

what the members of the Church of England are bound to subscribe to. Every one of these positions he ought to substantiate before he can expect us to adopt his conclusion; instead of which, he begins his defence of the book, by presenting us with a "non sequitur" as to its authorship. The extracts, he says, are taken from Bishop Sparrow, therefore the Companion "is not the production of any mean author, or of any one in any way connected with the modern Romanizing school." But who can trace here the connexion between antecedent and consequent? Because Mr. Coster's paper contains extracts from Hooker, does it follow that his paper is not the production of any one connected with the modern Romanizing school? The *remote ancestor* of the "Companion" might have been a good Ritualist; but its *immediate father* a very unsound member of the Church of England, perhaps not a member of it at all. The question is not, whether the extracts are from Bishop Sparrow; but who was the *modern Sparrow*, that picked these feathers from the old Sparrow's nest, and glued them together in their present form? My mind is not prone to suspicion, but I cannot help thinking that he is one of those delicate birds, that have been in the habit of migrating to Rome in the winter season, for a more genial climate. Let, however, this retiring bird, who sits at present in the shades of anonymous obscurity, come forward and show his plumage; and then we will undertake to show, that whether he belongs to the old Romanizing school, or the new one, it matters not, if his Work be one of *Romanizing tendency*, which any true Protestant, one would think, might easily discern that it *is*.

Mr. Coster's next argument is drawn from *internal* sources, from the contents of the book itself. It contains, he says, "a noble extract from Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity." Be it so. There might be fifty extracts from Hooker found in the writings of Roman Catholic authors;