

would he have been?—Evidently in the Church, and an Apostle, without any act of fresh setting apart: *ipso facto* he is reinstated. So of the Church of Rome, or of any part of her. She was a true Church of Christ: she falls; if she repents she is a true Church. If any part (or any other branch of Christ's Church that has been brought into subjection to her and corrupted with her corruption) repents, that part, (or that independent branch) is by the fact restored to primitive privileges. If any member of that Church repent, he takes the position he would have enjoyed if his Church had never fallen;—and that not by virtue of the act of the Church which ordained him, considered as a fallen Church, as the Church of Antichrist—but by virtue of the act of Christ when he constituted the Church originally free. In a word, the Church of Rome is a fallen Church—a *Church*, but fallen. Repentance and faith restore her, and so they do any member of her body. What more plain than this?" And if this be the case with repentant members of her own body, how much more with independent branches of the Church subjected for a time to her usurped authority!

If, in the good providence of God, the Church in France were to throw off the usurpation of the Pope, and remove away the corruptions which have effaced her beauty for many centuries; if she were to assert her right as an independent branch of the Christian Church, and follow the teaching and practices of the Apostles, and not the commandments and traditions of fallible men, there would not be the slightest ecclesiastical bar or difficulty to the most unrestrained communion between the Churches of England and France. English Clergymen could, if permitted by the civil power, perform all the duties of their office in French Churches, and French Clergymen in English Churches, just as there is no ecclesiastical bar to this intercommunion between the Church of England and her sister Church in Scotland, America, and the British Colonies.