

menian, printed at
d with numerous
nenian, printed at
is the first prod-
shed at Abgar at
e first portion of
o these should be
rk, entitled *De An-*
d in Lambeth Pa-
d intended for pri-
of the Archbishop.
enty-five copies of
agree entirely in
ow in the British
he use of the Dio-
by Jacob Cromber,
the greatest rarity,
nificant example
i issued from the
nan printers who
of the sixteenth
nown to exist, and
Rome.

is now ascertained
reet collection was
nd, amounting to
milar collection in
the proceeds are
aturday, September
Thirty thousand
nber of collecting
ultifarious business
and special sheets
ostal departments,
workmen's clubs,
riot board officials,
the London Rail-
e purpose of the

r. Mackarness, has
e farewell, signed
a diocese and 848
fully deserves, for
dly with his clergy,
ayed to a large ex-
piscopate. It is a
ry of that diocese
even upon burn-
out of this large
ign the paragraph
n striving success-
to on the persecu-
ers of ritual. To
look back upon his
feeling that he has
l the bishops, and

amed of its numeri-
alance-sheet of the
at a business-like
The stipends of
nt to £1,200, of
There are eight
three or four on an
tures of all kinds.
more than 8,000,
Easter Day; there
ages, and 276 were
usual income was
fferings the vicar
Sons of the Clergy.
arishes, to which
cities were help-
flowers for the de-

window, adorned
of the most illus-
t has been placed on
t. George's chapel,
panels contain the
der III., of Russia;
quis of Salisbury,
eath these are the
; Albert, King of
therlands, and the
being emblazoned
ince Albert Victor
arl of Derby, and
helmets, and ban-
illiam and Frede-
the Knights of the
t the present Ger-
The banners and
stria and the Mar-
reated Knights of
n the chapel. An
ient tapestry now
de of the reredos.

The needlework, the colors of which have been very well preserved, has a very curious history. It was found recently in the library of the Dean and Chapter, and is said to have been originally presented by Lady Mordaunt to the chapel in the time of King Charles II. The subject is the Saviour supping with the two disciples at Emmaus after His Resurrection, and the tapestry, according to Canon Dalton, is supposed to be a copy of a picture painted by Titian in 1520. If such is the case, the face of the Saviour is a portrait of the Emperor Charles V., uncle of Catherine of Aragon, who married Henry VIII., while the faces of the disciples seated at the table are likenesses of the Emperor's son, Phillip II. of Spain, and Cardinal Ximenes, the Prime Minister of the latter Sovereign. The tapestry is hung opposite the finely carved projecting window of the Queen's closet, which Henry VIII. had made for his consort, Queen Catherine of Aragon. The appearance of the choir and other portions of the interior of the sacred building has been greatly improved by the cleaning, which has been very carefully executed during the brief vacation by the chapel officials and workmen.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

THANKS.

SIR,—Will you allow me to acknowledge with many thanks to the kind donors, and with gratitude to God, the following gifts towards support of my Indian Homes, all received in response to my appeal, and in answer, as I believe, to prayer. \$10 from Rev. C. H. Marsh and wife, \$10 from L. R.T., \$5 from Mrs. Ball, \$5 from Lewis R. Marsh, \$5 from Mr. Wallis, \$2 from Miss Murray. Also \$75 from a lady in New Richmond, Quebec, towards support of an Indian girl. It is indeed a great responsibility, having these three Indian Homes, the Shingwauk, the Wawanosh, and the Washakada to support, but God has helped us hitherto, and I believe will help; the wave draws back into the deep only to increase its strength and to roll up still further on the shore. My work has on the whole, during the past 17 years been successful. The real measure of success that has attended us God only knows. Notwithstanding all the care and anxiety attending it, I can still thank God that I ever took the work in hand. I wish more of our kind friends would take our little paper "Our Forest Children;" it is only 10 cents a quarter, or 12 copies of each issue for a dollar, or 100 for \$8. Nothing would probably help us more than to distribute these papers broadcast.

EDWARD F. WILSON.

SIR,—It would seem that the *Toronto Mail*, for reasons best known to its Editor and Company, is disposed to discriminate in the matter of Church of England correspondence, being careful to exclude such as is at all strongly defensive of regular and well defined church principles. The following is in substance a reply to "Another Priest," Woodstock, whose letter has been lately reproduced in the "Evangelical Churchman;" but although a constant reader of the *Mail*, I have looked in vain for the appearance of my letter.

"To the Editor of the *Toronto Mail*."

SIR,—It would appear that some priests of the Church of England, when they desire to be particularly popular, or wish for an ephemeral increase of congregation at the expense of one or more of the denominations, deem that they have the diocesan episcopacy or other distinctive principles of the Church at their sole disposal, and seem inclined to pose as fine liberal men by decapitating episcopacy, and offering to bury the remains as a *quid pro quo* for the luxury of exchange of pulpits with their dissenting brethren. "Another priest, Woodstock," does not appear to know what to do with episcopacy, if not to send it begging for union. He is not certain whether "under certain circumstances it may be even in a measure necessary to the well being of a Church;" but, doubtless, he thinks its disparagement on barter and sale to be an excellent bid for popularity, or perhaps for possible preferment. Dr. Mollvaine, an Evangelical of Evangelicals, who maintains episcopal orders to be Scriptural as well as historical, is only comparatively learned in the estimation of the Woodstock priest, while the many(?) who now boldly advocate the recognition of non-episcopal orders, he judges to be the best and most learned in our Church! This is certainly an instance of special pleading. Again he says, Dr. Mollvaine had "to bolster up his claim for apostolic succession by ancient in place of trusting implicitly

in inspired authors." Is this a candid statement? Dr. Mollvaine is simply stating the doctrine of the Church on this subject, which, if it were not the teaching of the Church, would be impertinent; and asks, "Does she decidedly rest it upon the words of inspiration?" And answers, "the doctrine of the Church is that this feature of the ministry is of Divine appointment." He next cites the Preface to the ordination office, and says explicitly, "from this declaration it is clearly the doctrine of the Church, that not only ancient authors, but the Holy Scriptures, teach the apostolic origin of the episcopal ministry in the three orders just named." Does Dr. Mollvaine elsewhere stultify himself? Not, at least, in the extract quoted by "Priest of Huron," and to which the Woodstock priest apparently refers. Whether, then, does Dr. Mollvaine base the doctrine primarily upon Holy Scriptures, or upon the testimony of ancient authors? Clearly upon the former. But the aim of the Woodstock priest is evidently to introduce furtively, and by implication, the fallacy that, because the ancient authors sustain episcopacy, therefore the Scriptures do not support it. Is this sound reasoning? Are all doctrines and principles to be discredited and considered as unscriptural on account of the additional testimony given them by ancient authors? This were vicious argument; and yet, such is the implied reasoning by the Woodstock priest. Would not such reasoning tend to discredit the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Trinity, the Apostolate, the Christian Church, and the whole fabric of Christianity, from the fact that the ancient authors testify of them? Woodstock priest will notice that he is wholly indebted to ancient writers for his knowledge concerning the Canon of Scripture. He is assured that the books contained in the New Testament are authentic and genuine, that they are the productions of the writers whose names they bear, solely on the evidence of ancient authors. Here, on a matter, which he will doubtless consider of greater moment than episcopacy, he is compelled to rest his faith on the authority of ancient writers only, and these not all of very early date. Will he discredit and disparage the New Testament on that account? Another curious feature of implied sophistry, lately contrived, is, that while every religious body makes free use of the ancient authors in support of their peculiar doctrines, principles and practice, yet when the Church of England would share in what ought, at least, to be a common privilege, it is deemed by implication to be, forsooth, derogatory to her, and, it is complacently and coolly assumed by her adversaries, that she has little or no foundation for her doctrines and practice except tradition; and by none more offensively than by some of her own priests(?) who, as Dr. Mollvaine pertinently says, "were considered at their ordination as professing fully to believe in the apostolic origin of episcopacy and attachments to her doctrine." And a further curious phase of this matter is, that those Anglican priests, who are ambitious of "Showing a bold front" which their ordination in no wise authorizes them, appear to be doing a most gratuitous service. We do not find the ministers of other denominations so zealous in tearing down their Church principles, and discarding their practices for the accommodation of others, or exhibiting their distinctive doctrines for barter and sale in this vulgar manner; and, in this respect, they display an exemplary and commendable manner of good sense and devotion to duty. It would really appear, judging from the opinions and conduct of some of her members and ministers, that the Church of England only can afford to destroy herself, or to be destroyed by her own children. We were plainly informed lately by one professing to know the union theory of the denominations, that for them to unite with the Church of England on the basis of episcopacy would be to "abandon all that God had committed to their care" which ought to suffice consistent Church people in that direction. But perhaps those ultra liberal priests are ambitious of being regarded according to their own dictum, the best and most learned men of our Church. Who those supposed to constitute the many, the best and most learned are, outside of those holding anomalous positions like the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, together with such as have personal interests to serve, or special institutions to sustain, would most likely dwindle down to the very few, not to carry the parallel further. Arguments are often of little avail with men who have a penchant for talking and writing cant, and shallow talk and writing on grave matters, are far too prevalent. Yours Sincerely,
Norfolk, August, 29th, 1888, CONSISTENCY.

SCOTT'S EMULSION OF COD LIVER OIL AND HYPOPHOSPHITES is sold all over the world. It is far superior to plain Cod Liver Oil, palatable and easily digested. Dr. Martin Miles Stanton, Bury Bucks, London, England, says: "I have prescribed Scott's Emulsion, and taken it myself. It is palatable, efficient, and can be tolerated by almost anyone, especially where cod liver oil itself cannot be borne. Put up in 50c. and \$1 size."

SKETCH OF LESSON.

18TH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY. SEP. 30TH, 1888.

The Fugitive.

Passage to be read.—1 Samuel xxi. 10 to xxii. 5.

What a dreadful thing to be homeless! How sorry we are for a homeless wanderer! We picture him sleeping in barns—under dark arches—in stables, &c., afraid of police noticing him. How nice to have a home to go to! Bright fire (if winter)—everything clean, tidy, comfortable. How thankful we ought to be for blessings of home!

But how dreadful to be homeless not through any fault of yours! How sad to be driven from home, an exile, as we call it, and all for nothing! This David's position. A wanderer—an exile sometimes. Dare not come home, for fear of Saul—and yet he was innocent of any offence!

I. *The Flight to Achish.*—Let us follow David. Last Lesson, we found him at Nob. Now where does he go? He hesitates, perhaps. At last he decides. Strange decision. He determines to go to the Philistines. Philistines are Israelites' greatest enemies. Men generally keep as far as possible from their enemies. Yet see where David goes (xxi. 10). To Gath! You remember who came from Gath? (See xvii. 4.) Yet he, who killed Goliath, going to Goliath's city! Perhaps thought he should be welcomed as a deserter from Saul. But was he? (See v. 11). Philistines recognize him. "Is not this David?" Yes—this is he who has slain so many of them of late (ch. xviii. 27). They take him to Achish, the king. David sees his danger. Trembles for his life (v. 12). But see what he does (v. 13). Pretends to be mad—scribbles on palace doors—presents a disgusting sight—allows his spittle to run down on his beard. Achish, in disdain and disgust, sends him away.

What a strait David must have been in to be obliged to take refuge with the Philistines! But God saved him in this, the most unlikely place for safety.

II. *The Flight to Adullam.*—Now where is David to go? Goes to a hiding-place at Adullam. Here he dwells in a cave—great hole in the rock, probably up on a hill-side, where he would have a view of country's roads. Dark, damp cave—scarcely fit for any one to live in. Just the reason why David chose it probably. [Illustr.—Smugglers conceal goods in caves, sometimes—inaccessible places.] David thought, perhaps, no one would imagine he was in the cave of Adullam.

But not likely to escape observation long. See v. 2. A number of men had joined him. Quite a little army—400 men. And what a band!—"distressed," "in debt," "discontented," "bitter of soul." What a dangerous company, you would think! But this band, not the refuse and offscouring of the country, as one might suppose. Many brave men there (xxvi. 6). A prophet among them (xxii. 5). Many men had reason to be "bitter of soul." Oppressed—ill-treated—over-taxed by Saul, they went to David in their distress.

III. *The Flight into Moab.*—See who are among this band (xxii. 1). His father, mother, brothers, and relatives. Picture poor old Jesse, now 100 years old! How sad to have to leave the old home at Bethlehem! Yet obliged to go. Saul perhaps threatened them. They were afraid of him. Fled to David for protection. How sorry David must have been to cause the poor old people so much anxiety! But what can he do with them? Old and feeble. Can't stand the rough life of David and his band. Can't go with David, from place to place—in this and that wilderness—in caves, &c. How anxious David is for their safety! A thought strikes him. He will take them out of the country, and find a place of safety for them in Moab. See vv. 3, 4. But why Moab? Look at Ruth iv. 13 17. Who was Jesse's father? grandfather? grandmother? Now look at Ruth i. 4. Where then did Ruth, Jesse's grandmother, come from? This very land of Moab. Perhaps, thinks David, the Moabites will remember all about Ruth, and be kind to her descendants. So he goes to the king of Moab. Poor old people find shelter in Moab.

But David's wanderings to begin again. See v. 5. God tells him to depart into the land of Judah. Goes to Hareth. How tired David must have been! But we must leave him now.

HINTS TO HOUSEKEEPERS.

SANDWICHES OF POTTED RABBIT.—Make baking-powder biscuits, large, but thin. When cold, split them, spread one half with butter, the other with potted rabbit, and press together.

A HANDKERCHIEF case consists of a six inch square of celluloid in which a border of daffodil blossoms is painted. The celluloid is then cut out on the edges to fit the shape of the blossoms and lined with quilted pale blue silk. A puff of the blue silk finishes the edges.