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SIR,

Doctor Pickering's Sermon, preached before the right honourable the Lord Mayor, the Aldermen, &c. of London, in the Cathedral of St. Paul's, January 30th 1749-50, I have received from you by the post.

Very unluckily, upon the reading, I made a different application of the text: for I began to ask, how are the mighty fallen! and to imagine, that a base, degenerate, debauched sense of the most renowned city in the world was most glaring!—but I presently corrected myself, and charg'd the conception to the weakness of my judgment, and to the heat and fire of my own temper. What confirm'd me in this, was, a few days ago, I had found my intellects fail me in judging the conduct of the most learned University of Oxford, in the late affair of conferring doctoral degrees on Mr. Church, and Mr. Dodwell, for the merit of their remarks on Dr. Middleton.
For you must know, Sir, that I had not only concluded Dr. Middleton's grand hypothesis yet untouch'd, or unshaken, by those two pens; but I saw that which the learned Dr. Sykes has said of all the remarkers on Middleton, viz. "fix upon the hypothesis of which of these learned gentlemen you will, you are sure to have four out of five against the scheme you pitch on."

The university has nevertheless, in their great wisdom, thought fit to reward the intention. I now see, it must be confessed, that all these writers have one sort of merit in their writings; I mean, that of the church-kind, in the established sense of the term: for as the learned Dean has observed, "Mr. Dodwell extends the miracle-working power, or age of miracles, to the civil establishment of Christianity; and Mr. Church says, we have reason to think that [the power of miracles] stopped some time after the civil establishment of our religion."

In harmony with which, Dr. Pickering's sermon is intended to magnify and exalt this civil-church-establishment. Consequently there is church-merit in all these three performances; which will vindicate the University of Oxford in conferring their honours on the two former, as well as justify the London Magistrates, in their paying the compliment of thanks to the latter.

* Preface to two questions, &c.
If, Sir, you should happen to be squeamish in this matter, or be so puritanical as to suppose, that Christ's kingdom is not of this world! that it never did, nor ever can fare the better for a civil establishment; you may take the consolation of your own fanatical notions; and lay the blame of your ignorance upon your parents, for not giving you an university education. There your sight would have been corrected by church optics, a reconciling medium of vision, that brings into one focus, and an indissoluble union, the world and the church. At a College you would have learnt a more polite and profitable scheme of religion than what you receiv'd from the New Testament, and from the sense of weak brethren; heretical in their opinions, and schismatical in their practice.

Entring thus deeply into the reasons of the thing, gave me the cue, by which I was enabled to proceed with more honourable reflections on your city-magistracy and common council; who, it must be own'd, have copied with great fulness and accuracy after that famous seminary of learning; by the compliment paid to Dr. Pickering. As the doctor has done his best, we should, in reading his sermon treat him with tenderness. The first paragraph cautions us not to expect too much from his acquaintance with the sublime; for, "he fancies the Ikon Basiliike approaches nearest of any human-writing to the pathos" and
"and sublimity of this divine composition of "

David's.——

However, at the time he tells you, "King "

Charles laments his own undeserved cala-

mities, in the most moving, majestick "

strains;" he forgets not to make that prince very extravagant in his lamentations,—for having mentioned his own calamities, he adds, "

and the certain consequences of them, the "

utter ruin and defolation of his people."—

What notion had the doctor's audience of this?—Would they not ask, when did these certain consequences take place? Has there been an utter ruin and defolation of his people? Or shall such an utter ruin ever take place, as the natural or judicial product of the King's death? If neither of these things are at all probable, the lamentations of this prince were extravagant. And we might, with more cre-
dit, suppose that his death, did, in a great measure prevent the utter ruin and defola-
tion of his people. During the first fifteen years of his reign, he countenanced Papiists to such a degree, as to make them privy counsellors, secretaries of state, and lords-lieu-
tenants of counties. And on all sides theQueen's influence over him, is acknowledged: but she was a bigot to popery. To what purpose then can the doctor declame upon the character of Charles, when all his overt-acts demonstrate his designs to enslave England, by stretching the prerogative to an indepen-
dancy
dancy on parliament! To compass this design, he dealt much in *dissimulation*, and often violated truth.

But the reason of his shining like a *seraph* in the eye of the doctor, was, the court which he made to the *clergy*; and his great indulgences of their pride and vanity. It is not improbable but the figure *Laud* made in consecrating *Creed-Church*, may have its lively playings, and dazzle the eyes of the doctor; he grieves at the utter ruin and desolation of so much pomp, and pontifical grandeur! the consequence which closely followed the decollation of the King.—and he affectingly asks, *how are the mighty fallen!* Yet had the doctor only read and considered *a letter to the right reverend the bishop of Bangor, occasioned by his lordship's sermon before the house of lords, January the 30th 1748-9*, publish'd by J. Noon, Cheapside; he must have been ashamed of his *panegyric*! he surely could not have spoken with so much disrespect on a parliament that so bravely travers'd the designs of a monarch, who imbib'd and retain'd notions of the regal power, which denied the privileges of the parliament and the liberties of the people as their *inherent right*. A King, who forsooth, would have it, that they entirely depended on his *grace*, and had done so on the *grace* of his forefathers.—They had borne with the oppressions of *fifteen years* of his reign; the *high commission court* and the
the star-chamber acts fill'd the people with just horror!

But for the doctor to say, that "never since the foundation of the world hath there been recorded in history, a rebellion more perfidious and bloody in its rise and progress—more fatal in its event—more pernicious and destructive in its consequences,"--is the very height of infatuation! It represents as rebels, a generation of men, who took up arms, who spent their treasure and their blood in securing to that age and to posterity, what is most dear to us as men, as Christians, and as Protestants! whereas the very principles on which the revolution took place, under the immortal William, sanctified the parliament arms; and the success of them has, and will be matter of joy and gladness to all true britons.

The doctor goes on declaiming upon "the destruction of the established worship, and the setting up calves in our temples, after the example of Jeroboam!"

This is no other than a blaze of high church fury, because it is mere fiction; and has no truth in fact to rest upon. What if Episcopacy was for a time rejected, and Laud's pictures, and his fine altars demolished, even the representation of God Almighty, by the figure of an old man no more allowed of? What if the Sectaries run into some extremes in their treatment of their weak brethren, the Episo-
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Episcopaleans? (for, Sir, the term, weak in church style, is applicable always to the undermost:) will any, or all of this taken together amount to a setting up calves in our temples, after the example of Jeroboam? It should be taken into the account, that the people who now had power, were men who had seen a late example in the flagrant cause of it, under the Laudean administration! and none should wonder to find that one extreme had produced another, however there surely was a full retaliation made, and the accounts balanc'd by the Bartholomew Aët, of 1662, at the time when two thousand of the moderate clergy, who were tenacious of the principles of liberty and of the reformation, were turn'd out of their livings, and exposed to all kinds of sufferings. Whose ejection made more elbow-room for those sons of the church, that could preach up Non-resistance and passive obedience. Now was the establishment in the meridian of its glory! with its head well disposed towards Rome.— Both the sons of Charles restored to the possession of regal honour and power, which the father had abused and forfeited.

No, says the doctor, this I deny with both my hands, for the father "thoroughly understood and was master of his own tongue, as is manifest from his declarations, and the rest of his works; which are as much superior to the writings of the re-

B "bels
"belts in dignity of language and weight of reasoning, as their royal author was—* in
"birth—in virtue—in the goodness of his cause.—I wish I could add, the success of
"it too.—But at last Enthusiastic phrensy pre-
"vail'd over true courage.—Such was the
"will of God."—

Here the doctor's wish is oppos'd to the will of God;—though he says again, "had
"the King's first victories been pursued—
"but for our sins the will of God was other-
"wise." If it was for our sins that the will of God was otherwise, why does the doctor complain for the punishment of his sins? If he has any meaning, it surely must be, that the King's want of success was some-
way occasioned by our sins: and if so, then why should he charge so much upon the con-
duct of the King's opposers? For when he useth the phrase, for our sins, he cannot in-
tend to make the opposers of the King of the same party with himself. And if this be not allowed, then the pronoun, our, must either include the King and his friends, who were the immediate sufferers in this event; or else it must intend the sins of all the present defenders of the King's measures, and of all the admirers of his character!

* I would not contend with the doctor about the disputable Question whether the King wrote the Ikon, Baslike, or not; I am willing he should have all the glory of it.

Had
Had the doctor shewn an abhorrence of the measures of that arbitrary reign pursued both in church and state, a sense might have been found very just and pertinent: for then we could have understood him, but for our sins, i.e. the sins of the King's abettors, it was the will of God: since such a catastrophe would serve to shew in after ages, that oppression, violence and tyranny, are unworthy the submission of a free and generous people. For our sins, that is, to correct the disposition in men to dissimulation, oppression and tyranny, by shewing that God has punished them, in setting the King and his flatterers as ensamples for our admonition.

The doctor desires passionately, "that the royal Charles always may have a name in the calendar of our church." So it is said, St. Gilbert Heathcote, was of opinion that the day should be kept up, in order to be a memento to all future Kings, that they split not on the same fatal rock... in which sense it may have its use, but not surely by an absurd "common memoration of him, as among the first saints and martyrs for the gospel of God, who by his exemplary virtues adorned the Christian profession—and who lost his crown and life in defence of apostolical Episcopacy." Thus wildly raves the doctor in a paroxysm.—A first saint and martyr for the gospel of God!—Let who can, make common sense of the expression.—a first saint for
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for the gospel!—And how it comes to pass that our diocesan episcopacy is apostolical, if the doctor is able to shew, there is not another man in all the world can do it.—Let any one compare the New-Testament writings, with the Laudean system and plan; and if he can find the least resemblance, I will engage to prove the propriety of calling Sepulchre a faint, and the vicar of St. Sepulchre, a man of a clear head, and of good understanding.

The true character of Oliver Cromwell, he says, we have from an address presented by the Anabaptists to King Charles the second, before his restoration; and he refers us to Lord Clarendon's History 8vo. Vol. vi. p. 629.

With as much reason might the doctor have referred us to a man in an high fever, to learn from him either his own character, or that of his neighbour. Did the doctor never read, that in the year 1657, the project of some Anabaptists to kill Oliver Cromwell was discovered: when Major-General Harrison, Vice-Admiral Lawson, Colonel Rich, Major Danvers, and some others, all Anabaptists, on suspicion of being concerned in the conspiracy, were put under an arrest?—I take it to be the address mentioned by Rapin, in 1658, made by several Independents, Quakers and Anabaptists, wherein they supposed the death of Cromwell to be near; which seemed to
to intimated a design to assassinate him.—No marvel that they speak reproachfully of him.

The curses poured liberally since that time on the ashes of Cromwell, because of his decollating Charles the first, have little reason to countenance them; for he was put under a necessity of doing it for his own security and safety, as well as that of the public.—But why should this be imputed as a national guilt, any more than that of Queen Elizabeth's taking off the head of Mary?

Like parrots, many without meaning, affect to talk of the guilt of Charles's blood, lying heavy on the nation; and as having had no expiation for this hundred years.—But was there no atonement made in the reign of his two sons? heavy, intolerably heavy were the grievances these kingdoms groaned under in those reigns! which one would have thought sufficient to balance the guilt of the nation, in refusing or rejecting the heavy yoke of their father.

But why should the blood of Charles the first only be lamented with such briny tears, and divine judgments deprecated on that account, whilst no notice is taken of the attempts made to destroy James the second? for says the letter-writer, before-mention'd, "every bullet shot at the Boyne was a killing the King, and he might thank not his subjects, but his own heels, that he was not actually killed."

But
With what face then can it be said that the vengeance of God hangs over us, on account of the scenery of 1648; when we have enjoyed almost ever since 1688, the blessings of liberty, unknown in the former reigns of the Stuarts; and the security of our rights and properties, together with the free and impartial course of justice, blessings unknown from the beginning of James the first, till the end of James the second.

If we would not mock God, we shall be thankful that he has never set over us such a prince, as the man was, whom Cromwell beheaded.

The freedom which the doctor has taken with the Senate of the nation; with men, most generally, of the established religion, who bravely opposed the King in his measures to enslave and ruin the whole constitution; the freedom will be treated with a just indignation by all those, who have any just sense of liberty, or of the rights of a free people.

But was it possible that the doctor's audience could with decency hear him enumerate the methods made use of to supplant the ecclesiastical constitution?—There is an endeavour at being very witty in the enumeration—"a liberty of doing what?—why of establishing their own systems—shall I say "Arrian or Socinian systems."

Could the doctor mean any thing by the question, "shall I say Arrian or Socinian systems?"
"systems?" did he intend to be understood that in the time of the inter-regnum, when the Episcopaleans were unhors’d, or thrown out of the saddle, that the Sectaries, as he calls them, were making such an attempt?---If he did not intend to be so understood, he unpardonably trifled with his audience: and if he did intend that they did, there is room enough given to question whether he ever read any one history on the times? but if he has, we may call in question his having understood any one thing he has read.---When, and where was there an establishment of, or an attempt to establish the Arrian (Arian) or Socinian systems, during the whole inter-regnum?-----

He goes on---"a directory perhaps---or "a communion service, with a plain but not "a full account."---

This is very droll! a magazine of wit blew up here! for this, Sir, you see was design’d to ridicule the Bishop of Winchester’s treatise on the sacrament. A plain, but not a full account.—Swelling vanity! will the doctor promise his audience to expose the defects of that performance?—It is to be feared he is too much a novice in divinity for the task.

He dances a long—"or a catechism "composed by an assembly of judicious divine to ground children well in the most "edifying doctrines of Calvin."
Never did a majestic Bull, with a more scornful air toss over his head the little dogs that bay'd at him, than the doctor has rallied the assembly of Westminster Divines, for their contemptible catechetical performance. — Perhaps, Sir, the comparison may offend you: but stay a moment, and I will shew you the suitableness of the choice. — You plainly discern that the doctor would represent the catechism as a most pitiful, low, childish composition; "from its being design'd to ground children well in the "most edifying doctrines of Calvin." Here-in lies the horns of his sneer; or the whole force of his burlesque, and outrage comitted upon it! at which, perhaps, some of the audience might be diverted, full as much as if they had been at a bear-garden.—But nothing could have made the declamer more ridiculous; because it so happens, that the articles of his own adored establishment, are such as suppose, that all who subscribe them, are judicious divines, well grounded in the most edifying doctrines of Calvin.

Do you think the doctor could have made his own ignorance more conspicuous than he has done? for whilst he has been disdainfully pointing at the poor divinity, and rich edifying enthusiasm of the Westminster Assembly, he has been pushing at the eyes of his own venerable mother! for all the doctrinal light she gives in her thirty nine articles, is upon the
the system of Calvin.—Could any priest have
levell'd his burlesque more unhappily?—had
not the doctor been a graduate in divinity,
some excuse might have been made for him;
but as it is, there will be difficulty in apolo-
gizing for him: only one thing is in his fa-
vour, he had his degrees, if I don't mistake,
from an university,—that is not over nice or
too critical in the qualification of a man in
this science. It is not very material whether
he knows what is meant by Arianism, So-
cinianism, Calvinism, Arminianism, or Pelagi-
anism; if he can but understand the way of
subscribing blindfold, and of defending the
church as by law established! if he is
but well versed in the flowers of church-
rhetoric, and be able to pour contempt on all
dissenters, as Hereticks and Schismatics:—add
to this, if he has but some acquaintance with
the classicks, and is somewhat versed in scan-
dal, which gives an orator that boldness of
speech, so edifying on the 30th of January:
he may depend upon a degree.
The doctor informs us, "as soon as these
" licentious principles had their desired effect,
" wise and good men saw with grief a disor-
" derly rabble of Enthusiasts scrambling for
" power in every part of the kingdom;
" while the Papis stood by and laughed at
" the confusion."—I have heard that the
doctor is often absent, I partly believe it,
and can make a farther judgment of him, viz.
C

he
he does not see any thing, but through church-spectacles.

These licentious principles, were, it seems, "a liberty of establishing Arrian or Socinian systems.—Perhaps a directory—or a communion Service, with a plain but not a full account—or a catechism composed by an assembly of judicious divines to ground children well in the most edifying doctrines of Calvin."

Well; what of these? why as soon as these licentious principles had their desired effect, wise and good men saw—who were they? the displaced clergy. What did they see?—they saw with grief a disorderedly rabble of Enthusiasts scrambling for power in every part of the kingdom; i.e. they saw others attempting to divide and share the spoil, which they themselves had just been deprived of. Clamorous about offices, lands, or livings; about who should make the most of their interest, in that new state of things. And undoubtedly, those wise and good men, who had been served with a writ of ejectment, saw it with grief.—But what is all this to the purpose? if the establishment, and its emoluments have their original from the civil-power, as might be demonstrated, it is most convenient for that power which is supreme, to employ its own favourites, whether it be to day monarchy, to morrow aristocracy, or on the next day democracy. And though the wise and good
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good men grieved at the change of their circumstances, they might thank themselves for it; because had they acted conformably to the nature of a civil establishment of religion, they should have changed with the times, and submitted to the powers that then were. The true blue high-church principle, non-resistance, and passive obedience, taught in the reigns of the blessed Stuarts to the purpose of extending the royal prerogative to a despotic and arbitrary rule! so happily revived in the day of the more than famous Doctor Sacheverel, who deserves a name too in the church calendar; this principle should have made them all Vicars of Bray. The clergy, after the execution of 1648, ought to have been subject to the highest power: for it was a vain thing in them to expect that when the former head of the church had lost his head, that he could yet remain, over all causes ecclesiastical and civil, supreme! And in as much as no civil establishment of religion can subsist any longer than the civil power is able and willing to support it; when there is a change of maxims introduced in the civil power, and an ability of giving energy to that change of maxims, the establishment must of necessity suffer a change also—as you well know, Sir, was the case in Henry the eighth's reign: after that, in the reign of Queen Mary: again in the reign of Elizabeth: and the change was nearly affected in that of James the second.
Scotland can also witness to the truth of this observation.

"The Papists, says the doctor, stood by and laughed at the confusion." The fact is mistaken; with the leave of the good doctor, the time of their laughing, was whilst they had Charles under their thumbs, and could make use of him to the purpose of spilling seas of protestant-blood in Ireland and England.---but in the time of Cromwell's protectorship, their laughing season was over: it was rather the time of their panic; fear and trembling seized them: for Oliver made the Vatican itself shake with the terror of his power.
The reign of the Stuarts has been the merriest season which the Papists have ever known since their line begun.---They had almost gained the Horse-laugh in the last years of Queen Anne's reign: and what can divert them more, for half an hour, than such 30th of January sermons as this before us?

The doctor gives his advice in the most priestly manner, to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, of your great city.

"The only sure method, that I know of, (with the blessing of God) to prevent all such disorders and confusions for the future, is for the members of the established church to look upon the test act as an essential—most sacred—most inviolable law."
Had the parentheses been omitted, one might have read his opinion without any emotion, because very agreeable to the high-church system. But surely the doctor was quite bewildered, or he would not have inserted the parentheses. There is something absurd and unnatural in it.—with the blessing of God.—The only sure method, that I know of, (with the blessing of God) to prevent. It runs much smoother when read without it, the only sure method, that I know of, to prevent, &c.

Is there not impiety in the doctor’s supposing that God can bless a measure, which the very design of the institution of the Eucharist condemns? Can he bless the licence taken of prostituting a religious ritual to civil purposes?——The doctor had much better have said, the only sure method that I know of, with the blessing of the god of this world, i.e. with the blessing of the worldling’s God, upon which we may depend, as far as the method can avail us of success.—“the tell-a-lie, in this light should be look’d upon as an essential—“most sacred—most inviolable law.” But it is enough to make the devil laugh, to talk of the true God blessing a scheme, productive of success and prosperity to his own hellish empire.—

The friendly doctor after the advice, gives his audience a delineation of the spirit of a good churchman.

“No good churchman desires to afflict or grieve his weak brethren whilst they keep
"keep within the bounds of modesty and "
decency, and do not offend against the civil "
peace, nor vilify the established church. "
"We do not envy them—we rejoice at their "
toleration."

Modestly said, upon my word—but why must the emphasis of weakness be laid upon
the Protestant-dissenters? This cant-language
is common in the mouth of those persons
who would be called churchmen; yet in
what doth the term secure its propriety? is it because the dissenters have less natural abi-
lities than churchmen have? or because they
are more indolent and careless, about the im-
provement of their capacities? or have they
less opportunities, means, or advantages of improvement?—or else, is it because they
will admit of no other rule of faith and re-
ligious practice but the scriptures of the New Testament, of which they will every one
judge for themselves; and stubbornly refuse
that any man shall have dominion over their conscience? If so, the strength of the church-
man, his superior ability, lies, in his sub-
scribing to articles of human device, imposed
on him, if he will be qualified for those be-
nefits which the test-act is intended to secure.
His superior strength, is, in having a form of
worship recommended and enforced by acts
of parliament; and a ministry provided for him
by the civil power.—The dissenter's weakness
will then consist, in his not having a public
conscience,
to a Citizen of London.

23

conscience, in his chusing to pay something extraordinary for the enjoyment of the open exercise of his right of private judgment, rather than conform to a civil establishment of religion.—

Unless it can be shewn, that under the instructions of an established clergy, men have inculcated upon them more just and honourable sentiments of government, a more uniform and regular scheme of moral virtue! And that in consequence of this advantage, the members of the establishment are more judicious, pious, and charitable than their weak brethren. But if nothing like this can be shewn, why should the good churchman assume the airs he does, of stiling the Protestant-Dissenters, a weak brother? Is this to keep within the bounds of modesty and decency?---Dissenters, are painted by him, in the most frightful colours; as cruel, blood-thirsty, and fond of King-killing!---The same sort of methods are made use of to prejudice the ignorant and unwary against them, that were used by the French-Priests in America, to give the natives an abhorrence of the English.---And I wonder that none of our priests, in their effusions of scandal, never thought of charging the Protestant-Dissenters with being the very murderers of Jesus, as well as of Charles. Nevertheless, their weakness lies in not owning the divine right of Diocesan Episcopacy; in not calling men Rabbi;
Rabbi; in not relishing ceremony. They are unpolite, and have no taste for church-music, singing their prayers; or for praying at all by precription.

As to the article of offending against civil peace, let the history of every great event of our nation speak out plainly as to facts, whether the weak brother or the strong one has been more guilty.—Respecting the principles of loyalty, and a sacred regard to those of the REVOLUTION, the good churchman, I presume, will not desire a comparison between the strong and the weak.

The doctor says, we do not envy them—what?—he adds, we rejoice at their toleration. It was tenderly spoken by the learned doctor, and displays a greatness of mind in the good churchman, who would not afflict or grieve his weak brethren.—q. d. we rejoice that they may worship God, as their own judgments, form'd on God's word, shall direct. We rejoice at their not being hindred, as they have been in the reign of the Stuarts, from exercising the rights essentiel to religious men and Christians.—Is this meant by toleration? Yet, would it not be a greater reason of joy, that the scandal was removed from Britain, of pretending to a power subsiding in it over the rights of conscience!—We rejoice at their toleration—a joy somewhat unseasonable—toleration to men who are the avowed, known, proved friends and patrons
patrons of liberty, both civil and religious! and who would sacrifice their lives and fortunes for the *Hanover family*!—ay, doctor, this last article I suspect is the reason of your rejoicing at their *toleration*. The enemies of this family on the throne, may please themselves in seeing the *firmly-attach'd* friends of it, *tolerated*. It sounds well at St. Omer's, and is altogether as musical at *Rome!* *we rejoice at their toleration!*— Farther this deponent says,

"But amongst all the misfortunes that "followed upon this unnatural rebellion, "there are none that we are more nearly con- "cerned to lament—than that of this excel- "lent prince's children being driven from the "help of his parental care, when they most "needed it, to wander abroad, and to depend "upon the uncertain pity of foreign princes, "in a foreign land, where one of them "learned to *serve strange gods*; the effects of "which we feel to this day."

What they would have profited under the tutorage of their father, is not so cer- "tain; but it would have been no very *strange* thing if *both* of them had learnt to *serve strange gods* from their *mother*; who, we are assured, had a great ascendant over their *father*. However as it is, one is owned by the doctor to have learnt to *serve strange gods*: this we may easily understand; but what he designs by, *the effects of which* we
we feel to this day, is not so very intelligible. There is a possibility the good-churchman might mean, that by *James the second’s* so openly avowing Popery, made room for the revolution and Hanover-succession! for I know not what other effects there are which we feel to this day. If this be his meaning, he has spoken the sense of many others of his own complexon, who don’t envy, but rejoice with him at the toleration. He should seem to insinuate, that the throne is at present not rightly filled; but remains under the curse of God! and that it will do so, till the adopted family of *James* be received.—A meaning in high vogue at one university! And probably at St. Paul’s might secretly warm the hearts of some of the doctor’s audience.

From these cursory observations, some conclusions might be drawn: such as

*First,* That the orthodox system, or the Oxonian political creed, has great honours done it in your metropolis; though perhaps there is not a more absurd one that can be conceived of by the human mind.—It stands in connexion with slavery; for tyranny is implied in the *jure divino* of Kings—and *vassalage* must be the condition of the subject.—The very gentlemen who applauded the doctor’s sermon, would curse the present King if he proceeded on the same maxims of government.

*Secondly,*
Secondly, The doctor who preached this sermon, affuredly deserves a mitre, from the compliment he has paid the royal prerogative; advancing the name of the absolute Charles, to the summit of princely glory—"the most accomplish'd prince, not only of his own time,—but in no respect inferior to the best and greatest of his predecessors" and successors."

If his present majesty King George the second be desirous of imitating Charles, in trampling upon our laws, and invading every right of the subject, there is not a clergyman in the kingdom seems better disposed to trumpet his praises, and do him divine honours than the Vicar of St. Sepulchre's.

Thirdly, From the whole drift and intention of the doctor's sermon, the reason of continuing the solemn fast is made evident, because of the beneficial purposes it may serve. It gives the preacher a most desirable opportunity of reviving the prejudices of good churchmen against the Protestant-Dissenters; and of enflaming them with a pious, devout, religious contempt, and hatred of them. It is improveable to the purposes of keeping alive the spirit of Jacobitism; and of exercising the political abilities of the preacher.

Whilst these weighty reasons have any being, it will be expedient that an annual fast be observed, for the humiliation of some mens
mens souls: and especially, whilst this family remains on the throne, the effects that we feel to this day from James the second's abdication, there should on this account be a day of bitter complaint allowed for the ease of all good churchmen. It is a day of expectation, whereupon many throw up the crudities of uncharitableness, rancour and disaffection; and without which, so much wind and fire might be pent up in the bowels of good churchmen, as would occasion a dangerous commotion in their bowels. But to be serious, and quit the laugh—The impious endeavour of churchmen to blow up the sparks of disaffection to the King and to their fellow subjects, is the truest reason of humiliation.—

By these hints, Sir, you may see a way of defending your corporation, the doctor, and the day of humiliation.

I am,

With profound Respect,

Yours,

FINIS.