

T H E
 Indignity upon the Kingdom:
 WITH THE
 O A T H of A B J U R A T I O N
 C O N S I D E R ' D.

And Submittsd to the COMMONS of England in Parliament.

IT is render'd a great Indignity to have the Prince declared King. But *Marcus Aurelius* answers the Objection, and removes the Indignity thus: When a King *de Jure* (says he) is by his Subjects, or by any other Power drove from his Kingdom, and dyes dispossessed thereof, his next in Blood, or lawful Successor, tho' out of Possession, shall in Right, Title, and Dignity, succeed him. And to shew that it is no new Custom, observe, as followeth:

Aristotle relates that the *Lacedaemonian* Leaders of the Posterity of *Hercules*, after that they had been reduc'd under the Subjection of the Ephory, retain'd the Title of Kings — And *Suffetes*, whose Ancestors were Kings of the *Carthaginians*, was by *Polybius* called King; and so was *Hanno*, by *Solinus* called King of the *Carthaginians*. And *Strabo* in *Troas*, relates of *Scepis*, when having joined the *Mitresians* to a Common-wealth, the Posterity of the ancient Kings retained the Dignity of Kings.

Alexander the Great was so much concerned for unfortunate King *Darius*, that he he wept when he had seen him; and punish'd his Deserters and Murtherers with Death, and took as much Care of his Queen and Daughters, as if they were his own. In all his Conquest he unking'd none, tho' he had got Their Kingdoms: All which appears in the History of his Life, written by *Quintus Curtius Rufus*.

And *Julius Caesar*, who conquer'd the World, was so mild a Prince, that he required no more from any King than his Submission to *Rome*, then the Lady Emp'res of the World: By Virtue of his Conquest the British Kings paid to the *Roman* Emperors Tribute, for about Five hundred Years, and never, in all that Time, did any Roman Emperor take from any of them the Title, or Character of King.

In the Revolutions of *Denmark*, and *Sweden*, as by their own Histories appear, sometimes one King conquer'd the other, and had the Possession of both Kingdoms; and yet the Conquered retained the Title of King as well as the Conqueror; and so it was in the Revolutions of *Spain*, *France*, *Muscovy*, and all the World over. And when King *Charles* the First was murthered in *England*, his Son, the Prince of *Wales*, assumed to himself the Right, Title, and Dignity of King; and during his Twelve Years Exile



he was treated by all the World abroad, by the Style of King of England, &c. On the 19th of May, 1649. England was declared a Common-wealth, and an Oath accordingly established, in the Nature of an *Abjuration*, wick take as followeth.

You shall well and truly swear, to be True and Faithful to the Common-wealth of England, without either King, or House of Lords. So help you God. This was all the *Abjuration* in Cromwel's Time. See Scobel's Collections of the Acts, and Ordinances, made in those Days.

No Oath whatsoever inconsonant to the Laws of God is obligatory; and to swear to a Matter in doubt, is swearing to what a Man knows not; and to compel any Man to swear against his Knowledge, or to put a Penalty upon him for not so swearing, would be Tyranny by the Cannon-Law. And therefore (saith St. *Ambrose*) It is a Sin to tender an Impious Oath, a Sin to take it; and if taken, a Sin to keep it, and a Vertue to break it, *de Offic. primo*. By our taking the Oath of *Abjuration*, we take no share of Right from the Prince, nor give him any by our refusing of it: So that it is equal to Him, whether we take it, or take it not: But it is not equal to us; because every Body is not satisfied in his Conscience that the Oath of *Abjuration* is according to the Laws of God; and because the Performance admits of Impossibility, and that Impossibilities are not to be imposed upon Christians; nor upon Heathens: As, for Example, the *Archians*, when in Treaty with the *Romans*, swore to more than they could perform; but the *Romans* objected against the Impossibility of what they had sworn unto, and concluded the Oath void, and required the *Archians* to swear to such Matters as they could perform. In every Oath it is requisite the Obligation be lawful: For an unlawful Oath, or Promise, either naturally, or by Divine Interdict, or Humane also, will have no force; as in the Case of *David*, who had sworn he would kill *Nabal*; but when *David* had consider'd what he had sworn, he thought it a less Sin to break that Oath, than to kill *Nabal*, and spared his Life.

Fides, saith *Cicero*, est *Fundamentum Justitiæ*; therefore, said St. *Augustin*, If Faith be pawn'd to commit Sin, the Pledge becomes forfeited, and shall no more pass for the Foundation of Justice. *Concil. de Hildernensis, Cap. 7. Tom. 3.* Now to conclude: First, It is requisite the Prelates of the Kingdom should declare their Opinions of the Oath of *Abjuration* according to the Cannon-Law. Secondly, Whether the Persons of Honour, who had sworn to the Birth of the Prince, may swear that he has no Right. Thirdly, Whether it be proper, or safe, to swear at all, where two Princes contend for the Crown, a War commencing, no determination of the Dispute, and no assurance where the War shall end, or who shall have the Right, or the Kingdom at last. And Lastly, It may pass for an undeniable Rule, that such as break through the Oath of Allegiance, will never believe themselves the stronger bound by the Oath of *Abjuration*: And of the other hand, that such as keep within the Bounds of the former, ought not be obliged to take the latter. Lawful Allegiance is Religiously, and Morally Good, and Obligatory, but the Oath of *Abjuration* is against the Cannon-Law, against Reason, against Truth, and against the Law of the Land, and consequently not fit to be taken.

BB

F I N I S.
(Price 2 d.)