

“ ticle of the Constitution ; and if not, which I must suppose  
 “ was the case, by whom, and by what authority they came  
 “ there? I also beg leave to ask the Chairman, in his cha-  
 “ racter as our Rector and Spiritual Instructor, whether these  
 “ books meet with his approval, and whether he considers  
 “ their doctrines in conformity with the Church of England?  
 “ I shall pause, my Lord, for a reply.”

“ The Rev. Dr. W. Gray, the Chairman of the Book Com-  
 “ mittee *immediately*” (mark this, reader,)—“ immediately”  
 —without asking His Lordship’s permission—without waiting  
 one moment for His Lordship to take any action in the mat-  
 ter—without exercising the ordinary courtesy due to the  
 Chair ; but “ immediately,” as if *he* were the great oracle of  
 Faith and Doctrine, “ responded, stating that the books to  
 “ which reference had been made were not admitted into the  
 “ Depository with the sanction of the Committee—that *he*  
 “ disapproved of them—that *he* considered the ‘ Office of  
 “ Chorister’ objectionable, principally for its absurdity, but  
 “ that the ‘ Companion to the Prayer-book’ contains doc-  
 “ trines decidedly opposed to those of the Church of Eng-  
 “ land.”

The Rector’s words were not exactly as the learned Doctor  
 gives them. They were, as nearly as I can recollect (and I  
 find my memory sustained by that of many other gentlemen),  
 as follows :—“ The doctrines contained in those books are,  
 “ in my opinion, not in accordance with the doctrines of the  
 “ Church of England, but *are in accordance with those of the*  
 “ *Church of Rome.*” And it was not until after he had been  
 told by the Bishop, that the Chief Justice and two other res-  
 pectable Laymen had stated that they saw nothing objection-  
 able in the book called the “ Historical Notice of the Office of  
 Chorister” (not the “ Office of Chorister,” as Dr. B. calls it),  
 that he qualified his sweeping condemnation by confining it to  
 the other book above-mentioned.

If time permitted, I could easily shew that the “ Historical  
 Notice of the Office of Chorister” is, as its name imports, a  
 mere passage of history ; and though the custom it describes  
 appears absurd enough in our day, it was appropriate to the  
 age in which it obtained, and was scarcely more absurd than  
 the masks and mummeries of the reign of Glorious Queen  
 Bess, of Protestant and happy memory, in which the gravest  
 nobles of her Court took part. Must history be silent of the  
 truth? or must we tear from its page all that we now think  
 absurd? If so, I think the History of Puritanism will be  
 sadly mutilated!