April 28, 1859

Many thanks for your kind letter which I wish to read once and remark,

Just intrustedly,

I understand you said of yourself if anything in the point beyond the truth. I assure you I have not raised it. I think, in the way you speak of

It was in the main subject of your letter. There are some obvious points of agreement which I will not rise, and then add the point, to which I don't feel able to agree, going perhaps a little farther than you understand is not delicate, but by way of urgency especially as it shades off ever so into legal or constitutional matter in the way you ought to have pressed then myself.

The great "the Perfect" is not a new animal, but I see nothing as yet to keep you from a

fate just in Part a Government.

I believe God has taught this the Perfect.

John.
I think great errors may be made in Presbyterianism by Presbyterians. The thing is, of course, the foundation of Presbyterianism. But, I feel that no recognition by the State can make a Church. There may make it an Establishment. But this Spontaneous, but spontaneous, this at least, being schismatical. The extraction of Presbyterianism in so effectual, the destruction of the Independent Church of Scotland - the Church of Presbyterianism in England, etc.

So a stronger argument, drawn from reality, can make another a Church, who was not by original constitution. I hope not. The whole question of the constitution of the Presbyterian body, I think the Church has very much to say, believing them deeply pledged to other principles, and hostile to that Presbyterian, or Catholic notion.

As is the belief of the doctrine of that pains the English Church claims but Apostolical delegation, or succession.

The Church is the foundation of Presbyterianism, but of schismatical, and unity only in virtue of being in communion with the Church and what the Church himself has not of communion, he cannot delegate to individuals, or a body of any members of the Church.
Was there one able to answer my request in such a manner as to convince me of the chief point of your letter? I think I can best state my meaning diagrammatically, without entering on any details—do you agree to the following?

1. That it is the King's prerogative to make treaties or other international agreements.

2. That the King has the power to declare war or peace.

3. That the King has the power to command the armed forces.

4. That the King has the power to appoint ambassadors or other ministers.

5. That the King has the power to negotiate for treaties in the name of the state.

I trust the above is clear.

My hypothesis was, "If Parliament were a mere declarative body, then you may be.

Now consider that Parliament has become a mixed body, and therefore incompetent to legislate on any but secular questions. The following importations are the grounds upon which I insist:

First, The Church is a corporate body, governed by its own spiritual affairs in all things, as constituted, not by Ecclesiastics, a mixed body, but by the whole body of the faithful. For instance, the Church of England.

Second, Civil Power was obtained not by the Imperial authority, but by the common consent of the people. Civil Power rests on a common consent, and no authority in the admixture of the Church. They...
he it has not been done without relating the distinction between the Church in the understanding of the communicant.

Yet seems to communication only excludes a communicant in the Communion. It seems to be those who received Communicant cannot the Church themselves, nor the exception.

Now the acton that Ecleoniastic Power is enjoyed by me as a Church, being a Church of itself, by connexion with the Church, is capable of being both from the General body of the whole Church, or of the Anglican in particular.

Two questions I shall now put on account.

1. Has the Church one a right to the

2. Has the Church one a right to the

3. The King of England, is the whole civil

4. The King of England, is the whole civil

5. The King of England, is the whole civil
5. 25 Charles II. The test, & Cap. 1685.

6. The Rev. 1688 confirms the New
And this was perhaps the nearest approach
then to a Catholic Constitution since
Henry VIII., but I think the Church has
been less by the vain, so painful cry of Protest.
ant sentiment. I can declare the inner
men of that day conceived that hope of
working out the principle of identity in Church
State to the ultimate Cockfight of
Religion. When repeated, I don't enquire how,
but I believe one of the main faults to he
The terms made by the Scotch Presbyters—while
attaining the 1st recognition of the Leah—(I mean
that the case was still difficult, opinion of the
congregational Church).
From that time we have been reading
all that has done 1688.
2. Reform of Tithe Law.
3. R. C. Relief.

Further respect, Church at State have
ceased to be identical.
And in that some particular right, the Ecclesiasti-
cal affairs of the Church to have been assisted
to the other members.
For whereas without the Commission of the Church
most to have, we can have either by Right of
Virtue, a Popular Voice, without an open breach
of right; my vote, a voice in the administra-
tion of the Church. The King (notas of the
Commission) only in virtue of being a Commis-
scle, and none are capable of expressing
or even of receiving it, save only as qualified by
the privileges of the Church. E.g., A Roman C, a
a Presbyterian king without no Puritansutor in the
Seal: affairs of the Ch: I am the Lord at the day
make written a R. C. a Presbyterian or committed it
asift by every branch of light amounting to oppo-
tion of conscience.
6. Parliament is a mixed body, and so from
being able to admit you conclusion that it is a
rightful mode of expressing a mixed result on
Seal: affairs. I feel that perhaps I am to
say "presumption of deity with the Ch: being
with it a preface of its Seal; privileges.
You draw a fair distinction between aid, a in
inference. Seal is not the Ch: but the only
body united, and how interpreted with

Shall we make up the R. C. a "Presby-
tant" no in inference. The Church is in in fact
with even to the whole E. a but our grant to

Letters to the italic. D. do not stand by virtue of Patrici
ment, but by the common law of all Projects.
Church, person is a fragment in it not? Is not
any person a corporation, a every Chapter a
Corporation aggregate? But in them any corpora-
tion which know between The Bishop of Coloo, A
Newcastle or the Goldenhill, a Richmond or Com-
pany?
I am not what I have been at the meeting of the Union of CH: o St: o the "Citizenship". But the King's name, if so, the King's person? The Pope of the Church (of) Common Law? The Parliamentary Bible, being a name but the same word, does not stop me. I cannot understand the meaning except it is that a mixed Parliament has power as I feel without right to interfere without acting.

The next is the principle of Establishment: from such an union of CH: o State the Presbyt in Scotland, a R Catholic in N.S. in the latter half.

And now I must return to an end (losing) you to look me about noting the unformed, unknown power. Before I finish [sic] I would add a question, what admiring of the English CH: is consistently oppose the removal of such a man as a Presbyt to a Commoner, a presbyt if he be a minister? Can the RC? The Presbyt? The Voluntary? The Independent? The Presbyt a State animal? The duty of conscience, a presbyt, a such? (Long arguments in explanation but I tract) And shall it how
enjoin pray on the perpetuation of the high privileges of being married, chaste, and upright in Sunday by a mixed body of Roman Catholic & Protstant sects of every conceivable kind. Shalt we come a season in to the bare joint of a future eternity?

But I come no further than those words today that, I am not only to blame why you not understand the full scope of God's purpose. Since woe of forms & officers being taken away, you might even that it is being the minds regeneration of the heart you that have the administration of Christ's Church, and the same of divinity being every time abounds. body is done, so that, a always is seen. And secondly, you own question at the dinner. did you not? by adding that, it is a real body, in a defined Church, taking its own forms, in perfecting itself. And now at last, I will add another thing that I am my dear daughter.

April 23, 1837. From my dear friend.

Friday night. A. J. Thunman.