

*Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.*

- D**R. *Partridge's* Parable of the Pilgrim. The 6th Edition Corrected. — Exposition of the Ten Commandments. 8vo.  
 — Private Prayer to be used in difficult times.  
 — Sermon before the Prince of *Orange* at *St. James's*, 20th *January*, 1688.  
 — Sermon before the Queen at *Whitehall*, March 1. 1688.  
 Dr. *Burners* Collection of Tracts and Discourses, written after the Discovery of the Popish Plot, from the years 1678, to 1685. To which is added, A Letter written to Dr. *Burner*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pools* Secret Powers. The History of the Powder Treason, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Consideration of the Five Jesuits Dying Speeches, who were executed for the Popish Plot, 1679.  
 — His Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of *England*: In which is demonstrated, that all the Essentials of Ordination, according to the Practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches, are still retained in our Church.  
 — Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation, lately Printed at *Oxford*. In two Parts. 4to.  
 — Animadversions on the Reflections upon Dr. *BURNETT's* Travels. 8o.  
 — Reflections on a Paper, intituled his Majesties Reasons for withdrawing himself from *Rochester*.  
 — An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs, and in particular, whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? And whether we are bound to Treat with Him, and call him back or no?  
 — A Sermon Preached in *St. James's* Chappel before the Prince of *Orange* 23d. *December*, 1688.  
 — A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons, 31. *January*, 1688. being the Thanksgiving day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power.  
 — His Eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State, during the Reign of King *James* the Second. Seventeen whereof were written in *Holland*, and first Printed there; the other at *Exeter*, soon after the Prince of *Orange's* Landing in *England*.  
 — A Letter to Mr. *Thevenot*, Containing a Censure of Mr. *Le Grand's* History of King *Henry* the Eighth's Divorce. To which is added, a Censure of Mr. *de Meaux's* History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches. Together with some further Reflections on Mr. *Le Grand*. 1689.

*Sar p arum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria a Christo nato usque ad Sacculum XIV. Etenim Methodo digesta. Qua de Vita illorum ac Rebus gestis, de Secta, Dogmatibus, Eloquio, Stylo; de Scriptis genuinis, dubiis, suppositis, imitatis, deperditis, Fragmentis; deque variis Operum Editionibus perspicue agitur. Accedunt Scriptores Gentiles, Christiani Religiosi Oppugnatores; & cunctis Seculi Inevitamentum. Inscriuntur suis locis Interim aliquot Opuscula & Fragmenta, tam Græca, tum Latina, hæcenus edita: Præmissa denique Prolegomena, quibus plurima ad Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ studium præstantia continentur. Opus Indicibus necessariis instructum. Autore G U L L E L M O C A P E, SS. Theol. Profiss. Canonico Mont. fortensi. Accedit ab Alia Manuscriptis ab incunte Seculo XIV. ad Annum usque MDXVII. Fol. 1689.*

OF THE  
 Behaviour of Christians  
 UNDER  
 Various Revolutions.

---

IMPRIMATUR,

April 20:  
1893.

R. BARKER.

---

A  
LETTER  
TO A  
FRIEND  
CONCERNING THE  
Behaviour of Christians  
UNDER THE VARIOUS  
REVOLUTIONS  
OF  
STATE-GOVERNMENTS.

*By Peter Alex. D.D.*

L O N D O N :

Printed, for **Rich. Chiswell** at the *Rose and Crown*  
in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, MDCXCIII.

( 1 )

---

A  
L E T T E R  
T O A  
F R I E N D

Concerning the Behaviour of Christians  
under the various Revolutions of State-  
Governments.

**T**HE Revolutions that so frequently happen in States, may well engage an honest man to examine how Christians, and the Church in general, ought to behave themselves in such kind of Revolutions. I have therefore undertaken to answer your desire, in as clear and perspicuous a manner, as it is possible for me, without making too particular a Reflection upon the present change of Government which hath put you upon proposing this question to me. You desire to know of me whether it be lawful for a Christian to

to pray for a Prince whom he takes to be an Usurper, and how the ancient Christians behaved themselves in the like Revolutions.

The *First* Point is a question of Right, whether it be unlawful to pray for a Prince, whom we believe to be an Usurper; so, as that all those who are of this Opinion, are obliged to separate themselves from the Communion of those who believe him to be a Lawful Prince: it being impossible that those who think they ought to pray for a dispossessed Prince, because they consider him as their lawful Prince, should be present at the Prayers that are made for a Prince whom they consider as an Usurper. The *second* Point is a matter of Fact, which I might excuse myself from entering upon; because it is certain that Christians are to order their Lives not by Examples but by Rules. However for your satisfaction I will not refuse to take a short view of the Behaviour of the Primitive Christians in such kind of Revolutions.

As to the *first* Point, I answer, That it is not only lawful for a Christian, but that he is also obliged in Conscience to pray for those who are in possession of the Authority of the State wherein he lives, if he hath a mind to obey the Apostle *St. Paul*, and to follow the Principles of the Christian Religion. I suppose that that which is the Duty of every Christian in particular, is the Duty also of the Church in general, so far as the Church is nothing but an Assembly of Christians.

Take we a view therefore of the command of the Apostle *St. Paul* in his *First* Epistle to *Timothy*, *Chap. 2.* v. 1, 2, 3, 4. 'I exhort, therefore, that first of all, Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, and giving Thanks be made for all men, for Kings and all that are in Authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all Godliness and Honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have' all men  
'to

'to be sav'd, and to come unto the Knowledge of the Truth. The learned *Dr. Hammond* hath thus paraphrased this Precept. *First*, In the first place therefore I advise thee and all the Bishops under thy Metropolis, that you have constant publick Offices of Devotion, consisting. *First*, Of Supplications for the averting of all hurtful things, Sins and Danger. *2dly*, Of Prayers for the obtaining of all good things which you want. *3dly*, Of intercession for others, and *4thly*, Of Thanksgiving for Mercies already received; and all these not only for your selves, but, in a greater diffusion of your Charity, for all Mankind. *2dly*, For the Emperors and Rulers of Provinces under them, to whom we owe all our peaceable living in any place, in the exercise of Religion and virtuous Life, and therefore ought in reason to pray and give thanks for them. *3dly*, For this God under the Gospel approves of, and requires at our hands. *4thly*, In proportion to the example which he hath given us in himself, who earnestly desires the good of all Mankind, and useth all powerful means to bring them to reform their former wicked Lives, and now to entertain the Gospel. Whence it appears clearly that a Christian, as such, is obliged to offer up unto God publick Prayers for those that are invested with the Sovereign Authority, and that this is a Duty of the Church in general.

And here I desire you to observe two things, the one is that the Apostle *St. Paul* makes no distinction betwixt the lawful Emperors and Usurpers: the other, that he grounds the necessity of these Prayers upon a principle of gratitude and acknowledgment to the Government in general, whosoever they be that administer it, so far as we are beholden to them for the peaceable life we enjoy in the exercise of our Religion and a virtuous Life.

This being thus stated, a Christian can have no further scruple in this point, but only about the question of matter of Fact, *viz.* who those be that are in actual possession of the

the Sovereign Authority? But this is a question which may no less easily be decided by the Rules of the Gospel; in a word, every Christian is obliged to acknowledge him for his lawful Prince, to whom he payeth tribute. This is the Doctrine of our Saviour Jesus Christ, *Mark xii.* and *Luke xx.* the words of the Gospel are as follows; 'And the Chief Priests and the Scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him (but they feared the People) for they perceived that he had spoken this Parable against them. And they watched him, and sent forth Spies, which should feign themselves Just Men, that they might catch him in his words, and so might deliver him unto the Power and Authority of the Governor. And they asked him saying, Master we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly; neither acceptest thou the Person of any, but teachest the way of God in Truth. Is it lawful for us to give Tribute to *Cæsar*, or no? But he perceiving their craftiness, said unto them, why tempt ye me? shew me a penny: whose Image and Supercription hath it? They answered and said, *Cæsar*. And he said unto them, Render therefore unto *Cæsar* the things which be *Cæsar*'s, and unto God the things that be God's. And they could not take hold of his words before the people; but marveling at his answer held their peace.

For the better understanding of this answer of our Saviour, I shall again make use of an Annotation of the learned Dr. *Hammond* upon the 22 Chap. of St. *Matthew*, where he explains what the *Herodians* were, and what gave occasion to our Saviour to make this answer. Of the *Jew* some part, says he, acknowledged, and adhered to the *Cæsarian* or *Roman* Authority, some part lookt upon it, as an Usurpation; and of this generally were the *Pharisees*. This difference or controverſie was thus occasioned. About one hundred and fifty years before the birth of Christ the Government of *Judea* came into the hands of the *Zelots* or *Maccabees*, among them *Judas Maccabeus* being

being in fear of *Antiochus*, entered into a League with the *Romans*, which continued about ninety years. Then *Hircanus* and *Aristobulus* the Sons of *Alexander* falling into contention for the Kingdom, and the younger Brother *Aristobulus* getting possession of it, *Hircanus* applied himself to the *Romans* for redress, and by *Antipater*'s mediation besought *Pompey* (being then near) to come with an Army to his relief; *Pompey* did so, and thereupon besieged *Jerusalem*. *Hircanus*'s Party within, soon delivered it up; and *Aristobulus*'s party retired into that part, where the Temple stood, and *Pompey* storm'd the Temple, and took it, and so the City came into the *Romans* power, and *Hircanus* was restored to the High Priesthood, and Kingdom of *Judea*, but so as to hold (as he obtained) it under the *Romans* protection: which they did (those of them that were of *Hircanus*'s party) by consent, and not by force, by a choice which the Factions among themselves put them upon, and by way of dedition, and so *Josephus* plainly saith of the *Jews*, that they had made a dedition of themselves. Mean while they of *Aristobulus*'s party lookt upon the *Romans* as Usurpers, and forcible Possessors; and thus it continued till our Saviour's time, and at this time some of each party, *Pharisees* on one side, and *Herodians*, (i. e. followers of *Herod*) on the other, came unto Christ, meaning to insnare him in whatsoever he said, and to take advantage either to inflame the *Pharisees* (which were the most eminent among the *Jews*) if he should say that tribute was to be paid, or to bring him into danger of *Herod* and the *Roman* party, if he should say 'twas not to be paid; And though Christ's answer be punctually in favour of the *Roman* Emperor, especially to those that took the Tribute to be his right, yet in prudence he thought fit to give such an answer, as might best avoid the opposite danger.

After these things here alleged you see that nothing can be more natural than to form this Argument: Every  
B Christian

Christian is obliged to acknowledge him for his lawful Sovereign, to whom he pays Tribute. This is the express Doctrine of St. Paul; therefore every Christian is bound to pray for those that are in Possession of the Government, as for their true Sovereigns.

There are but two ways to elude the force of its Argument; for either we must maintain that our Saviour argued like a Sophister, in going about to persuade the Jews to own him for their lawful Prince, to whom they were forced to pay Tribute, in case it be true, that people may pay Tribute to a Prince, whom they ought not to acknowledge for their lawful Sovereign; or else we must maintain that St. Paul hath engaged Christians in sin, by commanding them to pray universally for those to whom they pay Tribute, though it may be such men are in possession of power, and receive Tribute, for whom they ought not to pray. This consequence is evident and necessary, if it be true that the paying of tribute be neither a lawful mark of their Sovereignty, nor a lawful Foundation to pray for them.

*But you'll say the conclusion of your Argument will lead us to confound a lawful Government with that which is unlawful, an Usurper with a rightful Sovereign. At this rate of arguing tho' we are convinced in our Consciences, that such a one is an Usurper, and such a one our lawful Prince, we are forced according to your Argument to pray for the Usurper, and against our lawful Prince. That is to say, according to your sense, we are charged by St. Paul to commit immoral acts, and are obliged to sin against God, that we may be obedient to St. Paul. And this is enough, say you, to discover the Sophistry of your Argument. Why this is the very point, where I would fain have you. The Principle, I oppose, is, that it appertains to the Church to judge of the Title of those who are in possession of the Government, whether it be a rightful Title, or not; whereas I maintain on the contrary,*

contrary, that it doth not in the least belong to the Church, to pronounce concerning the Title of those who are in Possession of the Sovereign Authority. It follows from this Principle, that we cannot lawfully pray to God for any but those, whose Title to the Sovereignty we own to be rightful: And I maintain, that if this Conclusion, which is drawn from the Principle I oppose, be true, it is impossible for any Christian Church to subsist in any State, and that consequently the Conclusion, as well as the Principle from whence it so naturally flows, cannot but be false.

I desire you, Sir, to take notice that I affirm that it doth not belong to a Christian, as such, to examine whether he who hath the power over a Society, possesseth the same by a just Title or by Usurpation. I acknowledge indeed that it is the right of the Society, and its Representatives to examine this question; but I flatly deny that it belongs to the Church, or to any of the people, considered as Christians, to discuss the Titles of their Sovereigns. Christians, in as much as they are Christians, are in a State in the same manner as Physicians, who in that capacity have nothing to do to meddle with Affairs of State, tho' they may take cognizance of them as they are Citizens. Affairs therefore of State, must not be regulated by any but those who are called to the management of them. And so far as the People are bound to submit themselves to the resolution of their Representatives, the Church accordingly is obliged to own him for a lawful Sovereign of the State whom the Managers of the State own for such, by ordaining Tribute to be paid to him, and Prayers to be offer'd up to God for him, &c.

This is my Position, the Truth whereof I shall here set forth with a full and convincing evidence.

*First*, Jesus Christ declared that Tribute ought to be paid to those, whom the greatest part of the Jews looked upon as Usurpers (I mean the *Roman* Emperors) and who indeed had usurped the Power, they themselves had formerly enjoy'd.

*2dly*, Our Saviour did plainly suppose, that the prosperity of their Emperors ought publickly to be prayed for in the Temple, as was constantly done; to which the Zealots of the *Jews* oppos'd themselves; for otherwise he ought rather to have joined himself to these Zealots, and forborn entering into the Temple, in case he had not approved the Prayers there offer'd up for such Governors.

*3dly*, St. Paul taught that we are bound to pray for those that have the Authority in their hands, without ever making the least distinction between those that were possessors of this Authority by a lawful or unlawful Title. Now where the Law doth not distinguish, it is plain, that neither ought we.

*4thly*, It hath been the constant practice of the Christian Church to pray for those that had the Sovereign Authority, without ever allowing themselves the Liberty to judge of the Validity or Invalidity of the Titles of those, that were in possession thereof. This practice of the Church in all times and in all places is so uncontested a matter of Fact, that we may defy any Person whatever to produce any one single example of a Schism that hath happen'd in the Church, on a pretence like to that on which they have formed one of late, *viz.* where one party of the Church maintain'd that they ought not to pray for a Prince in Possession, because his Title was not lawful, and separated themselves from those that submitted to him that was in Possession.

It is visible that according to the contrary Principle, if the Church had not only a Right to examine the Title of Sovereigns,

Sovereigns, but were also under an obligation so to do for fear of offering displeasing Prayers to his Divine Majesty, in favour of an Usurper, that it was of indispensable necessity for the Apostles to have made an exact draught of Politicks, fram'd according to the Nature and Rights of the Government; which they ought to have transmitted to their Successors in writing. It would have been necessary also in the Church, to instruct the Bishops, and all the Clergy, conformably to this Scheme of Politicks, to the end that they might afterward instruct the Church, and yet we do not find a tittle of all this neither in the New Testament, nor any other Books of Antiquity: Tho' without this so necessary precaution it cannot be imagin'd, but that a vast number of Schismes must have been formed, by occasion of so many Revolutions that have so strangely changed the Face of Governments, from the time of our Saviour to this present. We must therefore of necessity own either that none of the ancient Christians ever thought of discharging a duty so essential to the Christian Religion; in the most important Acts of Devotion, or that the Christians never believed, that it was their business to examine the Rights of Sovereigns, much less that they were oblig'd so to do, to the end they might be in condition to offer their prayers to God with a good Conscience.

I have told you, Sir, That the Christian Religion could never have been admitted, or have subsisted in any State, if our Saviour had given another Rule to his Apostles than that which he hath given them. And accordingly I entreat you to consider with your self a little, what would have become of the Christian Religion, if the Church had undertaken to examine the Titles of Sovereigns? Can you believe in good earnest, that ever she would have met with an easier entrance into the World, if it had been known, that those who preached it

it, entered into a State with a design and under obligations of examining the Titles of those who govern'd it, and with a design of charging upon the Subjects as their duty an enquiry of this Nature. I am certain that we cannot meet with any thing like this, neither in the Writings of the Apostles, nor in the Writings of the ancient Doctors of the Church, particularly in their Apologies, wherein they have refuted the principal grounds for which the Emperors rejected the Christian Religion and proscribed it. Yea, I am very ready to be so just to those who are of the contrary Opinion as to believe that they would have more Prudence, than to make any such kind of Declaration to the Indians or Chinese, if they had a mind to go and Preach the Gospel amongst them.

But some, it may be, may be apt to persuade themselves that the profession of the Christian Religion is rather to be received upon this Condition of engaging Subjects to examin the Title of their Sovereigns and the whole State. For indeed it may be thought what can be more advantageous to a Society or a Prince, than Souls of so tender a conscience as are unwilling to pray for a Prince till they have discuss'd the point whether their Titles be lawful? But yet I know not whether they would have been able to make the Gospel to be Received on those terms. For 1<sup>st</sup>. It plainly appears that they must have left all those Countries which from Monarchies were newly changed to Common-wealths, or the contrary. 2<sup>d</sup>. It appears that they would have been excluded out of any Country where a Prince had been depos'd, and another put in his place; forasmuch as they could not obey the Laws of an usurper, nor own him by praying for him. 3<sup>dly</sup>. They must even in those places where the government appear'd to them lawful, at their first entrance have declar'd, that their true disciples would be always ready to withdraw themselves from under the authority of the government as soon as any change should be made in it contrary to their

their Scheme of a lawful Government, and that they would do their utmost endeavours, to withdraw from the State all those that could not comply with this Change in the Government. This suppos'd, let them judge in how many places they could have got an entrance for the Gospel, clogg'd with those Conditionals.

But there is something Worse than all this; for by this jumbling of political Considerations about Government with the doctrine of the Gospel, the Apostles would have been Obliged at their first entrance to present the Governor of the Place a draught of a lawful Government according to their Notion, to the end that the State might Consider whether this political Scheme, did agree with the Nature of Government as it is establish'd amongst the several Nations of the World. This is the point whence they ought of necessity to have begun the preaching of the Gospel, for without this Christians could never be persuaded to offer up their prayers to God for the Governour of a State. In very truth, the Apostles would have seem'd a company of pityful Men, for understanding their Commission no better, as having failed to leave us a good and ample instruction in this most important matter, and which was of so great necessity, considering the vast number of Changes and Revolutions; that have happened in Governments: whereas instead of using this exactness they have only simply and in general commanded us to pray to God for all the Powers set over us, but they never daign'd to acquaint us either by their conduct or doctrine that this was to be restrain'd only to such Powers as are lawful. But they will say since you grant that a Christian and a Citizen are one and the same Person, under different respects, how is it possible that after all this you should conceive, that a Citizen, who is perswaded in his Conscience that such an one is an Usurper, may yet as a Christian, pray God for this Usurper, as if indeed he were his lawful Prince? To this I answer that



that a Man who embraceth any Principles contrary to the Constitution of a State, is very much to be pitied, and if besides he be so unhappy as to fill his brain with whimsies without any ground or probability of truth, and takes pains to confirm himself in the same from passages of Scripture misapplied, he is still more incurable; because in this case he hugs his error, as supposing it both Honourable and Meritorious. But to answer directly to this difficulty: I say that the Conscience of such a Person is most Vibly Erroneous. For 1. he judgeth in the quality of a Citizen that such an one is an Usurper for whom it is not lawful to pray; because, as he is a Christian, he admits a Doctrine and Principle in Consequence whereof he opposeth himself against the determination of the State, which hath manifestly acted and judged according to other Principles. If he forms this judgment as he is a Christian, then he attributes to himself a right which God hath never granted to Christians as such, but if he judge thus in the quality of a Citizen and not of a Christian, he violates the laws of a Society which can not subsist if every private Person be permitted to oppose his particular judgment to that of the publick, declared in the most solemn manner imaginable; the delusion of the Conscience of such a Person appears as evident to me as if a Person should have resolved to maintain from Scripture as a Doctrine of faith, that the Sun goes round the Earth, and in consequence to this Principle should refuse Communion with those that believe the Systeme of *Copernicus*.

I don't believe that those who represent the body of the State are infallible in their judgment, but seeing it is the highest Human Tribunal where these questions which concern the right of those that pretend to the Government can be decided; I assert that if a Citizen hath a judgment opposite to that of the State, either he must acquiesce in the judgment of the State, or he must depart out of it,

for

for fear of being made partaker of the punishment which he believes God may inflict upon a State for an unjust action, but after all there is none but God that can Correct that which he hath reserved to his Government. This is that which Conscience must naturally dictate to a Man who listens to its Suggestions.

This being granted, I say in the 2d. place, that they who reason thus and continue in the State, whose Authority they do not acknowledge, do not follow their own principles as they are bound to do: Suppose we therefore that they ought to separate themselves from their brethren; forasmuch as in the quality of Christians they cannot joyn in those Prayers that offend their Morals, are they not as much obliged, in the quality of Citizens to quit a Society, which they suppose to have violated the Fundamental Laws of the State by raising an Usurper to the Throne of the Lawful Prince? The obligation if I be not mistaken is as binding on this hand, as on the other.

This is an ignorant flattering of our selves, to believe that we may lawfully preserve a propriety in our Estates by continuing in a State, which we look upon as being in actual Rebellion against their Sovereign; for it is certain that the possession of the goods we enjoy, as members of the Society, is no further allowed us than as we own the Authority whereby the Society doth subsist. We have no right to them any further than as the Society allows us to enjoy the same, and that we own the Authority of the Rulers of the Society. The propriety we have in our goods is not from a Natural Right, but from a Positive Right, which cannot subsist but in the Society. As soon as we quit a Society, which we do when we disown its Authority, we have no longer any right to our goods, and accordingly *ipso facto* they cease to be ours. And therefore a stranger who is bound by his oath to his own

C

Prince

Prince, can possess nothing in a forreign State; he hath no leave to trade in a strange Country any further than he submits himself to the laws of the Society, and to undergo the punishments which the Law inflicts in case it appear that he hath violated the Laws of it. This is the Doctrine of *St. Augustin* upon *St. Iohn* confirmed by *Tyes of Charters, Epist. 65*. By what right, saith he to the *Donatists*, do you keep possession of the Lands belonging to the Churches, is it by Divine or Human Right? The Divine Right is contained in the Scriptures, and the Human in the Laws of Kings, whereupon you perceive that whatsoever a Man possesseth, he possesseth it by an Human Right; but as to a Divine Right, the Earth is the Lords and the Fulness thereof. 'Tis by Human Right that any one saith this Land is mine, this House is mine, this Slave is mine. Take away the Right of the Emperor, and who dares say this Land is mine, this House is mine, this Slave is mine. Neither do thou say, what have you to do with the King; yea what hast thou to do with this Possession? Don't say that thy Possessions are thine for thou hast renounced Human Right by which onely one possesseth whatsoever he has, for if these things were established by a Divine Law, it would not be in the Power of the Judges in some cases to judge according to the Rigor of the Laws, and in other cases more favorably. Nay Sir to reside onely under any Government, makes a Man subject to the said Government *ipso facto*, for otherwise a Stranger could not be justly punished for being guilty of high Treason against a Prince whose Subject he is not.

I have said thus much to remove a delusion some put upon themselves in this matter, for want of due Consideration, imagining that they may lawfully enjoy their Estates without owning the Authority of those that Govern the State, and that they satisfy their Consciences by refusing to pay for them, when indeed they do

do own their Authority, by having recourse to those Laws and Magistrates, who secure the Enjoyment of their possessions; the Magistrates who Execute the Laws, having no other Authority, but what is derived from those that Actually Govern the State.

Is it not strange, Sir, to see Men for the preserving the possession of their Goods to persuade themselves, that by their not praying for him whom they look upon to be an Usurper, they have done enough to satisfy their Conscience? It is every whit as much a Duty to pay tribute to the Higher Powers, and a Duty to which Conscience Obligeth us (as *St. Paul* expresseth it in the *13th. of the Epist. to the Romans, Ver. 3, 5, 6.*) as it is to pray for them; for neither can the Peace of a Nation be kept without Arms, nor Arms maintain'd. without Salaries, nor Salaries of Souldiers without Tribute. Thus *Tacitus* Explains the Justice of Tributes.

If therefore you do not believe the Authority to be Lawful, why can you pay Tribute which is exacted to maintain this unlawful Authority? Is not this to imitate the Conscience of the Jews, whom Our Saviour reproves for having denied the Power and Authority of *Cesar* at the same time when they acknowledged that they paid Tribute to Him? You will say we are Active in praying for an unlawful Authority, but we are onely passive in paying Tribute, because that Authority forces us thereto by ways we cannot oppose, as wanting power so to do. See here a subtle peice of Divinity: according to these Principles when *St. Paul* orders us to pay Tribute to those to whom Tribute is due, he doth not command Subjects to be Active in paying Tribute but onely to be Passive by suffering it to be taken from them by force. What is the meaning of a Tribute save onely a contribution that is raised to maintain the Authority

that governs us? Is it not therefore as positive an act of the Subject as the Honour he renders to whom Honour is due? But besides, if this answer be satisfactory it hath this little inconvenience, that it furnisheth the *Jews* with an answer to our Saviour's Argument; The *Pharisees* were reduced to silence because they did not conceive it to be a sufficient justification of themselves to say to our Saviour, *Cæsar* forceth the Tribute from us, we are only passive in paying it. Had they been acquainted with this distinction, they would have stopt our Saviour's mouth; without doubt the *Pharisees* were not in any condition to make resistance which obliged them to pay Tribute, but the action of paying Tribute to him whose Authority they disowned, was sufficient to condemn them, which accordingly also put them to silence. Our Saviour is still the same Judge he was formerly with respect to the *Jews*. The Maxime of Jesus Christ is that we must own him for our lawful Sovereign to whom we pay tribute, and who is possessor of the Publick Authority, as appears by the Stamp of Current Money.

I know that some may take an occasion to raise a Dispute here, because the learned *Dr. Hammond*, when explains those words of the *xiii.* of the Epistle to the *Romans*; *Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers*, he understands it of Sovereigns that are rightly established and constituted, and of Supream Governours legally placed in that Kingdom. Whence it follows, that we are not bound to pay tribute to those who have none of this Character, Conscience only obliging us to pay Tribute to such, who being lawfully constituted, may and ought to be consider'd as God's Ministers. But I desire you to consider. First, That according to *Dr. Hammond's* confession, *St. Paul's* design was to oppose the Doctrine of the *Gnosticks*, who believed that a Heathen could have no lawful Authority over Christians, and made the Liberty of the Gospel to consist

consist in this Maxime; according as *Dr. Hammond* explains himself on the 8 *verse* of *St. Jude's* Epistle. 2dly, That the Apostle *St. Paul* doth not give any Right, nor impose any necessity upon every Christian to oppose his Judgment to the Sentiment and Determination of the State, about the Right of the Sovereign that is placed on the Throne; but that he hath wholly left it to the Estates to determine who are their true and lawful Sovereigns. And that he hath imposed a necessity upon Believers to pay tribute to all those that are owned to be such, as a thing that is their due, so far as they are the Ministers of God. For if we conceive the thing otherwise; *St. Paul* must have engaged the Christians to examine the Title of such as are invested with the Government, for to judge whether it were lawful or no, and this even after that the State had owned them as lawful. The *Roman* Senate having Originally had the Right of naming the Emperors, as we see by the several Elections they have made, as well as by those which it hath approved, when the *Armies* had prevented its choice; and by this means the Christians would have been dispensed with from paying tribute to all those who had invaded the Empire, or who had not obtained the Approbation of the Senate, for their Election made by the Army; or else would be obliged to perform, without any regard to conscience, an act wherof the Apostle would have Conscience to be the Principle, as being founded upon an Emanation of the Authority of God himself.

I comprize here in a few words the force of *St. Paul's* reasoning. *St. Paul* commands Christians to pray for the Sovereign Powers of the State where they live; he orders them to pay the Tributes that are necessary to maintain their Domination, and to exercise their Authority. He grounds both these duties upon the obligation

obligation that lies upon us to wish all possible good to those, who are the Conservators of the Society in which we live, and to contribute to the Safety and Security the Church enjoys under their Protection, so that he supposeth that these two duties with regard to the Sovereign Powers are inseparable. If you cannot in good Conscience pray for the Sovereign Powers, which the Body of the State owns for such, then neither can you in good Conscience pay them any tribute; and on the contrary, if you can in good conscience pay them tribute, which is design'd to maintain their Domination, you may with as good a Conscience pray for their prosperity.

But this, I suppose, is enough, Sir, as to the first Article of the Question you have propos'd to me; I have by the by touch'd upon the second; which I am now willing to examin more carefully, because I perceive that Examples often have as great an influence upon the Spirits of men, as the strongest and most decisive Arguments.

To be assured how the Primitive Christians behav'd themselves, who could not but be acquainted with the Practice of the Apostles and their Successors, we need only to take notice of the Terms of their Liturgies: which the learned Dr. Hammond hath quoted in his Annotations on the Second Chapter of the first Epistle to Timothy. 'Of these four sorts of prayer 'tis affirm'd by St Chrysostome, that they were in his time all us'd in the Church, *καθημερινή λατρεία* in the daily Service, *καὶ αὐτοῦ*, saith he, *ἵσασιν οἱ μυσταῖοι, καὶ ἐκείτω ἡμέρῃ γίνεται καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ*, and this is sufficiently known to all the Priests, or those that officiate Morning and Evening. And so it appears by the Liturgies. The word *δεήσεις* referring to the larger or lesser Collects, that in the Litany for deliverance from all the Evils there named, and the other after, in which the Phrase *καὶ κενὸν δαυδάμεν* we humbly beseech thee

thee O Father is us'd, which is for the averting of Evils. The second to the Prayers for Mercy and other Wants. The third to the *dehōus*, wherein the word *αἰτησόμεθα*, let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church, for Kings, &c. is insert'd. And the fourth to the Solemn Thanksgiving for all men, and to the Hymns sung to the praise of God, and it may be observ'd that the direction here of praying for Kings, &c. is agreeable to that of the Hebrews, R. Chaninath in Pirche Aboth, C. 3. S. 2. Pray for the Peace of the Kingdom, for unless there be fear, men will devour one another alive. And so when Petronius came to set up Caligula's Image in the Temple, they that would die rather than that should be done, being asked then whether they would wage War with the Emperor, answered no, but on the other side twice a day they offer'd Sacrifice for the safety of the Emperor, see Josephus, and Jer. 29. 7. Accordingly was the Christians practise, as long as the Emperors continued Heathen, praying in their Liturgies *ὡς πρὸς βασιλέων* for Kings, after when they were Christian, *δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ διοικητῶν βασιλέων*. We pray thee for our most pious Kings Defenders of God, or of the Faith of Christ, as it is in St. Chrysostom's Liturgy, and that *ὡς πρὸς κράτος, νίκης, διαμονῆς, εἰρήνης, ὑγείας, σωτηρίας, αὐτῶν*, for their Power, Victory, Continuance, Peace, Health, Safety. The very things which they prayed for them, when they were yet Gentiles, saith Tertullian in *Apoll. sine monitore precamur pro omnibus Imperatoribus vitam illis prolixam, Imperium Securum, domum suam, exercitus fortes, Senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum; we pray for a long life to our Emperors, a secure Empire, a safe House, valiant Armies, a faithful Senate, a good People, a quiet World.* This was after done for Arrian and heretical Kings, as Constantius, *παρακαλούμεν τὸν θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοίτης τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης, ὡς καὶ τὸ κῶσιν δωρεῖσθαι ὑπὲρ βασιλέων, ὡς ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ συμμαχῶν*, saith Cyrillus, Cat. 10. We beseech God for the common Peace of the Churches, for

for the quiet of the World for our Kings, their Soldiers and Auxiliaries. Thus far the learned Doctor.

Accordingly I desire you to take notice. *First*, That this was a set Form, in which nothing might be changed except only the name of him that was raised to the Throne. *2dly*, That it doth not appear by any Record of the Church, that the reading of these Prayers was ever suspended in any case whatsoever. *3dly*, That there never arose any controverſie in the Church, about what Emperor they were to pray for, the Church always acknowledging him to be Emperor, who had that title in those places where it was settled: *4thly*, That there never happened any Schiſm on this account, during all the manifold Revolutions of the Empire. *5thly*, That there never was a Canon of Council made to regulate the Penance that was to be imposed upon those that had prayed for an Uſurper, against a lawful Prince. *6thly*, That it doth not appear that ever any Heathen Emperor persecuted the Christians of one Country, for having prayed for him who had usurped the Empire in the places where they lived. *7thly*, We do not find that ever any Christian in his Commentaries upon the Scripture hath taken notice that it was the Belief of the Church that they ought to make a distinction between an Uſurper of the Empire, and a lawful Emperor, before they made Prayers for him.

Would you have some examples to evidence to you the Truth of these Observations? *Cassius* in *Syria* revolted against *Marcus Antoninus* the Philosopher, at the Solicitation of *Fausina* the Emperor's own Wife: and upon the News that was spread abroad, that *Mark Antonine* was dead, he usurped the Absolute Power that had been conferred upon him by the Army which was in *Pannonia*: But this news of the Emperor's death being found to be a mistake,

stake, he notwithstanding carried on his pretensions, and made himself to be owned Emperor by the Provinces of *Cilicia*, *Syria*, *Judea*, and *Egypt*. Do you believe, Sir, that the Christians of those Provinces did continue to pray publicly for *Mark Antonine*, and that they refused to pray for *Cassius* in their Publick Service; if they had done so, they must have exposed themselves to the Persecution of *Cassius*; or if they did pray publicly for *Cassius*, they must thereby have separated themselves from the Communion of those Christians who lived under the Empire of *Mark Antonine*. But where do we read that *Cassius* persecuted them for not owning his Authority; or that ever they were excommunicated by the other Christians for having prayed for *Cassius*, who was an Uſurper.

Do not imagin, Sir, that *Tertullian* doth oppose what I here assert, when he saith in his Apology, that never any Christians were found to be *Cassians*, *Albinians*, *Nigrians*, as if the Christians who lived in those Countries where *Cassius*, and afterwards *Albinus* and *Niger* had revolted, the first against *Mark Antonine*, and the other two against the Emperor *Severus*, had refused to pray for these Uſurpers, and had always in their publick Service prayed for *Mark Antonine*, and for *Severus*; but his design onely was to assert, that never any Christians had a hand in these Conspiracies, which were always carried on by Heathens onely. And for the rest he sufficiently intimates, that they never concern'd themselves with examining the Title of those who were in Possession of the publick Authority, when he saith, speaking in the Name of the Christians; *Nobis nulla res magis aliena, quam Publicæ, Unam omnium agnoscimus Rempublicam Mutuam*; that is, no matters are greater Strangers to us, than those of the Publick; we are not much concern'd for any other Common Wealth besides the one great Common Wealth of the World.

Do you believe, Sir, that the Christians of the East prayed for *Aurelian*, whilst they were under the Power of *Zenobia* Wife of the Emperor *Odenat*, whom *Galerius* the Emperor had Associated in the Empire, and whose Rights he maintained in favour of her Children, against *Aurelian*; or that after the Defeat of *Zenobia* by *Aurelian* they refused to pray for him, under pretence that *Zenobia*, and her Children, for whom they had prayed before, had their lives given them by the Emperor? Did not the Fathers of the Council of *Antioch* acknowledge the Authority of *Aurelian*, as soon as he had Vanquish'd *Zenobia*, by petitioning that Emperor to drive away *Paulus Samosatenus* from his Episcopal Mansion, which they could not obtain of *Zenobia*, who had supported him in opposition to their former Judgment?

Can you imagin that ever the Christians concern'd themselves to interpose their Judgment in opposition either to the Senate, or the Army, when the Army having nominated an Emperor in the East, the Senate nominated another in the West? as it happened after the Death of *Aurelian*; and that they pronounced which of these two was the Lawful Emperor, to the end that they might lawfully and of right pray for him, in refusing to pray for the Usurper? Or do you believe that the Christians of *Africa* did not pray for *Alexander*, who had caus'd himself to be proclaim'd Emperor there, or that those of *Rome*, and the dependencies of it, did refuse to pray for *Maxentius* during the five years wherein he possess'd the Sovereign Authority there?

For my part I must own, that I cannot conceive, but that, if the Christians had refused to pray for those whom they consider'd as Usurpers, this their refusal would have rais'd a Persecution against them, from those who had usurped the Empire; or why those who have

have transmitted the Memory of the Martyrs of the Church, have not made mention of any that suffer'd because they refused to pray for an Usurper, being by this means Martyrs, both of Jesus Christ and of the Title of their lawful Emperors. Neither can I any whit better conceive how or by what means the Christians always exactly agreed about the Title of their Emperors, when the People, the Souldiers, and the Senate have been frequently divided in their Sentiments about it. And if ever the Christians were divided in their opinions about this matter, in the several Provinces of their Settlement, how is it that never any Schism happened amongst them; and if ever there were any, how is it that the Ecclesiastical Historiographers, who have given us an account of the several Schisms, have never mention'd any that was occasion'd upon this account?

If you suppose that the Christians were in so obscure a condition before *Constantine*, that the Heathen Emperors did not mind their Prayers, provided they did but pay their Tribute, and that accordingly they might pray for the lawful Emperors, under the Names of the Usurpers; at least you cannot imagine any such thing to have been since 333, when *Constantine* had brought the Pagan Religion to trundle under the Christian, and had given the Christians all the advantage of a Publick Worship. After that the Emperor *Constantius* was killed, *Magnentius* made himself the Master of the *Gaules* in *Ilyria*; *Vertrano* takes to himself the Imperial Purple; *Nepotianus* causeth himself to be proclaim'd *Augustus* at *Rome*, and twenty eight days after his Coronation was defeated by the Army of *Magnentius*, by which means *Magnentius* continued Master of *Africa*, *Italy*, and the *Gaules*: Do we read any where that the Bishops of the *Gaules*, *Italy* or *Africa* ever refused during the three years of the Reign of *Magnentius* to pray for him? When *Julian* took upon him

the Purple in the *Gaules* in 360. in spite of *Constantius*, did the Bishops of the *Gaules* thereupon refuse to pray for him till after the death of *Constantius*? When *Procopius* made himself to be declar'd Emperor at *Constantinople* in 365. do you read that the Christians of *Constantinople* did ever think of refusing to pray for him, or that any were excommunicated for praying for him, during the year of his Reign? When *Eugenius* invaded the *Gaules* after his having killed *Valentinian* the younger, did not the Bishops of the *Gaules* make publick Prayers for *Eugenius* for the space of two years and more? When *Gildo* in the year 396. posselt himself of *Africa*, did not the Bishops of *Africa* for a whole year together make any Publick Prayers for him, because forthwith, he was an Urturper? When *Constantinus* seized the *Gaules* and *Britain* in 407. and continued in possession of them till 411. did the Bishops of *Great Britain* and the *Gaules* pray all this time for *Honorius*, without praying for *Constantinus*? When *Alaric* after he had taken *Rome*, made *Attalus* to be chosen Emperor in 409. did any refuse to pray for him in the Countries under his subjection? When one called *John*, caus'd himself to be proclaim'd Emperor at *Rome*, and in the *West* against the Emperor *Valentinian III.* Can any one shew us that the Christians refused to pray for him, during the year that he was in possession of *Rome*, and divers other Provinces of the *West*?

Should I go about to run over all the History of the Church and Empire, I could every where make it appear, that this was ever the behaviour of the Christians in these cases, but because I am to confine my self within the Bounds of a Letter, I shall tie my self to four Examples, which will be sufficient to make you judge of the rest. The First is taken out of the History of *Constantine* the Great, who oppos'd *Licinius* his Brother in Law and Colleague in the Empire, for no other rea-

son

son but to put a stop to the Violent Persecution which *Licinius* had rais'd in the Empire of the *East*, which was his Part. How did the Christians behave themselves after that *Licinius* was overcome and forced by *Constantine* to betake himself to a Private Life, did they refuse to pray for *Constantine* under Pretence that *Licinius* the Father was yet alive? Or did they continue to pray for *Licinius* the Father, or *Licinius* the Son, whom his Father had declar'd *Augustus*? I know no body that was capable of such a preposterous Behaviour save only *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, who had all along been a great Favourer of *Licinius* against *Constantine*. All the rest of the Christians were overjoyed at this Revolution, and the Nicene Council blessed God for it, and order'd publick Thanksgivings therefore.

See here another Example, which I would desire you seriously to consider. The Emperor *Gratianus* having been assassinated by Count *Andragabius*, *Maximus* thereupon invaded *Britain*, the *Gauls* and *Spain*, and was there proclaimed Emperor. Do you suppose that the Churches of these Three Great Provinces of the Empire of the *West*, did continue to pray for *Valentinian*, whom *Gratian* had associated in the Empire, and that they refus'd to pray for *Maximus*? Or do you imagin that any Schism happen'd amongst the Christians of these Three Provinces upon this occasion? True it is that there happen'd a Schism between the Churches of *France*, the greater part whereof refus'd to communicate with those Bishops, that had employ'd the Authority of *Maximus* for the punishing of *Priscillian*, so great an Enmity did this Church at that time bear against all Persecution; but we do not read that the other Bishops divided themselves, some of them thinking themselves bound to pray for *Valentinian*, and other for *Maximus* the Urturper. Let any Man read over

over the Monuments of those times, and he shall no where find any the least instance that the Christians of Great Britain did follow any other order in their Prayers, than the Gauls and Spaniards did.

If ever there were a just occasion to refuse to pray for an Emperour, it was then when *Phocas* invaded the Empire and usurped it from *Maurice*. The Barbarous Cruelty which he used towards that Emperour and four of his Children, cannot be read without Sorrow; *Theodosius* the Son of *Maurice*, whom his Father had declared *Augustus*, had escaped the Massacre.

Well, do we find that for all this the Church refused to pray for *Phocas*? They who will read the 38th. Epistle of the XI. Book of the Pope that then was, may judge whether the Church of *Rome*, in the name whereof *Gregory* writes to *Phocas*, after that his Accession to the Empire had been signifi'd to the Church, and to the *Roman Senate*, made any difficulty to pray for *Phocas*, whom all Succeeding Posterity have consider'd as a great Tyrant.

I could easily make it appear that the same *Maximes* have been followed by all the Kingdoms of the West, which were rais'd from the Ruins of the *Roman Empire*; but it will be sufficient to alledge only the Example of *France*.

Some years since a great Question hath been started between *Father le Cointe*, and the Doctors of the Court of *Rome*. The latter contending that the *Franks* did not deprive King *Childeric* of the Royal Title, but by the concurring Authority of Pope *Zachary*; whereas *Father le Cointe* rejects this opinion for a meer Legend, maintaining that the Deposition of *Childeric* was perform'd by the Sole Authority

thority of the State of the *Franks*. See here what *Papebrocius* writes to prove that it is not improbable, that Pope *Zachary* never so much as consented to this Deposition, because the whole Body of the Nation judg'd it just and necessary. For it was no new thing, saith he, for the *Franks*, when they had dispatcht any of their Kings or thrust them into Monasteries, to substitute others in their Room, such as were indeed of the *Mervigian* Line, yet not always those that were, the next Heirs in a right Line of Succession; as is evident to any one, that reads the History of *Gregory of Tours*, stuf't with Royal Tragedies and Revolutions, wherewith the Popes never concern'd themselves, or enquir'd into the Right and Title of those in Possession of the Throne, by what means soever they got to it. And when ever did the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* refuse to crown, or the *Roman* Bishops to own those Emperours, which Fortune any way soever offer'd to them? For seeing none of the Bishops, nor of the Abbots, nor any of those Persons, who at that time were accounted famous for their Learning and Sanctity, did oppose the Elevation of King *Pippin*, if Pope *Zachary* had undertaken to oppose it, his opposition would have been to no purpose against such an unanimous Resolution of the whole Kingdom, already executed; and to which nothing was wanting save only the Ceremony of the Sacred Unction or Coronation. The reason of my alledging *Papebrocius* that famous Compiler of the Laws of the Saints, is only to let you see, how true the matter I have here advanced is, viz. That the Church never at any time refused to pray for those, who have been owned by the Body of the State, and that the Christians in all Ages have been infinitely estrang'd from that Maxim; whereon some Men do now build the Schisme we deplore, viz. That it be-  
longe



longs to the Church to Judge who is the Lawful Sovereign, and that she can and may consider him as an Usurper, who is owned by the State, and that its Members ought to refuse to pray for him, and to separate themselves from those, who do; as from Persons that openly Violate the Laws of God, and the Obligations of Conscience; which I heartily wish those Gentlemen may take into their Serious Consideration.

*I am,*

---

*F I N I S.*

---