

Concerning The King's Coronation.

on the other hand it may be true, that the King until he be crowned is not so much King in all Intent and Purpose, as he is after he is crown'd. For if the crowning of the King be but a mere Ceremony or compliment of State, and not essential in giving him a Right to the Allegiance of the Subject, then certainly no King of England would be troubled with the ceremony of being formallie crown'd, because then there will by no obligation upon him to take the coronation oath, and so he may be more at liberty to act according to his will because his conscience will not be clogged with the weight of so Solemn an oath; and then with less Infamy and Reflection he may suspend or pervert the Lawe. Again, before the crown be set on his head, the nobility and people are asked if they will do their homage and fealty to him; which by the way implies, that the people are at liberty in the thing, and that if he be crowned first by their heads and election, then if the people consent, the King takes the coronation oath, which is to profess the Church, our laws Liberties and properties, and to administer Justiceifferently; and this when he has sworn to us the crown is immediately put upon his head, and then the nobility and people do their Homage to him: And according to this has been plac'd ever since their most Kings in England. Henry L. D'Olamer Earl of Warrington, Resolution of two Imporant Questions. Tollem. Evelyn notes on Hales Hist. pl. viii. fol. 101. So that the Coronation is something more than an honourable ceremony, seeing it is a Solemn Engagement to Government according to Lawe.
But what ever be the case in other Kingdoms where the Prince always takes possession of all the Rights of majesty from the very moment of his succession, as much as the people are professed to have taken their oath of fidelity, and mutually received in the person of his predecessor: yet in all Elective Kingdoms Coronation is a necessary ceremony, because it is a confirmation of the Election, as well in respect of the persons that have made the Election, as on the part of the people who by this Solemn Action acknowledge the validity of the Election, and tacitly promise to obey the person elected. Therefore in Poland the King Elect and not crowned cannot exercise any Royal Function, besom any place or Benefice; the scepter is not carried before him, his Letters to foreign princes sign'd with the initials of his family, and not of the Kingdom, p[ro]p[ri]etate in his Chron.

The Dispensing power.

That which Sir M. H. professes and prophecies is now fulfilled, viz that one glorie when other happen'd was rather to be had from his twelve rods in Westminster Hall than from 1200 standing forces. It is strange that these Judges shoud understand so great a mystery as this, in that there be as great brains in a Judge as there was in the mannes of David; and if so how happens it that this same Scott of Ulster who sat before them on the same Bench, but of a double portion of that excellent spirit has rest upon our people, judging that they are able to doe in so great mystery as this, and see, ~~and~~ ^{and} much further than any who have been before them, surely they are bound in duty to declare this matter to the understandings of his people, or else in immorall the expences of their heads they may come to give the true reasons of their opinion: 1^o That the Kings of England are Sovereigns, 2^o That the Laws of England are the King's Law. 3^o That therefore is an inherent inseparable prerogative in the Kings of England as in all other Sovereigns power to dispence with all penal laws in particular cases and upon particular occasions, 4^o That of these Reasons and necessities the King himself is the sole Judge; and which is consequent therupon, 5^o That this is not a ~~privilegium~~ in relation to the King but the author of remains of the Sovereign power and prerogative of the Kings in England which was never taken from them nor can be. Sovereign power is of vast Extent, but is as much as unlimited, and to which no bounds are or can be set, that the Kings of England in parliament habe a sovereign power is true, that with the consent and concurrence of the Lords and Commons it may do what it will without question, and by as certaine title out of parliament his power is limited and confined within certain bounds which he cannot pass, without doing violence to either to the Lawe. His cannot command any man to do any thing, but by cause of a common Necessite, nor an appeal by the law of the party, but is most certaine, that till the 15 of Oct. 1603 during which we have beene so much fraighted, that the Lawe have beene more frequently slighted, the Lawes of the Land, than the King's Laws, and therefore of the denominated ^{of} some ^{as} regard the first, the King will be forced to take no longer Lawe he can not be forced to make, and therefore making the Lawe he can be changed or altered without their consent, for nothing, and thereby a King and the same power shall meete in. Nor if the Lawe were enacted by the King only, as it follows, had the King may dispense with the Lawe when he shall seeme right, for Lawe is no thing so infallible but may be limited. Thus was for the English Kings who were as absolute as any Monarch upon Earth, yet were constrained by their own promises and oaths. Even of such as were ^{as} over 127 Prelates when he had made a decree he could not oblige them, or ^{as} by force ^{as} will it. See H. 8. 8. Henry L. D'Olamer Earl of Warrington, Arguments agt the dispensing power

A Dispensation with Laws is a Relaxation of the force of some human positive laws either in part or in the whole for some certain space of time by him who has the dispensing power ligg'd in him. I say of human and positive Lawe because the Law of nature and Law of God cannot be dispensed with by man: he may count the temporal punishment of God, but he cannot pardon & take away his guilt thereof. I call a dispensation a Relaxation for a certain time because if a Law was relaxed or dispensed with a point of obligation for that, it would be an abrogation of such a Law instead of a dispensation or suspension of it. Only priests who have a full and absolute power of making laws can dispense with them as mala prohibita, but cannot dispense with laws that concern mala proibita. In antient times dispensations were seldom or never granted: But after the Canon Law was introduced, they became frequent by non-obstante's and other facultie's institutions of the court of Rome & the Canons of the following.