

approve of our Bishop's examining chaplain mutilating the commencement of the burial service, than of his curtaining the ante-communion office. We most devoutly hope that the young men who pass their ordination examination under the direction of one who is himself so lax in paying due deference to the Church's solemn and unmistakable order, are otherwise too well-grounded in the plain details of future duty, to be seduced into unseemly innovation, by the force of an example which should be the model of propriety to the whole Diocese. Some few years ago, men felt amazed at the unparalleled audacity of a famous Popish practitioner of law, whose boast it was, never to have seen that Act of Parliament through which he could not manage to drive a Coach and Four. Few now are at all surprised at the cool assurance of any minister of the gospel, who wantonly walks over rubrics, and his Bishop's charges, and violently breaks through the Burial Service with the help of a Hearse and Two. It is certainly to be deplored that in our cathedral city, any of the Clergy should allow themselves for a moment to suppose, that even the innovation of horses and hearses in burial grounds can possibly justify any self-willed mutilations of the prescribed Office of Interment. We are not aware that, elsewhere than in the neighbourhood of this city, there exists a Cemetery of the United Church of England and Ireland, into which hearses are systematically suffered to enter. We venture to assert, that the most uncultivated churchmen of our backwoods, would feel shocked at the idea of driving their cattle into a churchyard, into any of those consecrated spots where

"The rude forefathers of the hamlet sleep."

Why, we ask, should the Church's well-known, ancient, and universal usages be dispensed with, the "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*"? Why should not the corpse be borne to its burial by surviving brethren in solemn procession? What an interesting testimony to the Church of England's sense of propriety is to be found in her old churchyard, Litch-gates,—those amply roofed entrances where "the corpse,"—so recently a living temple of the Holy Ghost, is reverently laid on the accustomed bier till it be borne, not by harnessed horses but by human hands, either to the Church or to the grave. Thus would she have "all things done decently and according to Order." Her "Order for Burial of the Dead" commences in this wise: "The Priests and Clerks meeting the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard and going before it either into the Church or towards the grave, shall say or sing—I am the resurrection and the life saith the Lord. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and who so ever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. St. John xi. 25, 26. I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another. Job xix. 25, 26, 27. We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord. I. Tim. vi. 7. Job i. 21." How sad to the sorrow, stricken heart must be the total omission of all these words of godly consolation! Even when "the Clerks," (alluded to in the rubric, that is, the singing clerks or choristers) are not present to assist "the Priest" in singing these opening anthems of our burial service, while the funeral procession is advancing to the Church or to the grave, and when the Priest alone is saying these solemn sentences of holy writ, how surely are Christian hearts touched, and all the better feelings within them stirred to their very depths.

It was the intention of the compilers of our prayer book that such should be the case; and we earnestly hope that St. James' Cemetery is the only churchyard in the Diocese, in which such

omission is permitted. Let the cemetery authorities look to these things, and have such painful anomalies prevented. Except it be in the case of those poor unfortunate ones, whose case we brought before our readers lately, these same authorities omit no part of "the Order for the collection of burial fees," surely then they should not take less heed that the Church "Order for the Burial of the Dead" be decently solemnized in every particular, and that the officiating clergy shall have no possible shadow of excuse for dispensing with such portions of the burial service, as are distinctly enjoined to be used without any exception whatsoever.

Literature.

The *Christian Remembrancer* for July furnishes a candid view of the monastic life, in a notice of the "*Chronicles of Abingdon*," lately published. The "*Moral Character of Story-Books*" gives occasion for some excellent practical remarks. Congregationalism is held up in its startling effects, by an examination of the Congregational Year-Books for 1856 and 1860. It is shown from those documents that nearly one meeting-house in five is without a settled minister, and that the condition of many of those which are so provided is most deplorable. Some of the descriptions are, perhaps, exaggerated a little. There is an article on a *Native Christian Ministry* for our missions, of the proper sterling stamp; one on Miss Nightingale's "*Notes on Nursing*;" and also one on the great French work of M. De Broglie, on the "*First Christian Emperors*." But we pass on to that on "*Evening Communion*," in which a zealous attempt is made to stop the progress of what appears to the writer to be a dangerous innovation. We copy a passage, which will show the drift of the article:

"Evening Communion must involve two disastrous consequences. Of these, the first is a lowering of the conventional standard of sacramental preparation. Even in cases where the Holy Sacrament is received, say once a month, and then only after a late morning service, there is a species of consecration of the preceding hours in families which gives weight to religious considerations. The family prayers contain, it may be, a sacramental allusion. The breakfast-table, if attended, is, nevertheless, left earlier than usual. There is a restraint in conversation,—an eagerness to put serious topics forward. But this tension would not be kept up in such a family if the communion were deferred until the evening. Nothing would be left to represent the relaxation and cheerfulness of the Lord's-day, if its most solemn not were postponed until sunset, and the previous hours devoted to incessant preparation. Of course, exaggerated demands in religion, as in other matters, provoke exaggerated resistance. The consequence would be a large neglect of any sacramental preparation whatever. People would go to the Holy Sacrament, it may be, in great numbers, but just as they go to an evening service. They would carry with them minds which had been traversed by all the worldly associations which are inseparable from five or six o'clock of the evening of Sunday, do what you will. They would take faculties of which the first and freshest had been offered to others, or had evaporated through weariness, or had become impossible through repletion. Imagine a worthy squire rising from his wine after dinner to attend Holy Communion in the parish church. We forbear to dwell on the picture; but the case is not an impossibility; and it is certain to annihilate the lingering, indefinite, yet tenacious sense of what is due to their nearest act of approach to God which still prevails so generally among our people. And, secondly, evening communions will tend to lower the popular standard of Eucharistic belief even more than that of Eucharistic preparation. They are intimately allied, we believe, with a Zwinglian propaganda. Even a Calvinist, if intelligent, ought to be afraid of them; for he imagines the faith of the receiver to consecrate as well as to claim the Presence received. He must be therefore anxious that that faith should be lively. A Churchman knows that the promise of Christ standeth sure, resting on a basis happily distinct from his own weakness and vacillation and numbness of spirit, and effecting its best through the inviolable power of an apostolical priesthood. However anxious he may be to make the best use of the gift of Heaven, he is well assured that it is given independently of himself. Not so Calvin. With him faith makes what it touches, and it cannot create unless it be strong, and fresh, and unimpeded. Of course a mere external covenant-act—a symbolic commemoration, involving nothing supernatural, nothing beyond the natural action of the memory, and imagination, and affections—might be respectably gone through at any time of the day. The question becomes one of social convenience when we descend to this Zwinglian stratum of religious misbelief, and we forbear to follow it. But late Communions, when ought to present difficulties to religious Evangelicals, must seem fatally inconsistent with the belief in that Presence which serious Churchmen seek and find at the altar. And, we unhesitatingly predict that when Churchmen are so unhappy as to yield to the present current of the popular pressure, their higher, better, fuller, truer belief in the blessed Sacrament will be subjected to a rude shock, and probably abandoned."