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I HAVE read your *Exposition of the orthodox system of civil rights and church power*, &c. and have observ'd, that if your pen was not guided by the very hand of Mr. Warburton, you well deserve the reputation of an exact accomplish'd mimic. There is a wonderful agreement in the Spirit of your writings: and the manner of your treating the author of a piece, call'd, *A comment upon the Reverend Mr. Warburton's Alliance*, greatly resembles Mr. W——'s treatment of his answerers. This may be seen in your conclusion, which is, — "For I should think my time strangely mis-employ'd, and the Reader's patience as much abused, to take the least notice of a thing called a *Commentary on the Book of Alliance*; in which the nameless Writer has not only proclaimed his profound ignorance of the principles of that Book, (a case pretty general amongst answerers) but of all others principles whatsoever, even those of his own trade, which is calumny." If you insist upon the greater propriety of the term, *commentary*, than that of *comment*, I will not dispute it with you.—And now let
let me, Sir, be free, in my turn, to tell you that this rude usage of a man, in whom you are not able, in a single instance to fix the charge of calumny; is a demonstration of something not very favourable to yourself. As to my profound ignorance of the principles of the book of alliance, the reader may judge of it, from the comment itself; as well as from the following remarks on the exposition. And I ask, is there not the effrontery of a hair-brain'd church-man, in this assertion, viz. that the comment has proclaimed a profound ignorance in its author, of all other principles whatsoever? The principles desecrated by the Exposition, would naturally lead to such scandal and defamation; for therein you have echoed to the alliance, in excluding truth and religion from your church-establishment. Therefore the utility of a scandal is sufficient, with you, to warrant and sanctify any measure of calumny. The principle of calumny, is not received or admitted in my religion, however it is in the defence of your establishment. This you call my trade; yet compliment me with a profound ignorance of its principles! which is much more than I, or any man can say of you, who, by this specimen have shewn you to have a profound knowledge of the principles. —

In this collection of choler, you throw up, —nameless writer.— if you design'd it as a stigma of contempt, I would ask why the Exposition has appeared under no other name,
than, by a layman?—doubtless, you depended upon the reputation of your orthodox System. And, if I mistake not, this protean appearance has indulged your fondness of offering so much incense to your own shrine.

—or, because your reputation has sunk as a divine, you have chosen to appear under the more acceptable character of a layman.

Thus much is due to you from the cruelty of your thrust at the vitals of my character. —Had you possessed the least degree of humanity, or known the sacredness of every man's reputation, you could not have thus intentionally assassinated mine, without any just provocation. For nothing can be more malignant than to say, a man has betray'd a profound ignorance of all principles whatsoever, even those of his own trade!—If the world should give you credit, what must be the consequences I may expect from it?—But Mr. Layman, assure yourself, that I stand a better chance for credit with the virtuous, than you do: since your Exposition, and your orthodox System, professedly discard truth, and turn solely on the hinge of utility; a principle that the thief or murderer does daily avail himself of.—This is your plan; and let who will give you credit upon it: I should not chuse to entrust you with any part of my small property.

But one thing more, good Mr. Layman; how came it to pass, that your great sagacity should fail you so much, in this your sovereign
sovereign contempt of the comment? of which say you, "I should think my time strangely misemploy'd, and the reader's patience as much abus'd, to take the least notice of a thing called a Commentary on the book of alliance."—If you had behav'd with prudence, and not been imposed upon by your evil genius, you would not have taken the least notice, i.e. you would not have mention'd the comment at all. And I have the vanity to think, that the more ignorant the world is of that performance, the better it may fare with your orthodox system, and the exposition of it.

Thus far I have been guided by that maxim of wisdom, answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit. And I have, at the same time, conform'd to that other, viz. answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him: since what I have recriminated, has truth for its support; and can boldly appeal to the judgment of the public. It is a piece of necessary self-defence, to disarm a mad-man, who throws about arrows, firebrands and death! tho' all the while he pretends to be defending liberty, as her mighty advocate!——

Farther I would ask you, Sir, aside,—whether that thing called the Comment, has not occasion'd the pains you have taken in your Exposition? tho' you have, under colour, directed your Reader's eye to the performances of Dr. Stebbing. But enough of this
this—I will proceed to examine your Ex-
position. You thus address the Friends of
the Church, p. 76. "Let them recollect, that
" the Church is surrounded with enemies,
" ever ready to dispute the reasonableness of
" the privileges possessed by her, and to en-
" quire into the grounds and foundation, up-
" on which she claims them. Let it be re-
" member'd, that the Gentlemen they have
" to do with, make no scruple to attack the
" Legislature; and to call for the repeal of
" laws, when not satisfied with the fitness,
" equity, and justice of them. If therefore
" we are press'd with objections, it will be
" to no purpose to shelter under the sanc-
" tion and authority of custom and usage.
" If we would offer any thing decisive in
" the present question, we must shew that
" the privilege in dispute is derived from the
" nature and reason of the thing; or that
" it is the necessary consequence of an al-
" liance between the two societies." So ap-
parent is it, that my profound ignorance pro-
claim'd in the Comment has led you to re-
nounce the sanction and authority of custom
or usage; for you know, Sir, that the alliance
you expound has defended the test law, upon
the Game Law, and upon that of prescrip-
tion. To decide the question in dispute,
you are to shew, that the privilege is derived
from the nature and reason of the thing; or
that it is the necessary consequence of an al-
liance between the two societies.

But,
But, your way of deciding the question in dispute, I fancy will not be sufficient to satisfy the Gentlemen who call for the repeal of laws, when not satisfied with the fitness, equity, and justice of them; unless you could prove that the alliance is itself founded on the nature and truth of things, or upon fitness, equity, and justice: and therefore for you to pretend to shew, that the privilege in dispute is derived from the nature and reason of the thing; or that it is the necessary consequence of an alliance between the two societies, is very silly; and not a whit better than sophistical church-declamation. Nor should only the alliance be prov'd to have its foundation in reason and nature, but also the privilege in dispute should be shewn to be fairly deriv'd from the reason and nature of the thing.

But what have you done in the Exposition, to shew this? why, verily, in the language of the man you adore, you separate truth from utility in the idea of the church, which has a national establishment, p. 13.

P. 35. You apprehend, "that it will not be easy to vindicate even our own constitution, according to the Bishop of London's reasoning; that is, on the simple principle of truth." Yea, that "an establishment and a test law may be considered either as mere utilities, or as designed to propagate, countenance and support truth. In this last light, what has the Magistrate to do with them, since it does not appear, that religion, as such, is his proper
proper and direct business, p. 21. To assert
the reasonableness of the test law upon the
principle of truth, would be just as prudent and reasonable, as to prove the being
of a God from innate ideas." p. 64.

Mere utility you avow, as the Magistrate's sole view in an establishment and test law: and I am of opinion, it will by and by be evident, that the Church has no more regard to truth or religion than the Magistrate is suffered to have in your new system.

But, Sir, what idea can one possibly form of an establishment of religion, the truth of which, is discarded by the alliance? Notwithstanding you make much pother about religion, as not the proper, immediate, and direct business of the Magistrate; yet you rave about a Church-establishment, and about an alliance between Church and State! Your church must consequently, be a church without religion. For because Dr. Stebbing, and those in the common system were for having religion one end of civil government; you say, p. 33.

"It has no real and natural foundation; as "religion is not the proper, immediate, and "direct business of the Magistrate."

Nay, you further say, "that if the Magis- "trate establishes a religion, merely because "he conceives it to be true; he does too "assign the Clergy a public maintenance, purp-
"ly for the support of the true religion, or for "the defence of certain opinions, considered, as "such," p. 22. a Scheme you reject. This you
you found needful to justify the same power, establishing of English Episcopacy on this side the Tweed, and Scotch Presbytery on the other.

More than this you affirm,—“that the "Magistrate is not supposed to endow the "Clergy consider'd as Ministers of this, or "that religion, but only as they become a "public order in the State." p. 71. "And you "recommend it to the consideration of the "Clergy, whether it will not be most pru- "dent to claim their Revenues on the prin- "ciple above-mention'd." p. 73.

So far, it seems, are the endowments of the Clergy from being matter of divine right, as some fanatical Churchmen have dreamed, that to shew your moderation, you say, — “with "respect to that part of the public proper- "ty assigned for the maintenance of the Cler- "gy, I would know, whether it would not "sometimes be useful to the State, to apply "it to civil purposes; or whether the con- "siderable sums raised on this score, might "not, at certain junctures, be employ'd in "the defence of the State, to the great "advantage of the public." p. 19. Yet, this is the acquisition which the Church has made by pawning her independency, and con- "ferring the high honour of supremacy, up- "on the civil Magistrate. —— But fagacious Sir, how does this prove that there has been such a stipulation and contract between the State and Church, as your Alliance? The State has yet, you own, a sovereign right of
disposal even of that part of the public property assigned for the maintenance of the clergy. The above declaration is urged in proof of the Magistrate's having regard to the use and service which religion is of to the state, as the reason of his affording it protection and support.

Another instance of the impression the comment has made upon you, for you say that the church's most inveterate enemies seem ready to allow the justice of this plea. *ib.*

Yet, your exposition of the orthodox system, after having excluded truth and religion from the church establishment and alliance, speaks, p. 77. "of an alliance between the two societies form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom!"

The expositor is bless'd with no small share of the same absurdity which runs through the book of alliance: as appears by his talking of an alliance of two societies form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom. The state and church in alliance are one society, composed of the same individuals; actuated by the same principles; the clergy being no other than what they are, under the Magistrate's appointment.

If we attend to your reasoning, against Dr. Stebbing, we shall be told, "that a religious society has one peculiar, separate, and distinct end, and so the civil too. —

* The reader may see this very argument in the comment for the Quakers paying tythes. sect. 31.
that we must not look upon civil society in two different capacities, both as religious and civil animals; and as intending to provide both for their religious and civil interests. But if your observations have any weight, you say, they must be considered under the "last character only." p. 11. I would here ask, that if one end, peculiar, separate, and distinct is to be considered, as appertaining only to each distinct society, how are they capable of an alliance? But if they retain, notwithstanding the alliance, their peculiar and distinct ends; then they remain to all intents and purposes two distinct, separate societies, and the mutual resignations import just nothing at all. The alliance is as great a solicism as can be imagined: for surely too ends that are distinct and peculiar to church and state, can never become the common principles of equity and freedom, to the two distinct and separate societies, that are said to be civil and religious.

Good Mr. Layman, you seem to understand as little of Law, as the Author of the alliance does. pray what sense is there in an alliance formed between two societies upon the common principles of equity and freedom? It might surely have sufficed you to have attempted a proof of the justice and legality of the alliance, without presuming to make a chancery decree in favour of it. But do you think, that his Lordship, the present Chancellor, would make a decree in favour of
of any contract, where truth was not regarded? would he own it equitable that a religious society should make a bargain with the state, as such, or under the merits of a religious society; and yet, that the magistrate should not be allowed to grant the privilege stipulated for, from any such consideration of that society? which is the new scheme you doat upon.

The common principles of equity and freedom, require a farther exposition. ——— Equity, properly means, a restraint of the rigorous claims of right or justice; in prevention of some apparent injury arising from those rigorous claims. how, is your Alliance founded on the common principle of equity? ——— besides, the common principles of equity and freedom, has as great impropriety in it, as to call the court of common pleas, the court of equity. we often say, the courts of common law, when we speak of the inferior courts; one of which is called the court of Common Pleas.

I wish you would explain yourself, and not hastily conclude, that because the author of the Alliance has his chapel so near the hall where the Lord Chancellor frequently holds a court of equity; that therefore truly, your favourite alliance is made upon the common principle of equity!

What do you mean by the common principles of equity and freedom? are your two societies at liberty to pursue reciprocally their distinct
distinct ends? may the church in alliance look upon herself at liberty to pursue the end either of the civil or religious society at pleasure? and v. v. may the state do the same? this you deny in your exposition; and affirm, "that it has been clearly and incontestibly proved, by the excellent author of the Alliance, that the Church is a real society; and a society, in, and of, itself, sovereign, and independent on any other.—So that the civil community could not invest the Magistrate with church-supremacy." p. 17.

But if this real society, in, and of itself, sovereign, and independent, has made an alliance with the state upon the common principles of equity and freedom: then surely upon the principles of truth, must we conclude church and state remain no longer two societies, but by the alliance must be as truly one society, as England and Scotland, formerly two separate and distinct kingdoms, are become one kingdom by the union, even that of Great-Britain. Nay the church and state are become more strictly one by alliance; since it is form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom, whereas by the act of union, some peculiar, distinct and separate articles were stipulated for North-Britain: so that one cannot say of Great-Britain that the union was form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom. You give an instance of this, p. 23. "The Magistrate has thought fit
"fit to establish English Episcopacy on this ""side the Tweed, and given it the prefer-""ence to Scotch Presbytery. —— But ""on the other side, he has chose [chosen] ""to establish Scotch Presbytery, and given it ""the pass before English Episcopacy."

This has been done by the Magistrate, to whom, you say, your church has resigned her independency, and also invested with supremacy. or, it has been done, by the two societies which are in an alliance, form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom.—done by the reigning Queen, Lords and Commons. But did not your Bishops concur in this act of union? ""whose only end and purpose of ""their sitting in Parliament, you say, Mr. W. has declared, is to represent the church."

p. 75. And yet, these very Bishops gave Scotch presbytery the pass before English episcopacy on the other side the river! To clear yourself, and scheme, you reject the common system, by saying, ""it has no real and na-
""tural foundation, as religion is not the pro-
""per, immediate, and direct business of the ""Magistrate. It is an unreasonable, unrighte-
""ous and oppressive scheme.—It blackens and ""defames the credit of our own Legislature,
""as it arraigns the Establishment settled in ""North-Britain; an establishment declared ""perpetual by the act of union."" p. 33.

How did your Bishops, whose end in sit-
ting in parliament is only to represent the church, give their suffrage in the act of union,
union, consenting thereby that the passes before English episcopacy should be granted to Scotch presbytery on the other side the Tweed? and yet, was not this one of the most flagrant instances of the alliance of the two societies being formed on the common principles of equity and freedom?

It may be proper to examine the merits of what you call the church, or what the foundation of her claim to state-favour and protection is. This, you say, with Mr. W. "was her resignation of her sovereignty and independency. Of which she could not be depriv'd, but by her own voluntary and free act. That she did resign this privilege in favour of the state." p. 40. What this sovereignty and independency is, that the church resign'd to the state, does not appear either from the alliance, or the exposition. What, or wherein does the right of supremacy consist, which the church has so willingly resigned to the state? Has the church hereby enabled the civil magistracy by new modelling civil laws, to restrain, and punish sin, as such? This you will not allow, "for, as things now stand, 'tis the crime and not the sin, which is properly consider'd by them; or they proportion and adjust their punishments to the effects of actions, merely as they affect the peace and welfare of the state." p. 15. So that the Magistrate has acquired no additional or new power of punishing or rewarding, by this resignation which
which the church has made.—I would then ask, had the church here in England ever any such thing as a right of independency and supremacy? and when was the time of her resignation.

Farther, you say in your exposition, "That you find both State and Church actually possessed of such powers, as do not properly belong to them; or to which they have no natural, immediate, and inherent right." p. 58. And you mention the church constituting the Magistrate her supreme head at the same time, "you find her possessed of temporal, coercive power, to which she could have no pretence, or even shadow of pretence, in her natural and independent state." p. 59. which, you think, shews the reality of the alliance in question.

But how will this chimerical representation satisfy any man, who wants to know the meaning of these things? what fitness, equity, or justice is there in them? Truth is excluded from being the basis of the establishment; Religion itself is denied any place in the idea of the civil magistrate, as the reason of his favour and protection: the Clergy are only considered by him as a public order in the state: and you "take the liberty to add, "that if the Magistrate do not assign it on this score, he cannot on the principles of "equity and justice assign it at all." p 72.

I freely own, that I am profoundly ignorant of the principles of the orthodox scheme,
and of your exposition; if the *church* you are pleading for, from your own description of its alliance, can be considered in any other light whatever, but merely as a *creature of the State*.

You are conscious that the term, *church*, when it has a religious sense, is not capable of any human establishment. Both the *alliance* and *exposition* betray this apprehension of the imposibility: which has led you to the scandalous distinction of *Truth* and *Utility*. For in religion, Sir, they are eternally inseparable. And hence what you have observed from the alliance, is not capable of any defence, *viz.* "that the Church, in her natural and independent State, has no claim to the protection of the civil power; and therefore cannot but be disposed to resign her independency, and enter into an alliance with the State, upon reasonable and proper motives," *p. 70.* What an adept must you be in sophistry, who can talk of reasonable and proper motives to such alliance, after you have stripped your church bare of all that is virtuous and valuable, by taking away from her *truth* and *religion*.

Yet this assertion of yours is false in fact; as well as from some propositions both in the alliance and in the exposition. For if the *church* be justly defined, as distinct from civil society, it must denote a *society of faithful men, who fear God and work righteousness*. Now such society has a claim to civil protection, from the very nature and end of civil government.
government. You cite the Bishop of London insisting upon it, "that the Magistrate has " no right to punish any one in his fortune," or even exclude him from civil power, " on account of his religion." p. 51.

The Protestant-dissenters, if allow’d to be capable of religious character, may be, and are a part of the Church of Christ, as truly as any other men under the heavens. i. e. if they support that character. They therefore must be consider’d as the Church, in a religious sense; because they have not resigned their independency, neither have entered into an alliance with the State: and yet, they have a claim to the protection of the State, and do actually enjoy that protection. You must allow this, Sir, though they acknowledge no supreme, legislative authority in their religious character, but that only of Jesus.

You are aware of this, and say, "the " Question is, whether the supremacy of the " Magistrate be a real disgrace to a national " church professing its faith in Jesus; and an " invasion of the natural and proper rights " of the Church of Christ." p. 73. But then, you trample upon the difficulty thus: "If " indeed we can prove, that the Magistrate " actually derives this power from the Church; " and that the Church has conferred it upon " him, on reasonable and proper motives; this " will come up to the point in question, " for what ground will then remain, to insul- " t and reproach the Church for passing D..."
with her independency, if she has resign'd it upon reasonable and proper terms? And who hath proved she hath done so, but the author of the alliance between Church and State?" p. 84.

This is such a piece of profound reasoning, that a person of profound ignorance may discover the fallacy of. For the church of Christ having but one head and Lord, and he in heaven; never was in a state of independency on this its head, any more than a natural body can be independent on its natural head. consequently the Church of Christ never had a power of resigning, or transferring the supremacy of its head. This will and must ever remain the same, however men, who are called by you the Church, fancy themselves in alliance with the state, from a resignation of their independency. Indeed it is possible for any number of men, who profess to believe in Christ; to disavow the authority and binding force of his laws, and call other men Lords, and Masters; and be under their edicts and prescriptions. But this must be their own voluntary act; and it may be done from worldly considerations: yet, by no means can such men be said to own no other Law-giver but Jesus.—the churches in alliance, by your system, don't resign their independency on Jesus, but their dependency: and they put themselves out of a religious, into a civil State.—

The Protestant-dissenter then is not chargeable with holding a notion that implies an Imperium.
perium in Imperio, an empire within an empire tho' you say it. p. 84. But it is this orthodox-sy
stem that is chargeable; by pretending to profess
faith in Jesus, at the same time the Church
has resigned her independency, and conferred
a supremacy upon the civil magistrate.

If a man, whom you brand with profound
ignorance may inform you; the Protestant-
dissent, who is consistent in his spirit with
the principles of his dissent, envies you not
the emoluments your Church enjoys, upon
the terms of your alliance. He knows, that
Christ's Kingdom is not of this world. That
the riches and honours of the world are no
part of the reward of Christ's subject. He
knows that the friendship of the world is en-
mity with God. His religion consists in righ-
teousness, peace, and joy. He is clothed with
humility. And he is crucifying the world
with its affections and lusts.

So that by a citation you have made
from Dr. Stebbing, p. 53. it must be a truth,
" that, that which prejudices men against
the faith, is commonly some worldly inte-
rest or other which presents itself in op-
position to it. That there are very few
who reject or depart from the truth through
the fault of their understandings, compa-
ratively to the number of those who are
led aside by the prevalency of their flesh-
ly appetites." From whence you justly in-
fer, " whatever may be the case of some par-
ticulars, it will, I think, be difficult to
prove
"prove that the body of the several sects is tempted to continue in its separation, by any secular or worldly interest whatsoever."

In this declaration you have unanswerably acquitted the body of the several sects from worldly motives in their separation. And so far they are secure of the most manifest criterion of their belonging to the Church of Christ; since they are not of the world, even as their Lord was not of the world.

Hence forward, you, and all other Church-defenders, may excuse yourselves the trouble of, recovering the Protestant-dissenters to the Bosom of the Church, which you so ardently wish, p. 57. Since your Church has no one advantage over ours, except you reckon upon titles of honour, temporal dignities, riches, and worldly power. All which our Church disclaims. And you yourself own, that your Church could not be considered as a religious society, in her obtaining the alliance.

But then, for what reason do you stigmatize and reproach them as enemies to the church? is it because they are obliged by their religion, not to love the world, nor the things of it; which you have obtained by a resignation of your independency and supremacy? Be it so; the prize is your own. For a Protestant-dissenter, as a consistent Christian cannot resign or transfer the supremacy of his one Lord. It is then their not being influenced by worldly motives in their separation, that is the infectious dissembler which makes your test-
test-law necessary to keep them out of your family? p. 44. note. "That law's being "merely a Security to the Church from "those who would destroy it," is but an imaginary reason of it, whilst the dissenting body preserve their virtue; or remain separatists upon no worldly principle, which you have already allow'd they do,—no danger can take place. Yet I must ask you, Sir, how you can reconcile the Bishop of London's opinion with your defence of the test-law? an account of which you give us, with your approbation of it, "My Lord of London himself agrees to this "idea of the Magistrate's office; yet insists, "that the Magistrate has no right to punish "any one in his fortune, or even exclude "him from civil power, on account of his "religion."

How will you make it appear that the Magistrate has no right to exclude any one from civil power, on account of his religion, whilst you defend the Test-law, which in its very nature and design does exclude men from civil power, on no other account than that of their not being of your church? —

You have affirmed, "that the test-law is "necessary, as the peace and tranquility of "the public, both in Church and State, would "be greatly endanger'd, without some pro-
"vision of this kind.—and that diversity "of Sects in the public administration, would "be a real evil." —p. 64. 65. But is this consistent with my Lord of London's insist-
ing upon it, that the Magistrate has no right to exclude any one from civil power, on account of his religion? —— were the characters of men canvass'd, and thoroughly known that have been and are in the administration of civil power, under the subsistence of the Test-law, I am persuaded; greater danger to the peace and tranquility of the public could not be apprehended from the repeal of it. Are there not as profligate and abandon'd men occupying spheres of influence in the civil administration, as are to be found among those whom the Test-law excludes? I am persuaded there are. And as different in religious and political sentiment too, even so different that Christians and unbelievers, loyalists and known Jacobites, are admitted. Difference of religious opinion cannot, in the least be prevented, by an establishment and a test-law; as I have shewn more at large in the Comment. And yet the Church is not alarm'd with the danger of the public peace and tranquillity being disturb'd! so that you may see, Sir, that the reasonings of the Alliance and Exposition, as well as those of your other church-writers, have no foundation in truth.

The Test-law you imagine necessary to secure the Church-Establishment. Why so? you have not the least reason to suppose that the Government will neglect to avail itself of all those important advantages, which you are confident you have demonstrated to arise from
from the alliance between Church and State. You need not be afraid — no Protestant-dissenting preserving his virtue will hurt you. He is not a more obnoxious animal, than those of your own church. His principles will lead him to loyalty, to peace, and to do all he can to serve the interest of truth and liberty.

Speak out, Mr. Expositor, and let the world know, what are those inestimable jewels of independency and supremacy, that your Church has resigned to the State.—How she became possessed of them.—what was the use she made of them before the resignation,— and make it appear that the privilege which the state has gain’d by that resignation is a quantum meruit. hereby you will do honour both to the state and your church.

Upon the whole, the laugh at your system, is not void of grace; since one is not able to consider your Establishment under the idea of a national religious institution. For as to the principle of truth, you ask, "what is it " but an awkward prop in the old system, " which effectually undetermines one side of " the edifice, while it only bears up the " other in imagination." p. 36. Truth will not serve either the Church or the State in your system. And religion is quite unfit to become a principle of the alliance.

And yet, panegyric is bestowed with a liberal hand upon the book of alliance, and its incomparable author. Merit is ascribed to him at the expense of the credit of the alliance itself, and that of all its defenders. For hav-
ing mentioned the Church's resigning her independence upon reasonable and proper terms; you ask, "who hath proved she hath done so, but the author of the alliance between "Church and State?" p. 84.

But is it not incredible, that this public contrast, which church-men have long rav'd about, and swell'd in their boastings of the church's claims, should never be entered into, nor understood, till Mr. W. made the discovery? And which, probably, had been the scandal even of his attempt, but for the profound knowledge he had acquired of the Esoteric doctrine of the antients.

You might well "not wonder, that the "author should chuse to leave this work "as a monument of his love to his Country; "or that the finest genius of the age,— "should with satisfaction and pleasure, see "it addressed to him, as to one who un- "derstood the principles best, and had the "consequences most at heart." The elegant, the sublime finishing period of the Exposition.

But good Mr. Layman, did Lord Chesterfield understand the principles of the alliance before your Apollo made the discovery? If he did, and had the consequences most at heart, how will you account for his not disclosing them to the public? If his Lordship and the world owe the discovery entirely to your Apollo, how did he understand them at all? If not till the book of alliance came forth, how know you, that he understood them best?

And
And are there no Churchmen who have the consequences more at heart than that noble Lord? can you prove it to be any shade cast on the lustre of his genius, that he has less at heart the consequences of the orthodox principles than you have, or than the author of the alliance?

However I will place before you the sentiments of a genius, to which I am persuaded, that noble Lord will vail; and confess an incompetency of judgment in the comparison: I mean, Sir, one Jesus, the only Lord of the Christian-church, who in his prayer, says, "I have given them thy word: and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them by thy truth, thy word is truth."

The task therefore which devolves upon the expositor, is, to shew the public what concord there is between the doctrine of this prayer, and the orthodox system. If you do this, or can shew any countenance given to your Church-establishment in the gospel, I will answer for the addition of one member to your Society.

Till then, the calm satisfaction I enjoy in my dissent, is not in any danger of being unsettled or discomposed by the attempts you are making to defend your alliance.
As I am closing this letter; be assured, that your calumny has not ruffled the peace of my mind. I attribute the rancour only to the pride and malice of your spirit. — you have my pity. if you repent, you have my pardon.

One word more of consolation, and adieu. despair not of the influence of those principles, on which you build the alliance. They are not the least, but the more popular as they exclude truth and religion! and in the eye of the world, you may depend upon it, they will certainly have the force of demonstration.— would you have more?

I am,

the author of the Comment, &c.