

Pontifical authority, though only eighteen years old. Cardinal Baronius, the celebrated Church historian, refuses him the title of legitimate Pope, but says that notwithstanding his corrupt morals he was still revered as the successor of St. Peter. The Church of Constantinople was at this time a prey to equal disorders, its Patriarch being a lad of sixteen, devoted to the chase and other pleasures, and selling bishoprics to the highest bidder. Great disturbances again broke out in Italy. The Pope put himself at the head of the Roman troops and endeavoured to restore order, but was at length compelled to appeal to the German Emperor. Otho thereupon brought his army into Italy and vanquished the insurgents, and then visited Rome, where he was received by the Pope with great honour, and crowned King of Italy. He then confirmed the Pope the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, reserving to himself only the rights of the supreme monarchy. Nevertheless, after the departure of the Emperor, the Pope favoured a sedition raised by Prince Adalbert against the imperial authority. Otho thereupon returned to Rome in the year 963, and the Pope took to flight. The Italian and German bishops then prevailed upon the Emperor to call a Council; at which the Cardinals brought charges against the Pope of horrible immoralities. The Pope was cited to appear, but replied by a letter excommunicating the entire Council. The Council then wrote to him again, urging him to appear before them and offer his defence, adding: "If you come to the Council to justify yourself we will defer to your authority; but if you refuse to come without having some hindrance or legitimate excuse, we shall despise your excommunication and return it upon yourself. Judas had received with the other Apostles the power to bind and to unloose; but after his crime he could bind only himself." This letter was sent to the place from which the Pope had written; but before its arrival he had disappeared, and no information could be obtained as to his place of concealment.

(135.) LEO VIII., 963-964.—The Council then unanimously chose a Roman priest by the name of Leo, who was approved by the Emperor, and at once received consecration at the hands of the Cardinals. The Emperor remained in Rome until the Christmas of 963, having previously sent away the greater part of his army. A sedition was raised among the citizens, who had become jealous of the Emperor's authority. On the 2nd January, 964, the people rushed to arms and attacked the imperial guard. Otho at once put himself at the head of his guard, and drove back the citizens, slaughtering an immense number of them. He then left the city and rejoined his army.

(To be continued.)

DOMESTIC ECONOMY.

ARRANGING FLOWERS.—Of all decorations which a house can have, flowers are the most beautiful, but much of their effect depends upon the manner in which they are arranged, and even the colour of the vase is of importance. Bright reds and blues, for instance, should never be selected, for they do not harmonize with the delicate hues of the flowers. Bronze or black vases, dark green, pure white, or silver, always produce a good effect, and so does a straw basket; while clear glass, which shows the graceful interwindings of the stems, is the most desirable of all, in my opinion. Delicate flowers, such as lilies of the valley, sweet peas and forget-me-nots, should be placed by themselves, in slender, tapering glasses. Violets should nestle their fragrant petals in a tiny china vase, and the bright-faced pansies should be arranged in flat, open dishes, and mixed with geranium leaves, which is also the only way to arrange double balsams. Flowers should never be overcrowded: a monstrous bunch made up of all the flowers that the garden could furnish, can never be elegant. If you desire to make an arrangement of many varieties, take care not to mingle hues which will surely destroy each other. Scarlets and pinks will not show well side by side with blues and purples, and light lilacs and yellows do not heighten each other's beauty, but white and green should always divide them. If your vase or dish is a very large one, and will hold a great quantity of flowers, it is well to arrange it with an eye to divisions of colours, making each half or quarter harmonious in itself, and then blend the whole with lines of white flowers and green leaves, such as feathery ferns and any delicate, small, white flowers. But every group of mixed flowers should have a vivid touch of yellow to brighten it, yet it must be tastefully mingled. It will be good practice to experiment in this way: Arrange a vase of maroon, scarlet and white geraniums, mingled with their own foliage, and add a cluster of gold-coloured calceolaria, and see how it will light up the whole bouquet. And now, after these practical suggestions, I must indulge in a little sentiment, and beg you to cultivate your flowers with a tender love, and learn to associate them closely with joy and sorrow; then, as you grow older, you will find them most cheerful companions, and think no room well furnished that does not contain them, both in vase and plant-stand.

SUNFLOWERS AND MALAKIA.—This subject received some attention a few years ago, when a conversation between General Sherman and the correspondent of a London paper, respecting the pestilential marshes around Rome, was published. The General said: "We utilize such places and make them healthy; we just sow them with sunflower-seed—common sunflower—and that does it." My own experience points to the same conclusion. Taking up the cultivation of the sunflower a few years ago, my attention was forcibly drawn to the subject of its extensive cultivation having a marked beneficial effect on the surrounding atmosphere, by the fact that one season the village near which I resided was visited by a severe epidemic of scarlet fever and typhus; many children died—one in a cottage, where the whole family was prostrated at one time not a hundred yards from my own house. All my family escaped without a touch of sickness. I had at that time about sixty very large sunflower plants in my garden surrounding the house, many of them being twelve feet high. My personal experience of the efficiency of the cultivation of the sunflower as a preventive of miasmatic fever has been fully borne out by other and worthier authorities, of whom General Sherman is one. A land-owner on the banks of the Scheldt sowed the sunflower extensively on his property near the river, with such effect that there has not been a single case of miasmatic fever among his tenants for years although the disease continues to prevail in the neighborhood. The medical men in France, Italy, and Germany believe the cultivation of the

sunflower to be effectual in removing the sources of disease. It may not be generally known that the sunflower absorbs during its growth a vast quantity of impure gases; it feeds largely by its leaves, absorbs nitrogen more rapidly than any other plant, and will evaporate as much as a quart of water daily. I am convinced that the cultivation of this much neglected plant on a larger scale would not only be beneficial, but remunerative. The fibre can be used for making paper; the ripe seed is most useful as food for poultry, especially during the moulting season; from it a fine oil—second only to olive—is extracted; the leaves are much relished by rabbits, and the thick stems may be used as fuel.—*Letter to Exchange.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

It is distinctly to be borne in mind that we do not by inserting letters convey any opinion favourable to their contents. We open our columns to all without leaning to any; and thus supply a channel for the publication of opinions of all shades, to be found in no other journal in Canada.

No notice whatever will be taken of anonymous letters, nor can we undertake to return those that are rejected.

Letters should be brief, and written on one side of the paper only. Those intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, 162 St. James Street, Montreal; those on matters of business to the Manager, at the same address.

QUIEN SABE?

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—I regret to find that the name of a minister of this city has been spoken of in connection with the authorship of the "Quien Sabe" papers. As you are aware, the responsibility begins and ends with the CANADIAN SPECTATOR office and its employés. I regret also that the paper on "Ministers' Wives" has given offence to several ladies; each of whom imagines the sketch intended for herself. The fact is that many of the sketches are English, and some of the circumstances twenty years old. Some of the portraits—notably that of "Dora"—are also composite; like the "Venus" of a great painter; one British lady who sat for part of it having been long deceased. The grotesque nomenclature and local colouring were added for effect; and to stimulate curiosity. The fact that there are different claimants for the same portrait shows that the resemblance is but fanciful.

QUIEN SABE?

"THE TORONTO PULPIT."

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—I am a reader of your paper, and am much impressed with the quality of the matter that appears in its columns. Three contributions on "the Toronto Pulpit," from the pen of a person signing himself "Quien Sabe," have recently appeared that have not a little excited my attention. Many of the ministers whom "Quien Sabe" has criticised I have frequently heard preach. But before I read his remarks I had never heard the Rev. Mr. Rainsford. Indeed, I had never seen the gentleman to know him. Although residing in Toronto during the time of his evangelistic services, my interest was never so much arrested as to feel a desire to hear him. I had heard of the success that had attended his work in London, Ontario, prior to his coming to Toronto, but even that did not cause me to think that his method of preaching had any attraction for me. It was not until I read what "Quien Sabe" had written on the subject that I felt a wish to hear Mr. Rainsford.

For the first time, then, I listened to Mr. Rainsford on Sunday the 6th instant, and last Sunday, the 13th instant, I heard him twice, and I have come to the conclusion that he is the ablest preacher that I have ever heard in the Toronto or any pulpit. It may be that I am not a competent judge, and that my knowledge of preachers is limited. That is a matter I do not wish to argue, for the most of my leisure time has been taken up in reading works that preachers are prone to denounce as being subversive of Christ and his Gospel. Buckley, Mill, Tyndall, Huxley and Herbert Spencer are never referred to in the Toronto pulpit, either directly or indirectly, that I have heard, but in terms of reproach and condemnation. I look upon these as honest men—men who have the courage of their opinions, and who are therefore worthy factors in the economy of God's providence in relation to humanity. The tendency of an acquaintance with the works of such writers is to divest the mind, at least, of bigotry. I can honestly confess that in my religion I am not sectarian, nor wedded by prejudice to the merits or demerits of any preacher whom I have heard. I judge Mr. Rainsford from an ordinary standard of intelligence. He is a young man of fine form and presence. There is action, and graceful action too, in every atom of the man's frame; that is, if I may be allowed to predicate of the atom from the action of the whole man. He is possessed largely of the stuff of which ability and greatness are made.

When first I heard him his sermon was upon the invitation of Christ to His people to partake of the holy communion. The sermon was simplicity itself. There was nothing high-sounding nor laboured about it. He had no metaphysical subtleties with which to consume time and impress his hearers with his intellectual grasp. It was not a sermon that had first been committed to paper and afterwards to memory—none of that. But in simple and earnest words, eloquent with sympathy, he conveyed the Divine invitation.

However, that was not sufficient evidence for me that "Quien Sabe" had overstepped the bounds of just criticism in regard to Mr. Rainsford. I must hear him again, and a third time. I heard him on the afternoon of the 13th to a small congregation of about fifty persons. Such a number in St. James Cathedral was the next thing to a church of empty pews. Mr. Rainsford, however, preached with the zeal of a man whose soul was in his work. From the congregation that came to hear him in the evening it was evident that few knew that he would preach in the afternoon. He preaches extempore. His language is vigorous and exact—his intonation and inflection are pleasing, and his illustrations are in accord with science or in harmony with God's truths that are not found in the Bible. For example, he spoke of the wonderful piece of mechanism (in his sermon on Sunday evening) by which a steamer is propelled across the Atlantic with its freight of souls that would suffice for the population of a small town. The exact relation of parts in the engine, and the conse-