattern of those churches, whether French or German, which they accounted more truly reformed, to follow a purer type of divine service, which our Bishops had almost universally defiled with their ceremonies and superstitions, or if any, in
25 fine, excelled the rest either in piety toward God or in purity of conduct, such persons were by the Bishops' party termed Puritans. These are they whose principles you so loudly declare to be unfriendly to kings; nor are they alone in this, for

mitas; neque hi solum, nam *plerique rejomatorum*, inquis, *qui in alios discipline ejus articulos non jurdrunt, hunc tamen unum videnturapprobdsse, qui regiæ adversatur dominationi.* Ita Independentes, dum gravissimè insectaris, laudas; qui eos
 5 ab integerrima Christianorum familia deducis; et quam doctrinam Independentium esse propriam ubique asseris, eam nunc *rejomatorum plerosque approbdsse* confiteris; usque eò demum audaciae, impietatis, apostasiæ provectus es, ut etiam Episcopos, quos tanquam pestes et Antichristos ex Ec-
 10 clesia radicitus evellendos, atque exterminandos esse nuper docuisti, eos nunc a *rege tuendos fuisse* affirmas, ne quid *Sacramento* scilicet *inaugurations derogatum iret.* Nihil est ulterius jam sceleris aut infamiæ quo possis procedere, quam, quod solum superest, ut reformatam, quam polluis, religio-
 15 nem quamprimum ejures. Quod autem nos ai's *omnes sectas et heereses tolcrare*, id noli accusare; quamdiu te impium, qui Christianorum sanctissimos, et plerosque etiam reformatos tibi adversos € *tcnebris orci prodire* audes dicere, te vanum, mendacem, et conductitium calumniatorem, te denique Apo-
 20 statam ecclesia tamen toleret. Tuas autem exinde sycophantias, quibus magnam reliqui capitis partem insumis, et quæ monstrosa dogmata Independentibus, ad cumulandam iis invidiam, affingis, quidni omittam? cum neque ad causam hanc regiam omninò pertineant, et ea ferè sint quæ risum po-
 25 tius aut con temp turn cujusvis quam refutationem mereantur.

"the majority of Protestants, who have not adopted the rest of their principles," you say, "yet seem to have approved of this only, which opposes royal despotism." So that while you inveigh bitterly against the Independents, you praise them in
5 deriving their descent from the most pure and uncorrupted family of Christians; and a principle which you everywhere affirm to be peculiar to the Independents, you now confess that "the majority of Protestants have approved." Nay, you are arrived to that degree of temerity, impiety, and apostasy,
10 that even the Bishops, who, you formerly maintained, ought to be uprooted out of the church, as so many plagues and Antichrists, you now aver "ought to have been protected by the king" in order not to "impair his coronation oath"! Beyond your present villainy and shame there is no step you can
15 take but one alone—to abjure as soon as possible the Reformed religion which you taint with your presence. Whereas you say we "tolerate all sects and heresies," you ought not to find fault with us for that as long as the Church tolerates you, impious wretch and empty-headed lying slanderer for hire,
20 you Apostate who have the impudence to say that the most saintly Christians, and even the majority of Protestants—a majority which happens to be opposed to you—issue forth out of the darkness of Hell!

Why should I not pass by the telltale rascalities upon which
25 you spend a great part of the rest of your chapter, and those prodigious tenets that you ascribe to the Independents, to render them odious? For they concern not at all this disputed question about kings, and are for the most part such as deserve anybody's laughter or contempt rather than refutation.

CAPUT XI.

A undecimum hoc caput videre mihi, Salmasi, quamvis nullo cum pudore, cum aliqua tamen conscientia futilitatis tuæ accessisse. Cum enim hoc loco perquirendum tibi proposueris *quod auctoritate* pronuntiatum
5 de rege fuerit, jungis quod a te nemo expectabat, *frustra id quæri*; scilicet *quæstioni huic vix locum reliquit qualitas hominum qui id jœerc*. Cum igitur, quam es importunitatis et impudentiæ in hac causa suscipienda compertus, tam sis nunc etiam loquacitatis tibi conscius, eo è me brevius respon-
10 sum feres. quærenti jam tibi *quod auctoritate* ordo plebeius vel judicavit ipse regem, vel aliis id iudicium delegavit, respondeo suprema: supremam quemadmodum habuerit, docebunt te ea quæ tunc à me dicta sunt, cum te supra, hac ipsa de re gnaviter ineptientem redarguerem. Quod si tibi saltern
15 crederes, posse te ullo tempore quod satis est dicere, non eadem toties cantare odiosissimè soleres. Aliis autem delegare suam iudicandi potestatem ordo plebeius eadem sane ratione potuit, qua tu regem, qui et ipse omnem potestatem a populo acceperit, eandem aliis delegare potuisse dicis. Unde in ilia
20 *solenni conventionis*, quam nobis objecisti, cum Angliæ turn

CHAPTER XI

YOU seem to me to approach this eleventh chapter, Salmasius, though still unashamed, yet with some sense of your inefficiency. For whereas you proposed to yourself to inquire in this place "by what authority" sentence was given against the king, you add immediately something which nobody expected of you, that "it is in vain to make any such inquiry," to wit, because "the quality of the persons that did it leaves hardly any room for such a question." And therefore as the conviction of meddlesomeness and impudence of which you have been found guilty in the undertaking of this cause is now matched by your present guilty consciousness of your own impertinent garrulity, I shall give you the shorter answer. To your question then "by what authority" the House of Commons either condemned the king themselves, or delegated that power to others, I answer: "the highest in the land." How they came to have the highest authority, you may learn from what I said before, when I was refuting your persistent nonsense upon this very subject; for if you believed yourself capable of ever saying the sufficient and satisfactory thing, you would not have the habit of so often and so tediously repeating the same old singsong. And the House of Commons might delegate their judicial power in the same way in which you say the king, who himself likewise received all he had from the people, may delegate his. Hence in that Solemn League and Covenant that you have brought against us, the Estates of England and

Scoriae summi ordines religiose profitentur ac spondent, ea se supplicia de perduellibus esse sumpturos, *quibus utrisque gentis potestas judiciaria suprema, aut qui ab ea delegatam potestatem acœpturi erant*, plectendos judicassent. Audis hic
5 utriusque gentis Senatam unâ voce testantem se posse suam authoritatem judicariam, quam *supremam* ipsi vocant, aliis delegare: vanam ergo et frivolam de ista potestatis delegatione controversiam moves. At *cum his*, inquis, *judicibus è domo inferiori selectis juncti etiam judiccs juere ex cohortibus mili-*
10 *taribus sumpti; nunquam autem militum juit civem judicare.* Paucissimis te retundam; non enim de cive nunc, sed de hoste memineris nos loqui: quern si imperator bellicus cum tribunis militaribus suis, bello captum, et è vestigio, si ita videretur, occidendum, pro tribunal! judicare voluerit, an quicquam
15 prater jus belli aut morem œsebitur fecisse? qui autem hostis reipublicx, et bello captus est, ne pro cive quidem is, nedum pro rege in ea repub. haberi potest. Hanc ipsa lex Regis Eduardi sacrosancta sententiam tulit; quæ negat malum regem aut esse regem, aut oportere regis nomine appellari. Ad illud
20 autem quod ai's non *integram* plebis domum, sed *maneam et mutilam de regis capite judicâsse*, sic habeto; eorum, qui regem plectendum esse œsebant, longe majorem fuisse numerum, quam qui res quascunque in Parlamento transigere, etiam per absentiam caeterorum, ex lege debebant; qui cum

Scotland solemnly protest and engage to each other to punish traitors in such manner as "the supreme judicatories of both Kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, shall judge convenient." Now you hear the
5 Parliaments of both nations with one voicē bearing witness that they may delegate their judicial power, which they call "supreme"; so that the controversy you raise about delegating this power is vain and frivolous.

"But," you say, "with those judges that were chosen from
10 the lower House were joined even judges from the army; soldiers never, though, had a right to sit in judgment upon a citizen." I will turn the edge of your argument in a very few words; for remember that we are not now talking of a citizen, but of an enemy. Suppose such an enemy taken pris-
15 oner, and to be dispatched at oncē if duly sentencēd; now if the commander of the army with his officers should decide to try him before a Court Martial, would he be deemed to have done aught contrary to martial law and custom? An enemy to a state, made a prisoner of war, cannot be looked upon to
20 be so much as a citizen in that state, much less a king. This is the purport of the sacred law of St. Edward, which declares that a bad king neither is a king, nor ought to be called a king.

To your objection that it was "not a whole" House of Commons, but a house "maimed and mutilated, that tried and con-
25 demned the king," take this answer. The number of them who gave their votes for putting the king to death was far greater than is lawfully necessary—even in the absence of the rest—to transact any business whatsoever in Parliament.

suo vitio atque culpa abessent (defectio enim animorum ad communem hostem pessima absentia erat) nullam iis, qui in fide permanserant, afferre moram conservandae reipub. poterant; quam vacillantem, et ad servitum atque interitum
5 prope redactam, populus universus eorum fidei, prudentiae, fortitudini primo commiserat. Atque illi quidem strenue rem gessere; exulcerati regis impotentiae, furori, insidiis sese ob-
10 jecere; omnium libertati atque saluti suam posthabuere; omnia antehac Parlamenta, omnes majores suos prudentia, magnanimitate, constantia supergressi. Hos tamen populi magna pars, quamvis omnem illis fidem, operam, atque auxilium pol-
licita, ingratis animis in ipso cursu deseruit. Pars Hæc servi-
tutem et pacem cum ignavia atque luxuria ullis conditionibus volebat; pars altera tamen libertatem posebat, pacem non
15 nisi firmam atque honestam. Quid hie ageret Senatus? partem hanc sanam, et sibi et patriae fidelem defenderet, an desertricem illam sequeretur? Scio quid agere oportuisse dicere; non enim Eurylochus, sed Elpenor es, id est vile animal Ciræum, porcus immundus, turpissima servitute etiam sub
20 foemina assuetus; unde nullum gustum virtutis, et quæ ex ea nascitur, libertatis habes; omnes esse servos cupis, quod nihil

Now since they were absent through their own fault, nay guilt (for their hearts' desertion to the common enemy was the worst sort of absence) they could not delay the rest, who had continued faithful to the cause, in the work of preserving
5 the state, which, when it was tottering and almost quite reduced to slavery and utter ruin, the whole body of the people had before all else committed to their fidelity, prudence, and courage. And they acted their parts like men; they set themselves against the unruly wilfulness, the rage, the secret de-
10 signs of an embittered king; they held the common liberty and safety before their own; they outdid all former Parliaments, they outdid all their ancestors, in wisdom, magnanimity, and steadfastness to their cause. Yet a great part of the people, though it had promised full fidelity, support, and
15 assistance, did ungratefully desert these men in the midst of their undertaking. This part was for slavery and peace, with sloth and luxury, upon any terms; the other part, however, kept demanding liberty, and no peace but what was sure and honorable. What was the Parliament to do now?
20 Ought it to have defended the part that remained sound and faithful to it and to the country, or to have sided with the one that deserted both? I know what you will say it ought to have done, for you are not Eurylochus, but Elpenor, a miserable Circean beast, a filthy swine, accustomed to foulest slavery
25 even under a woman; so that you have not the least relish of manliness or of the liberty which is born of it. You would have all men slaves, because you feel not in your heart aught

in tuo pectore generosum aut liberum sentis, nihil non ignobile atque servile aut loqueris aut spiras. Injicis porrò scrupulum quòd *et Scotiae rex erat, de quo statuimus*, quasi idcirco in Anglia impune quidvis illi facere liceret. Ut hoc caput
5 denique prae caeteris elumbe atque aridum aliquo saltern facètè dicto queas concludere, *duts*, inquis, *sunt voculx iisdem ac totidem dementis constantes, solo literarum situ diftercetes, sed immane quantum signification differenæs, Vis, et Jus.* Minimi profectò mirum est, te trium literarum hominem tarn
10 scitam ex tribus literis argutiolam exculpere potuisse; hoc magis mirandum est quod toto libro asseris, duas res tarn inter se caeteroqui *differenæs*, in regibus unum atque idem esse. quæ enim vis est unquam a regibus facta, quam non jus regium tu esse affirmaveris? Hæc sunt quæ novem paginis
15 bene longis responsione digna animadvertere potui; caetera sunt ea, quæ aut identidem repetita haud semel refutavimus, aut ad hanc causam disceptandam nullum habent momentum. Itaque solito nunc brevior si sum, id non meae diligentiae, quam in hoc summo taedio languescere non patior, sed tuæ
20 loquacitati, rerum et rationum tarn cassæ atque inani, imputandum erit.

magnanimous or free; you say nothing, you breathe nothing, but what is mean and servile.

You raise another scruple, to wit, "that he whom we condemned was the king of Scotland too." As if he might there-
 5 fore do what he would in England! But that you may conclude this chapter, which of all others is the most dry and doddering, at least with some witty quirk, "There are two little words," you say, "consisting of the same letters and the same number of them, and differing only in the position of
 10 them, but differing enormously in meaning, to wit, VIS and IVS (might and right)." Of course it is no great wonder that you, being a man of three letters (*fur*, a thief), should make such a clever little quibble upon three letters; much more wonderful is this which you affirm throughout your book:
 15 that two things "differing" so much in all other respects should yet be one and the same thing in kings. For did kings ever perpetrate a royal violence which you do not affirm to be their royal right?

In nine long, long pages these are the matters that I could
 20 observe worth answering. The rest are either matters which, having been again and again repeated, have been more than once refuted, or matters which have no bearing upon this discussion. So that my more than usual brevity should not be counted against my diligence, which, though I be irked in the
 25 extreme, I let not slack, but against your everlasting talk, so void and vacant of matter and sense.

CAPUT XII.

VELLEM equidem, Salmasi, ne cui fortè videar in regem Carolum, suo fato atque supplicio defunctum, iniquior esse aut acerbior, ut totum hunc de *criminibus ejus* locum, quod et tibi et tuis consultius fuisset, 5 silentio praeteriisses. Nunc verò quoniam id magis placuit, ut de iis praefidenter et verbosè diceres, faciam profecto ut intelligas, nihil a te fieri incogitantius potuisse, quam ut deterrimam causæ tuæ partem, nempe ejus crimina ad extremum re-
10 atrocissima ostendero fuisse, et ejus memoriam omnibus bonis ingratam atque invisam, et tui defensoris odium quam maximum in animis legentium novissime relinquunt. *Duæ, inquis, partes ejus accusationis fieri possunt: una in reprehensione vitæ versatur; altera in delictis qua tanquam rex potuit com-*
15 *mittere.* Et vitam quidem ejus inter convivia, et ludos, et fcEminarum greges dilapsam facile tacuero: quid enim habet luxus dignum memoratu? Aut quid hæc ad nos, si tantum privatus fecisset? postquam voluit rex esse, ut nec sibi vivere, ita ne peccare quidem sibi solilm potuit. Primum enim ex-

CHAPTER XII.

IN order that no one shall by any chance get the impression that I am unfair or too severe to King Charles, now he has fulfilled his destiny and borne his punishment, I for my part, Salmasius, wish you had passed over in silence
5 this whole passage concerning "his crimes," as it had been more advisable for yourself and your party to do. But since it has pleased you rather to talk copiously and over-confidently upon them, I will make you clearly perceive that you could not have done a more inconsiderate thing than to save up
10 the worst part of your cause,—namely the tearing open and searching those old wounds, the king's crimes—to the last. For when I shall have proved them to have been actually committed and most heinous, they will not only render his memory repulsive and hateful to all good men, but leave in your
15 readers' minds as well an intense final hatred of you as his defender.

"The indictment against him," you say, "may be divided into two parts: one is concerned with censure of his way of life; the other with faults he might commit as king." I will
20 be content to pass by in silence the life he spent amid banquets, plays, and be vies and troops of women; for what can there be in luxury and excess worth relating? And what would those things have been to us if he had been only a private person? but he would act the king; consequently, as he could not live
25 unto himself alone, so neither could he sin unto himself alone. For in the first place, he did his subjects much mischief by his

emplo suis vehementissime nocuit; secundo loco, quod temporis libidinibus et rebus ludicris impendit, quod erat plurimum, id totum reipub. quam susceperat gubernandam, subduxit; postremo immensas opes, innumerabilem pecuniam
5 non suam, sed publicam luxu domestico dilapidavit. Itaque domi rex malus primum esse coepit. Verum ad ea potius crimina *qua mate regnando commisisse arguitur transeamus*. Hic doles *tyrannum eum, proditorem, et homicidam* fuisse judicatum. Id non injuria factum demonstrabitur. Tyrannus
10 num autem prius, non ex vulgi opinione, sed ex Aristotelis et doctorum omnium judicio definiamus. Tyrannus est qui suam duntaxat, non populi utilitatem spectat. Ita Aristoteles ethicorum decimo, et alibi, ita alii plerique. Suane commoda an populi spectarit Carolus, pauca Hæc de multis, quæ tan-
15 tummodo perstringam, testimonio erunt. Cum aulae sumptibus patrimonium et proventus regii non sufficerent, imponit gravissima populo tributa; iisque absumptis nova excogitavit; non ut reipub. vel auget, vel ornaret, vel defenderet, sed ut populi non unius opes vel unam in domum importatas ipse
20 sibi congereret, vel una in domo dissiparet. Hunc in modum sine lege cum incredibilem pecuniam corrasisset, quod

example; in the second place, all the time—and it was very much—that he spent upon his lusts and sports, he stole away from the State which he had undertaken to govern; lastly, he squandered away upon the luxury of his household boundless
 5 wealth, uncounted sums of money which were not his own but the public revenue of the nation. So it was in his private life at home that he first began to be an ill king.

But let us rather "pass over to those crimes that he is charged with having committed in misgoverning." Here you lament
 10 his being condemned as "a tyrant, a traitor, and a murderer," That in this he was not wronged shall now be shown. First, however, let us define a tyrant, not according to the notions of the crowd, but according to the judgment of Aristotle and of all learned men. A tyrant is one who regards his own wel-
 15 fare and profit only, and not that of the people. So Aristotle defines one in the tenth book of his *Ethics*, and elsewhere, and so do many others. Whether Charles regarded his own advantage or the people's, these things, which I shall only touch upon, and which are only a few out of many, will serve to
 20 show.

When his crown property and royal revenue could not defray the expenses of the court, he laid very heavy taxes upon the people, and having squandered these, invented new ones—not for the benefit, honor, or defence of the state, but that
 25 he might hoard up in one house, or in one house fritter away, the riches of nations more than one. When in this fashion he had unlawfully scraped together an incredible amount, he attempted either wholly to do away with Parliament, which

unicum sciebat sibi fraeno fore, Parlamentum aut funditus abolere, aut convocatum haud saepius quam id suis rationibus conduceret, sibi soli reddere obnoxium conatus est. Quo fraeno sibi detracto, aliud ipse populo framum injecit: Germanos 5 equites, pedites Hibernos per urbes, perque oppida quasi in praesidiis, cum bellum esset nullum, collocandos curavit: parimne tibi adhuc tyrannus videtur? In quo etiam, ut in aliis multis rebus, quod supra per occasionem abs te datam ostendi (quanquam tu Carolum Neroni crudelissimo conferri indignis) 10 Neroni perquam similis erat: nam et Senatum ille e repub. se sublaturum persaepe erat minatus. Interea conscientis religiosorum hominum supra modum gravis, ad caeremonias quosdam et superstitiosos cultus, quos e medio papismo in ecclesiam reducerat, omnes adigebat; renuentes aut 15 exilio aut carcere multabat; Scotos bis eam ob causam bello adortus est. Hue usque *simplici* saltern *viae* nomen tyranni commeruisse videatur. Nunc cur adjectum in accusatione proditoris nomen fuerit exponam. Cum huic Parlamento saepius pollicitis, edictis, execrationibus confirmasset, se nihil contra 20 repub. moliri, eodem ipso tempore aut papistarum delectus in Hibernia habebat, aut legatis ad regem Daniae clanculum missis, arma, equos, auxilium diserte contra Parlamentum petebat, aut exercitum nunc Anglorum nunc Scotorum pretio

he knew was the only thing that could bridle him, or to summon it no oftener than suited his conveniencē, and to make it accountable to himself alone. This bridle being onç cast off himself, himself put another bridle upon the people: he had
 5 German horse and Irish foot stationed in many towns and cities as if to garrison them, though in time of peace. Do you think he does not begin to look like a tyrant? In this very thing, as in many others which I have exhibited above upon occasion given me by you—in this, I say, though you scorn to
 10 have Charles compared with so cruel a tyrant as Nero, he resembled him extremely, for Nero likewise often threatened to abolish the Senate.

Meanwhile the king bore extremely hard upon the consciencēs of godly men, and compelled all to use cœrtain cœrimonies and superstitious worships which he had brought back
 is into the Church again from the midst of popery. Them that would not conform he banished or imprisoned; and he made war upon the Scots twice for no other cause than that. So far he may seem to have surely deserved the name of tyrant at
 20 least "onç over."

Now I will tell you why the word traitor was put into his indictment. While he had again and again assured this Parliament by promises, by proclamations, by imprecatory oaths, that he had no design against the state, at that very time either
 25 he was recruiting levies of Papists in Ireland, or by secret embassy to the king of Denmark he was begging arms, horses, and troops, expressly against the Parliament, or he was endeavoring to raise an army, first of Englishmen, and then of

sollicitabat; illis Urbem Londinum diripiendam, his quatuor provincias Aquilonares Scotorum ditioni adjungendas promisit si sibi ad Parlamentum quoquo modo tollendum commodare suam operam vellent. Cum Hæc non succederent, 5 cuidam Dillonio perduelli dat secretiora ad Hibernos mandata, quibus juberentur omnes Anglos ejus insulae colonos repentino impetu adoriri. Hæc fere proditorum ejus monumenta sunt, non vanis rumoribus collecta, sed ipsis literis ipsius manu subscriptis atque signatis comperta. Homicidam 10 denique fuisse, cujus acceptis mandatis Hiberni arma œperint, ad quinquies centena millia Anglorum in summa pæe nihil tale metuentium exquisitis cruciatibus occiderint, qui etiam ipse tantum reliquis duobus regnis bellum civile conflarit, neminem puto negaturum. Addo enim quod in illo Vectensi 15 colloquio hujus belli et culpam et crimen rex palam in se suscepit, eoque omni Parlamentum notissima confessione sua liberavit. Habes nunc breviter quamobrem rex Carolus et tyrannus et proditor et Homicida judicatus fuerit. At *cur non prius*, inquis, neque in illo *solemni joedere*, neque postea cum 20 dedititius esset, vel *h Presbyterianis* vel ab *Independentibus* sic judicatus est, sed potius, *ut regent decuit accipi, omni reverentid est exæptus?* Vel hoc solo argumento persuaderi cuivis intelligent} queat, non nisi sero tandem, et postquam omnia sustinuerant, omnia tentaverant, omnia perpassi erant, delibe-

Scots, by bribes. To the English he promised the plunder of the City of London; to the Scots, that he would annex the four northern counties to Scotland, if they would but help him get rid of the Parliament by any means soever. These projects not
5 succeeding, he gave one Dillon, a traitor, secret instructions to the Irish to fall suddenly upon all the English colonists in Ireland. These are the proofs of his treasons, and they are not gathered out of idle reports, but are certainties found in letters under his own hand and seal.

10 Finally, I suppose no man will withhold the name of murderer from him by whose order the Irish took arms and put to death with most exquisite torments five hundred thousand English, who in a time of profound peace apprehended nothing of the kind; nor will any man, I suppose, deny that he
15 who raised so great a civil war in the other two kingdoms was a murderer. I add that at the conference held in the Isle of Wight the king openly took upon himself the guilt of this war and the blame for it, and in his confession known of all men cleared the Parliament. Thus you have in short why King
20 Charles was adjudged a tyrant, a traitor, and a murderer.

But you ask "why was he not so adjudged before by either the Presbyterians or the Independents," either in that "Solemn League and Covenant," or afterwards when he was surrendered, but rather "was received as became a king to be
25 received, with all reverence?" This very point is sufficient to convince any man of good understanding that only at long last, and after they had borne all things, and tried all things, and steadfastly endured all things, were the Estates resolved

ratur Ordinibus fuisse regem abjicere. Tu id solus malitiose nimis in invidiam rapis, quod summam eorum patientiam, aequanimitatem, moderationem, fastusque regii tolerantiam nimis fortasse longam apud omnes bonos testabitur. At

5 *mense Augusto qui præcessit ejus supplicium, domus Communium quæ sola jam turn regnabat et Independentibus erat obnoxia, scripsit literas ad Scotos, quibus testabatur nunquam sibi in animo fuisse mutare statum qui huc usque in Anglia obtinuerat sub Rege, domo Dominorum et Communium.*

10 Vide jam quam non doctrinae Independentium abrogatio regis attribuenda sit. Qui suam dissimulare doctrinam non solent, etiam potiti rerum profitentur *nunquam sibi in animo fuisse statum regni mutare.* Quod si id postmodum in mentem venit, quod in animo non fuit, cur non licebat quod rectius, et e repub.

15 magis esse videbatur, id potissimum sequi? praesertim cum Carolus neque exorari, neque flecti ullo modo potuerit, ut justissimis eorum postulatis, quæque semper eadem ab initio obtulerant, assentiretur. Quas initio de religione, quas de jure suo sententias perversissimas tuebatur, nobisque adeo calamitosas, in iisdem permanebat: ab illo Carolo nihil mutatus, qui et pacæ et bello tanta nobis omnibus mala intulerat. Siquid est assensus, id et invitè facere, et quamprimum sui juris

to depose the king. That which to all good men will evidence their extreme paciencē, calmness, self-control, and perhaps overlong forbearancē with the king's pride, you alone maliciously seize upon as a reproach.

5 But "in the month of August before the king suffered, the House of Commons, which already ruled alone and was controlled by the Independents, wrote a letter to the Scots protesting that it had never had in mind an alteration of the form of government which had obtained so long in England under
10 King, Lords, and Commons." See now how little the deposing of the king is to be ascribed to the principles of the Independents! They, who are not wont to dissemble their principles, profess even then, when they have the sole management of affairs, that they "had never had in mind an
15 alteration of the form of government." But if a thing which at first they had not in mind afterwards came into their mind, why might they not take the course which seemed to lead straighter to the common weal? Especially when they found that Charles could not possibly be entreated or anywise moved
20 to assent to those just demands which they presented, and which were always the same from the beginning. Those froward opinions with respect to religion and his own right which he had all along maintained, and which were so destructive to us, in these he persisted, nothing changed from
25 that too-well-known Charles who both in peacē and in war had done us all so much mischief. If he assented to anything, he gave intimations not obscure both that he did it against his will, and that as soon as he should have his own way he would

fuisset, pro nihilo se habiturum haud obscuris indiciiis significabat: idem aperte films, abducta secum per eos dies classis parte, scripto edito; idem ipse per literas ad suos quosdam in urbe declarabat. Interea cum Hibernis Anglorum hostibus
5 immanissimis, reclamante Parlamento, foedis conditionibus occult[^] pacem coagmentaverat, Anglos ad repetita inutiliter colloquia et pacem quoties invitabat, toties contra eos omni studio bellum coquebat. Hie illi quibus concredita respub. erat, quo se verterent ? an commissam sibi nostram omnium
10 salutem in manus hosti acerbissimo traderent ? An alterum belli prope internecini septennium, nequid pejus ominemur, gerendum nobis iterum, et exantlandum relinquerent ? Deus meliorem illis mentem injecit, ut prioribus de rege non movendo cogitationibus, non enim ad decreta pervenerant, rem-
15 pub. religionem, libertatem ex ipso illo foedere solenni anteponerent; quæ quidem stante rege constare non posse, tardius illi quidem quam oportuit, sed aliquando tamen viderunt. San& Parlamento nunquam non liberum atque integrum esse debet, ex re nata quam optime reipub. consulere; neque ita
20 se prioribus addicere sentiis, ut religio sit in posterum, etiamsi Deus mentem et facultatem dederit, vel sibi vel reipub.

hold it null and void. The same thing his son openly declared by a published writing, when in those days he ran away with part of the fleet, and so did the king himself by letter to certain of his party in town.

5 In the mean time, against the open disapprobation of Parliament, he had in secret struck up a peace upon base dishonorable terms with the Irish, our most savage and inhuman enemies; but whenever he invited the English to negotiations for peace—which he kept asking for, and which were always
10 bootless—at those very times he was making every effort to prepare for war against them. In this situation, which way should they turn who were charged with the common weal? The safety of us all, with which they were entrusted—should they betray it to our most bitter adversary? Should they leave
15 us another seven years of almost exterminating war to bear again to the bitter end, not to forebode worse? God gave them a better mind, to prefer, pursuant to that Solemn League and Covenant, the common weal, and religion, and liberty, before their former thoughts of not dethroning the king (for they
20 had not come to a vote); all which they saw—later indeed than behooved them, but still some time!—could not stand firm if and while the king stood. Surely Parliament ought never to be otherwise than entirely free and uncommitted, to provide in the best possible way for the good of the nation as
25 occasion requires, nor so bound to their former opinions as to scruple to change—though God have given them the understanding and the means—to wiser ones thereafter for their own or the nation's good.

plus sapere. At *Scott non idem sentiunt, quinimo ad filium Carolum scribentes, sacratissimum regem appellant parentem ejus, et saërrimum facinus quo necatus est. Cave plura de Scotis, quos non novisti; nos novimus, cum eundem regem sa-*
 5 *ærrimum, et homicidam et proditorem; facinus quo tyrannus necaretur sacratissimum appellarent. Nunc regi quam dicam scripsimus, quasi parum commode scriptam cavillaris, et quid opus juerit ad elogium illud tyranni addere proditoris et homicides titulos, quæris; cum tyranni appellatio omnia mala com-*
 10 *prehendat: turn quis tyrannus sit grammaticè et glossematiæ etiam docēs. Aufer nugas istas literator, quas una Aristotelis definitio modo allata nullo negotio difflabit; quæque te doctorem docēbit, nomen tyranni, quoniam tua nihil interest præter nomina intelligere, posse citra proditionem et homicidium*
 15 *stare. Atqui leges Anglicante non dicunt proditionis crimen regem incurrere si procuraverit seditionem contra se vel populum suum. Neque dicunt, inquam, Parlamentum Ixxx Majestatis reum esse, si malum regem tollat, aut unquam fuisse, cum saepius olim sustulerit: posse autem regem suam maje-*
 20 *statem laedere atque minuere, immo amittere, clara voce testantur. Quod enim in ilia lege Sancti Edouardi legitur, nomen regis perdere, nihil aliud est quam regio munere ac dignitate privari; quod accidit Chilperico Franciæ regi, cujus ex-*

But "the Scots are of another opinion; for in a letter to the younger Charles they call his father a most sacred king, and the putting him to death a most execrable villainy." Take care to say no more of the Scots, whom you know not; we know
5 them, and know the time when they called that very king a "most execrable" murderer and traitor; and the putting the tyrant to death a "most sacred" deed.

Then you pick holes in the sentence we drew up against the king, as not being properly drafted, and you ask "why we
10 needed to add to the count of tyrant the titles of traitor and murderer, since the name tyrant includes all evils," and then you actually explain to us grammatically and lexicographically what a tyrant is! Off with your trifles, pedant, which that definition of Aristotle's that has lately been cited will alone
15 easily blow away, and teach you, teacher, that the word *tyrant* (for you care not to understand aught but words) may well fall short of treason and murder.

But "the laws of England do not declare it treason or lese-majesty in the king to stir up sedition against himself or his
20 people." Nor, say I, do they declare that Parliament can be guilty of lese-majesty, or hurting majesty, in deposing a bad king, or ever was guilty, though it has often deposed one in times past; but our laws do plainly declare that a king may indeed hurt his own majesty, and diminish it, yes and wholly
25 lose it. For that expression in the law of St. Edward, of "losing the name of king," signifies neither more nor less than being deprived of the kingly office and dignity; as befel Chilperic king of France, whose example the law itself mentions

emplum illustrandae rei causâ eodem loco lex ipsa ponit. Committi autem summam perduellionem tarn in regnum, quam in regem non est apud nos jurisperitus qui inficias ire possit. Provoco ad ipsum, quern prefers Glanvillanum. *Siquis all-*
5 *quid jcærit in mortem regis, vel seditionem regni, cmmcn*
proditionis esse. Sic ilia machinatio qua Papistae quidam Parlamenti curiam cum ipsis Ordinibus uno ictu pulveris nitrati in auras disjicere parabant, non in regem solum, sed in Parliamentum et regnum, ab ipso Jacobo et utraque Ordinum domo
10 *summa proditio* judicata est. Quid plura attinet in re tarn evidenti, quæ tamen facile possem, statuta nostra allegare? cum ridiculum plane sit et ratione ipsa abhorrens, committi perduellionem in regem posse, in populum non posse, propter quern et cujus gratia, cujus, ut ita dicam, bona venia, rex est id quod
15 est. Frustra igitur tot statuta nostra deblateras, frustra in vestustis legum Anglicarum libris angis te atque maceras; ad quas vel ratas vel irritas habendas Parlamenti autoritas semper valuit; cujus etiam solius est, quid sit perduellio, quid laesa majestas interpretari: quam majestatem nunquam sic à
20 populo in regem transiisse, ut non multo celsior atque augustior in Parlamento conspiciatur, jam saepius ostendi. Te verò vappam et circulatorem Gallum jura nostra interpretantem quis ferat? Vos verd Anglorum perfugæ, tot episcopi, doc-

in the same passage for the sake of illustration. There is not a lawyer amongst us who can deny that high treason may be committed against the kingdom as well as against the king. I appeal to Glanville himself, whom you cite: "If any man
5 attempt to put the king to death, or raise sedition in the realm, it is high treason." Thus that machination whereby certain Papists were making ready to blow up the Parliament-house with the Estates themselves in a single explosion of gun-powder was by King James himself and both Houses of Par-
10 liament adjudged to be "high treason" not against the King only, but against the Parliament and the realm. Where the truth is so clear, of what use is it to quote, as I yet could easily, more of our precedents established? For the thing itself is highly ridiculous, and contradictory to reason itself, that trea-
15 son can be committed against the king, and cannot be against the people, on account of whom, for whose sake, by the grace of whom, and by whose good leave, so to speak, the king is what he is. So that you babble in vain over so many statutes of ours; in vain you torment yourself and steep yourself in our
20 ancient law-books; for the laws themselves Parliament always had power to confirm or repeal; and to Parliament alone it belongs to declare what is treason, what lese-majesty. And I have often shown that this majesty never has so far deserted the people for the king, as not to be visibly more lofty and
25 august in Parliament.

Who can yet endure to hear such an inspid French mountebank as you expound our laws? But you, English deserters! so many bishops, doctors, and lawyers, who proclaim that all

tores, jurisconsulti, qui literaturam omnem et eruditionem vobiscum ex Anglia aufugisse praedicatis, adeone ex vestro numero nullus causam regiam atque suam defendere satis strenue satisque latine scivit, gentibusque exteris dijudican-

5 dam exponere, ut cerebrosus iste et crumenipeta Callus mercede accersendus in partes necessariò esset, qui regis inopis, tot doctorum et sacerdotum infantia stipati, patrocinium susciperet ? magna, mihi credite, infamiâ etiam hoc nomine apud exterarum nationes flagrabit; et merito vos utique occidisse

10 causa omnes existimabunt, quam ne verbis quidem, nedum armis aut virtute sustinere valuistis. Sed ad te redeo, vir bone, dicendi perite, si tute modò ad te rediisti; nam stertentem te tarn prope finem et de *morte* voluntaria nescio quid ab re somniculosè oscitantem offendo; turn statim negas *cadere in*

i₅ *regem suæ mentis compotem, ut populum seditionibus distrahat, exercitus suos hostibus debellandos tradat, ut jactiones contra se suscitet.* quæ omnia cum et alii multi reges, et Carolus ipse fecerit, dubitare non potes, praesertim Stoi'cus, quin ut omnes improbi, sic omnes quoque tyranni prorsus insaniant.

20 Flaccumaudi.

*Quem mala stultitia, et quæcunque inscitia veri
Cæcum agit, insanum Chrysippi porticus et grex
Autumat, hæc populos, hæc magnos formula reges,
Exæpto sapiente, tenet. —*

learning and literature is fled out of England with yourselves, did not one of you know how to defend the king's cause and his own with sufficient vigor and Latinity, and submit it to the judgment of other nations ? Did you fall so far short that
 5 this crackbrained purse-snatcher of a Frenchman must needs be fetched out for hire to take sides with you, and undertake the defence of a helpless poverty-stricken king, attended though he was with so much infantry of speechless priests and doctors ? Even for this too, believe me, your dishonor will
 10 blaze forth notorious among foreigners; and all men will consider that you deserved to fail at any rate in a cause which you availed not even to uphold by words, much less by force of arms and valor.

Now, goodman speechifier, I come to you again,—if at
 15 least you are come to yourself again; for here, so near the end of your book, I catch you snoring, and sleepily yawning out an irrelevant something-or-other about voluntary death. Then you deny "that it can occur to a king in his right wits to embroil his people in seditions, betray his own forces to defeat
 20 by enemies, and raise factions against himself." All which things having been done by many kings, and particularly by Charles himself, you can no longer doubt, especially being'a Stoic, that, like all profligate villains, all tyrants too are downright mad. Hear what Flaccus says: "Whoever is led blindly
 25 on by malign stupidity and by whatsoever ignorancæ of truth, him doth Chrysippus' porch and school account a madman. This saying comprises great kings, this whole nations, except the wise man only." So that if you would clear King Charles

Si igitur insani cujuspiam facti crimen a rege Carolo amovere cupis, debebis improbitatem ab eo prius amovere quam insaniam. At enim *rex non potuit proditionem in cos committere, qui vassalli ipsius et subjecti fuere*. Primum, cum aequè atque
5 ulla gens hominum liberi simus, nullum barbarum morem fraud! nobis esse patiemur: fac deinde *vassallos* fuisse nos regis, ne sic quidem tyrannum perferre dominum necesse habuimus. Omnis ea subjectio, ut ipsæ leges nostrae loquuntur, *honesto et utili* definita est. Leg. Hen. i. c. 55. Fidem earn
10 esse *mutuam* jurisconsult! omnes tradunt, si dominus *ligeam*, quod ai'unt, *dejensionem* praestiterit: sin è contrario nimium saevus fuerit, aut atrocem aliquam injuriam intulerit, *dissolvi et fenitus extingui omnem homagii connexionem*. hæc ipsa Bractoni verba et Fletse sunt. Unde vassallum est ubi lex ipsa
15 in dominum armat; eumque singular! certamine a vassallo, si accident, interimendum tradit. Idem si universe civitati aut nationi in tyrannum non licuerit, deterior liberorum hominum conditio quam servorum erit. Nunc Caroli homicidia aliorum regum partim homicidiis, partim juste factis
20 excusare contendis. De Ianiena Hiberniensi *remttis lectorem ad ofus illud regium Iconis Basilicæ*; et ego te remitto ad Iconoclastem. *Captam Rupellam, proditos Rupellenses, osten-*

from the imputation of acting like a madman, you must rid him of wickedness first, before you can rid him of insanity.

But you say: "The king could not commit treason against such as were his own vassals and subjects." In the first place, 5 since we are as free as any nation of mankind, we will not endure any barbarous custom to our hurt. In the second place, suppose we had been the king's "vassals"; even so we were not bound to endure a tyrant to lord it over us. And as for our being "subjects," all such subjection, as our own laws declare, 10 is limited to what is "honorable and beneficial." Leg. Hen. I. Cap. 55. All our lawyers tell us that this engagement is "mutual" upon condition that the lord shall give, as the phrase goes, "liege protection and defense"; but if the lord be too harsh to his tenant, and do him some cruel hurt, "all bond of 15 homage is dissolved and utterly extinguished." These are the very words of Bracton and Fleta. Hence there are situations in which the law itself arms the vassal against the lord, and delivers the lord over to be killed, if it so fall out, by the vassal in single combat. If a whole state or nation may not lawfully 20 do the same to a tyrant, the condition of freemen will be worse than that of slaves.

Then you strive to excuse king Charles's murders, partly by murders committed by other kings, and partly by instances of right action on their part. For the matter of the Irish butch- 25 ery, you "refer the reader to the king's well-known work the *Eifyn Basilike*," and , ' refer you to *Eikonoklastes*. "The taking of La Rochelle," the betrayal of its townsmen, "the making a show of assistance instead of giving it them," you will

tatam potius quhm datum opem, imputari Carolo non vis: imputetur necne merito, non habeo dicere; satis superque ab eo peccatum est domi, ne externa persequi curem: omnes interim ecclesias Protestantium, quotquot ullo tempore se contra
5 reges religionis hostes armis defenderunt, eodem nomine rebellionis damnas. Quam contumeliam ab alumno suo sibi illatam quanti intersit ad disciplinam ecclesiasticam, sudmque tuendam integritatem, non negligere, secum ipsi cogitent: nos etiam Anglos ea expeditione proditos acerbè tulimus.
10 Qui enim regnum Angliæ in tyrannidem convertere diu meditatus erat, non, nisi extincto prius militari civium robore ac flore, cogitata perficere se posse arbitrabatur. Aliud erat crimen regis quod ex jurejurando regibus regnum capes-
sentibus dari solito verba quædam ejus jussu erasa fuerint,
15 antequam jurasset. O facinus indignum et execrandum! impium qui fecit, quid dicam qui defendit? nam quæ potuit, per Deum immortalem, quæ perfidia, aut juris violatio esse major? quid illi sanctius post sacratissima religionis mysteria illo jurejurando esse debuit? Quis quæso scelerator, isne qui
20 in legem peccat, an qui legem ipsam uti secum una peccare faciat dat operam? aut denique ipsam legem tollit ne peccasse videatur? Agedum, jus hoc religiosissime jurandum rex iste

not have laid at Charles's door, nor have I anything to say as to whether it deserves to be; he did mischief enough and more than enough at home, so that I need not take the trouble to follow up his misdemeanors abroad. (But you in the mean
5 time would make out all the Protestant churches that have at any time defended themselves by force of arms against kings who were professed enemies of their religion, to have been upon this one ground guilty of rebellion. Let these churches themselves consider how important it is for the preservation
10 of ecclesiastical discipline and of their own integrity, not to pass by this insult offered them by their own nursling and disciple.) What troubles us most is that we English were betrayed in that expedition. He who had long designed to convert the government of England into a tyranny thought he
15 could not accomplish his plan till the flower and strength of his subjects' military power were cut off.

Another of the king's crimes was the causing some words to be struck out of the usual coronation oath before he would take it. Unworthy and abominable action! Him that did it I
20 call wicked; what shall I call him that defends it? For by the eternal God, what breach of faith and violation of the laws can possibly be greater? What ought to be more sacred to him, next to the holy sacraments themselves, than that oath? Which, pray, is guiltier, he that offends against the law, or he
25 that endeavors to make the law his accomplice in offending, or rather, destroys the law that he may not seem to offend against it? Look you: that oath, which he ought most scrupulously to have sworn to, this king of yours did violate; but

violavit; sed ne palàm tamen violasse videretur, turpissimo quodam adulterio per dolum corrumpit; et ne pejerasse dicèretur, jus ipsum jurandum in perjurium vertit. Quid aliud potuit sperari, nisi injustissime, versutissime, atque infelicis-

5 sime regnaturum esse eum, qui ab injuria tarn detestanda auspiciatus regnum est; jusque illud primum adulterare ausus, quod solum impedimento sibi fore, ne jura omnia perverteret, putabat. At enim *Sacramentum* illud, sic enim defendis, *non magis obligate reges potest, quàm leges; legibus autem se*

10 *devinciri velle free se ferunt, et secundùm eas vivere, cum tamen re vera iis soluti sint.* Quemquamne tarn sacrilege, tamque inœsto ore esse, ut sacramentum religiosissimum tactis Evangeliiis datum, quasi per se leviculum solvi sine causa posse asserat? Te vero, scelus atque portentum, ipse Carolus

15 redarguit; qui cùm sacramentum illud non esse per se leve quidpiam existimaret, idcirco ejus religionem aut subterfugere, aut fallaciâ quavis eludere satius duxit, quam aperte violare; et corruptor jurisjurandi hujus et falsarius esse maluit, quàm manifeste perjurus. At vero *jurat quidem rex populo*

20 *suo, ut populus vicissim regi, sed populus jurat regi fidelitatem, non populo rex.* Lepidum sane hominis commentum! annon qui juratus promittit atque spondet se quidpiam fideliter prxstiturum, fidem suam iis obligat qui jusjurandum ab eo exigunt? Rex sanè omnis ad præstanda ea quæ promittit,

25 et *fidelitatem, et obsequium, et obedientiam populo* jurat. Hic ad Gulielmum Conquæstorem recurris, qui ipse, non

that he might not seem openly to violate it, he craftily adulterated and foully corrupted it, and lest he might be said to have perjured himself, turned the very oath into a perjury. What else could be expected than that one who began his
5 reign with so detestable a wrong, and dared as a first step to adulterate that law which he thought his only hindrance from perverting all the laws, would rule most unrighteously, craftily, and disastrously ? But that "Oath" (thus you justify him) "cannot bind kings more than do the laws; and kings pretend
10 that they will be bound by laws, and live according to them, though actually they are unbound by them." To think that anyone should express himself so impiously and sacrilegiously as to assert that a most solemn oath, sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, may without cause be unbound as if in itself
15 were the merest trifle! Scoundrel, monster, you are refuted by Charles himself, who, thinking that oath no trifle, chose rather by stealth to evade, or by artifice to elude, its binding force, than openly to violate it, and chose rather to be a corrupter and falsifier of the oath, than visibly a perjurer.

20 "The king indeed swears to his people, as the people do to him; but the people swear fealty to the king, not the king to them." Pretty invention! Does not he that promises and engages under oath faithfully to perform something, bind his fidelity to them that require the oath of him ? To the per-
25 formance of what he promises, every king does in fact swear to the people his "fealty, service, and obedience." Then you come back to William the Conqueror; yet even he was forced more than once to swear to perform not what was agreeable

quod sibi collibitum erat, sed quod populus ab eo et magnates postulabant, id omne baud semel jurare est coactus se praestitutum. Quòd si multi reges *coronam* solenni ritu non *accipiunt*, et proinde non jurant, et tamen regnant, idem de populo responded potest; cujus pars magna fidelitatem nunquam juravit. Si rex ob eam causam solutus erit, erit et populus. quæ autem pars populi jurabat, non regi solùm, sed regno et legibus jurabat, a quibus rex factus est, et quidem eatenus tantum regi, quoad is leges observaret, *quas vulgus*, id est, 10 communitas sive plebeius ordo *elegerit*. Stultior enim sit, qui legum nostrarum loquelam ad puriorem semper latinitatem exigere velit. Hanc clausulam, *quas vulgus elegerit*, Carolus, antequam coronam acciperet, ex formula juramenti regii eradendam curavit. At, inquis, *sine regis assensu nullas leges* 15 *vulgus elegerit*; eoque nomine duo statura citas, unum Anni 37 Hen.6. c. 15. alterum 13 Edouardi 4. c. 8. Tantum autem abest quo minus eorum alterutrum in libro statutorum usquam appareat, ut annis abs te citatis, neuter eorum regum ullum omnino statutum promulgaverit. Tu fidem jam per- 20 fugarum, statuta tibi inaudita dictantium, elusus querere; dum alii tuam admirantur impudentiam simul et vanitatem, quern non est pudium iis in libris versatissimum videri velle, quos inspexisse nunquam, ne vidisse quidem tam manifestè

to him, but what the people and the great men of the realm demanded of him.

If many kings "receive the crown" without the usual solemnity, and accordingly reign without taking an oath, the
5 same thing may be said of the people, a great many of whom never have taken the oath of allegiance. If the king by not taking an oath be unbound, the people are so too. And that part of the people that swore, swore not to the king only, but to the realm and the laws by which the king came to his
10 crown, and to the king so far only as he should act according to those laws which "the common people," that is, the commonalty or House of Commons, "should choose." For it were folly always to wish to turn the phraseology of our laws into purer Latin. This clause, "which the commons shall choose,"
15 Charles before he was crowned procured to be razed out of the form of the royal oath. "But," say you, "without the king's assent the people can choose no laws"; and for this you cite two statutes, one 37 Henry VI, Chap. 15, and the other 13 Edward IV, Chap. 8. But either of the two is so far from
20 appearing in our statute-books, that in the years you mention neither of those kings enacted any statute at all! Now that you are fooled, go and complain of the bad faith of those renegades in dictating to you statutes that never were heard of; while other people stand astonished at the combination of
25 presumption with empty-headedness in you, who were not ashamed to pretend to be thoroughly versed in books which you have so clearly shown you have never looked into or so much as seen.

argueris. Clausula autem ista jurisjurandi, quam tu perfricti oris balatro *commentitiam* audes dicere, *regis*, inquis, *defensorcs fieri fosse aiunt*, ut in aliquot antiquis exemplaribus extiterit, *sed in desuetudinem abiisse, qubd commodam signifi-*
5 *cationem non haberet*. Verum ob id ipsum majores nostri illam clausulam in hoc regis jurejurando posuere, ut significationem tyrannidi semper non commodam haberet. In desuetudinem autem si abierat, quod tamen falsissimum est, quis neget multò meliori jure revocandam fuisse? frustra, si
10 te audio: quippe *in regibus mos ille jurandi qui hodie receptus est, cæremonialis est tantum*. Atqui rex, cùm episcopus aboleri oportuit, per illud jus jurandum non licere sibi causatus est: ita sacramentum illud sanctissimum, quoties ex usu est regis, vel solidum quiddam et firmum erit, vel inane tantum
15 et *caremoniale*. Quod ego vos obtestor, Angli, etiam atque etiam animadvertatis: et qualem estis regem habituri, si redierit, vobiscum reputetis: non enim in mentern venisset unquam huic Grammatico sceleroso et extraneo de jure regis Anglorum velle scribere, aut posse, nisi Carolus ille extorris,
20 paterna disciplina imbutus, unaque illi monitores ejus profligatissimi, quid hac de re scribi vellent omni studio suggestissent. Dictabant huic illi, *totum Parlamentum prodicionis in regem insimulari posse*, vel ob hoc solum, quod *sine assensu*

As for that clause in the coronation oath, which you, brazen-facèd jack-pudding, dare to call "fictitious," you yourself say: "The king's defenders say that possibly" it may be extant in some ancient copies, "but that it fell into disuse because it had no satisfactory meaning." But precisely on this account did our anœstors put that clause into this oath, that it might have a meaning which would forever be *not* satisfactory to tyranny! If it had really fallen into disuse, however, which yet is utterly false, who would deny that there was the greater need of reviving it? But even that would have been to no purpose, according to your doctrine; for that custom "of taking an oath, as kings nowadays generally use it, is only œremonial." Yet the king, when it behooved him to put down the bishops, pretended that he could not do it by reason of this same oath. Consequently that sacred solemn oath, according as it serves the king's turn or not, will be something genuine and immovable, or merely something empty and "œremonial."

Englishmen, take notice of this, I adjure you, again and again, and consider what manner of king ye are like to have, if he ever come back! For it would never have entered into this rascally foreign grammarian's head to wish to write, or to think himself able to write, of the law of the English crown, had not Charles's banished son, deep-dyed in his father's teachings, together with those profligate prompters of his, eagerly supplied what they would have him write. 'Twas they dictated to him "that Parliament as a whole was liable to be charged with treason against the king" even for this alone,

regis declaravit omnes esse proditores qui arma contra Parliamentum Anglia sumpserunt; vassallum scilicet regis esse Parliamentum; jusjurandum verò regium & reneroniale tantum esse, quidni vassallum etiam? Ita neque legum ulla

5 *sanctitas, neque sacramenti ulla fides, aut religio, quicquam valebit ad cohibendam a vita atque fortunis vestrum omnium vel libidinem effraenati regis, vel ultionem exacerbatam: qui ita institutus à pueritia est, ut leges et religionem, ipsam denique fidem vassallari sibi, et servire suis libitis arbitretur debere.*

10 *Quanto praestabilius esset, vobisque dignius, si opes, si libertatem, si pacem, si imperium vultis, a virtute, industria, prudentia, fortitudine vestra non dubitare petere Hæc omnia, quàm sub regio dominatu necquicquam sperare? certe qui sine rege ac domino parari Hæc posse non putant, did non*

15 *potest, quam abjecte, quàm non honestè, non dico quam indigne de se ipsi statuunt: quid enim aliud nisi se inertes, imbecillos, mentis inopes atque consilii, corpore atque animo ad servitutem natos fatentur esse? Et servitus quidem omnis homini ingenuo turpis est; vobis autem post libertatem Deo*

20 *vindictæ, vestroque Marte recuperatam, post tot fortia facinora, et exemplum in Regem potentissimum tam memorabile editum, velle rursus ad servitutem, etiam præter fatum, redire, non modo turpissimum, sed et impium erit et sceleratum: pârque vestrum scelus illorum sceleri erit, qui servitutis*

that "without the king's assent it declared all to be traitors who have taken arms against the Parliament of England; for that Parliament is the king's vassal"; but that the king's coronation oath is "merely a matter of œremony." Then why not
5 the vassal's oath too? So that no reverence for laws, no binding force of an oath, or scruple to break it, will avail to protect your lives and fortunes either from the cupidity of a king unbridled, or from the revenge of a king embittered, who from childhood has been taught to think that laws, religion,
10 nay, and his own promise, ought to be his vassals, and subject to his will and pleasure. If you desire riches, liberty, peace, and empire, how much more excellent, how much more becoming yourselves would it be, resolutely to seek all these by your own virtue, industry, prudencœ, and valor, than under
15 a royal despotism to hope for them in vain? They who think that these things cannot be compassed but under a king and lord—it cannot well be expressed how meanly, how dishonorably (I do not say how unworthily!) they think of themselves; for what do they other than confess that they them-
20 selves are lazy, weak, wanting in intelligencœ and prudencœ, and born to be slaves body and soul? All manner of slavery indeed is disgraceful to a man freeborn; but for you, after recovering your liberty with God to warrant and your own arms, after so many brave deeds done, and so notable an
25 example made of a most mighty and puissant king, for you to desire, against your very destiny, to return again into bondage, will be not only most shameful, but a thing sinful and wicked. And your wickedness will be like unto the wick-

olim Ægyptiacæ desiderio capti, multis tandem cladibus ac variis divinitus absumpti, liberator! Deo poenas tarn servilis animi dedere. Quid tu interim, servitutis conciliator? *Potuit, inquis, rex froditionis et ddictorum aliorum gratiam facere;*
5 *quod satis evincit legibus cum solutum juisse.* Proditionis quidem, non quæ in regnum, sed quæ in se commissa erat, poterat rex, ut quivis alius, gratiam facere: poterat et quorundam aliorum fortasse maleficiorum, quanquam non id semper: an ideo qui maleficum servandi nonnunquam jus quoddam
10 habet, idem continue omnes bonos perdendi jus ullum habebit? Citatus in curiam, eámque inferiorem, necesse non habet respondere, nisi per procuratorem, rex, uti nec de populo quidem ullus; an ideo in Parlamentum citatus ab universis non veniet? non ipse respondebit? *Conari nos ai's Batavorum*
15 *exemplo jactum nostrum tueri,* atque hinc, stipendio scilicet metuens quo te Batavi luem atque pestem alunt, ne Anglos infamando etiam Batavos altores tuos infamasse videaris, demonstrare cupis quam *dissimile sit quod hi et quod illi jecerunt.* Quam ego collationem tuam, quanquam in ea quxdam
20 sunt falsissima, alia, ne salario fortasse tuo non satis litares, palpum olent, omittam. Negant enim Angli opus sibi esse ut

edness of them who were seized with desire of their former Egyptian bondage, and were at length divinely cut off with many and divers destructions, paying to God their deliverer the penalty for so slavish a mind.

- 5 You who would persuade us to become slaves, meanwhile what say you? "The king," you say, "had power to pardon treason and other crimes; which sufficiently proves that the king himself was not bound by the laws." The king might indeed pardon treason, not against the kingdom, but against
10 himself, as anybody else may pardon a wrong done to himself; and he might perhaps pardon some other offenders, though not always. But does it follow that one who sometimes has some right to save an evildoer, shall therefore necessarily have any right whatever to destroy all good men? If
15 the king be impleaded in an inferior court, he, like any one of the people, to be sure, is not obliged to answer but by his attorney; shall he therefore, when summoned by all of his subjects to appear in Parliament, refuse to come—refuse to answer in person?
- 20 You say that we "endeavor to justify our action by the example of the Dutch"; and hence, fearing to lose the pay with which the Dutch support such a murrain and pest as you, you would fain show "how unlike are their actions and ours," lest in defaming the English you should appear also to defame
25 the Dutch who support you. I shall omit this comparison of yours, though some things in it are quite false, and other things reek flattery lest perchance you should not bring an acceptable offering unto your wages. For the English think

exterorum quorumvis exemplo facta sua tueantur. Habent
leges, quas secuti sunt, patrias, hac in parte, sicubi terrarum
aliæ sunt, optimas: habent quos imitentur, majores suos, viros
fortissimos, qui immoderatis regum imperiis nunquam cæs-
5 sere; multos eorum intolerantius se gerentes per supplicium
necavere. In libertate sunt nati, sibi sufficiunt, quas volunt
leges, possunt sibi ferre; unam præ cæteris colunt antiquissi-
mam, à natura ipsa latam, qua: omnes leges, jus omne atque
imperium civile non ad regum libidinem, sed ad bonorum
10 maximè civium salutem refert. Jam præter quisquilias et ru-
dera superiorum capitum restare nihil video; quorum quidem
acervum cum satis magnum in fine congesseris, nescio quid
aliud tibi volueris, nisi hujus tuæ fabricæ ruinam quasi præ-
sagire. Tandem aliquando post immensam loquacitatem rivos
15 claudis; *Deum testatus te hanc causam tuendam suscepisse,*
non tantum quia rogatus, sed quia meliorem nullam te po-
tuisse defendere conscientia tibi suggestit. Rogatus tu in res
nostras tibi alienissimas, nobis non rogantibus, te interponas?
Tu populi Anglicani summos magistratus pro autoritate
20 præque imperio sibi commisso quod suum munus est in sua

they need not justify their actions by the example of any foreigners whatever. They have their laws of the land, which they have followed—laws which in this matter are the best in the world; they have for their imitation the examples of
5 their ancestors, great and gallant men who never gave way to the unrestrained power of kings, and who put many of them to death when their government became insupportable. They were born free; they stand in need of no other nation; they can make unto themselves what laws they desire. One
10 law in particular they venerate before the rest, a very ancient one enacted by nature itself, which measures all human laws, all civil right and government, not according to the lust of kings, but, above all else, according to the safety and welfare of good men.

15 Now I see nothing left over but rubbish and fragments of your earlier chapters; yet as you have raised an huge great heap of these at the end, I cannot imagine what other design you could have than to forebode the ruin of your whole fabric. At last after unmeasured talk you shut off the stream, "calling
20 God to witness that you undertook the defence of this cause not only because you were asked, but because your conscience prompted you that you could defend no better cause." Merely because you were asked, would you intermeddle with our affairs, so utterly foreign to you, when we ourselves did
25 not ask you? Would you rend with insults undeserved, would you in a disreputable book libel and defame, the supreme magistracy of the English nation, when according to the authority and power to them entrusted they do but their duty within

ditione agentes, nulla injuriâ læcessitus (neque enim natum te esse sciebant) indignissimis verborum contumeliis læeres, libroque infami edito proscindas? A quo autem rogatus? An ab uxore, credo, quæ jus regium, ut perhibent, in te exerçet; 5 quæque tibi, quoties libet, ut ilia Fulvia, cujus, ex epigrammate obscoeno, æntones modo consuisti (*p.* 320.) *aut* scribe *aut pugnemus* ai't: unde tu, ne signa canerent, scribere malebas. An rogatus fortasse à Carolo minore, et perditissimo illo peregrinantium aulicorum grege, quasi alter Balaamus ab 10 altero Balacco Rege acçersitus, ut jaçentem regis causam, et mate pugnando amissam maledicendo erigere dignarere? Sic sane fieri potuit; nisi quod hujusmodi quiddam interfuit; ille enim vir sagax asino insidens locutuleio ad execrandum venit; tu asinus loquacissimus insessus a foemina, et sanatis quos vul- 15 neraveras episcoporum capitibus obsitus, apocalypticæ illius bestię parvam quandam imaginem exprimere videris. Sed ferunt poenituisse te hujus libri, post paulo quam scripsisses. Bene profectò habet; tuam itaque ut testere omnibus poenitentiam, nihil tibi prius faciendum erit, quam ut pro libro tarn 20 longo unam tantummodo literam adhuc longam ex te facias. Sic enim poenituit Iscarioten ilium Judam cui similis es; idque novit puer Carolus, qui crumenam idcirco tibi, insigne illud Judæ proditoris, dono misit, quod primum audierat, et postmodum sciebat, te apostatam esse et Diabolum. Judas

their own jurisdiction—and all this without the least injury or provocation from them, for they did not even know that you were born ? By whom, though, *were* you asked ? By your wife, I suppose, who, they say, exercises the royal right over
5 you, and, like the notorious Fulvia in the obscene epigram from which a while ago (p. 320) you patched together a *œnto*, cries to you whenever she has a mind: "Either" *write* "or we must fight!" Wherefore you preferred to write rather than the trumpets should sound the charge! Or were you
10 asked by the younger Charles and that profligate crew of vagabond courtiers, like a second Balaam solicited by a second King Balak, to deign to restore by curses and ill writing a king's desperate cause that was lost by ill fighting ? That may well be, except there was something like this difference: when
15 *he* came to curse, he was a clever man sitting upon a talkative little ass; you are a very talkative ass yourself, sat upon by a woman, and being overgrown with the healed heads of the bishops that heretofore you had wounded, you seem to present a sort of miniature portrait of that beast in Revelation.

20 But they say that you repented yourself of this book a little after you had written it. It is mighty well; and therefore to witness your repentance unto all men, the first thing you ought to do will be, instead of so long a book, to make only just one proper long letter of yourself. For it was so Judas
25 Iscariot repented himself, whom you resemble. Young Charles found it out too, and he sent you the purse, that badge of traitor Judas, precisely because he had heard before, and knew afterward by experience, that you were an apostate and

ille Christum prodidit, tu Christi Ecclesiam; Episcopos Antichristos esse docueras, ad eos defecisti: quos inferis damnaveras, eorum causam suscepisti: Christus omnes homines liberavit, tu omnes ad servitutem redigere conatus es: ne dubita,
5 postquam in Deum, in ecclesiam, in omne genus hominum tam impius extitisti, quin te etiam idem exitus maneat, ut desperatione magis quam poenitentia ductus, tuique pertæsus, ab infelici tandem arbore pendens, sicut et par ille tuus olim, medius crepes; illamque malefidam et fallacem conscientiam,
10 bonorum et sanctorum insectatricem, ad destinatas tibi quandoque supplicii sedes præmittas. Hactenus, quod initio institueram ut meorum civium facta egregia contra insanam et lividissimam furentis sophistæ rabiem et domi et foris defenderem, jusque populi commune ab injusto regum dominatu
15 assererem, non id quidem regum odio, sed tyrannorum, Deo bene juvante, videor jam mihi absolvisse: neque ullum sine response vel argumentum, vel exemplum, vel testimonium ab adversario allatum sciens prætermisi, quod quidem firmitatis in se quicquam, aut probationis vim ullam habere videretur;
20 in alteram fortasse partem culpæ propior, quod sæpiuscule ineptiis quoque ejus, et argutiis tritissimis, quasi argumentis, respondendo, id iis tribuisse videar, quo dignæ non erant. Unum restat, et fortasse maximum, ut vos quoque, â Gives,

the Devil. That other Judas betrayed Christ, and you betray Christ's Church. You had taught heretofore that Bishops were Antichrists; you have deserted to them. You have undertaken the cause of them that you had damned to Hell. Christ
5 delivered all men; you have attempted to drive all men back into slavery. Never question, since you have been such a wicked wretch to God, to the Church, and to every nation of men, that the same fate awaits you as erewhile befel your double: out of despair rather than repentance, and utterly
10 weary of yourself, to hang at last upon the gallows-tree, and burst asunder as he did; and to send beforehand that faithless and treacherous conscience of yours, that persecutor of good and holy men, to the place of torment that is sooner or later prepared for you.

15 And now I think, through God's good help, I have finished the work I undertook at the beginning, namely to defend both at home and abroad the noble actions of my countrymen against the brainsick envious rage of this mad sophist, and to assert the people's common rights against the unrighteous
20 despotism of kings,—and this not out of any hatred of kings, but of tyrants. Nor have I knowingly left unanswered any argument or example or document alleged by my adversary, that seemed to possess any solid substance or power to convince. Perhaps I have been nearer the opposite fault, that by
25 rather too often answering also his sillinesses and threadbare quibbles as if they were arguments, I may seem to have given them an importance that they nothing deserved.

One thing yet remains, haply the greatest, and that is, that

adversarium hunc vestrum ipsi refutetis; quod nulla alia ratione video posse fieri, nisi omnium maledicta vestris optime factis exuperare perpetuo contendatis. Vota vestra et pieces ardentissimas Deus, cum servitutis baud uno genere oppressi
5 ad eum confugistis, benigne exaudivit. quæ duo in vita hominum mala sane maxima sunt, et virtuti damnosissima, Tyrannis et Superstitio, iis vos gentium primes gloriosissime liberavit; eam animi magnitudinem vobis injecit, ut devictum armis vestris et dedititium regem iudicio inclyto iudicare, et
10 condemnatum punire primi mortalium non dubitaretis. Post hoc facinus tarn illustre, nihil humile aut angustum, nihil non magnum atque exœsum et cogitare et facere debebitis. Quam laudem ut assequamini, hac sola inœdendum est via, si ut hostes bello domuistis, ita ambitionem, avaritiam, opes, et
15 secundarum rerum corruptelas, quæ subigunt cæteras gentes hominum, ostenderitis posse vos etiam inermes media in pace omnium mortalium fortissime debellare; si, quam in repel-
lenda servitute fortitudinem præstitistis, eam in libertate conservanda justitiam, temperantiam, moderationem præstite-
20 ritis. His solis arguments et testimoniis evincere potestis, non esse vos illos, quos hic probris insequitur, *Perduelles, latrones, sicarios, parricidas, janaticos*; non vos ambitionis aut alieni

ye too, my countrymen, yourselves refute this adversary of yours, which to do I see no other way than by striving constantly to outdo all men's bad words by your own good deeds. Your vows, your burning prayers, when, crushed beneath
5 more than one kind of slavery, ye fled to God for refuge, he hath graciously heard and granted. Gloriously hath he delivered you before all other nations from what surely are the two greatest mischiefs of this life, and most pernicious to virtue—Tyranny and Superstition; he hath inspired you with
10 the greatness of soul to be the first of mankind who, after having conquered their own king, and having him delivered into their hands, have not hesitated to judge him with a judgment that yet resounds in men's ears, and to condemn him, and pursuant to that condemnation to put him to death. After so
15 glorious a deed, ye ought to think, ye ought to do, nothing that is mean and petty, nothing but what is great and sublime. This praise that ye may attain, there is but one path to tread: as ye have subdued your enemies in the field, so ye shall prove that unarmed and in the midst of peace ye of all mankind
20 have highest courage to subdue what conquers the rest of the nations of men—faction, avarice, the temptations of riches, and the corruptions that wait upon prosperity; and in maintaining your liberty shall show as great justice, temperance, and moderation as ye have shown courage in freeing your
25 selves from slavery. By these arguments and documents only can ye prove ye are not such as this libeler reproaches you with being—"Traitors, Robbers, Assassins, Parricides, Madmen"; that what ye did was not the slaughtering of a king

invadendi studio, non seditione, aut pravis ullis cupiditatibus, non amentia aut furore percitos regem trucidasse, sed amore libertatis, religionis, justitiæ, honestatis, patriæ denique charitate ardentem, tyrannum punisse. Sin autem, quod, bone
5 Deus, ne unquam siveris, aliter in animum induxeritis, si in bello fortes, in pace turpes eritis, qui manifestum sensistis nomen vobis tam propitium, hostibus tam grave, neque exemplo tam insigni et memorando ante oculos posito, Deum vereri, et justitiam colere didiceritis, quod ad me attinet, concedam
10 sanè, et fatebor, neque enim potero negare, ea omnia quæ nunc maledici et mendaces de vobis pessime aut loquuntur aut sentiunt, vera esse: vosque multo iratiorem brevi tempore experturi estis Deum, quam aut infensum inimici vestri, aut vos benignum et faventem, præ cæteris omnibus terrarum orbis
15 gentibus hodiernis, experti estis.

hæc cum ante annos jam aliquot, pro eo ac ratio turn reipub. postulabat, festinans edidisssem, quod existimabam fere fit siquando per otium in manus resumsissem, ita ut fere fit, nonnihil postea vel expolirem, vel demerem fortasse aut ad
20 jicerem, id nunc, paucioribus licet quàm putabam, perfecisse me arbitror: monumentum, ut video, cujusquemodi est, non facile interituum. In quo siquis unquam civilem libertatem

because ye were driven by factiousness, or desire to usurp the rights of others, or mere quarrelsomeness, or perverse desires, or fury or madness, but was the punishing of a tyrant because ye were aflame with love of your liberty and your religion, of
5 justice and honor, yea—and is not this the sum and end of all these?—with dear love of your country.

But if ye prove to be of other mind—which may the good God forbid forever!—if as ye have been valiant in war, ye should grow debauched in peace, if ye that have had such
10 visible demonstrations of the goodness of God to yourselves, and of his wrath against your enemies, have not learned by so eminent and memorable an example before your eyes, to fear God and work righteousness, I for my part shall verily grant and confess, for I cannot deny, that the worst which
15 slanderers and liars now speak or think of you is true. And in a little time ye will find God far more wrathful against you than either your adversaries have found him embittered, or ye have found him aforetime gracious and favorable beyond all other nations at this time on earth.

20 It is now several years since I published the foregoing, in haste, as reason of state then required, for I kept thinking that if ever I might take it in hand again at leisure, as occasionally happens, I might thereupon smooth out, or remove, maybe, or add somewhat. This I now judge that I have accomplished,
25 though more briefly than I used to count upon doing it: a memorial which, such as it is, I see will not easily perish. Though someone may be found who may have defended civil

liberius, at certe in exemplo majore atque illustriore qui defenderit vix reperietur: ut si exempli tarn ardui atque praxclari facinus non sine divino instinctu tentatum tarn prospere atque confectum creditur, sit sane cur eadem ope atque impulsu celebratum quoque idem his laudibus atque defensum videatur: id quod ab omnibus multo malim existimari, quàm aliam quàmvis felicitatem vel ingenii vel judicii vel diligentiae mihi tribui. Hoc tantùm, quemadmodum Consul ille Romanus, abiens magistratu juravit in concione rempub. atque
10 illam urbem suâ unius operâ esse salvam, ita ego manum huic operi nunc ultimam imponens, Deum hominésque contestans ausim dicere, ea me demonstrasse hoc libro, eaque ex summis cum divinæ turn humanæ sapientiae authoribus in medium protulisse, quibus et populum Anglicanum ad sem-
15 piternam posteritatis famam satis esse confidam in hac causa defensum, et plerosque mortales foeda sui juris ignorantia, falsaque specie religionis antea deceptos, nisi qui servire ipsi malint ac meruerint, satis esse liberates. Atque illius quidem Consulis jusjurandum tale atque tantùm populus Romanus
20 universus ilia in concione juratus ipse una voce et consensu approbavit: meam hanc persuâsionem non meorum modo civium, sed exterorum etiam hominum quosque optimos hand tacita ubique gentium voce comprobare jamdudum intelligo.

freedom more freely than here it is defended, yet there shall hardly be found anyone who hath defended it in a greater and more glorious example. If, then, an action of example so high and illustrious is believed to have been as successfully accomplished as not without God's prompting undertaken, let this
5 be reason good for thinking that in these my praises too it hath even by the same Might and Inspiration been glorified and defended. Indeed I had much rather all men thought so, than that any other success, whether of wit or judgment or industry,
10 were allowed me. Yet as that famous Roman Consul, upon retiring from office, swore in the popular assembly that the state and the city owed their safety to his single efforts, even so, as I now put the last touches to this work, so much only I dare assert, calling God and man to witness: that in this book I
15 have indicated and brought to light, from the highest authors of wisdom both divine and human, matters whereby, I trust, not only the English people has been adequately defended in this cause, to the everlasting reputation of its posterity, but numerous other human beings as well, hitherto deluded by
20 foul ignorance of their right and by false show of religion,—multitudes of men, I say, except such as themselves prefer and deserve to be slaves—have been quite set free. Now the oath of that Consul, great as were its claims, was in that same assembly ratified by oath of the whole Roman people with
25 one mind and one voice; this conviction of mine, I have long understood, is fully ratified by the most excellent not only of my fellow-citizens, but of foreigners too, with the loud voice of nations everywhere.

Quo ego fructu summo studiorum meorum, quern quidem in hac vita mihimet proposui, et gratus fruor, et id simul potissimum cogito, quîpossimmaximè non patriæ solùm, cui quod habui summum persolvi, verum etiam quarumvis gentium
5 hominibus totique præsertim nomini Christiano testari³ majora his quidem si possum assequi, potero autem si Deus dederit, eorum causa me cupere quidem interea ac meditari.

This my zealous labor's fruit—the highest that I for my part have set before me in this life—I gratefully enjoy; yet therewith too consider chief how I may bear best witness—not only to my own country, to which I have paid the highest
5 I possessed, but even to men of whatever nation, and to the cause of Christendom above all—that I am pursuing after yet greater things if my strength suffice (nay, it will if God grant), and for their sake meanwhile am taking thought, and studying to make ready.

NOTES

DEFENSIO PRIMA

THE editor has accepted the conclusions of F. F. Madan (*Milton, Salmasius, and Dugard*, Transactions of the Bibliographical Society IV (1923), pp. 119-145) in regard to the chronological order of the editions. In the preparation of the text chief use has been made of the third issue of the quarto first edition (1651: Madan no. i), of the folio (*Editio emendatior*, 1651: Madan no. 2), and of the edition of 1658 (*Editio correctior et auctior, ab Autore dcnuo recognita*, 1658: Madan no. 14). The readings of the 1658 edition, which Milton designates as the final form of the work, have been printed unless there appeared to be excellent reasons for rejecting them. In cases of special difficulty the continental reprints which Madan numbers 3, 4, 5, 9, 12, and 13 have occasionally been consulted also.

Editions are designated in the critical notes by Madan's numbers. Unless otherwise stated, it is to be understood that the 1658 edition (Madan no. 14) has been followed. The very small number of emendations made by the editor are designated by his initials.

C.W. K..

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

Masson (IV. 258, note), when introducing translated excerpts from the first *Defensio*, praises the translation by "Mr, Washington, of the Temple," published in 1692, as "faithful and good in the main." In practice, however, he finds it inadequate: "I have had it before me, and have taken phrases from

it, while translating the present and subsequent passages from the original."

The present translation originated in an attempt to render the Washington translation available by means of minor changes. As the work proceeded, such changes proved insufficient: strong reasons were found for disagreeing with Masson's praise and agreeing with his practice. The present translation, then, though retaining some of the phrases of the old, was made directly from Milton's Latin.

s. L. w.

PAGE 2

TITLE. Salmasii Defensionem] I, 2 *Salmasii*, Defensionem —9
perstringam,] I, 2 astringam, —10 esse:] I, 2 esse; —15
parvas, neque vulgares; Regem] I, 2 parvas neque vulgares, regem

PAGE 4

—18 perfunderet;] i, 2 perfundere —19 vereretur?] c. w. K.
vereretur? I, 2, 14 vereretur. —20 prsedico;] I, 2 prsedico?
—21 Deum?] 1, 2 Deum.

PAGE 6

—i efferentes,] I, 2 attollentes, —4 Ducem] I, 2 ducem
—14 confidat] I, 2 opinetur —19 gesserant,] I, 2 gessere

PAGE 8

—10 facili nuper negotio] I, 2 facili negotio nuper —12 re-
dargui atque summovi,] i, 2 redarguit atque summovit, —13
nunc] I, 2 ego —15 et, quàmvis] I, 2 et quàmvis —16 ea
tamen stipe] I, 2 ea stipe contentus, quàm] i, 2 contentus quàm
—18 sed etiam aliense:] i, 2 sed alienæ: —25 quàmvis . . .
partes,] I, 2 quàmvis alioqueregias secutus ipse partes,

PAGE 10

—2 quidem, qui] I quidem qui —4 more, (quandoquidem)
I, 2 more (quandoquidem —20 fuisset,] I, 2 foret,

PAGE 12

—3 aggrediamur,] i, 2 aggrediamur; —4 barbariem,] I, 2
barbariem; —5 studia atque] I, 2 studia, atque —8 imprimis,
quid exponat, videamus:] i, 2 imprimis videamus quid ait, —10
filium:] i, 2 filium; —16 *Rtgiisi*] I, 2 *Regns*\

PAcæ 14

—i empta,] I, 2 emta, rege:] I, 2 Rege: Non] I, 2 non
 —3 variatam;] I, 2 variatam, —7 Regis] I, 2 regis —9 operâm,
 et] I, 2 operâm et —13 Regis] I, 2 regis —15 machæram
 . . . quàm] I, 2 gladium multo longiorem eo quern —22 mittam]
 I, 2 apportem —24 habeant] I, 2 habent

PAGE 16

—2 barbaric] I, 2 audacia —5 simillimo, nullius,] I, 2
 shnullimo nullius, —7 excitasse.] I, 2 concitasse. —8 Regis]
 I, 2 regis —9 Regis] I, 2 regisi —n Regis] I, 2 regis
 —14 Regis,] I, 2 regis, Rex] I, 2 rex —18 Magistratibus]
 I, 2 magistratibus Rege] I, 2 rege

PAGE 18

—7 reipublicæ] I reipub. —8 reipublicæ] I reipub. —11
 vindicæ] I, 2 Vindicæ —12 illustrissimi . . . Ordines,] I, 2
 Illustrissimi Foederatorum Ordines, —20 fuisset,] I, 2 foret,

PAGE 20

—2 Physici comas] I, 2 Physici, comas —5 indicare?] I indicare
 2 indicare. —10 jubeo,] I, 2 jubeo

PAGE 22

—3 crebrius] I, 2 frequentius —ò sumpti] I, 2 sumti
 —21 moli tanta] I, 2 mole tantùm

PAGE 24

—ò acæpturus] I, 2 exæpturus sit:] I, 2 sit; —I4calumniac
 et] i, 2 calumnise, et —21 ecclesia] I, 2 Ecælesta

PAGE 26

—7 196.] I, 2 169. —13 probability cur] I, 2 frobabilis cur

PAGE 28

—I prodere?] I, 2 prodere; —8 nunc, et] I, 2 nunc et
 —14 redegisses,] i, 2 redigere poteras, —19 republica] I Respub.
 2 Respublica

PAGE 30

—I3majore] i, 2 majori

PAGE 32

—3 dicis;] i, 2 dicis, —4 esses;] I, 2 esses, —ò terra
 flii i terræ fi,il 2, 14 terra-filii —8 quid] I, 2 quæ
 —9 doceat:] i, 2 doceat. —12 promens.—] i, 2 promens—
 —18 vendendo quod] i, 2 vendendo, quod

PAGE 34

—10 ecclesiam;] I, 2 Ecclesiam; —II hinc] i, 2 Hinc

PAGE 36

—3 rex] i, 2 Rex —7 hostes;] I, 2 hostes: —8 Arsaci. Te]

I, 2 Arsaci: Te —9 quæ tanta fiducia] I, 2 quæ fiducia
 —14 credam?] I, 2 credam. —18 *faciamus, quàm]* I, 2
faciamus quàm

PAGE 38

—ò dubites,] I, 2 dubitas, —10 removere] I, 2 amovere
 —15 suspicetur;] I, 2 suspicaretur; —18 ageres, quis,] I ageres
 quis,

PAGE 40

—IO postera] I, 2 proxima —12 ut] I, 2 si —15 pervagari
 . . . sinant.] I, 2 pervagari, quo velit, sinant. —18 nos,
 quemadmodum] I, 2 nos quemadmodum —igCaput1.] I Cap. I.
 —20 superbe, Salmasi,] I, 2 superbiæ Salmasi,

PAGE 42

—4 duodecima, *Ornari]* i, 2 duodecima *Oman* —10 potes,
 rhetoricis] I potes rhetoricis —14 causidici] I, 2 caussidici
 possis;] I, 2 potes} 22 dicam] i, 2 Dicam

PAGE 46

—3 perdiderit?] i, 2 perdiderit, —5 sestimandum] I estiman-
 dum —9 decennalem;] I decennalem,

PAGE 48

—2 quàm plurimos] I, 2 quàm plurimos 14 quàmplurimos
 —14 reorum, qui,] I reorum qui, —15-18 Qure ratio . . . fuisse
 creditur?] 2 quæ ratio igitur animadvertendi in civem moderatior est
 habita, cur non eadem in regem quoque moderatior, et vel ipsi regi
 acceptior fuisse existimanda est? I AS 2, EXæPT . . . existimanda est.
 —22 faventem] I, 2 amicam

PAGE 50

—8 sit,] i sit? 2 sit: —12 crediderim,] i crediderim;
 —13 repeto,] I repeto; —16 depoposærit.] I, 2 deposæbat.
 —17 magistratum, sive] I, 2 magistratum sive

PAGE 52

—2 reddiderunt.] 1, 2 reddidere. —9 rege] I, 2 Rege

PAGE 54

—16 publicam] I, 2 Publicam —20 conscriptos;] i, 2 con-
 scriptos:

PAGE 58

—9 effudisset,] i, 2 effuderit, 9-10 fuissent . . . eo] I, 2
 sint quæ charta illinantur; adeo

PAGE 60

—2 docuerant;] I, 2 docuerunt; —3 destiterant,] i, 2 destite-
 runt, —7 sacerdotibus, quos] I sacerdotibus quos —16 quod

iniques ambitione] i quod, iniques, ambitione —22 extirpari;]
1, 2 extirpari,

PAGE ò2

—2 scioj] I, 2 scio, —5 factiosis,et] I, 2 factiosis, ct —12
curatores;] I, 2 *curatores.* Appar. I Appar: —17 feliciter;]
I feliciter, —19 sis non] I, 2 sis, non

PAGE 64

—3 est, supersticiosas] I est supersticiosas —7 *Christian]*
l christiani —8 fuissent,] I, 2 essent, —II transfuga;] I, 2
transfuga, —15 nominabo, quoniam] I nominabo quoniam
—19 *sapentum, et]* i, 2 *sapentium et* —20 *illustres?]* I, 2
illustres.

PAGE òò

—5 assensus] I, 2 assentitus —10 sunt, aboleret] I, 2 sunt
aboleret —14 perlegisse;] I, 2 perlegisse? —15 mendosum
crepas;] I, 2 mendosum, crepas; —17 rixari, et] I, 2 rixari et

PAGE ò8

—2 nebulonem appellas,] i nebulonem palam appellas, —2
Grammaticum] I, 2 grammaticum —7 habeam, nam] i, 2 habeam
(nam —9 esset; qui] I, 2 esset) qui —IO quasi . . . cui]
I ac si deo cuilibet 2 ac si Deo cuilibet —14 virtutem et] i, 2
virtutem, et —21 doctrina,] I, 2 doctrina;

PAGE 70

—i Caput II.] i Cap. II. —i(.*sentianty*)\ i, 2 *sentiant*\ —ò
retorquere.] I, 2 affirmare. —10 testimoniis et] 1,2 testimoniis,
et —12 barbariam] I, 2 barbariem —15 quenquam] I, 2
ullum 17-18 flagitia, . . . defenderit.] I, 2 flagitia regum jura
esse asseverarit. —19 abhorruere;] i abhorruere,

PAGE 72

—2 ingenio atque animo] I, 2 vernilitate —4 Caracalla, ab]
i Caracalla ab —5 persuâsus, non] I edoctus non 2 edoctus,
non —ò est, aut] I est aut —15 es?] i, 2 es; —16
dejiçere] I, 2 projicere

PAGE 74

—2 qui, contra] i quîcontra —3 Dionysius, ex] i Dionysius
ex —15 ferendi, neque] I, 2 ferendi neque —19 statuerit.]
I, 2 statueret. —23 *dices, statuum]* I, 2 *dices statuum*

PAGE 76

—3 fuisse vel] i, 2 fuisse, vel —7 Deo] I deo —9 con-
cæsserit.] i, 2 concæderet. —II juste;] I, 2 juste, —13 ipsi]
I, 2 sibi —14 potuerit.] I, 2 potuit.

PAGE 78

—I antepoenendus:] I, 2 antepoenendus. lib. 4,] I, 2 lib. 4.
 —I2possit.] i, 2possit, —13 etc.] 14 &c: i, 2 &c. —18
 igitur, quid] I, 2 igitur quid

PAGE 80

—5 quenquam] I, 2 ullum —9 videamus:] I, 2 videamus.
 etc:] 14 &c: I, 2 &c. —12 ei, quid] I, 2 ei quid —14
 regis] i, 2 suâ —18 Jos. I:] I, 2 Jos. I. —20 alioquin] I, 2
 Alioquin cap. 9:] 1, 2 cap. 9. —23 volet, jaciēt,}] I, 2 volet jaciēt,
 PAGE 82

—I nimirum . . . autoritate] I, 2 nimirum faciet autoritate
 armatus:] I, 2 armatus, —4 regis, ibi domination] i, 2 regis
 ibi dominatio, ei, quid] I, 2 quid —ò fecisti, I Sam.]
 I fecisti. Sam. 2 fecisti. I Sam. —7 pag. 49.] i, 2 pag. 49.
 —IO insita] I, 2 tacita —13 plurimum damnosa] I plurimum,
 damnosa —15 universus, quoties] i universus quoties —20
 grassetur, ita] I, 2 grassetur ita

PAGE 84

—i posthac] i, 2 post hoc —10 teste] i, 2 Teste

PAGE 86

—affirmat:] I, 2 affirmat.

PAGE 88

—3 causam] I, 2 causam —4 demonstraret.] I demonstraret,
 —14 indicaverat:] I, 2 indicaverat. —16 erat, sed] I, 2 erat sed
 PAGE 90

—2 causa] i, 2 caussa —5 potuisses,] I, 2 potuisti, —14
 fatearis?] i, 2 fatearis.

PAGE 92

—2 eorum] I, 2 illorum —3 expulerant?] i, 2 expulerant.
 —7 Pare:Aliaque] I, 2 'pare', aliaque —16 impellunt.] I, 2
 proturbant.

PAGE 94

—7 dicas,] i, 2 dicis, —12 94:] 1, 2 94. —14 statutum?]
 I, 2 statutum. —16 docuerit,] i, 2 doceret, —19 quein
 tu] 1, 2 quem, tu

PAGE 96

—3 introductum, non] I, 2 introductum non —7 recitem;]
 1, 2recitem, —84.] 1, 2 4 —19 agat?] I agat, —20
 inimicum et] 1, 2 inimicum, et

PAGE 98

—2 postremo, leges] i, 2 postremo leges —II pœnam] I
 pœnam —20 libuisset] I, 2 libeat

PAGE 100

—3 *rabbinosj*] I, 2 *rabbinos*, —n *Jehova*\\ i, 2 *Jehovah*;
 —15 *proculdubio*] I *procul dubio* —18 *csetera*] I *cætera*
 —21 *acœpimus*;) I, 2 *acœpimus*,

PAGE 102

—13 *Postbabylonicis*] I, 2 *Post-babylonicis*

PAGE 104

—18 *abire et*] I, 2 *abire, et* —19 *Judæos et*] I, 2 *Judasos, et*

PAGE 106

—5 *impius, iniquus*;) I, 2 *impius, iniquus*, 14 *impius iniquus*,
 —13 *Carolum IV. se*] 1, 2 *Carolum 4 se* —16 *assequuntur?*] I, 2
assequuntur. —18 *Majestatismaximè*] I, 2 *Majestatismaximè*
 —14 *Majestatis,maximè* —19 *Aristoteles, Polit.*] I, 2 *Aristoteles*
Polit. —22 *reipub.*] I *reipub*:

PAGE 108

—2 *proficisœns, acœrsivit*] I, 2 *proficisœns acœrsivit* —ò
inquis;) I, 2 *inquis*, —9 *populus, refragante*] I, 2 *populus*
refragante Deo, regem] i, 2 *dco regem* —13 *David*;) I, 2
David? —15 *Sam. 5.*] i, 2 *Sam. 5.* —16 *Solomon*;) I, 2
Salomon, —17 *Domini, et*] 1, 2 *Domini et Par.*] I, 2
Paralip. —19 *populum*;) i, 2 *populum*.

PAGE 110

—5 *debuisti, vers. n, 12. Tua*] i *potuisti v. 11, 12. tua* 2 *potuisti*.
 v. 11, 12. *tua* —7 *etc: diciturque*] I, 2 &c. *Diciturque* —9
Deum] i, 2 *deum essecui*] I, 2 *esse, cui* 11-17 *nam . . . Et*]
 OMITTED IN i, 2 —17 *œrte*] i, 2 *enim*

PAGE 112

—3 *mtuentur*\\ I, 2 *intuentur*. —4 *quia . . . objiciant*\\
 i, 2 IN ROMAN LETTERS io *Horatii*;) i, 2 *Horatii*.

PAGE 114

—8 *Evangelio*] I *evangelic* —io *gloriantur: ne*] I, 2 *glori-*
antur. Ne —19 *œrte, . . . loquitur*;) I, 2 *œrte quern citas de*
avrap^aia loquitur;

PAGE 116

—18 *visa*;) I, 2 *visa*; —18 *Judzorum*\\ I, 2 *Judaorum*,
addis, Judeeoi] I, 2 *addis Jud&os*

PAGE 118

—5 *Psal. 17*;) i *Psal. 17.* 2 *Psal. 17.* —7 *scripsisse cum*] I, 2
scripsisse, cum —17 *palmarium, Tibi*] i, 2 *palmarium. Tibi* Ps.]
 I, 2 *Psal.*

PAGE 120

—3 *peccavi, proculdubio*] I *peccavi procul dubio* 2 *peccavi pro-*

culdubio —II videatur, 2 Sam. 12.] I videatur. 2 Sam. 12. 2 videatur, 2 Sam. 12. —12 numquis] I, 2 an quis —14 condemnauerat] v. 5.] 1, 2 condemnauerat. v. 5. —18 pronuntiaverat, v. 13.] I, 2 pronuntiaverat. v. 13.

PAGE 122

—4 30 hsec] i, 2 30. Hæc —ò 42 Advocatum] I, 2 42. Advocatum —8 *est, savitiam] i est sævitiam* —9 *assueverant\]* I, 2 *assueverant.* —12 advocatus:] i, 2 advocatus, —23 tuam, et] i, 2 tuam et Apparatus:] i Apparatus:

PAGE 124

—9 Affirmas p. 29.] I, 2 Affirmas. p. 29. —10 *gentes\]* i, 2 *Gentes,* —11 *Occidens:]* I, 2 *Occident.* At p. 43.] i, 2 At. p. 43. —16 tibi,] I, 2 tibi;

PAGE 126

—23 secundus:] i, 2 secundus;

PAGE 128

—19 possit,] I, 2 possit. quanquam] I, 2 quàmquàm

PAGE 130

—i Moses, Deut.] i Moses Deut. —3 *Dei,] i dei.* 2 *Dei.* —IO dicis:] I, 2 dicas] Apparatu . . . 230,] I, 2 apparatu in primatum, p. 230. —13 idque, sicut] I, 2 idque sicut —15 sequitur, reges.] i sequitur reges, —17 summo non] i, 2 summo, non —18 suum?] i, 2 suum. —20 *constituendo,]* i, 2 *constituendo.* —22 *regem:]* i, 2 *regem;*

PAGE 132

—i p. 42,] I, 2 p. 42. —ò *Deus] i deus* —7 impeditum:] I, 2 impeditum: —8 Prophetam,] i, 2 prophetam, Deum,] i deum, —13 verbo, improbe,] i, 2 verbo improbe,

PAGE 134

—5 testatur Deus] i, 2 testatur Deus 14 testatur. Deus —ò petissent: . . . *sed]* I petissent. ver. 7 *Non te sed* 2 petissent. ver. 7. *Non te sed* —8 plane quasi] I, 2 acsi —13 19,] I, 2 19. —14 *malis et]* I, 2 *malis, et* —15 *nobis\ . . . 12,]* i, 2 *nobis.* et cap. 12. 12. —16 *vester: . . . 17,]* I, 2 *vester.* et ver. 17. —17 *Jehova, fetendo* 1, 2 *Jehova fetendo* —i Srege, . . . ii:] I, 2 rege, 13. 10. 11.

PAGE 136

—ò 13,] I, 2 13. —8 habuisset.] I, 2 habuerat. —u fuit.] i, 2 fuerit

PAGE 138

—2, 'p.] *i, 2 pag.* —ò magistratus?] I, 2 magistratus. —14

suâmet] I, 2 suomet operâ] I, 2 opere —18 *rex]* I, 2 *Rex*
—20 *dubitaverint,]* I, 2 *dubitarunt,*

PAGE 140

—I *erat:]* I, 2 *erat;* *Jacobus, Darlii]* I, 2 *Jacobus Darlii* —ò
dictus;] I, 2 *dictus, divinandum . . . reliquerit.]* I, 2 *dubium sit.*
—8 *Solomone, qui]* I, 2 *Solomone qui* —19 *Bucchingamio]*
I Bucchingamio —21 *Summo regni concilio]* I, 2 *comitiis*
—23 *conventum]* I, 2 *comitia*

PAGE 142

—2 *impendit;]* I, 2 *impendit,* —3 *est;]* I, 2 *est,* —10
populo] i, 2 *populo* 14 *Populo* —16 *Caput III.]* I *Cap. III.*
—20 *possent,]* I, 2 *possint,*

PAGE 144

—i *Lex,]* i, 2 *lex,* —5 *Dei]* I *dei* —8 *civili:]* I, 2 *civili;*
—12 *stabilivit,]* I, 2 *stabiliret,* —13 *subjecit?]* I, 2 *subjiçeret.*
—17 7,] i, 2 7. —18 *statuit:]* i, 2 *statuit.* —22 *confirmavit:]*
i, 2 *confirmavit.*

PAGE 146

—917,] 1,2 17. —ii *Ergo,]* i,2 *ergo,* —19 *loquitur;]*
I, 2 *loquitur,*

PAGE 148

—3 *est, civibus]* i *est civibus* —7 *est, fideles]* I *est fideles*
Christianos] I *christianos* —9 *Christo, liberos]* I, 2 *Christo*
liberos —10 *Christianos:]* I *christianos:* —15 *nosset.]* I, 2
esset —16 *imponere, ærte]* I, 2 *imponere, ærte* 14 *imponere*
ærte —17 *Christianos,]* i *christianos,*

PAGE 150

—5 *esset,]* i, 2 *sit,* —n *Cujus,]* i *cujus,* —12 *Dei sunt*
Deo.]\ i dei sunt deo. —18 *hominis et]* I, 2 *hominis, et* *aspi-*
ciens, interrogaret] I, 2 *aspiçiens interrogaret* —20 *Dei]* I *dei*
Dei] I *dei* —21 *Deo]* I *deo*

PAGE 152

—i *est, homini,]* I *est homini,* —2 *piaculo et]* 1,2 *piaculo, et*
—3 *Dei,]* i *dei,* —5 *Deo]* i *deo* —7 *Deo]* I *deo* —18
effigie] i, 2 *nomine*

PAGE 154

—8 *regio, sed]* I *regio sed* —12 *Atque]* 1, 2 *Verum* —18
Christianos] I *christianos* —21 *eas;]* I, 2 *eas,*

PAGE 156

—i *servus.}]* I, 2 *servus?* —ò *cæci . . . tanquàm]* I, 2 *uti tu*
soles, cæci atque inermes tanquàm —9 *Deus]* I *deus* —12

Christianus] I christianus populus more] I populus more —16
vult (quis] i, 2 vult, quis —17 major?) esto] I, 2 major, esto
frimus] i, 2 primus —20 Christianum] i christianum

PAGE 158

—I Christianos] I christianos —3 Christianus] i christianus
—4 populo tamen superbe] I populo superbe —ò lactantem:]
I, 2 lactantem. nutricius] I, 2 nutritius —7 dominos, sed]
1 dominos sed —12 Dei] i dei

PAGE 160

—i domi Lyciscam] i, 2 domi, ut ferunt, Lyciscam tibi . . .
misere] I, 2 tibi misere —2 dominatur, . . . unde] I, 2 dominatur;
cujus partim impulsu etiam scripsisse hæc diceris] unde —13
Dommum;] I *dominum*, 2 *Dominum*, —16 *Dei.] i dei.*
—17 dispersis atque] I, 2 dispersis, atque

PAGE 162

—9 *Dominum.] i dominum.* —10 *Deo] i deo* —11
Dei.] I dei. —14 addit, v. 16,] I, 2 addit. v. 16 *liberi;]* I, 2
liberi, —21 Atqui] I At quî ille, cui] I ille cui

PAGE 164

—ò Romanes: c. 13,] i, 2 Romanos. c. 13. —7 *esto; non] i,*
2 *esto, non* —8 *Deo;]* i *deo,* 2 *Deo, Deo] i deo* —14
est, quisque] I, 2 est quisque —17 *induxisse, ut] I* *induxisse ut*
—22 *suscipenda-,]* I, 2 *suscipenda,*

PAGE 166

—I *novafores, quasi] i, 2 novatores quasi* —4 Apostoli,] i
apostoli, —7 Apostolo] I apostolo fuerit, ex] I, 2 fuerit ex
—8 scrutemur:] I, 2 scrutemur. —9 *esto;]* i, 2 *esto,* —17
appellat:] i, 2 appellat. —i Srationem:] I, 2 rationem. —19
Kparvve]] I, 2 Kparuvn.

PAGE 168

—9 *Deo;]* i *deo-y* —II Deum] I deum —12 Phil. 12,]
I, 2 Philip. 12. 12-14 *nihil . . . contraria.] i, 2 IN ROMAN LET-*
TERS. —14 *Deo] i deo* —17 *proculdubio] i procul dubio*
—19 8,] 1, 2 8. —20 *principes, quos] i, 2 principes quos* —21
Deum] i deum 22 Deum] i deum —23 *Deo] I deo*

PAGE 170

—I Nonnumquàm] I, 2 Aliquando —3 4;] 1, 2 4. *Omnem-,]*
i, 2 omnem, —5 dicitur:] i, 2 dicitur, 13,] 1, 2 13. —7
Quapropter] i, 2 Propterea —8 legitimas cujusmodi] I, 2 legi-
timas, prout —ii *Deo] i deo* —13 *Deo,]* i *deo,* —14
Chrysost.] I, 2 Chrysostomus. *Deo] i deo* —23 *Deo] i deo*

PAGE 172

—10 Deo] I deo —15 *existunt*, reddi] I, 2 *existunt* reddi
 —17 ἀπώλεισας:] ἀπώλεισας:

PAGE 173 1/4

—7 num] i, 2 an —13 hortetur:] I, 2 hortetur; —23 ilia,
 neque] I ilia neque

PAGE 176

—14 *damus*] I, 2 *damus*.

PAGE 178

—4 deserto,] I, 2 deserto; Dei] I dei

PAGE 180

—2 Deus] I deus —5 Deo] I deo Deo] I deo —7 Deus]
 I deus —10 Deo] I deo

PAGE 182

—2 Flacco;] I, 2 Flacco, —6 *servire, nisi] i servire nisi*
 —8 Populus] i, 2 populus —uPlancio] i, 2 Plancio, —22
tyrannum, plus] I tyrannum plus simplici, fuisse] I simplici
fuisse

PAGE 184

—3 Senatu;] i, 2 Senatu, —10 debet?] 1, 2 debet. —13
Honorii] I, 2 *Honorii*.

PAGE 186

—17 alioquin] I alioqui —19 *intelligemus]* I, 2 *intelli-*
gemus. —22 nonnulli, pro] i nonnulli pro

PAGE 188

—2 *pessimi:] I, 2 pessimi-*_y —3 est] i, 2 est, —5 Paulus,
 non] i, 2 Paulus non —13 honestam mallet agere,] I, 2 honestam
 agere, —¹⁵~¹⁹ inhonestam? Audi . . . adhibeo; non] c. w. K.
 inhonestam? 14 inhonestam. Audi . . . adhibeo; non I, 2
 inhonestam. Teipsum testem adhibebo, non —20 discors tibi,]
 i, 2 fraudulentus,

PAGE 190

—7 edita, p. 412;] I, 2 edita. p. 412. —9 vidimus, et] I, 2
 vidimus et —12 Scriptura] i, 2 scriptura —16 Scriptura]
 I scriptura —18 Deus,] I deus,

PAGE 192

—7 quis iis] I, 2 quis non iis

PAGE 194

—2 Imperatorem] i, 2 imperatorem —5 *cognomen:] I, 2*
Cognomen: —6 Dei] I del —7 *ceterum] Ceterum Deus]*
i deus —8 *ibidem, qui] I, 2 ibidem qui Dominus] i, 2 dominus*
 —14 antea] i, 2 prius —20 Dei] I dei

PAGE 196

—4 plusquàm] I plus quàm —11 *inferator, interiora*] I, 2 *inferator interiors*

PAGE 198

—3 *Deo*] *i deo* —4 <*peccavisse*\ I, 2 *feccavisse*. —9 *Deum*] *i deum* —13 *Deum*] I *deum* —14 *Deus*] I *deus* —18 *Deum*] *i deum* —22 *Deus*] I *deus*

PAGE 200

—16 *barbariam*] I, 2 *barbariem*

PAGE 202

—13 *addictissimum, nullius*] I, 2 *addictissimum nullius* —16 *mancipium nostrum*] *i Mancipium, nostrum* —21 *erat, tuæ*] *i erat tuæ*

PAGE 204

—12 *docuerint neque approbarint?*] I, 2 *docuerunt neque approbarunt?* —14 *dissentiant?*] *i, 2 dissentiunt?* —15 *Deo*] *I deo* —16 *Deo*] *I deo* —17 *Deum*] *i deum*

PAGE 206

—4 *Deus*] *i deus* 54.] I, 2 54. —12 *affirmas*] *I affirmas confituti:] i, 2 constitute.* —13 *Deo*] *I deo* —15 *Deo*] *I deo*

PAGE 208

—9 *passus, zequissima*] *i, 2 passus æquissima* —11 *possit*] *i, 2 possit,* —13 *Deus*] *I, 2 deus* —21 *Deus*] *I deus*

PAGE 210

—2 *ecclesia*] *I, 2 Ecclesia* —ò *ecclesia*] *i, 2 Ecclesia* —7 *ecclesiæ*] *c. w. K. ecclesiæ* *I, 2 Ecclesias* 14 *ecclesia* —13 *ecclesia*] *I, 2 Ecclesia*

PAGE 212

—I *Caput IV.]* *1 Cap. IV.* —ò *propellere*] *I, 2 abigere*

PAGE 214

—ò *sapientissimi:]* *I, 2 sapientissimi.* —20 *reliquisse,]* *i, 2 reliquisse;*

PAGE 216

—11 *Jerichunte*] *I, 2 Hierichunte* —12 *Dei*] *i dei* —16 *Dei*] *i dei* —19 *Dei*] *i dei* —20 *legimus. Clamarunt]* *I, 2 legimus, clamarunt*

PAGE 218

—i *erat:]* *I, 2 erat;* —5 *consul]* *I, 2 Consul* —13 *suis, Jud. 15.]* *I, 2 suis (Jud. 15.)* —16 *Dei,]* *I dei,* —17 *Deum]* *r deum* —21 *Dei.]* *I dei.*

PAGE 220

—2 *Dei]* *i dei* —6 *Deus]* *I deus* —8 44.] *i, 2 44.*

Domini] I domini —14 Domini.] I domini. —15 105,]
 2 105. est, populum] I est populum —18 Domini] I domini
 —19 Domini] I domini —22 Domini] I domini

PAGE 222

—732,] 1,2 32. —Iomeliore] i,2meliori —12 rex;]
 I, 2 rex,

PAGE 224

—I Philistæis] I, 2 Phelistrueis —7 mendacissime?] I, 2
 mendacissime. —17 Philisfæos] I Phelithseos 2 Philisthasos

PAGE 226

—5 *Domini] i domini* —9 Solomone, populus] I, 2 Solomone
 populus —16 sibi, suâdent,] I, 2 sibi suâdent, —22 testatur:]
 I, 2 testatur.

PAGE 228

—9 regem;] I, 2 regem, Deus] I deus —13 Deoj] I, 2 Deo,
 PAGE 230

—i quis] I Quis —7 *fuit, et] 1,2 fuit et* —9 Dei] I dei
 —21 *fuisse.* Anglos] I, 2 *juisse.* Primum delirasse te cum Hæc scriberes
 plane video, neque mentis neque latininitatis compotem satis fuisse: deinde
 Anglos

PAGE 232

—3 quia is dereliquerat] I, 2 quia dereliquerat —4 Deumj]
 I deum; —16 Deus] I deus —19 Deus] I deus

PAGE 234

—8 potuit, utpote foemina;] I, 2 potuit utpote foemina, —10-11
 tyrannum: . . . foemina.] I, 2 tyrannum. Pares ergo jam sumus.
 —15 *Deum\ i deum*

PAGE 236

—i inferiorem.] i, 2 inferiorem; —11-12 virorum etiam regum
 nomina] i, 2 virorum nomina —13-16 Davide, . . . justissimo]
 i, 2 Davide, regem et prophetam religiosissimum cum superstitioso et
 Christianas doctrine vix initiate, sapientissimum cum stolido, fortissimum
 cum imbelli, justissimum cum iniquissimo —21 cætera dicam,
 attrectare] i, 2 dicam cætera, pertrectare —23 ego quere] I ego,
 quas

PAGE 238

—21 ductus, mortem] I, 2 ductus mortem

PAGE 240

—2 Pharisæorum] I, 2 pharisseorum —4 habet:] I, 2 habet;

PAGE 242

—2 vi, (extraneorum] I vi, extraneorum ducebaj] partim] I
 ducebat; partim

PAGE 244

—II Cæsari et] I, 2 Cæsari, et —13 verba?] I, 2 verba,

PAGE 246

—5 *inter'positam.] i interposita.* —7 accipe:] I, 2 accipej
—9 esse.] I, 2 erit, —22 *probatur]* I, 2 *probatur:*

PAGE 248

—2 loquatur:] I, 2 loquatur, —5 *civilibus postmodum]* I, 2
civilibus, postmodum prætulerit.] I, 2 prastulit. —9 *movisse:]*
I, 2 *movisse,*

PAGE 250

—14 *Christianos, aut]* I, 2 *Christianos aut* 20 *Deo]* I *deo*
—23 *Deo]* I *deo*

PAGE 252

—11 *puduerit?] I, 2 puduit?*

PAGE 254

—*lolaudat:] I, 2 laudat.* —*i\$Dei]* I *dei*

PAGE 256

—10 *commemoro:] i, 2 memoro:* —13 *Christiani,]* I
christiani, —17 *Christianas]* i *christianus*

PAGE 258

—9 *Christianorum]* I *christianorum* —11 *Pastores]* I, 2
pastores —12 *Patres,]* I, 2 *patres,* —20 *pene]* i, 2 *pæne*

PAGE 260

—3 *sed vel]* I *sed, vel* —4 *Christianorum]* I *christianorum*
—11 *Christianos cum Christianis,]* I *christianos cum christianis,* —16
si ita pronuntiavit] I, 2 *ista si dicat* —17 *dixisse]* i, 2 *dicere*
—19~p. 262, 10. *videatur: . . . sit. Quse]* i, 2 *videatur. quæ*

PAGE 262

—17 *Christianum,]* I *christianum,*

PAGE 264

—5 *suâ, cap. 13.] I suâ cap. 13,*

PAGE 266

—i *Nam]* i *Nam* —13 *Caput V.] I Cap. V.* —14 *Dei]*
I *dei* —16 *Dei]* I *dei* —18 *sit,]* I, 2 *sit;*

PAGE 268

—I *Dei]* i *dei* —5 *Græci, turn]* I *Græci turn* —7 *quàm]*
I, 2 *sed* —22 *Prudentia;]* I *prudentia;*

PAGE 270

—12 *potuissem,]* I, 2 *potueram,*

PAGE 272

—IO—II *respiciat; . . . Jam]* I, 2 *respiciat. Jam* —16 *præ-*
cellit; cæteri] I, 2 *præcellit: Cæteri*

PAGE 274

—2 rebus publicis] I rebuspublicis —3 habere, cum] I habere.
Cum —9 Deo] I deo

PAGE 276

—8 inservires?] I, 2 inservires. —II invitus perque] I, 2
invitus, perque —13 potest, ne] I potest ne —18 excitaveris?]
c. w. K. excitaveris? 1, 2, 14 excitaveris.

PAGE 278

—2 dixisses,] I, 2 dixeras, —2-3 rationem, . . . ague] I
rationem sive per plures sive 'per fauciores sive 'per unum teque —4
earn qua\ 2 earn, qua: exerætur, ex] \ exerætur ex tribus, magis]
I tribus magis —5 ais;] I, 2 ais, —14 Dei] I dei —17
Deo] I deo —18Dei] I dei

PAGE 280

—2 casterarum, . . . resfub.) I cterarum te teste respib. —ò
nostra:] I, 2 nostraj

PAGE 282

—I ratio fostulaty] i, 2 ratio naturalis postulat, —22 recitata
his] I recitata, his

PAGE 284

—i dissensiones,\ I, 2 dissentiones, —2 malum, affirmabas,]
1 malum affirmas, 2 malum, affirmas, —5 deauratus, . . . seu]
I, 2 delinitus et deauratus in —8 erubesære;] I, 2 erubesære,
—22 perditam, quo] I perditam quo

PAGE 286

—2 Stoicum] I stoicum —3 tale, sat] i talc sat —9 deso-
lat(B^\ i, 2 desolates\ —23 num] i, 2 an

PAGE 288

—i num] i, 2 an civili, quàmvis] I civili quàmvis truculentis-
simo, supersedendum,] i truculentissimo supersedendum, —2 num]
i, 2 an

PAGE 290

—2 Deo] i deo —3 Deus] i deus —19 Inquis, nusquàm]
i, 2 inquis nusquàm

PAGE 292

—12 verum] I, 2 at enim —16 Triumphas;] I, 2 Lætaris;
—18 recitoj] I, 2 recito, —18-20 tolerabant . . . ^oterant.\ i,
2 IN ROMAN LETTERS.

PAGE 294

—15 ^gyptii, fideles,] i, 2 ^gyptii fideles, extitere'] I, 2
extitere; —20 Cum . . . desciscunt,] 1, 2 Quo occiso iterum
fidem mutant,

PAGE 296

—i Ocho rursus in] I, 2 Ocho in —20 Deum] I deum

PAGE 298

—4 *Jus]* I, 2 *jus* —8 *Persarum, id]* 1,2 *Persarum id*

PAGE 300

—3 *fateris]* I, 2, 14 *fateris*

PAGE 302

—5 post] i, 2 *postea* —22 *est-,]* 1,2 *est,*

PAGE 304

—I *tegitimus',]* I, 2 *legitimus,* —6 infra, 6] 1,2 infra 6 —9 octava, '*Aprij]* i, 2 o c τὰρχή a — 2 3 *statuanf.]* i, 2 *statuunt.*

PAGE 306

—3 *sexto,]* i, 2 6^{to}- —9 *poetas]* i, 2 *Poetas* —14 *scito,*
(*prscipitem]* i *scito, prscipitem* —15 *perspicio) scito,]* I *perspicio, scito,*
—16 *poetam]* I, 2 *Poetam* —19 *poetas]* i, 2
Poetse cuique persons maxime] I, 2 *cuique maxime* —21 *se contulerantj]* I, 2 *pervenerant;*

PAGE 308

—i'*jaceremy]* I, 2 *jaciam,* 20 *Lxtantis,]* I, 2 *L-etantis.*

PAGE 310

—24 *redduntur.}]* I, 2 *refenduntur.*

PAGE 312

—4 [ἴβυϛ] i fzbvu —5 *solis.]* i, 2 *solum.* —6 *Antigone:]*
I, 2 *Antigone.* —10—p. 314, 14. *nemo . . . hasc]* I, 2 *nemo*
ignorat. Atque hsec

PAGE 314

—4 2. 13. 29] I, 2, 14 23. 1. 2. —24 *libitum, Romanis]*
I *libitum Romanis* —26 *legibus colluvies]* i, 2 *legibus, colluvies*

PAGE 316

—7 *tandem, ut]* 1,2 *tandem ut* —9 *antea]* I, 2 *prius* —10
censuisset?] I, 2 *sensisset?* —12 *regi]* i, 2 *Regi* —24 *etsi]*
I, 2 *quamvis*

PAGE 318

—3 *alia, quae]* I *alia quae* —7 *solum, aut]* i *solum aut*
—13 *statu, nihil]* I, 2 .r/rfta »*A*7 —15 *regium:]* i, 2 *regium;*

PAGE 320

—i *Cassaris, effectum]* i *Csesaris effectum* —9 *Deus]* I *deus*

PAGE 322

—1-2 *dignior, . . . superbire,]* I, 2 *dignior esj* *quanquam tu Kinc*
noli superbire, —3 *confero,]* i, 2 *conferendum putcm,* —5—6
solvendum . . . imponcre] i, 2 *solvendum, imponcre* —8 *suum*
cod.] i, 2 *suum, cod.* —9 *juris imperatorum]* i, 2 *juris, impera-*

torum —15 *Omnia*] I, 2 *omnia* —22-p. 324, 17. Tarquinium
 . . . *Sed*] I, 2 Tarquinium expulerunt. *Sed*

PAGE 324

—17-18 *inquis, Tarquinium expulerunt?*] I, 2 *inquis, expulerunt*[^]
 —21 *mori, si modo*] i, 2 *mori, modo* C.] 1, 2 Ca. —22 *illius*]
 I, 2 *ejus*

PAGE 326

—2 *secunda*] 1, 2 2^{da} —3 *è0w, quantum*] I *è0quantum*
 —5 *infra*] I, 2 *infra*. —16 *Si*] i, 2 *si* —23 *Panegyrico*:]
 I, 2 *Panegyrico*.

PAGE 328

—3 *Nemo*] I, 2 *w^wo* —8 *trucidaverit*] I, 2 *trucideraverit*.
 —17 *mortuum et*] 1, 2 *mortuum tamen et*

PAGE 330

—2 *consularis, cum*] I *consularis cum* —8 *ct ut*] 1, 2 *et, ut*

PAGE 332

—ò *accident, framium*] I, 2 *occiderit framium* —II *Pauc<e*]
 i, 2 *paucæ*

PAGE 336

—2 *nunc, hominum*] I *nunc hominum* —3 *corruptissime, ob*]
 i *corruptissime ob* —ò *luerunt*] i, 2 *luent* —7 *vellem*:]
 i, 2 *vellem*; —20 *inde statuere*] I, 2 *colligere*

PAGE 338

—I *eo, quo*] I *eo quo*

PAGE 340

—5 *Galba, qui*] I *Galba qui* —9 *Trifurcifer!*] I, 2 *Trifurci-*
fer, vituperado] i, 2 *vituperium* —I4*sint.*[?]] i, 2 *sint*.

PAGE 342

—17 *canemj te Sancti*] I, 2 *canem, te S*

PAGE 344

—9 *possent?*] I, 2 *poterant?* *argumentari*] I, 2 *ratiocinari*

PAGE 346

—i i *Caput VI.*] i *Cap. VI.*

PAGE 348

—8 *opporteret*:] i, 2 *opporteret*, —13 *Dei, aut*] I *Dei aut*
 —14 *rebusj*] I, 2 *rebus*, —16 *libertate*:] I, 2 *libertate*:

PAGE 350

—7 *Euripides*] I *Euripides* —19 *Me-,j*] I, 2 *hic*> —23
octava.] i, 2 *octava*,

PAGE 352

—ò *tertio*:] i, 2 3^{tio},

PAGE 354.

—5 *Deum*] I *deum* Deus] I *deus* —ò *Deus*] I *deus*
—10 *recoquemus,*] I, 2 *recoquemus?* *refutavimus?*] I, 2 *refutavimus.*

PAGE 356

—2 *Parlamento*] I, 2 *parlamento* —16 *obsederant,*] *obsederant;*

PAGE 358

—4 *Deo*] i *deo*

PAGE 362

—I *Vates*] I, 2 *vates* —2 *Deum*] I *deum* —9 *Nihil*] I, 2 *nihil* —ii *plures:*] i *plures.* —13 *temetipso*] I *temetipso*

PAGE 364

—I *usum fructum*] i *usumfructum* —3 *prostaes,*] i, 2 *cursiataes,* —*Svicit'*] i, 2 *vicit,* *tametsi*] I, 2 *etsi*

PAGE 368

—I *Caput VII.*] i *Cap. VII.* —ò *foret;*] I, 2 *foret,* —7 *Crux*] i *crux* —13-14 *duodecim . . . Pares?*] I *regis Franciæ duodecim vetustissimi Pares;* —14 *an Turpini fabulæ*] I, 2 *an fabulæ* —16-18 *dixeris. . . . Quod*] 2 THE SAME EXÆPT *duodenos INSTEAD OF duodecim i dixeris. Quod* —19-p- 370, I. *regis . . . vide*] I *regis pares, ut nominantur, vide*

PAGE 370

—I3~p. 372, 4. *plebi . . . poterunt*] i *plebi visum est. Illustri exemplo esse poterunt*

PAGE 374

—5 *tuis*] I, 2 *tuismet* —16 *ridiculum sed*] i, 2 *ridiculum, sed*
—20 *agamj*] I, 2 *agam,*

PAGE 376

—7 *Panegyrico:*] i, 2 *Panegyrico.* —*qverbum, non \ \ verbum non* —16 *œdere, siquidem*] I *œdere siquidem* —18 *optimorum?*] I, 2 *optimorum.*

PAGE 378

—9 *dicis. quàm*] i, 2 *dicis. quàm* —14 *dicis quàm* —10 *vel, ut*] i, 2 *vel ut dicam, virtualiter,*] I, 2 *dicam virtualiter,*
—11 *Etenim quise*] i, 2 *Quise enim*

PAGE 380

—2 *natura, neque*] i *natura neque* —ò *judicari, quia*] i *judicari quia* —II *collegas:*] i, 2 *collegas,* —15 *Magistratum,*] i, 2 *magistratum,* —20 *immanissimum, nullum*] i, 2 *immanissimum nullum*

PAGE 382

—20 poculis, . . . alii] I, 2 poculis, alii —21 elegantias, . . . nam] I, 2 elegantiae, nam

PAGE 384

—8 minus, quaeso, rex] i, 2 minus quæso rex —10 regem,] I, 2 regem? —11 gesserit?] I, 2 gesserit. —21 interdum non] i, 2 raro

PAGE 386

—I quàm patientia . . . ne] 1,2 quàm æquitate id fit, ne —7 interfectoꝝ,] I, 2 Interfectoꝝ.

PAGE 388

—7 ponis;] I, 2 ponis, —21 *sum^torum*\\ I, 2 *sumptorum*.

PAGE 390

—3 *residere*;] 1,2 *residere^*

PAGE 394

—10 Diodorus, lib.] I, 2 Diodorus. 1.

PAGE 398

—4 Non] i, 2 non —ò Caput VIII.] i Cap. VIII. —12 *Omnes*\\ i, 2 *omnes* —13 *Italos, sive*] i, 2 *Ita,os, sive* —14 *Italos sive* —20 *ejusqui*] I, 2 *ejus, qui* *conduxit copia,*] 1,2 *conduxit, copia,*

PAGE 400

—ò refert, quid] I refert quid —7 vis, Ole,] I, 2 vis Ole, —8 pertineat?] I, 2 pertinet? —22 Sapit] I, 2 sapit

PAGE 402

—8 Sexto] 1,2 ò^{to} —17 *Deo*] i *deo Deum*] *\deum*

PAGE 404

—5 Quatuor] I, 2 quatuor —8 Barbaricum,] I, 2 barbaricum,

PAGE 406

—8—9 concinnare semper soles!] i, 2 semper concinnas!

PAGE 408

—7 Nam] i, 2 nam —9 Secundum] I, 2 2^{dum} —n *inferioꝝ cut*] i *inferioꝝ cui*

PAGE 410

—13 Gulielmus] i, 2 Guilielmus —18 Gulielmo,] i, 2 Guilielmo, —19 Gulielmus] I, 2 Guilielmus

PAGE 412

—9 Gulielmo] i, 2 Guilielmo

PAGE 414

—3 Buchananum;] I, 2 Buchananum, —i\ *Rex*] *i,2rex*

PAGE 416

—3 *convoætur*] i, 2 *convoætur*. tibi] I, 2 tibi, —n
vocatam, bis] I, 2 vocatum bis

PAGE 418

—I qui] I, 2, 14 *qui* —16 *membrorum*-[^] i, 2 *membrorum*,

PAGE 420

—10 *debebas? cæte*] c. w. K. *debebas? cæte* 14 *debebas. cæte*
I, 2 *te oportebat? cæte* —12 *hoste papa, ejus*] i, 2 *hoste, cjus*
—13 *Verum, quia*] I *Verum quia* —17 *saltern posse*] I, 2 *saltern*
aliquem posse —21 *Dei scd*] I, 2 *Dei, sed*

PAGE 422

—3 *quin sicuti*] I, 2 *quin, sicuti* —u *Tertii*] i, 2 3ⁿ
Baronum] I, 2 *baronum* —16 *fuisse*] i *fuisse*, —18 *quin-*
quagesimo secundo] I 52. 2 52 —22 *Edouardus*] i, 2
Edouardus 14 *Edovardus*

PAGE 424

—IO *plebeii*] I, 2 *plebeii* 14 *plebii* —17 *Agraria*] i, 2
agraria

PAGE 426

—18 *nos, et*] I *nos et* —21 *transtulisse, (neminem)* I, 2 *trans-*
tulisse, neminein —23 *approbatas,]* I, 2 *approbatas:* 17.)
sequitur] i, 2 17. *sequitur*

PAGE 428

—ò *County*] i, 2 *Countie* —20 *essent, recte*] I, 2 *essent recte*
—21 *Parlamntum*] I, 2 *farlamentum*

PAGE 430

—5 *Parlamentd*] I, 2 *farlamento* —8 *administrat*] I *admini-*
strat, —20 *judicandum*] I, 2 *judicandum;* —21 *Deo*] i *deo*
—22 *authoritas, quæ*] I *authoritas qua?*

PAGE 432

—14 *prasstitero;]* I, 2 *prxstitero:*

PAGE 434

—8 *furem;]* I, 2 *furem;* —11 *Congesta in extreme*] i, 2
Congesta extreme

PAGE 436

—2—3 *nonnullos supplicio*] i, 2 *nonnullos, supplicio* —3—5
Britannos . . . sed] I, 2 *Britannos eo nomine Gildas, contra quàm tu*
facis, reprehendit, non quod reges necavere, sed —23 *nominator ab*
ipsis usque] I, 2 *nominatur; Ipsi*

PAGE 438

—2 *Beda. Sic*] I, 2 *Beda; sic* —4 *promulgavit;]* 1, 2 *promul-*

- gavit; —5 *concilia* item] I *concilia*, item —13 fore:] I, 2
fore. —19 Tertio] I, 2 3^{uo}
PAGE 440
—i dat, vel] I dat vel —10 traditas, abesse] I, 2 traditas abesse
PAGE 442
—5 Guilielmus] i, 2 Guilielmus —16 *rex, ubi]* i *rex ubi*
voluntas, et] \voluntasct —17 *regie;]* i *regit, tyrannus, dum]*
i *tyrannus dum* —19 *Dei:]* I *dei'*. —20 *Dei:]* I *dei*:
PAGE 444
—2 Eduardinx vere] I, 2 Edvardinæ, vere —4 *Dei]* I *dei*
—ò *Dei,]* I *dei*. —7 *Dei]* I *dei* —14 *feccat\]* I, 2 *feccat,*
legunt, si] i *legunt si* —20 *Ccmites]* i, 2 *comites Comites]*
i, 2 *comites* —21 *regis'y]* I, 2 *regis,*
PAGE 446
—ò *paribus* 25,] I *paribus*, 25. —10 *quidem;]* I, 2 *quidem,*
PAGE 448
—5 *Pares]* I, 2 *pares* —8 *Parlamentum]* I, 2 *parlamentum*
—10 *Parlamenta]* i *parlamenta*
PAGE 450
—17 *Caput IX.]* i *Cap. IX.* —19 *legitimos,]* I, 2 *legitimos;*
PAGE 452
—18 *poterat,]* I, 2 *poterat;* —21-p. 454, I. *rex jus aut jus-*
titiam,] i, 2 *rex justitiam,*
PAGE 454
—2 *ne . . . num]* I, 2 *nc in Curia quidem ulla minori, an* —7
7 H.] i, 2 7. H. —11-12 *coegerunt;]* i, 2 *coegerej* —13
statuunt;] i, 2 *statuunt:* —17—18 *servitatem, . . . asseris:]* I, 2
servitatem asseris, sed eas in libertatem:
PAGE 458
—14 *insimulet.]* I, 2 *insimulat.*
PAGE 460
—3-4 *quinetiam . . . erat,]* I, 2 *quinetiam quod nequit ex Evan-*
gelio, —9 *imponat,]* I, 2 *imponatj* —20 *Collige te]* i, 2
Subsiste
PAGE 462
—2 *tangendos,]* I *tangendosj* —4 *liberavit;]* I, 2 *liberavit:*
PAGE 464
—5 *Quarto,]* i, 2 4^{to}, —ò *Septimo,]* i, 2 7^{imo}, *Sexto]*
i, 2 ò^{to} —8 *precariam,]* I, 2 *precariam;* —15 *Quarto,]*
I, 2 *quarto,* —iò *Secundo]* I, 2 *secundo* I Hen.] 1, 2 I. Hen.
—17 108,] 1, 2 108.

PAGE 466

—2 Quart!] I, 2 4^{ti} —8 voluerint] I, 2 vellent —14
 exterorum, quotquot] I exterorum quotquot —15 attingere, testan-
 tur.] I attingere testantur. Edouardi] I, 2 Edvardi

PAGE 468

—4 valuit.] i, 2 valebat. abs] I ab —6 *legiones, qua* I
legiones qua

PAGE 470

—6 *subditis;*] I, 2 *subditis*, —12 nuntio et regis] I, 2 nuntio
 et regis 14 nuntio regis —15 Eadem] I, 2 eadem *fiduciaria,*
 I, 2 *fiduciaria;*

PAGE 472

—2 *Charta*] I, 2 *charta Magna*] I, 2 *magna* —12 recensens;]
 I, 2 recensens: —17 Dei] I dei —18 Stulte,] I, 2 Stulte;

PAGE 474

—2 æntum] I, 2 æntenis —4 desipere:] I, 2 desipere;
vexilli, ad Regem I, 2 *vexilli ad regem* —23 Tyrannus] i, 2
 tyrannus

PAGE 476

—ò judicasset] I, 2 judicat; —7 Sancti] I, 2 S^l —15
 fas regi non erat:] i, 2 rex non potuit: —18 Sexti] i, 2 ò^l
 —20 imponere. Sed] i imponere, sed

PAGE 478

—I nomine, nostris] I, 2 nomine nostris —14 Fortescutius, de]
 I Fortescutius, Fortesc. de

PAGE 480

—4 magis quàm teipsum ridiculum] i, 2 magis ridiculum —5
 neges.] i, 2 negas. —10—II *cælo, . . . moverit.*] i, 2 *cælo ipso*
petitum nihil movit. —12 Stoicus] I, 2 stoicus —14 *extitisse*]
 I, 2 *extitisse*

PAGE 482

—i CaputX.] I Cap. X. —5 Dei,] I dei, —II pugnemus,]
 I, 2 agamus,

PAGE 484

—IO occubuisse:] I, 2 occubuisse: 14 occubisse: —18 quod]
 I, 2 veluti —19 consueverunt insulsiissimi,] I, 2 deterrimi,

PAGE 486

—8 aulici de] I, 2 aulici, de —14 vero] I, 2 forte *Virgiliana*
ignavissimi,] I, 2 *Virgiliana,*

PAGE 488

—3 scribis.] I, 2 scribis? —5 merito] I, 2 merito, —7
 adversari] I, 2 refragari —9 ipsos] I, 2 ipsi redigi.] I, 2
 redigerentur.

PAGE 490

—6 ipse] I, 2 ipse 14 ipsa —14 habituros;] I, 2 habituros,
—15 accepturos. Post] i, 2 accepturos: post —19 cupiebant,
ministris] I, 2 cupiebant, et ministris —20 tempusque sibi oppor-
tunum] i, 2 opportunum sibi tempus

PAGE 492

—7 anteponebant.] i, 2 pnonebant. —15 censuerant; Scoti]
i, 2 cœnsuerant; dum Scoti —17 insidebant;] I 2 insidebant,
—18 tenebant;] I, 2 tenebant, habebant: ipsi] I, 2 habebant: dum
ipsi —20-21 quâtumultus paulo] I quâpaulo

PAGE 494

—5 compressit.] I, 2 compescuit. —10 reipub.] c. w. K. reipub.
I, 2, 14 rempub. —15 inimicissimis, Presbyteriani,] I, 2 inimicis-
simis, quàmvis sanguinem eorum avidè sitientibus, Presbyteriani, —20
sibi suo] i, 2 suo sibi

PAGE 496

—7 prolixius] I, 2 fusius —16 dicere.] I dicere:

PAGE 498

—2 promiserint;] I, 2 promiserè; —16-18 *estis* . . . vos]
i, 2 *estis* vos

PAGE 500

—16 *Cum*] i, 2 cum

PAGE 502

—20 Deum,] i deum,

PAGE 504

—7 usque eo] I, 2 eo usque

PAGE 506

—i Caput XI.] i Cap. XI. —3 aëssisse.] i, 2 acœdere. —20
solenni conventionè i, 2 IN ROMAN LETTERS.

PAGE 508

—4 judicassent.] i, 2 judicarent.

PAGE 512

—14 affirmaveris?] 1,2 affirmasti?

PAGE 514

—i Caput XII.] i Cap. XII. —9 reservares,] I, 2 reservares;
—13 *j>ossunt:*] i, 2 *fossunt*; —14 *versatur;*] I, 2 *versatur*;
—16 tacuero:] i, 2 tacœbo:

PAGE 516

—19-20 importatas ipse sibi congereret,] 1, 2 congerendas inferret,
—21 incredibilem pecuniam corrasisset,] I, 2 pervolaret omnia,

PAGE 518

—16 *simplici saltern vice*] I, 2 IN ROMAN LETTERS.

PAGE 520

—2-3 promisit si] i, 2 promisit, si —7 repentino impetu]
i, 2 repente armis —12 etiam ipse tantum] I, 2 etiam tantum

PAGE 522

—9 *Rege,*] I, 2 *rege,* *Dominorum]* I, 2 *dominorum*

PAGE 524

—i *fuisset,*] I, 2 *foret,* —3 *scripto editoj idem]* i, 2 *scripto,*
idem —21 *Deus . . . vel sibi vel]* I, 2 *Deus dederit, vel sibi, vel*

PAGE 526

—ò *appellent.]* i, 2 *appellent.* 14 *appellarunt.* —8
elogium] I, 2 *Elogium* —13 *docebit, nomen]* i, 2 *docebit nomen*
—21 *Sancti]* I, 2 *S^u*

PAGE 528

—7 *Ordinibus]* I, 2 *ordinibus* —9 *Ordinum]* I, 2 *ordinum*
—16 *angis]* I, 2 *exeres maerasj]* I, 2 *volutas;*

PAGE 530

—2 *vestro]* i, 2 *vestrum* —4 *scivit.]* I, 2 *sciebat,* —13 *ab re*
somniculose oscitantem] i *ab re somniantem* 2 *abs re somniantem*

PAGE 532

—7 *neesse habuimus.]* I, 2 *tenemur.*

PAGE 534

—4 *Protestantium.]* I, 2 *protestantium,* —13 *jurejurando*
regibus] I, 2 *jurejurando a regibus* —20 *quì . . . peccare]* i, 2
quisecum legem ipsam ut peccare

PAGE 536

—ò *ausus.]* i, 2 *audcret,* —24 *ad]* i, 2 *quoad* —26
Gulielmum] i, 2 *Guilielmum*

PAGE 538

—3 *Quod si]* I *Quod, si* —16 37 *Hen. . . . c. 8.]* I, 2 xxxij.
Hen. ò. c. xv. alterum decimo tertio, Edouardi IV. c. VIII. —18
neuter eorum regum] I, 2 *neque rex iste neque ille* —20 *tibi*
inaudita dictantium.] I, 2 *tibi dictantium,* —22 *est puditum]* I, 2
pudebat —23 *manifeste]* I, 2 *facile*

PAGE 540

—I *Clausula autem ista]* i, 2 *Clausulam autem istam* —10
audio:] I, 2 *audiam:* —13 *est: ita]* I, 2 *est. Atque ita* —20
paterna disciplina] i, 2 *disciplina patria*

PAGE 542

—12 *non dubitare]* I, 2 *indubitanter* —13 *necquicquàm]* I, 2
incassum —17 *inopes atque]* i, 2 *inopes, atque* —18 *servi-*
tutem natos fatentur] I, 2 *servitium natos, fatentur* —20 *vindiæ.]*
I, 2 *vindiæ;* —21 *Regem]* I, 2 *regem* —23 *erit et]* I, 2
erit, et

PAGE 544

—II necesse non habet respondere,] I, 2 respondere non tenetur,
—12 rex, . . . an] I rex] an

PAGE 548

—12 hujusmodi quiddam] I, 2 hoc fere

PAGE 550

—6 extitisti,] I, 2 fuisti, —13 rabiem et] I, 2 rabiem, et
—16 juvante, videor] I, 2 juvante videor —23 Gives, adversarium] I Gives adversarium

PAGE 552

—4 oppressi ad] I, 2 oppressi, ad —5 exaudivit.] I, 2 exaudiit.
—7 Superstitio,] I, 2 superstitio gloriosissime] I, 2 gloriose

PAGE 554

—4 ardentes,] I, 2 accensos, —14 faventem, præ] I, 2 faventem et paternum, præ —16 WHAT FOLLOWS (TO THE END OF THE WORK) is FOUND ONLY IN 14.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

—
FOREIGN AGENT

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
AMEN HOUSE, LONDON, E.C.

