

the Empire, as well as the Queen of *Hungary*, I say, while he was doing all this, and perhaps more, I mean stirring up the *Bavarians* to Plots and Conspiracies, the expecting the Queen of *Hungary* to restore his Dominions, or the imputing it to her as a Crime, that she did not restore them, is past all Understanding. Did ever the Laws of Honour oblige a Person who had disarmed another in a Duel, to restore his Adversary his Sword, while he was manifestly in a Temper of attempting to do the same Mischief with it again, of the Power of doing which he was deprived but the Moment before? No, certainly; the nicest Laws of Honour require no such Thing; and whenever the Advocates for the Treaty of Union shall shew either Law or Reason, why the Queen of *Hungary* should tempt Providence, by such an Act of Rashness, I shall be ready to own that Treaty is not altogether without Foundation.

But, says the EXPOSITION, that notable Piece which drew upon you this Trouble, the Emperor did more; for he offer'd to renounce his Pretensions to the *Austrian* Succession, which would have put an End to the Dispute. But how can we be sure of that? The House of *Bavaria* had renounced all Claims, and had guaranteed this very Pragmatic Sanction before; so had the Crown of *France*, and received a Consideration for it; but they made War against the Queen of *Hungary*, with a View to dispossess her of that Succession which they had acknowledged and guaranteed. Why? because they imagin'd at the Conjuncture they attack'd her, they had Force sufficient to do what never could have been justified, if done. It is plain therefore, if any thing can be plain, that the Queen