

His Church, founded also a ministry in the Church in the persons of His Apostles. These Apostles must be supposed to have had a temporary function in their capacity as followers under Christ. In this capacity they held an office by its nature not perpetual—the office of bearing the original witness to Christ's resurrection and making the original proclamation of the Gospel. But underlying this was another—a pastorate of souls, a stewardship of divine mysteries. This office instituted in their persons was intended to become perpetual, and that by being transmitted from its first depositaries. It was thus intended that there should be in every Church, in each generation, an authoritative stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, and a recognized power to transmit it, derived from above by Apostolic descent. The men, who from time to time were to hold the various offices involved in the ministry and the transmitting power necessary for its continuance, might, indeed, fitly be elected by those to whom they were to minister. In this way the ministry would express the representative principle. But their authority to administer,—in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration—was to come from above, in such sense that no ministerial act could be regarded as *valid*—that is, as having the security of the divine co-tenant about it—unless it were performed under the shelter of a commission, received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles."

This, with Mr. Gore, lies at the foundation of every Scriptural statement for the authority of a divinely appointed ministry, and is of much more consequence than the consideration of the exact form in which that ministry perpetuated itself.

Mr. Gore acknowledges that:—

"There is considerable room for uncertainty as to the exact steps by which in this place or that the Apostolic ministry passed into the ordinary ministry of the Church. But there are matters of more importance as to which there is no such uncertainty."

These matters are, first, the *principle of succession*, and, secondly, the *eventual revelation everywhere*, as if by "a common instinct," of the *threefold organization*, as we have it to-day, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. From this review of Mr. Gore's book it will be seen how thoroughly satisfactory the work is. It is a book needful for the present times, and which Churchmen will do well to study.—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

## THE ORIGIN OF TITHE.

### I.

A few remarks on the way in which tithe first arose in this realm of England, may perhaps be of interest to the general reader in consequence of the discussions which have taken place in various newspapers, and the erroneous views which have been not unfrequently promulgated. And as the average layman is oftentimes in a state of great confusion upon this subject, it will perhaps not be out of place to give some of the material facts.

Now, to understand this question, it is necessary to go back Anglo-Saxon times, and examine the very beginnings of our national history. Here at once one thing strikes the student, and that is, the way in which the Church as we now have it was formed before the State. There was an Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, before there was a prince of the House of Cerdic, King of All England. In consequence of this, the earliest notices of tithe are to be found in ecclesiastical rather than civil documents. Moreover, a vast mass of charters, and other parchments former-

ly held to be genuine, must now be rejected as spurious when brought to the crucial test of modern criticism.

The earliest notice of tithes is in the second volume of a collection of answers or precepts said to have been given to inquirers by Archbishop Theodore. The compiler styles himself 'a disciple of the Umbrians,' and was doubtless a student of divinity in one of the schools of Northumbria. The object of this work is to set forth the pastoral teaching of the famous Primate of All England, who came from the far east, and was the first to organize the dioceses of England. The next authentic mention of the subject is in the letter which Boniface, the English missionary, and some time Archbishop of Mentz, wrote to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, between the years A.D. 746 and 749, and the terms of his letter may be regarded as evidence of the customary payment of tithe in his day. The next mention of tithe occurs in the seventeenth article of the Legatine Injunctions of Chalcelyth, A.D. 785-787. The best critical authorities differ as to the exact import of this document, and the Earl of Selborne, after careful investigation, holds that it does not amount to 'a civil enactment for the payment of tithe.' In the year 906 a clause occurs in a treaty between the English and the Danes, which stipulates for the payment of tithes. 'If any one withhold tithes, let him pay *lah slit* among the Danes, *wite* among the English;' and about the year 927 King Athelstan issued a royal ordinance, commanding the punctual payment of tithe.

We see, then, that it was during the opening years of the tenth century that it can be proved that a civil sanction was first given to this payment, though the payment itself was then regarded as ancient, and in fact a Godly custom based on the fundamental principles of the Christian faith, and gladly received by the mass of the people. During the course of the tenth century ecclesiastical canons, and other authoritative documents, from time to time enforce this payment; and, as is quite natural, are now preserved in greater numbers than in an earlier age. We may just mention the canons enacted under King Edgar, and the laws of King Edmund and King Edgar.

The above mentioned facts are sufficient to explain the origin of tithes in this realm of England. We find that the payment was made by custom amongst the Anglo-Saxons, as a consequence of their conversion to the faith of Christ, and was general before England became one nation; that a civil sanction was added to the religious sanction early in the tenth century, when the new-born English State was first beginning to feel its strength and power, and was being gradually developed, more or less, on the line of the existing organization of the Church. Thus the legal title to tithe (apart from its religious purpose) is one of the oldest and most firmly established in the kingdom. After the lapse of a thousand years or more, it seems absurd to argue that tithe-rent charge is a diminution of anybody's interest in the land, since that interest cannot have been enjoyed by the would-be claimant's predecessor for the last ten centuries. In face of the facts, still more ridiculous is it to speak of tithe as created by Act of Parliament, or as in some way the gift of the State, for the first complete Parliament of England was held over 400 years after King Edgar's death, and the State had not yet been formed out of the kingdom of the Heptarchy when the earliest notices of the customary payment of tithe occur. It is rather a badge of the nation's piety, which has been publicly worn from the first beginning to the present day, and has proved a material witness to the nation's faith through many days of change, and strange convulsions of theological thought.—R. L. M., in *Church Bells*.

We want 10,000 subscribers; who will help in securing them?

## RITUAL PROSECUTIONS.

It would of course be out of place, now that certain charges against the Bishop of Lincoln for alleged infractions of the law are *sub judice*, for us to offer any observations on the trial itself, either with regard to the constitution and powers of the Court or in respect of the allegations brought against the Bishop; and we have no intention of doing anything of the kind.

But there are certain general considerations bearing on the question of prosecutions for ritual worthy of the attention of every serious mind at all times; and at the present juncture it is well that they should not be lost sight of by Churchmen.

1. Throughout the history of these unhappy prosecutions which have so sadly marred the work of the Church during the past generation, and have given so much cause for the enemy to blaspheme, no impartial observer can fail to have noticed that in every case the actions at law have been instituted by members of one party only in the Church. It is notorious that numbers of that party do not adhere to the *strict* letter of the law, as laid down in the Prayer-Book, and yet there has never been any attempt at retaliation on the part of those who think differently from them, nor any endeavour to force upon them by legal processes the observance of certain practices which they have neglected. Take, for instance, the question of daily services. The Prayer-Book evidently contemplates that in *all* churches there shall be *daily* prayers, morning and evening; yet no one has ever been prosecuted for the omission of this practice. It is a marvellous evidence of the growth of Church life that daily services should now be the rule in so many hundreds of churches throughout the land; but this has been the outcome, not of legal processes, but of an earnest endeavor to provide the full ministrations of the Church in her daily offices for those who are minded to avail themselves of the privilege. Indeed had there been any attempt at legal enforcement of the rule, it is very probable that the success which has attended this movement would not have been nearly so great as it has been.

But, although in the past no such retaliations have been made, can any one foretell what the party now subject to these prosecutions may not be driven to do? Constant litigation *may*—though we would fain hope it will not—have the effect of driving some to exasperation, and causing them to take those steps from which they have hitherto shrunk. If such should unhappily be the case, how disastrous the result would surely be?

2. Is it possible to secure even by the most harsh enforcement of the law, absolute uniformity of practice in ritual matters? The rubrics in the Prayer-Book were clearly not framed with that precision necessarily required in order to fix absolutely a uniform practice in every matter of ritual observance. Indeed a minute examination of the rubrics with the object of settling what every act and gesture of the officiating minister should be shows how impossible it is to arrive at exact uniformity. Some of the directions given are imperfect in themselves and unless the principle of common sense be admitted one is often landed in ridiculous absurdity. This applies not only in the case of directions to the clergy but also in those referring to the laity.

3. We constantly hear that one of the greatest drawbacks to the Church of England in her work amongst the masses is the want of elasticity in her services. But, if a constant appeal to the arm of the law to enforce a rigid uniformity of practice is to be the normal condition of affairs, the result must follow that many an earnest worker will be hampered in his labours, and perhaps his whole energies will have to be diverted from their proper sphere, so that in