

# The Church.

VOLUME VII.—No. 7.]

COBourg, CANADA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 1843.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCCIX.]

## Poetry.

### THIRD DAY OF THE CREATION.

Thou spakest; and the waters roll'd  
Back from the earth away;  
They fled, by Thy strong voice controll'd,  
Till Thou didst bid them stay:  
Then did that rushing mighty ocean  
Like a tame creature cease its motion,  
Nor dar'd to pass where'er Thy hand  
Had fix'd its bound of slender sand.

And freshly risen from out the deep  
The land lay tranquil now  
Like a new-erected child asleep  
With the dew of heaven on its brow  
As when in after-time the Earth  
Rose from her second watery birth,  
In pure baptismal garments drest,  
And calmly waiting to be blest.

Again Thou spakest, Lord of Power,  
And straight the land was seen  
All clad with trees and herb and flower,  
A robe of lustrous green.  
Like souls wherein the hidden strength  
Of their new-birth is wak'd at length,  
When robed in holiness they dwell  
What might did in those waters dwell.

And still within this earth resides  
A hidden power divine,  
And waiting for the day the hidden  
Till Thou shalt give the sign:  
Then sudden into light shall burst  
A flash of glory like a star,  
And this dark world around us lie  
Arrayed in immortality.

Lord, o'er the waters of my soul  
The word of power be said:  
Its thoughts and passions bid Thou roll  
Each in its channel'd bed;  
Till in that peaceful order flowing,  
They time their glad obedient going  
To Thy commands, whose voice to-day  
Bade the tumultuous floods obey.

For restless as the morning sea,  
The wild and wayward will  
From side to side is wearily  
Changing and tossing still;  
But sway'd by Thee, 'tis like the river  
That down its green bank flows for ever,  
And calm and constant tells to all  
The blessedness of such sweet thrall.

Then in my heart, Spirit of Might,  
Awake the life within,  
And bid a spring-tide calm and bright  
Of holiness begin:  
So let us with Heaven's grace  
Fall shining on its quiet face,  
Like the young Earth in peace profound  
Amid th' assuaged waters round.

REV. T. WHYTEHEAD.

### KING JAMES THE FIRST AND NEAL, THE PURITAN HISTORIAN.

(From *Life and Times of Archbishop Laud*, by J. Parker Lawson, M.A.)

It is amusing to observe the opinions which the Puritan historian indulges on James's accession.—That *persecutor* writer, determined to support his enthusiastic party at the expense of truth, fears not to hazard any assertion, however absurd or contradictory; and as Laud is most conspicuous in his narrative of this period, for the public share he sustained in the controversies of the day, a few remarks upon the following passages may not be out of place. "There had been a cessation of controversy," says Neal, "for some time before the death of Queen Elizabeth: the Puritans being in hopes, upon the accession of a king that had been educated in their own principles, to obtain an easy redress of their grievances; and certainly no prince ever had it so much in his power to compromise the differences of the Church as King James I. at the Conference at Hampton Court, but being an indolent and vain glorious monarch, he became a willing captive to the bishops, who flattered his vanity, and put that maxim into his head, 'No bishops, no king.'" "If King James," he farther remarks, "had any principles of religion besides what he called king-craft, or dissimulation, he changed them with the climate, for, from being a rigid Calvinist, he became a favourer of Arminianism in the latter part of his reign: from being a Protestant of the purest Kirk upon earth," a doctrinal papist; and from a disguised Puritan, the most implacable enemy of that people, putting all the springs of the prerogative in motion to drive them out of both kingdoms." And once more, to the same purpose, in another place, about James's accession, "The Scotch ministers did not approach him with the distant submission and reverence of the English bishops, and therefore within nine months he renounced Presbytery, and established it for a maxim, no bishop, no king; so soon did this pious monarch renounce all his former principles, (if he had any), and break the most awful and solemn oaths and vows."

The above assertions are utterly groundless from beginning to end, and this, even although I were not persuaded that future generations will yet do justice to the too-often misrepresented motives and actions of James, when those times arrive in which men will divest themselves of the prejudice of party and accustom themselves to calm and sober reflection. These statements, however, are false, on three accounts: first, because they contain a dogmatic apology for the fanaticism of the Puritans, not on facts, but on mere assumptions; secondly, because they are libels on the character of James, which are disgraceful to the writer, in his lamentations for James's departure from "the purest Kirk upon earth" because they are not supported; and because some few phrases which the monarch used in ordinary conversation, are taken advantage of, and made to do violence to the truth, and to be denied by the practice of modern times.

The apology which is here made for the fanaticism of the Puritans is remarkable. There had been no cessation of controversy before the death of Elizabeth, for the Puritans, as I have already shewn, had filled the Universities with their disputes, had been patronized by Walsingham, and had been strengthening themselves by training future supporters to their cause. If there was a cessation, it was because they had the advantage, being adepts in intrigue, they looked forward to the accession of James as the period of their complete triumph: for already did they prevail in the University of Oxford under the fostering care of Abbot, and Cambridge contained a considerable number of the disciples of Cartwright. Accordingly we find, that in the former University they held the chief influence, until Laud astonished them by his lecture of Mrs. Maye's foundation. The Puritan leaders had been industrious in circulating their principles among the people, as their works testify, and they were indefatigable in securing to themselves a vantage-ground, which they anticipated would enable them to triumph in the next reign. Knowing Elizabeth's determined opposition to them, it was not to be supposed that they would brave her power: her decease could not be far distant; they were busy, therefore, in laying the foundation on which they were afterwards to build. But not a single authority can be adduced to prove that this part of Neal's representation is supported by facts, and the slightest examination might have satisfied that writer, had he resolved to be candid, that the very history of those enthusiasts whom

he lauds so highly, is against himself; nay, he himself has written in his first volume what he directly contradicts in the second.

These statements, again, are false, because they are malicious libels on the character of James. We are told, that "from a Protestant of the purest Kirk upon earth," he became "a doctrinal Papist," from a "disguised Puritan," he became their "implacable enemy." And were there, then, no purer churches in that age than the Kirk of Scotland? and are the opinions of John Calvin the sole criterion of purity? But do the admirers of Neal require to be told that it is not so? I am persuaded that there are few Dissenters in England, the very descendants of the Puritans, who will subscribe to these assertions of their historiographer. The preachers of the "purest Kirk upon earth" had disgust, James on almost every occasion. They had insulted him, traduced the memory of his mother, had openly denounced her before his face, had made pointed allusions to her from the pulpit, had offered seditious prayers to the throne of Heaven, had preached sedition. Whenever they conclave thought proper to legislate, they did so as if that legislation were the standard of government; if the slightest opposition was made, condemnation was openly denounced: they were invariably sharers in secret plots and intrigues; continually interfering in politics, with which they had no concern; they vindicated the plots of more than one band of conspirators; they had their own share in the daring conspiracy of Ruthven, Earl of Gowrie; in a word, they declared that they were superior to the parliament, and that it had no right to enact laws without their consent, "because," said they, "our power is of God, and Jesus Christ alone is our King."

I venture to add one remark upon the Puritan historian's assertion, that James was a "doctrinal Papist," and that from a "disguised Puritan," he became their most "implacable enemy." These falsehoods are made, because James defended his own prerogative, and the Episcopal Church of England, and because he did not countenance and yield to puritanical extravagance. But James, though pedantic, and often imprudent—though at times weak, and it may be, indolent, was not deficient in political foresight, though he knew not always how to exercise it. His misfortune, and that of his successor, was the want of such able statesmen as conducted the public affairs in the reign of Elizabeth, while his partiality to favourites made him elevate some to that distinction who had no capacity for it, and disregarded others who were more deserving. But he saw the enthusiasm of his Puritan subjects; he needed "no bishops" to be his instructors; he had felt it, severely felt it, before his accession, while his rule was confined to their Presbyterian friends in the north. He saw it necessary, therefore, to assert his prerogative, to draw tightly the reins of government, and, if possible, to restrain that religious frenzy which had excited the spirit of faction. The pupil of Buchanan was not destitute of penetration, and he is called a "doctrinal papist," not because he believed in Popery, for not even the sturdiest Puritan could be animated by a greater anti-papish zeal than he, but because he became the "implacable enemy" of men who, he saw, were secretly spreading their enthusiastic opinions throughout the kingdom, to overthrow the constitution of the Church and State, and who were attempting to make Calvin the grand oracle of all theological and political science. What, therefore, was the result? Of what advantage would the reformation of religion have been to James, as a monarch and a prince, had he yielded at his accession to the demands of the Puritans? A Church in which "every man did that which was right in his own eyes," and rejected all human authority, was a nursery of sedition, of treason, of every thing, in short, which could molest and annoy, and which its preachers would not fail to defend, in their visionary themes about spiritualty, and what they termed things lawful.—These remarks, therefore, are against *private interpretation*, whether in religion or politics: it should be the voice of the learned, not of the ignorant; of the prudent, not of the clamorous and violent; and not even should it be always the former, seeing that they are alike subject to deception. The Reformation had indeed rid James of the intolerance and tyranny of one Pope; but to have yielded to Puritans, would have been to have raised up against himself a pope in every parish of England and Scotland. He had been delivered, I say, from the absurdities of one extreme, nor would he have fallen into another. And if the contest had been between him and the Bishop of Rome, if he fell, there was glory in the fall: it was to be eulogized before the Puritans, and the preachers of the north, to have yielded to them, to have allowed their fanaticism to triumph, — it was unworthy of him as an English monarch.

The Puritan historian's assertions are, moreover, proved to be false by historical facts, and are refuted by the practice of modern times. The former part of this particular I shall point out as I proceed; the latter part may be discussed in a few words. "No bishop, no king," was a favourite phrase among their party, which they faithfully repeated from James, who had jocularly used it on one occasion. But granting its absurdity, had it been seriously used, the practice of the Puritans, and indeed their language, may justly be retorted upon them with no less acrimony, for it was with them virtually, No Puritans, no freedom; no Presbytery, no true church-government; no opposition to Episcopacy, no liberty of conscience! And, let it be noted, the writer who has faithfully recorded this phrase, and his partisans who believe it true, are the very persons whose conduct displays that heated imagination which will not allow them to think with candour, and reason with impartiality. It has, indeed, been again and again asserted by the Presbyterians of the north, and the Dissenters of the south, and in this they make a most deplorable display of ignorance, that Episcopacy did not exist before it was countenanced by the civil power: that it was readily adopted by those monarchs who aimed at arbitrary government and despotism; and that it is merely a worldly hierarchy, existing solely by the support and protection of the secular arm: therefore, according to these speculators, there can be no Episcopacy where there is no monarchy—no Episcopacy where there is no civil support. The first and second of these assertions will come under my notice in another place: let me therefore make a single remark on the third, and on the natural inference which is to be drawn from the facts. In the United States of America, in which it yet remains to be shewn whether the government, or that of the monarchy of England, is the wiser and the better, notwithstanding the high encomiums which have been passed on that republicanism by certain men in this country,—under a government which professes to be a non-religion at all, but to protect every sect, however absurd and ridiculous its belief, however infidel and deluding,—in that country, where, notwithstanding

\* By the phrase, a "doctrinal papist," it must be understood, I presume, that James was a believer in the doctrines of the Romish Church; otherwise, if the Puritan historian really did write figuratively, he might have endeavoured to explain his meaning more fully. But the severity of James's treatment towards the Roman Catholics so exasperated them, that human sagacity alone enabled him to escape from the dreadful vengeance which they had prepared to execute on him and his court, in the memorable Gunpowder Plot. From his fondness for controversial learning, too, he founded Chelsea College, for the support of a number of polemical divines, whose talents and exertions were to be employed in refuting the Romish Catholics. This is the monarch whom our Puritan calls a "doctrinal papist," and a prince who "was destitute of principle, if he ever had any!"

† Kirke's History of the Church of Scotland, edited from the original MS. by C. Kirkepatrick Sharpe, Esq.

standing its many works of religious philanthropy, infidelity stalks abroad, shewing its gorgon head, and ejecting its deadly poison, there is a branch of the Episcopal Church, having dioceses and regularly consecrated bishops, who by their practice conform to every apostolical and primitive injunction—which Church, to say the least, ranks the third in point of numbers in the United States, and the first in point of the learning and moral worth of its clergy, and its conformity to apostolical truth and primitive order.—Here, then, is a church, a branch of the ancient Episcopal Church, which has bishops, where there is "no king;" and which is not only existing, but increasing in its members every year. This fact, therefore, proves the fallaciousness and ignorance of the assertion, that Episcopacy is dependent upon monarchy, and cannot prosper without it; which is refuted by Presbyterianism being now the legal establishment of Scotland, which, though professing to be republican and free in its constitution, nevertheless is closely allied to the state, and exists as an establishment by its protection from the secular power.

But there is another proof, which in a discussion of this nature, and especially in a narrative of Laud's life and times, ought not to be forgotten. I allude to that venerable and primitive, though humble and depressed communion, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, about which it will be my duty hereafter to say much in detail. This small suffering Church, in whose welfare Laud in his prosperous days interested himself so greatly, has existed since the Revolution in a state of total neglect, at which period it ceased to be the Established Church, not because William III. had any particular partiality for Presbyterianism, although a Calvinist, for he solemnly declared to Bishop Rose of Edinburgh, at the Hague, that he would preserve it, but because the bishops and clergy, from conscientious motives, would not take the oath of allegiance. Nay, this Church has not only existed without the slightest support or patronage from the secular power, but even when its clergy were proscribed and punished, if found "worshipping God after the manner of their fathers," when its members were prohibited from assembling themselves together, and when their chapels were plundered and destroyed by outrageous and ignorant mobs of Presbyterians. Nor was this the procedure of that age of strife, turbulence, and sedition, when the zealots of the Covenant drew the sword, and threw the seaboard away, but it was the procedure of the eighteenth century, and the vengeance of the government was wreaked on the unfortunate Episcopians of Scotland, as if they had been the chief ringleaders of the insurrection of 1745. The Episcopal clergy had been *rabbed out* (as it was called) from their livings on the triumph of Presbytery in 1688, nor were the insults felt which they experienced from the stern and intolerant Calvinists. But with a purpose still more malignant, more than half a century after that event, the Presbyterians made ample retaliation for the persecutions which their fathers were said to have undergone, and which they most unjustly and ignorantly ascribed to the Church. At that time, they procured edicts from the court, not only against the Episcopians of Scotland, but against their religion itself; and some of the clergy were actually imprisoned in the middle of the last century for officiating according to the established ritual of the Church. Nor was it till within the last thirty years that those penal acts were removed, which so disgracefully oppressed this humble Church, under which it laboured long, without exciting the commiseration of the more flourishing Church of England. And at this moment, what are the prospects of this our Church in Scotland? We rejoice to know that it is advancing in popular opinion, which must be the case in proportion as men become more enlightened; that it can reckon a considerable number of chapels within the five dioceses, and that it can boast of a clergy who are not, for learning, in any respect, behind their more favoured neighbours of England. Here, then, is another branch of the Episcopal Church, existing, as in a republic, without any protection from the state save toleration; and yet the episcopal order is preserved without the slightest variation.—This is a powerful argument against the maxim on which the Puritans have expatiated so copiously, "no bishop, no king."

### MORAL EFFECT OF RITUAL IRREGULARITY. (From the *Christian Remembrancer*.) (Continued from our last.)

Such being the apparent more general evil consequences resulting from a disregard of the authority of the rubric: let us now consider a few of the particulars in which this disregard is more usually manifested; and this perhaps will serve to convince us that some of the calamities under which the Church is at present labouring, if not absolutely produced, have at least been helped on, by it.

1. The neglect of the daily morning and evening service: "All priests and deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause."  
"And the curate that ministrereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministrereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him."

Now, if a man were given to understand, before he entered upon the ministry, that such a demand upon his time were expected of him—that, with such exceptions as the rubric may be fairly understood to contemplate, he is to be at his post morning and evening, not only on Sundays, but every day, would the life of a clergyman be sought, as in many instances it now is, as a life of convenience and leisure and time at command, inverting the common lot of mortal man, giving him one day wherein to labour, and six wherein to rest from his work? Would not the office of the priesthood be less covered by men of lukewarm devotion, if to "spend and be spent" in the ministry of the word, and in prayer, was not the exception but the rule?

One serious evil arising from this neglect is, that it leaves men time for employing themselves in secular matters, for holding situations at variance with the distinctive character of the priest's office. Thus, by interfering with their duties, the lay people are provoked to jealousy, and the ministers of religion forget their peculiar calling, which is to train men up to fulfil the duties of their responsible situations, and not to devote those situations themselves, and add the function of another man's office to their own.

But, there are other things, in connexion with this matter, which it will be important to notice. For, if there is any reason to believe that prayer is answered, and that great and undesired blessings flow to our souls, and others from faithful and fervent supplications, prayers, and intercessions, are not the Church, the State, and the several orders in both of them likely to be sufferers from a disregard of one of the first injunctions in the Common Prayer-book? Sodom could have been saved if only ten righteous persons had been found within its walls. What might this Church and nation have been, had the fervent prayers of not ten, but ten thousand faithful priests (to say nothing of those of their people who may have been inclined, had they been invited, to hear God's word and to pray with him) been daily offered up at the throne of grace in

the consecrated temples of the Most High? Should we see all that indifference about error, those heresies, and schisms, and heart-burnings, and hear all that fearful blasphemy which we of this day are doomed to hear and to see daily, if from the lips of holy men, each the representative of his own flock, had daily been poured forth the fervent prayer that we might "be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life?" If the cloud had been pierced with one never-failing stream of prayer, flowing as it were from one heart and one mouth, what might we not have been by this time? Why not the joy of the whole earth? Indeed, the remarkable position we still hold in regard to the kingdoms of the world, and the other branches of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, our nearness to something great, seem to intimate that a little more would have made us the glory and praise of the earth, and exalted us like Capernaum to heaven!—God grant that our last end be not like that of this infatuated city, for our neglects that are past, and the opportunities which, it may be, we have let go by for ever!

There is yet one other consequence of this particular breach of rubrical authority, which we cannot suffer here to pass unnoticed. It cannot fail to be seen how much the neglect of public prayer, as such, has tended to exalt preaching above every other religious consideration (so as, indeed, materially to injure that blessed ordinance itself so unduly magnified). Had people been only in the way of knowing that prayer was going on without preaching, they would not have come to think, as is too frequently now the case, the prayer a sort of tedious preface to a sermon. They would hardly have thought religion consisted in the mere hearing of sermons, or have fallen into the fatal and destructive snare of exalting the man, whilst they degrade the office of the priesthood; they would have saved the misery and folly of worshipping at the shrine of an earthly idol, whose fall has but too frequently proclaimed its own worthlessness and their sin.

2. Let us now proceed to consider some consequences which appear to follow from a neglect of the rubrics, in regard to the Holy Sacraments. Is it not evident, beyond dispute, that holy Baptism, from the prevalent custom of administering it otherwise than as enjoined in the rubric, and without any care whether the sponsors be communicants or not, has lost much of its importance in the eyes of men, and is thought by many to differ in a very small degree, if at all, from a mere emblematical ceremony, or Jewish ordinance hardly necessary to salvation, and certainly not so necessary as that the absence of it would imply that a man was not in the kingdom of heaven?

To convince ourselves of this, we need not ask the general opinion of persons in what light they consider a certain class of their unbaptized neighbours, and nine out of ten—(forgetting that, to be entitled to the name of Christian, it is necessary to be baptized, as well as to believe in the truths of Christianity)—would be shocked at the insinuation that they were not Christians.

When we put the door out of sight, it is not surprising to find men attempting to climb up into the fold some other way. Again, has not this disregard affected the doctrine of the sacrament? Had baptism been always administered in the face of the congregation, would those erroneous notions respecting regeneration have been so prevalent among us? Could the true doctrine, standing out as it does in prominent relief through the solemn service, have been sounded in men's ears on Sundays and holy-days, without leaving an impression of the truth upon them?

There are some, indeed, who disbelieve in the doctrine that regeneration takes place in baptism, who are yet sufficiently candid to acknowledge that the formalities of our Church uniformly hold the opposite: and such persons would gladly see an alteration made in the forms themselves; whilst others, holding the same opinion, have, with less candour, vainly endeavoured to invest the words with a meaning which they were never intended to convey, and cannot be made to bear without the grossest perversion.

By keeping the public office of baptism out of sight, contrary to the rubric, the system which darkens counsel by errors without knowledge is enabled the more quietly and surely to establish its own tradition; whereas, if the lay people were in the habit of hearing the simple language of the Prayer-book, they would be furnished, at least, with a court of appeal from the new-fangled notions of modern times, of which advantage, however, the prevailing practice of baptizing, when the congregation are not present, in too many instances deprives them. Thus, the doctrine of the Church is liable to be misconceived, and God's truth is placed in jeopardy.

With regard to the other Holy Sacrament, what consequences may have followed from the total indifference with which the preliminary rubric has been treated, it is impossible to determine, and the question is left for the consideration of the reader.

In one remarkable particular, the case in respect of this holy sacrament is somewhat reversed. The letter of the rubric is respected, but the spirit disregarded; it is made needful, by one of the later rubrics, for each parishioner to communicate "three times a year at the least," on pain, as we find by the canon, of being presented to the Bishop for negligence. Hence, in how many cases has countenance been assumed for the practice of celebrating the holy Communion just often enough to give the people a chance of escaping public censure; that is, three or four times in the year? Our children are taught that this sacrament is necessary to salvation, and that their souls are strengthened and refreshed by it: is it surprising that this teaching should be neutralized, when it is contradicted before the very eyes of men by the (till of very late date) prevailing disposition to administer this holy Sacrament the smallest possible number of times?

Can we wonder that half our people are non-communicants? Again, who can tell the consequences of the almost universal violation of the rubric, immediately preceding the prayer for the Church militant? "Then shall the Priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory, saying one or more of these sentences following, as he thinketh most convenient in his discretion."  
"Whilst these sentences are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, shall receive the Alms for the Poor, and other Devotions of the people, in a decent basin or to be provided by the Parish for that purpose; and reverently bring it to the Priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy Table."  
"And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine, as he shall think sufficient. After which done, the Priest shall say,"  
Persons, forgetting that they are under an obligation to observe it, may please to call this a trifling ceremony. Yet, trifling as it may appear to those who look no deeper than the surface, the neglect of it may involve important consequences, not obvious at the first glance. When we celebrate the Lord's Supper we are fed from His hand; the oblation of the bread and wine is the solemn act on our part of presenting to God of those good creatures which He has bestowed upon us, in order that we, by making them again His own in the form of an humble offering, may receive them once more at His merciful hand, conveying to us what they themselves symbolize—"the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

By neglecting to obey the rubric, which orders this oblation to be made, the whole of this idea is lost sight of; and here it may be irrelevant to notice, that, since no possible inconvenience could result from conformity in this instance, the disregard of it is something like an indication that obedience to the rubric, as a principle, has come to be lost sight of altogether. It is very common, in these days, to hear much declamation against manifesting any sort of regard to matters which men are pleased to call trifling. It is strange that it never occurs to them, that, in religion, trifling matters (if anything may safely be denominated trifling in religion) are sometimes so intimately connected with matters of the deepest moment, that the neglect of the former frequently involves the damage, not to say the loss, of the other. Great things are held together only by the slenderest ties; the highest results are suspended upon the most unlikely conditions.—Indeed, God seems to make things to have apparently slight connexion; and supports, in order to teach men to walk circumspectly, carefully, thinking of others as well as themselves, to touch with a delicate hand, reverentially, like those who walk among old and endeared ruins where every stone is precious; and are we not, in point of fact, actually doing this—walking among ruins—among the ruins of a spiritual temple—the frail race of man—where a careless touch—a sound or jar—may cause to fall the stones which had been once built into the spiritual temple of God? And this is not the only violation of the rubric in the Communion-service, which involves consequences more serious than at first appear. The irregularity alluded to is the mode of administering the sacred elements to which is sometimes resorted—modes, one should rather say, for in a matter of less moment it would raise a smile to compare the various methods which have been invented by ingenious clergymen to administer the holy elements to the largest number of persons in the least possible space of time. It is to be lamented, that in these cases generally one method is left untried—the weekly administration of the sacrament; and is nothing lost by this? Yes, each several communicant loses the benefit of one of the distinctive features of this heavenly feast—the individual address of the priest, which all have felt to be one of the most solemn and impressive things that occur to man in the exercise of religion.

But, to pass on, no one can tell to how great an extent the number of non-communicants (as they are called) has been multiplied by the omission of the solemn warning which the minister is ordered to read when he shall see a backwardness to attend the Lord's table. Nor can any one say how many might have been led to a deeper repentance and insight into their spiritual state before coming to the Communion, had the other ordinary address been obediently used.

The intention of those who drew up the service for the celebration of the holy Eucharist—was, evidently, that the sermon should occupy a portion, and that a subordinate portion of the service; the directions all imply as much—then shall follow the sermon."

The usual practice of the clergy retiring to the vestry, changing their vestments, and the people in their absence singing a psalm, is quite inconsistent with order. Moreover, the minister is directed, as soon as the sermon is over, to return at once to the Lord's table, and commence reading one or more of the Offertory sentences; and on Sundays, when there is no communion, concluding the service with the blessing from the altar. Such is the order, and yet the usual practice is to conclude the service in the pulpit, and deliver the blessing from thence. But the most serious inconsistency of the practice of the present day in this respect with the intention of our ritual, is the mode of proceeding on days when the holy Communion is celebrated; and it is strange, that when the service is rightly concluded on other days, this inconsistency is still adhered to on Communion days. By the rubric, when the sermon is done, the minister ought immediately to return to the Lord's table, and commence the Offertory, and present the alms, and offer the oblations of bread and wine before the whole congregation, and before any one retire. Then the children, catechumens, penitents, and other non-communicants retire, and the communicants place themselves in convenient order, as directed before the address, "Ye that mind," &c.

Such is the order: what is the practice? The minister concludes the service in the middle of it, dismisses the non-communicants with an unauthorized blessing; retires into the vestry, and returns into church, as though a fresh service were about to commence, finds nine-tenths of his congregation gone, and one Samaritan, as it were, left behind to return thanks unto God; and he collects five pounds, when he ought to have had fifty.

The evils of all this irregularity are manifest. The sermon is made too distinct and prominent a portion of the Eucharistical service, eclipsing all the rest; and, whereas the authorized mode of proceeding exhibits a silent protest against those who unthankfully refuse to come to the Holy table, the unauthorized mode not only robs them of the privilege of giving their alms, but sends them blessed and contented to their homes, just as if all their duty had been performed.

Will any one say, that it is not meant for those who do not partake of the communion to be present at the oblation? He surely forgets that the oblations are expressly the offering of the whole parish; and it is intended that they should be presented in the face of the whole congregation. It seems to be yet a question, whether the bidding prayer should be used before the sermon when it occurs in the service for the Eucharist; but, certainly, none other is authorized. In these cases, however, last mentioned, real doubts may have been entertained as to the intention of the Church. But it is gratifying and encouraging to see one spiritual Father, as in the case of the Bishop of London's charge, turning his serious attention to the matter.

EPITAPH.  
BY WORDSWORTH.

It needs scarcely be said, that an Epitaph presupposes a Monument, upon which it is to be engraven. Almost all nations have wished that certain external signs should point out the places where their dead are interred. Among savage tribes unacquainted with letters this has mostly been done either by rude stones placed near the graves, or by mounds of earth raised over them. This custom proceeded obviously from a twofold desire; first, to guard the remains of the deceased from irreverent approach or from savage violation; and, secondly, to preserve their memory.—"Never any," says Camden, "neglected burial but some savage nations; as the Bactrians, which cast their dead to the dogs; some varlet philosophers, as Diogenes, who desired to be devoured of fishes; some dissolute courtiers, as Maccenas, who was wont to say, Non tumulum curio; sepelit natura relicto."  
"I'm careless of a grave—Nature her dead will save."  
As soon as nations had learned the use of letters, epitaphs were inscribed upon these monuments; in order that their intention might be more surely and adequately fulfilled. I have derived monuments and epitaphs from two sources of feeling; but these do in fact resolve themselves into one. The invention of epitaphs, Weaver, in his Discourse of Funeral Monuments, says rightly, "proceeded from the praiseworthy feeling of immortality, implanted in all men naturally, and is referred to the scholars of Linnæus the Theban poet, who flourished about the year of the world two thousand seven hundred; who first bewailed

this Linnæus their master, when he was slain, in doleful verses, then called him *Epitaphia*, afterwards *Epitaphia*, for that they were first sung at burials, after engraving upon the sepulchres."

And, verily, without the consciousness of a principle of immortality in the human soul, man could never have been awakened in him the desire to live in the remembrance of his fellows: mere love, or the yearning of kind towards kind, could not have produced it. The dog or horse perishes in the field, or in the stall, by the side of his companions, and is incapable of anticipating the sorrow with which his surrounding associates shall bemoan his death, or pine for his loss; he cannot preconcieve this regret, he can form no thought of it; and therefore cannot possibly have a desire to leave such regret or remembrance behind him. Add to the principle of love which exists in the inferior animals, the faculty of reason which exists in Man alone; will the conjunction of these account for the desire? Doubtless it is a necessary consequence of this conjunction; yet not I think as a direct result, but only to be come at through an intermediate thought, viz. that of an intimation or assurance within us, that some part of our nature is imperishable. At least the precedence, in order of birth, of one feeling to the other, is unquestionable. If we look back upon the days of childhood, we shall find that the time is not in remembrance when, with respect to our own individual being, the mind was without this assurance; whereas, the wish to be remembered by our friends or kindred after death, or even in absence, is, as we shall discover, a sensation that does not form itself till the social feelings have been developed, and the reason has connected itself with a wide range of objects.—Forasmuch, and cut off from communication with the best part of his nature, must that man be, who should derive the sense of immortality, as it exists in the mind of a child, from the same unthinking gaiety or liveliness of animal spirits with which the lamb in the meadow, or any other irrational creature is endowed; who should ascribe it, in short, to blank ignorance in the child; to an inability arising from the imperfect state of his faculties to come, in any point of his being, into contact with a notion of death; or to an unreflecting acquiescence in what had been instilled into him! Has such an unfoldment of the mysteries of nature, though he may have forgotten his former self, ever noticed the early, obstinate, and unappeasable inquisitiveness of children upon the subject of origination? This single fact proves outwardly the non-straightness of those suppositions: for, if we had no direct external testimony that the minds of very young children meditate feelingly upon death and immortality, these inquiries, which we all know they are perpetually making concerning the *whence*, do necessarily include correspondent habits of interrogation concerning the *whither*. Origin and tendency are notions inseparably co-relative. Never did a child stand by the side of a running stream, pondering within himself what power was the feeder of the perpetual current, from what never-wearied sources the body of water was supplied, but he must have been inevitably propelled to follow this question by another: "Towards what abyss is it in progress? what receptacle can contain the mighty influx?" And the spirit of the answer must have been, though the word might be sea or ocean, accompanied perhaps with an image gathered from a map, or from the real object in nature—these might have been the *letter*, but the *spirit* of the answer must have been as inevitably,—a receptacle without bounds or dimensions,—nothing less than infinity.—We may, then, be justified in asserting, that the sense of immortality, if not a co-existent and twin birth with Reason, is among the earliest of her offspring; and we may further assert, that from these affections, and under their countenance, the human affections are gradually formed and opened out. This is not the place to enter into the recesses of these investigations; but the subject requires me here to make a plain avowal, that, for my own part, it is to me inconceivable, that the sympathies of love towards each other, which grow with our growth, could ever attain any new strength, or even preserve the old, after we had received from the outward senses the impression of death, and were in the habit of having that impression daily renewed and its accompanying feeling brought home to ourselves, and to those we love; if the same were not counteracted by those communications with our internal being, which are anterior to all these experiences, and with which revelation coincides, and has through that coincidence alone (for otherwise it could not possess it) a power to affect us. I confess, with me the conviction is absolute, that, if the impression and sense of death were not thus counterbalanced, such a hollowness would pervade the whole system of things, such a want of correspondence and consistency, a disproportion so astounding betwixt means and ends, that there could be no repose, no joy. Were we to grow up unfostered by this genial warmth, a frost would chill the spirit, so penetrating and powerful, that there could be no motions of the life of love; and infinitely less could we have any wish to be remembered after we had passed away from a world in which each man had moved about like a shadow.—If, then, in a creature endowed with the faculties of foresight and reason, the social affections could not have unfolded themselves uncountenanced by the faith that man is an immortal being; and if, consequently, neither could the individual dying have had a desire to survive in the remembrance of his fellows, nor on their side could they have felt a wish to preserve for future times vestiges of the departed; it follows, as a final inference, that without the belief in immortality, wherein these several desires originate, neither monuments nor epitaphs, in affectionate or laudatory commemoration of the deceased, could have existed in the world.

Simonides, it is related, upon landing in a strange country, found the corpse of an unknown person lying by the sea-side; he buried it, and was honoured throughout Greece for the piety of that act. Another ancient philosopher, choosing to fix his eyes upon a dead body, regarded the same with slight, if not with contempt; saying, "See the shell of the flow bird!" But it is not to be supposed that the moral and tenacious-hearted Simonides was incapable of the lofty movements of thought, to which that other Sage gave way at the moment while his soul was intent only upon the indestructible being; nor, on the other hand, that he, in whose sight a lifeless human body was of no more value than the worthless shell from which the living fowl had departed, would not, in a different mood of mind, have been affected by those earthly considerations which had incited the philosophic Poet to this latter view. It may be assured that, if he had been destitute of the capability of communing with his own thoughts that appertain to human nature, he would have cared no more for the corpse of the stranger than for the dead body of a seal or porpoise which might have been cast up by the waves. We respect the corporeal frame of man, not merely because it is the habitation of a rational, but of an immortal soul. Each of these Sages was in sympathy with the best feelings of our nature; feelings which, though they seem opposite to each other, have another and a finer connection than that of contrast.—It is a connection formed through the subtle progress by which, both in the natural and the moral world, qualities pass insensibly into their contraries, and things revolve upon each other. As, in sailing upon the orb of this planet, a voyage towards the regions where the sun sets, conducts gradually to the quarter where we have been accustomed to behold it come forth at its rising; and,