

and it, the  
ing within  
however,  
the whole  
lieve, one  
which could  
an who has  
also, that  
mpire than

o counter-  
ions, it is  
deprecated  
e, in the  
be found  
well as to  
parties so

e in ques-  
tion of a  
one which  
nt year, of

appointed  
the 203rd  
The Arch-  
SERVICE,  
edraal, and  
riffs."

ebec was  
all Choral  
rmed by  
Church,  
ice, have  
fully and  
o procure  
n expen-  
d, Lon-  
ir hands,  
Floria in  
even in

*parochial use appointed to be sung or said* (in some of the instances, *said or sung*.) They may also see, in the order for the *burial of the dead*, that the *Priest and Clerks*, preceding the corpse, are to *say or sing* the introductory sentences of that service.

I have only two more remarks to make. First, that even if any persons among us hold the usage here in question, to be objectionable, they can hardly regard it as an honest part to smother and keep it out of sight as if the Church of England did not own such a practice. For a condemnation of the Choral service, whether well or ill founded, undeniably and of necessity, involves a *censure upon the Church of England*, and as such we must deal with it: we cannot, consistently with common truth, attempt to make the Church more acceptable in other quarters, by *suppressing* the fact that this service is a part of her system.

Secondly, that it seems to me very undesirable to encourage that unenlightened and undiscerning Protestantism, (for I find it impossible to regard it as having any other character,) which confounds with superstitious practices or leanings, certain accessories and circumstantial attaching to the English ritual, and in some instances to that of the continental Reformation in Europe, which are not essential parts of Religion itself, but which have venerable claims upon our regard, many of them retained from the remote ages of a Christianity still pure and sound before God,—and which are wisely adapted to promote reverential and devotional effect in public worship. It looks like a want of safe and clear discrimination, a *defective apprehension* of the *real nature* of the anti-Scriptural errors repudiated by *Protestants*, as such, and of the *grounds* of that repudiation, to suppose that the use of a surplice, (for example) or the intoning of portions of the service, are things of the same stamp with those errors, or falling within the same category. We might, exactly, upon the same principles, raise an outcry against the use of bells—against steeples or arched windows in Churches,—still more against the revival, in all the branches of Protestantism, of mediæval architecture in places of worship,—or against a black habit as the ordinary dress of Ministers, all of which are derived to Protestants through the Church of Rome. This subject is much too large to enter upon here: but I am bold to say that the world has seen few