

said he would talk to the people of Greenock, for whom Monday night of his adventures and hair-breadth escapes among the Yankees, wheeled round, and rushed up the quay, going off to Glasgow by the railway train."

**CHRYSOSTOM ON FASTING.**—After strongly exhorting the people of Antioch to prayer and fasting, he proceeds:—

"I mean not this [as] a common fast, but a strict fast; an abstinence, not only from meats, but also from sin; for the nature of fasts sufficeth not to take away sin unless it be according to the law: for the wrestler, unless he strives lawfully (saith he,) cannot be crowned." Let us then, lest, while we undergo the labor of fasting, we fall of the crown, learn how we ought to handle this matter: since also that Pharisee fasted, but after he fasted went down (to his house) empty, and without the fruit of his fasting. The Publican did not fast; and yet, not having fasted, was preferred before the Pharisee; that thou mayest learn that the utility of fasting is nothing unless all the rest follow. The Ninevites fasted, and obtained mercy of God: the Jews fasted and profited nothing, but went away blamed."

Speaking afterwards of the Ninevites, he says—  
"Dost thou not perceive that it was not fasting that snatched thee from danger; but a change of life rendered God appeased and benevolent towards these heathen?" Again: "I have spoken these things, not that we should despise fasting; for the honor of fasting is not the abstaining from meats, but the flying from sin."

"In the same homily (third *Ad Populum Antiochanum*) Chrysostom has the following admirable remark on slander:—

"Thou hast not fixed thy teeth in his flesh, but an evil speech on his soul—a wicked suspicion: thou hast injured him, thyself, and others in numberless ways; for by calumniating thy neighbor, thou renderest the bearer worse. Is he a sinner? Thou makest him easier in his sins as partaking of a common sin. Is he just? He is exalted and puffed up by another's sin, being persuaded to think great things of himself.—  
*Ch. & St. Geo.*

**EPISCOPAL COMPREHENSION.**—Under this head, the *Christian Intelligencer*, an organ of the Dutch Reformed Church, has the following remarks on the Memorial, which we quote entire, as presenting an outside view of the contemplated change in our system:

At the last General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a Memorial is presented praying the allowance of certain alterations in the Prayer Book in certain cases, and also liberty for the Bishops to licence men to preach, not in the Episcopal Church but simply on their faith in the Scriptures generally. We write from memory, not having the paper before us, and we may not be strictly accurate. But the drift of the proposed measure could hardly be mistaken. Its main features were, in certain cases, to relax the rigidity of the forms of service as now compulsory on all, and to allow ministers of other Churches to receive Episcopal orders without requiring them to adopt the entire standards of the Episcopal Church.—The object avowed, and no doubt entertained, was to do something toward removing the divisions of Christians, and bringing all who follow Christ under one and the same banner. Such an excellent object, and such an amiable spirit, of course forbid anything like harshness and severity in animadverting upon the proposition. As to the propriety of the adoption of this plan by the General Convention, we have nothing to say. That question concerns only themselves, nor could we touch it without becoming an intermeddler in other men's matters.

But the question of success in case of its adoption brings it fairly under our review, inasmuch as we belong to the party on whom this new device of promoting union is to be tried. In this light we propose to offer one or two remarks. The first difficulty in the way is, that the accomplishment of the object sought would be no gain in our view. A comprehension of this sort would be merely mechanical. It would be union without unity. There would still be great doctrinal differences, from which intestine discord must needs issue. For example, a large part of the Episcopal Church is understood to hold the objective force of the sacraments, while the non-prelatical bodies almost to a man regard this view as substantially "another gospel," so much so that on all proper occasions they warmly denounce it. Nor would they be willing to give it a quasi endorsement by entering into common ecclesiastical connection with those who avow such a

tenet. And if they were, what profit would follow? The outward disunion would be replaced by an inward one, even more sharp and acrimonious. The formal union would show itself to be a mere pretence, and the divisions of Christians would be as much a scandal as before. And this is only one instance of the many in which the attempt formally to unite those who conscientiously differ, would signally fail.

Another difficulty is found in the proposal that non-episcopal ministers should receive orders at the hands of prelatical bishops. How could they do this without a sacrifice of principle, without repudiating their existing commissions, without practically admitting what they do not all believe? We do not suppose one in a thousand would do this, and if any did, their hybrid character would go far to disqualify them for any extensive usefulness. Or, in any event the upshot would soon be the existence of another sect in addition to those already among us.

The whole scheme seems to us to proceed on a wrong basis—to seek what is impossible. The idea of uniting all that believe in the apostle's creed into one organic whole, one grand corporation, is beautiful and attractive, but chimerical. It would cost far more than it is worth. The Church of Rome is an instructive illustration of this. There we have complete external unity. The immense machine is firmly compacted in all its parts. Not a chink, not a crevice appears to the superficial spectator. Yet to those who look beneath the surface, how thin is all this varnish of unity! There is only a mechanical junction of the parts, a formal cohesion of the most dissimilar elements.

A good Armenian Methodist and a Calvinistic Presbyterian in New York are much nearer together, much more one in spirit, aim, and feeling, than are the Roman Rector of St. Ann's, in Eight street, and a Popish Priest of New Granada. Yet the two latter would boast their connection with "the one, holy, Roman Church." No; unity of spirit must precede union of body. We must be united at least as to the fundamentals of doctrine and discipline, ere the now scattered bands of Protestantism can be brought together. Unreasonable attempts to hasten it will only put the desired result further back. The best means of promoting union is to cultivate charity, to be forward to recognize Christ's people in whatever communion, to forbear and frown upon all sinister dealing, to disclaim in word and act proselytism, and to study at all times the things that make for peace. Most certainly no scheme of comprehension will effect it, and least of all such an one as is put forth by the "Memorial," alluded to, as we might easily show, but we desire to avoid saying anything which might be deemed disparaging or offensive.

ONE of the most opulent of the Amsterdam capitalists, died a few days ago, one Nijnheer Van der B—. He was during his lifetime very careful not to disclose to any one the amount of his possessions. He would not even confide in his notary. Thus, when a few years ago this worthy Dutchman—a Roman Catholic—made his will, he resolved not to permit even his professional advisor to have anything to do in its composition. In the privacy of his own cabinet he made such a division of his almost fabulous wealth as he deemed right. The document—his last will and testament—he then placed in an envelope, sealed it with his own signet, and transferred it to the archives of his notary, by whom (and four witnesses, as the law requires) it was signed, registered, and duly legalized as the will of him whose signature it bore. On his death bed he communicated to certain of his friends the fact that one of the items in his will was 250 florins as a legacy for every Roman Catholic priest residing at Amsterdam. This was no great tax upon the good man's heirs, and Mother Church required some proof of affection from her dying son. He died shortly after, and the will was opened. But the abrownness of a Dutch capitalist had been deceived. The Roman Catholic "Priests" were not mentioned in the document; the word had, by some accident, escaped the writer's pen, and "I give and bequeath to every Roman Catholic (priest, of course, included) residing in Amsterdam at the time of my decease, the sum of 250 florins," or words to that effect, thrilled on the astonished ears of the late capitalist's children, as the notary read to them their father's will. Legal proceedings have been instituted by the family to obtain a rule against the enforcement of the will, but as the error cannot be proved, the writer of it was never afflicted with an hour's insanity, and his profits will do more than meet all the claims resulting from this singular accident, it is not probable the plaintiffs will obtain a verdict. Several claims, I hear, have already

been made, and it will require about 12,000,000 florins to carry out the liberal conditions of the will. However, 40,000,000 or 50,000,000, it is said, will still be left as a consolation for his injured family.

**OUR UNITARY DIVISIONS.**—The number of the principal religious denominations in the United States is twenty. The whole number of edifices of worship is thirty-six thousand, capable of accommodating fourteen millions of people. The total value of church property is \$46,416,032. The average value of each church and its appurtenances is twenty-four hundred dollars. The most numerous denomination is the Methodist. The Baptist comes second, Presbyterians third, Congregationalist fourth, Episcopalians fifth, Roman Catholics sixth. The property of the Methodists is estimated at \$4,630,671, that of the Presbyterians at \$14,360,880, Episcopalians, \$11,261,070; Baptists, \$10,931,382; Roman Catholics, \$3,973,838; and Congregationalists, \$7,973,802.

### Correspondence.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

#### LENTEN HYMNS.

"And there are three that bear record upon earth, the Spirit and the water and the blood, and these three agree in one."—1st John, v. 8.

When mem'ry teeming with the past,  
Pours on my soul its torrent tide,  
Around the Cross I cling, and cast  
My hope upon the Crucified.

But, when I see the bleeding brow,  
And hear the loud and piteous cry;  
Still more with sin oppress'd, I bow,  
Deserving wrath—condemn'd to die.

Then o'er the scene O radiant Dove,  
Light issues from thy brooding wing.  
And from the Cross a fount of love  
Wells out its rich and copious spring.

In blood and water's mingled stream,  
Thy soul is purged from every stain;  
Beneath the Spirit's vital beam,  
The blighted earth is born again.

With one consentient voice they speak,  
One course of truth together run;  
With one coherent grace they seek  
To gather all things into one.\*

The Dove upon the Cross shall rest,  
Emblem of light and love divine;  
To weary souls the pledge of rest,  
To troubled hearts the peaceful sign.

One spark of light from that bright flame,  
One gush of love from that pure shrine  
Is all I crave—is all I claim,  
And I am Christ's and Christ is mine.†

\* Ephesians i. 10. † Canticles ii. 16.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

#### ON BOWING AT THE NAME OF JESUS

MR. EDITOR,—As uniformity in the performance of Divine Service adds greatly to its solemnity, and beauty, it is desirable that it should be maintained, as far as practicable, in our public assemblies. To give effect to our excellent and Scriptural service, it is necessary that our congregations should not only, *all speak the same thing*, and be, *perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment*, but also conform to the same rule with regard to the outward postures and gestures of the body. Having observed in several of our churches, a want of uniformity as it respects the ancient custom of bowing at the name of Jesus, and having understood that much of late has been said on that subject, and supposing that it may have arisen either from misapprehension, or want of information in some, respecting its origin and design, I have thought the opinion of some of the most distinguished Bivalists on this subject, would not at this time, be unreasonable or useless.

Of the origin of this custom, we have the following account in Bingham. "Some ask us," says he "why the Church enjoins bowing at the name of Jesus, and not as well at the name of Christ, or God, or the Holy Ghost &c., to which I answer, if there were no other reason to be given for this, but only the custom of the Church of God, that were sufficient in this case; but if we look to the first rise, and origin of this custom, a much more rational account may be given of this difference, which was this. The name *Jesus* was become a name of reproach among the Jews—they always blasphemed and reviled him by this name, terming him, by way of reproach *Jesus the Nazarene*, and *Jesus the impostor*; which terms of infamy and disgrace they endeavour to saddle upon Him, and propagate not only in India but over all the world; for *Jesus* the Nazarene, in his dialogues with the Jews, that immediately after our Saviour's death, they sent forth their apostles and emissaries from Jerusalem, to all the synagogues in the world, to tell them, that there was a certain impious lawless sect, then up and going, *one Jesus a Galilean impostor*. So that the name *Jesus*, was become a name of infamy among the Jews, whereas the