AN IMPARTIAL
CONSIDERATION
OF THOSE SPEECHES
OF THE FIVE JESUITS

Digitized by
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

thus depoſed it was unlawful for any perſon whatſoever to attempt his life. But as long as he uſeth the current phraſe among them, we muſt take their interpretation of it alſo; and then he muſt ſay any private perſon may kill a King in the circumſtances before ſpoken of, ſo that a King is only ſecur'd againſt private revenge, or the preſent rage of his Subjects; but if they have Warrant for ſo doing from the Pope or People, then Lord have mercy on him, for he is like to find none from them.

So that after all his renouncing of Equivocation, *&c.* he in his *laſt dying* words is found baſely to Equivocate, whilſt he neither tells us what the King is whom a private perſon ought not to kill, nor what that private perſon is that ought not to kill him. And when if he means according to the ſtile of his Order, it is no more but that whilſt a Lawful King is not Excommunicate, an Heretirck, or depoſed, no one may kill him; and when he is either of thoſe, no one of a private revenge or malice may be allowed ſo to do: But if the publick good be concerned in it, or there be Authority or Commiſſion from Superiors [that is, Pope or People in Parliament] then the private perſon is no private perſon, and there is no bar to ſecure a Prince's life from the Aſſaults even of ſuch.

And if there be ſuch a notorious Equivocation in this ſo ſett a performance of his; and that he acted ſo conformably to his own Principles, of obeying his Superiors in whatever they commanded, in denying what-ever may be to the prejudice of their Cauſe or Party, in uſing mental reſervations even whilſt he renounced them, for theſe and the other ends before ſpoken of; what hinders but we are to think that all the reſt wrote after the ſame Copy with him; as when they ſay that they *are as innocent as the Child unborn of treaſonable crimes*, is not this reconcilable to the principles of Diſpenſation and Abſolution? (which laſt they might, and its probable did give one to another) Is it not reconcilable to the Excommunication and Depoſition of his preſent Majeſty, and to the Title which the Pope challengeth to theſe Kingdoms, by the ancient claim of Surrender? When they ſpeak of the King, might they not apply it either to the Pope or a Succeſſor, doing therein much as a certain Prieſt did, that when asked who was Supream in all Cauſes in the Church of *England*, preſently anſwered the King, meaning thereby the King of Heaven, as he afterward Expounded it? [a] When they do declare againſt a Plot for the alteration of Government, is not that eaſily applyed to the kind or form or ſome main parts of it? when they renounce Equivocations, *&c.* Did not *Garnet* and *Coome* do the ſame, and yet in the mean while did equivocate or lye? Did they do all this at their death and call God to witneſs, and pawn their Souls to verifie and confirm what they ſaid? Is this more than what was practiſed by Mr. *Treſham* and *Curphy*; and what is frequently done by villains at their Execution without ſuch reaſons for it from Religion or Intereſt as theſe men had? When I read their Speeches, I can hardly but believe them; When I think of their Accuſations, their Principles, and the Practices uſual amongſt them, I begin to tremble: To think that at ſuch a time, and in ſo great a caſe as this is men ſhould prevaricate, and to deceive the World, care

[a] *Abbot. Antilog. cap. 2. p. 12. b.*

Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME Original from UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

not what becomes of their own Souls; or elſe that they can be ſo ſtupid as to think that the Salvation of their Souls can be conſiſtent with ſuch Impieties. I queſtion not but that time will make this as clear as the day, and then what they did to ſtrengthen their Cauſe, will be the greateſt blow to it that perhaps it ever yet had. When it ſhall be upon record, and Publiſhed before all the World, that ſo good may come of it, the good of their Church and Order, they care not what evil they do, nor how they Subvert the Laws of God and Nature, ſo they may eſtabliſh their own.

A Note to be added. p. 5. lin. 18.

Agreeable to this is that which is ſaid by *Lud Lopez.* 1. *p. Inſtruct.* c. 42. who is quoted as good Authority by *Raynaudus* the Jeſuit, *ut ſupra. A Woman that hath been falſe to her Husband, doth ſin, if ſhe without cauſe doth ſwear that ſhe is Innocent, and doth ſo ſwear becauſe ſhe hath done Penance for the ſame; unleſs her Husband doth unjuſtly compel her to ſwear.* The meaning of which is, that if ſhe doth ſwear it vainly, when not put to it, and there is no reaſon for it, then ſhe offends; but if her Husband threatens, and ſhe is in danger (for that is often the meaning of unjuſtly in the ſence of theſe Caſuiſts) then ſhe may ſafely ſwear that ſhe is Innocent, foraſmuch as ſhe hath repented, and given ſatisfaction to the Prieſt and been abſolved by him.

From whence it appears that if perſons be compelled to ſwear unjuſtly, as (in their opinion they all are when they are made to ſwear before Hereticks,) that then they may ſwear, though never ſo Guilty, that they are Innocent and without fault, as having been Abſolved for it.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

THe third *Quotation in the Margin of* Pag. 3. [Ibid. c. 19. §. 1. P. 408.] *is miſplac'd, and ſhould ſtand againſt line* 14. P. 6. l. 16. *Marg. for* 119. r. 118. P. 7. l. 21. r. *their.* l. 22. r. *a Judge that is incompetent,* l. 36. r. *Lords. Marg.* l. 25. *for* 147. r. 174. P. 8. *Marg.* l. 3. r. 650.

Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME Original from UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Digitized by
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME