

Reader, how the propo- sition afore- said is to be vnderstan- ded, and ad- deth that the goods of the clergie is not vtter- ly to be ta- ken away, but in case they do a- buse the same. The 17. ar- ticle proued by 44. argu- ments.

ces or secular Lordes should take away the goods from the cleargie when they woulde, or howe they woulde, and conuert them to what vse they list. But our whole intent is, diligently to search out whether this article, as touching the taking away of temporalities from the cleargie may haue in it any true sence, whereby it may be defended without reproofe. Wherefore this article being the 17. in the nombre of the 45. is propounded vnder thys fourme. The Lordes temporall may at their owne will and pleasure, take away the temporal goodes from the cleargie, if they doe offend, and therein continue: It is thus proued. The kings of the old Testament take away the temporall goods at Gods commandement from the cleargie. That is to say from the priestes offending. Therefore the kings also of the new Testament, at Gods commandement, may do the like. When as the priestes of the new law do offend. The consequent dependeth vpon a similitude. And the antecedent is euident. First it is proued by Salomon in the 3. of the kings 2. chapter. Which Salomon deposed Abiathar the high priest, because hee had toke part with Adonias, the brother of Salomon, to make him king, without the aduice either of Dauid, or of Salomon him selfe which ought to raigne: And set vp Sadoc the priest in the place of Abiathar, because he had not consented with Abiathar vnto Adonias, as it is writen in the 3. boke of kings 1. chapter. Where it is sayde, Adonias the sonne of Agithe, exalted himselfe, saying: I will raigne; and made vnto him selfe chariotes and horsemen, and 40. men which should ruone before him: whether did his father rebuke him at any time, saying: Wherefore hast thou don this? For he was very comely being second sonne, next to Abfolon, and his talke was with Ioab the sonne of Saruia and Abiathar the priest, which toke part with Adonias. But Sadoc the priest, and Banaias the sonne of Iotada and Nathan the Prophet, and Semei, and Serethi, and Felethi, and all the power of Dauids hoit, were not on Adonias part.

This was the cause of the deposing of Abiathar, because hee toke part with Adonia, that he shuld be king against Salomon the eldest sonne of king Dauid; wherefore it is wrytten in the thirde boke and second chapter of the kings: The king sayd vnto Abiathar the priest, goe your wayes vnto Anatota thine owne felde; for thou art a man of death; but this day I will not slay thee, because thou hast caried the Arke of the Lorde before my father Dauid, and diddest labour in all things wherein my father laboured. Then did Salomon cast out Abiathar, that hee should be no more the priest of the Lord, that the word of the Lord might be fulfilled, which he spake vpon the house of Hely in Sylo.

Beholde the most prudent king Salomon, according to the wisdom which was geuen him of God, did exercise hys power vpon the sayd priestes, putting him out of his priesthode, & letting in his place Sadoc the priest: this was a greater matter thā to take away the temporalities. If then in the law of Christ which now reigneth ouer vs, a byshop, should likewise rebel against the true heire of the kingdome, willing to sette vp another for king; why shoulde not the king or his heire, haue power in like case, to take away the temporalities from him so offending?

Item, it is also euident by the king Nabuchodonozor which had power geuen him of God, to lead away the children of Israell with their priestes: and Leuites, into the captiuitie of Babylon, as it is wrytten 4. booke of the kings 25. chapter.

Item it is read in the 4. boke of kings and 12. chapter. How that Iosias the most godly king of Iuda according to the wisdom which God had granted him, toke away all the consecrate vessels, which Iosaphat, Ioram, and Ochofias, his forefathers kings of Iuda had consecrated, and those which hee himselfe had offered, and all the treasure that could be found in the temple of the Lord, and in the kings pallace, and sent it vnto Azahel king of Syria, & he departed from Ierusalem. Marke how this most holy king exercised hys power, not onely in taking away the temporalities of the priestes, but also those things which were consecrate in the temple of the Lord, to procure vnto the common wealth, the benefite of peace.

Item, in the 4. boke and 18. chapter of the kings. it is wrytten howe that the holy king Ezechias tooke all the treasure that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the kings treasure, & brake downe the pillars of the temple of the Lorde, and all the plates of gold which he himselfe had fastned therupon, and gaue them vnto the king of the Assyrians; yet was hee not rebuked of the Lorde therefore, as hee was for his other sinnes, as it appeareth in the 2. boke of Paral. 32. chapter, for so much then as in time of necessity, all things ought to be in common vnto Christians, it foloweth then that the secular Lordes in case of necessitie, in many other common cases, may lawfully take away the moueable goodes from the cleargie, when they do offend.

Item, it is also read in the 12. of Mathewe, that the disciples of Iesus for to slake their hunger vpon the Saboth day, pulled the eares of corne, and did eate them, and the Pharisees rebuked them therefore, vnto whome Christ answered. Haue ye not read what Dauid did, when hee was hungry, and those that were with him, howe he entred into the house of the Lorde, and did eate the shew-breades, which it was not lawfull for hym, neither for them that

were with hym to eate, but only for the priests. This story is wrytten in the 1. boke of the kings and 21. chapter. And the commandement in the 12. of Deuteronomie. Whereby it appeareth that it is lawfull in time of necessitie to vse any thing, bee it neuer so much consecrate. Otherwise children by geuing their moueables to the consecration of any temple, shoulde not be bound to helpe their parents, which is contrary and against the Gospell of S Matthew in the 16. chapter: whereas our Sauour sharply rebuked the Pharisees, that for their owne traditions they did transgresse the commaundement of God.

Item, Titus and Vespasian secular princes had power geuen them of God 24. yeares after the Lordes Ascension to take away the temporalities from the priestes which had offened agaynst the Lordes holy one. And thereby also bereft them of their liues, and it seemeth vnto many they did, and might worthely doe the same according to Gods good wil and pleasure. Then for so much as our priestes in these dayes may transgresse and offend as much, and rather more against the Lordes annoynted, it followeth that by the pleasure of God, the secular Lordes, may likewise puny the them for their offence.

Our sauour being king of kings, and high bishop with hys disciples did geue tribute vnto Cesar, as it appeareth Mathewe 17. and commaunded the Scribes and Pharisees to geue the lyke vnto Cesar. Mat. 22. Whereby hee gaue example vnto all priestes that shoulde come after hym to render tribute vnto their kinges; whereupon blessed S. Ambrose in his 4. boke vpon these wordes in the 5. of Luke, (cast out your nettes) wryteth thus. There is an other kinde of fishing among the Apostles, after which manner the Lord commaunded Peter only to fish, saying, cast out thy hoke, and that fish, which cometh first vp, take hym. And then vnto the purpose he sayth. It is truly a great & spirituall document, whereby all Christian menne are taught, that they ought to be subiecte vnto the higher powers, and that no man ought to thinke that the lawes of a king here on earth are to be broke. For if the sonne of God did pay tribute, who art thou so great a man, that thinkest thou oughtest not to pay tribute? He payed tribute which had no possessions; and thou which daily seekest after the laker of the world, why doest thou not acknowledge the obedience and due- tie of the world? Why doest thou thorowe the arrogancie of thy minde exault thy selfe about the worlde, when as thorowe thine owne miserable couetousnesse, thou art subiect vnto the world? Thus wryteth S. Ambrose, and it is put in the 11. quest. 1. Magnum quidem. He also wryteth vpon these wordes in the 20. of Luke, she xene a pennie, whose Image it hathe; if Christ had not the Image of Cesar, why did hee pay any tribute? He gaue it not of hys owne, but rendered vnto the worlde: that which was the worldes; And if thou wilt not be in daunger of Cesar, possesse not those things which are the worldes; for if thou halt richesse, thou art in daunger of Cesar.

Wherefore if thou wilt owe nothing vnto any earthly king, forsake all those things, and followe Christ. If then all ecclesiasticall ministres, hauing richesse, ought to be vnder the subiection of kings, and geue vnto them tribute: It foloweth that kings may lawfully by the authoritye which is geuen them, take away their temporalities from them.

Here vpon S. Paule acknowledging him selfe to be vnder the iurisdiction of the Emperour, appealed vnto Cesar, as it appeareth Actes 25.

I stand sayth he, at Cefary iudgement-seat, there I ought to be iudged. Whereupon in the 8. distinction, chapter quatuor. S. Ambrose allegeth, that all things are lawfull vnto the Emperour, & all things vnder his power. For the confirmation wherof, it is said Daniel second chapter, the God of heauen hath geuen vnto thee a kingdome, strength, Empire, and glory, and all places, wherein the children of men do dwell; and hath geuen into thy power, the beastes of the field, and fowles of the aire, and set all things vnder thy subiection.

Also in the 11. question and 1. he sayeth, if the Emperour require tribute, we do not denie that the landes of the Church shall pay tribute, if the Emperour haue neede of our landes, hee hath power to challenge them, let him take them, if hee will, I doe not geue them vnto the Emperour, neither doe I denie them. Thys wryteth S. Ambrose, expressly declaring that the secular Lorde hath power at hys pleasure to take away the landes of the Church; and so consequently the secular Lordes haue power at their owne pleasures to take away the temporal goodes from the Ecclesiasticall ministres, when they doe offend.

Item S. Augustine wryteth, if thou sayest, what haue we to do wyth the Emperour? But nowe as I sayde, wee speake of mannes lawe. The Apostle would be obedient vnto the kinges, and honor them, saying. Reuerence your kinges: and doe not say what haue I to doe with the king? What haste thou then to doe with possessions? By the kings law the possessions are possessed, thou hast said, what haue I to doe with the king? but doe not say, what hath thy possessions to doe with the king? For then haste thou renounced the lawes of menne, whereby thou diddest possesse thy landes.

Et i. Thus

Case of necessitie.

Titus and Vespasian.

The example of Christ paying of tribute. S. Ambrose minde.

Christ commaunded tribute to be payd vnto the emperour.

Paule appealed to the emperour. S. Ambrose there in the vij. distin.

Daniel. 2.

9.

S. Augustine.

2. Nabuchodonozor.

3. Iosias.

4. Ezechias.

5. Dauid.