

and was cleansed of his leprosy, he ceased, on that account, to be the man he was before,—that he ceased to be a Syrian,—that he lost his post and his privileges,—that he ceased to be “a great man with his master and honorable”—that he ceased to be captain of the host of the king of Syria. One might as well contend that a dissipated magistrate ceases to be a magistrate when he throws off the thralldom of sin and becomes a reformed character. To adopt another kind of illustration:—It is well known that, in his career of conquest, Napoleon Buonaparte overran the greatest part of Europe, and obtained the dominions of Spain, amongst other kingdoms, partly by stratagem and partly by force of arms. The Spaniards never liked the government of Joseph, whom his brother Napoleon made his King of Spain. When therefore the English, under the immortal Wellington, came to their assistance, the Spaniards gladly united with them in driving out the usurper and restoring the former royal family to their throne. Now no one contends for a moment, that the kingdom of Spain was not identically the same kingdom, when freed from the presence of the French armies, that it was before they came to Spain, although, in the meanwhile, Spain had been under the usurpation of Buonaparte. Nor would any contend that the kingdom of France was not the same kingdom, when Louis the Eighteenth was established on his throne, that it had formerly been when governed by his predecessor, Louis the Sixteenth, although it had seen great changes in the meanwhile, and few of the same men lived and acted, that had lived and acted before the bloody French Revolution. Now if this be so,—and it cannot be denied—we may surely believe the Church of England to be the *same* Church that it was when it was represented in the Council of Arles in France by the Bishops of London, York and Lincoln, although the usurpation of Rome and its accompanying errors subsequently prevailed over it for centuries. Length of time makes no difference whatever in the *principle* of the thing. If it be the same Church after an usurpation of ten years, it is the same Church after an usurpation of one thousand years. And if so, we cannot be guilty of schism. Nor can the Roman Catholics with any truth assert, as they have done, that the Church of Rome is “the mother Church” of England, and that the Anglican Church was instituted and founded, like the generality of the Protestant sects, by certain Reformers in the sixteenth century. No: at the time of the glorious Reformation, Archbishop Cranmer, and those who aided him in his good work, discovered that all the errors which were in the Church, were innovations gradually and imperceptibly introduced, and not originally or essentially belonging to the Church of England. They determined, therefore, as was unquestionably their right and duty, *not to overthrow the*

existing Ch
tracted in
beauty. A
independe
of Rome, v
than the B
tinuing pr
perstition
neous doc
and re-arr
Liturgy.
the same
same bran
In Mary
to what t
erable A
Hooper,
Deacons,
fell victim
attested v
of pure a
Elizabeth
its forme
schismatic
years of C
ped in t
Pastors.
love for
away. T
expected
ately; bu
in the en
after the
Fifth iss
Elizabeth
their oar
the Kir
schism
tinued i
that tim
the Rom
nity, ma
which v
the com
be add
the yea
land, to
till the
have r