

ly consented to be
d women's work in
ildings opened last
bridge, Mission by
e Duke of Clarence
d her great interest
rk.

bers went down to
election. Each had
d his time and call
l for the Conserva
r Master won the
Conservatives and
ted moral to adorn

ed by the Bishop of
Lebombo has been
dmund Smyth, who
y in the adjoining
Mr. Smyth, the
hurchman. Before
Curate of St. Mary-
t. Peter's, London

to the secretary of
h of England Tem-
t see why total ab-
ensing plan, which
ourg system. He
ediction of God, the
ll result in the re-
house system, and
e people a joy and
resent, in no small

a daily visited the
inster Abbey. It
protect the many
e around it. The
has been laid over
tomb a magnificent
ur feet high, com-
ed on one arm by

of Uganda by the
s been ordered by
eans abandonment
s, and imperilment
erts. Surely a sad
rated by the noble
in the action of the

l Bristol, speaking
Bristol on Wednes-
ll that there should
ad Nonconformists
come about in His
ver be hastened by
tion, and still less
vital principles of
l in the historic, or
postolically-derived
union they must be

ch to the London
tes that a mob of
sh missionaries at
use of the Rev. Mr.
job and completely
wife had a narrow
of the bloodthirsty
ve been killed had
als intervened for

nce.

ons will appear over

r the opinions of our

or a Christian senti-
from facts, useful to
e would solicit their
tters in this depart-

atty notes upon the
ve that every one
st sometimes wish
k-letter series, but
e other day. There
and we are always
Thom give any au-

thority for stating that about the Martinmas season in former days "the cattle are killed for storage during the winter months," or can he give any reason for believing that this was anywhere the case? The legend of St. Martin has nothing to do with the pickling of beef, and I have never found any authority, beyond supposition, for connecting the season with the curing business.

JAMES GAMMACK, LL.D.
East Toronto, Nov. 7th, 1892.

Mr. Wilson's Indian Homes.

SIR,—The Bishop of Algoma's letter in a recent issue of the *CHURCHMAN* conveys, I think, the impression that in leaving the Indian Homes at Sault Ste. Marie, I am depriving them also of the support which they have hitherto received from our friends in England. I should be exceedingly sorry for any such impression to go abroad, as, since I decided finally on giving up my Indian work on account of repeated attacks of ill health, I have been using every endeavour to leave them in a satisfactory condition when the time comes for me to withdraw. I think most of your readers know how thoroughly my heart has been in this work ever since its first inception, and I think it is scarcely kind even to infer that I would be willing to throw the Homes overboard and feel no care or interest about their future. As matters stand at present, our English secretary and English treasurer, who have both tendered me their resignations, are just waiting until they can hear what person or persons appointed by the Bishop will relieve them of their duties. I am at present staying a few days with my son at Elkhorn. He has 58 pupils in residence, and his Homes seem to be prospering; but I regret to say that he is himself laid down with an attack of typhoid fever, brought on by overwork and anxiety. Those who have not actually engaged in this Indian school work little know what a tax it is upon one's energies and strength and patience, and then when added to this there is a debt of several hundred dollars staring them in the face and nothing to meet it, no wonder that one is driven almost to the verge of despair. I do most earnestly hope and pray that some help may be shortly forthcoming, both for our recently established Homes at Elkhorn and also for the old original Homes at Sault Ste. Marie.

E. F. WILSON.

Church Quarterly Review.

SIR,—Having been a subscriber to this excellent high-class periodical since its first issue 17 years ago, I beg the favour of your printing the accompanying letter that has come with the latest (October) number. The letter will speak for itself. This much I may say, that I know of no other, and certainly no better Church journal, treating of all manner of subjects of interest to our thoughtful laymen, as well as to the clergy, more deserving of general support. The writers of the articles in the *Church Quarterly* are among the most learned scholars of the Church of England, and avowedly not party men. In these days when startling theories about all things sacred are being propounded by fanciful scholars—by an "acrobatic criticism which is more sensational than sensible," it is surely well to have the speculations and opinions of believers and unbelievers alike reviewed for us calmly by wise and trusted students. These men are able to winnow the wheat from the chaff; and it would repay such gentlemen as the chancellors of our dioceses, judges and other learned persons, who happily take an interest in questions affecting Christianity and the Church, to make *Church Quarterly* part of their Sunday reading. They may be sure of not having any rubbish put before them in the variety of subjects dealt with, while in the "Short Notices" they would have constantly presented very readable summaries of the best and newest publications of which otherwise they may never hear. I have no doubt that we have an intellectual class of Churchmen in this country who would fully appreciate the *Church Quarterly*, if only it were brought to their notice. The names of the Dean of St. Paul's, and the eminent Chairman of the House of Laymen, are a sufficient guarantee of the high character of the periodical, the discontinuance of which (as they say) would be indeed "a great loss to the Church of England." I feel I am only doing my duty in writing this, and requesting the publication of the following letter.

T. BEDFORD-JONES, LL.D.
Archdeacon.

Brockville, Nov. 4, 1892.

New-street Square, E.C., Oct., 1892.

DEAR SIR,—We believe that you value the *Church Quarterly Review*. For 17 years it has had a series of articles which we are satisfied have been very useful in the interests of the Church. We find there is a general impression that the circulation is more than sufficient to pay its expenses. We regret to

say this is not the case; for some years a committee of its supporters have had to provide a small guarantee fund to make both ends meet. It is impossible for such a state of things to continue indefinitely, and as we are satisfied that the *Review* is doing a good work, and that its discontinuance would be a great loss to the Church of England, we feel constrained to make the present state of things known to those who we believe would exert their influence to obtain new subscribers, or who would, if not subscribers already, become so.

The additional number of subscribers required is about 200. It would need very little effort on the part of our friends to obtain that additional number. We therefore bring this matter under your notice in the hope that you will assist us.

R. Gregory, Dean of St. Paul's, chairman of the proprietary body; G. A. Spottiswoode, publisher; C. Knight Watson, hon. treasurer.

Intoning.

SIR,—Mr. A. Bisset Thom, in his contribution to the discussion in the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN* on "Intoning the Prayers of the Church," begs the question on more than one point.

1st. He defines "intoning" as "monotoning on an unnaturally high note." Now, "monotoning" may be on any note in the voice register, and is confined to no particular note, high or low. As a matter of fact, musicians select G usually for the purpose because A is too high, and F is too heavy.

2nd. He declares the "monotone" to be "irreverent and ridiculous." This is a matter of taste or opinion, but many millions of persons deem it to be neither unnatural, irreverent or ridiculous—on the contrary, the vast majority of his fellow Christians and a very great number of educated persons, including Mr. Clifford Harrison, whom he styles "a well-known and fashionable reciter," deem the intoning of the common prayers to be both "natural and reverent." I would remind your correspondent that schoolmasters find the "monotone" the only effective method for the common recitation of a multitude of persons (children in this case), gathered together; also that every reader and speaker in great buildings finds himself more readily heard when speaking or reciting, if not in an absolute monotone, at least with very slight intonations of the voice.

3rd. He begs the question when he says that "clergymen's sore throat" is due to the practice of reciting in monotone. Experience has long shown that the said "sore throat" is generally due to the uneven strain upon the vocal chords, in the case of those who do a great amount of public speaking on Sunday, and none at all during the six week days. Clerical sore throats are almost unknown in that class of clergy who follow the instructions of the Prayer Book, and say the prayers and lessons of the Church in public, daily. Again, Mr. Bisset Thom asserts that hardly 5 per cent. of the clergy read the prayers either with expression or sense. But who is the judge? Is your correspondent? Then it is good as his opinion, but no further. Anyway this is largely a matter of taste and fancy. Mr. Thom might have made a wider statement on another line, and with greater certainty, viz., that probably not one per cent. of the educated men of the world are good readers. Anyway the Church distinctly instructs her clergy to say the prayers, to read the scriptures, and to preach the sermon (see rubrical directions in the Book of Common Prayer). Those ministers who say the prayers (not read them), who read the scriptures (not oratorize them), and who preach the gospel in their sermons, give to their voices and to the ears of the people that varied and most pleasing variety of tone which Mr. Thom is seeking after. The truth is, in this case, that your correspondent falls into common error on the subject of "public prayer."

He evidently misses the object for which common prayer in the church is put into the mouth of the clergy. The common prayer of the congregation in church is not meant for the instruction of the people, for the people know them quite as well as the clergyman, who is simply their leader in prayer; nor are the prayers meant for the instruction of the Almighty, and, therefore, being addressed to Him, they form a most inappropriate field on which to display oratory or rhetoric. Mr. Thom can easily put his theory to actual test. Let him visit a congregation of the Church of England, where the prayers and psalms and versicles are read oratorically, or conversationally, and mark the volume of part taken there-in by the people. Then let him visit a congregation where the same common portions of the service are said in monotone, and mark again the volume of the share taken in them by the people—a few such visits will soon totally upset his theory on the subject of "intoning." If, however, he desires to hear great volume of sound by the congregation, let him visit a church where it has been the custom for some years to vary the monotone of saying the prayers by "intoning," that is, saying them with intonations, commonly, but erroneously called "singing the prayers."

The instances quoted of blunders in accentuation in the Creed and the Absolution are entirely irrelevant to the subject of "intoning." Nevertheless, in them he is hypercritical and pedantic. Let him try to read, or say, or sing, the phrase "He rose again from the dead," and he will find how extremely difficult it is, requiring an almost unnatural effort, to repress the emphasis on the word *again*. Even if the ministers who lead should pronounce this according to the criticism of Mr. Bisset Thom, the congregation would quite drown out his correct accentuation. I hardly think that this blunder has yet seriously affected, as your correspondent assumes, the Christian's faith. Lastly, his quoted blunder in the use of "He" in the Absolution is very far-fetched. It is a question of grammatical construction that no excess or defect in "tone" can in any way affect.

CHAS. E. WHITCOMBE,

Hamilton, Nov. 4th, 1892.

Notes and Queries.

Letting Down the Sack through the Roof.

Ans.—We are much pleased that Mr. Bloomfield has criticised the account in "Notes and Queries," and hope he will often return. What appeared on Oct. 13 was in great measure written offhand, but more extended reading has only confirmed the proposed view. It is not known under what conditions the miracle on the palsied man took place; if this were known, there would be no further question. We only make a probable suggestion, as many others have done with more or less probability, and try to meet all the objections. That we give nothing new, we may quote from Dr. Smith's *Smaller Bible Dictionary*, p. 222: "Around part, if not the whole, of the court is a verandah, often nine or ten feet deep, over which, when there is more than one floor, runs a second gallery of like depth with a balustrade. . . . The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and taking off a portion of the boarded covering of the verandah," &c. The tile (*ceramos* and *tegula*) was well known for covering a roof, and made of clay, as it is now in the West. St. Mark ii. 4 says the four bearers "uncovered the covering where he was, and having dug through they let down the bed." St. Luke v. 19, literally translated, says, "Ascending to the roof they let him down in his bed through the tiles into the midst before Jesus." It is true that in poor rural houses the roofs are commonly, but not always, flat, and are usually formed of a plaster of mud and straw laid upon boughs or rafters (Smith, p. 222), but this could not have been a small and poor house (St. Mark ii. 1; St. Luke v. 17). Again Seneca tells us that the Romans formed artificial gardens on the tops of their houses, which contained even fruit trees and fish ponds (Smith's *Greek and Roman Antiquities*, p. 497), but, however true, this does not assist us in understanding the miracle. The Jewish house had usually a flat roof, surrounded by a parapet, and covered with a hard cement or indurated clay. All the conditions appear to be fully met by the bearers coming up to the flat roof, removing first a portion of the parapet and then a few of the tiles covering the verandah. It would be easy, expeditious, and not unseemly. The only difficulty is the strong word in St. Mark ii. 4, *exorizantes*, which appears to be met by the digging out of a part of the parapet.

Sunday School Lesson.

23rd Sunday after Trinity. Nov. 20th, 1892.

PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION—CONFIRMATION.

In the last three lessons a full explanation has been given of the meaning and importance of Holy Communion, what the Lord Jesus meant it to be to His Church, and the spirit in which it is to be received. It remains, in this the last lesson for the year, to show to the children of the Church their own *personal* interest in this great Sacrament, and to awaken or to deepen in their hearts the desire of becoming partakers of it.

The Catechism begins with one Sacrament and leads up to the other. It tells how in Holy Baptism we are first made members of Christ and His Church; and at the end we are told that the Holy Communion is the highest privilege and blessing we can enjoy in the Church, because in it we become not merely members of Christ, but partakers of His Body and Blood, so that we become *one* with Him and He with us. No one, who has any true love to our Lord, would be willing to stop short of this higher blessing; and no one, who knows how great and holy He is, would venture to be brought