

to fetch her, and as she went in all Heaven rose up. You cannot think of her now without a rush of tenderness that stirs the deep foundations of your soul, and you feel as much a child again as when you cried on her lap; and if you could bring her back again to speak just once more your name as tenderly as she used to speak it, you would be willing to throw yourself on the ground and kiss the sod that covered her, crying: "Mother! mother!" Ah! she was the queen.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

TITHING—THE MISSIONARY CONFERENCE AT YARMOUTH.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—I am greatly pleased that "Candid Friend" in your issue of the 15th has raised the question whether the clergy should pay tithes or not, and to whom or what should they pay them.

I am quite unprepared to quote any authoritative word of the Church in this matter, but hope that some one will come forward and enlighten us as he has requested.

I know it is often thought by clergymen, who have made but little study of this whole question, that the clergy are exempt on the ground that they would be only putting money out of one pocket into another. I am glad, therefore, that "Candid Friend" has said that the Levites paid tithes of the tithes which were their inheritance—"even a tenth part of the tithe." Should any reader be in doubt as to this let him carefully peruse Num. xviii. 25-32.

But when a difficulty is discovered from these verses, viz., that the tithes of clergymen should go to the Bishops, because "the tithes of the Levites were for the support of the High Priest," I cannot but think that the whole question is being considered from a wrong standpoint.

It is quite a mistake to suppose that the tithing system binding upon Christians is based upon the laws in this regard governing the Hebrews. At the most they should be appealed to for illustration only. The principle of giving one-tenth of all increase is much more venerable than the Mosaic period, and its institution was not primarily for the purpose of supporting a ministry, or even to insure the tithing once for all of all monies, valuables, properties or produce. Far from it.

It is precisely because of this wrong standpoint from which people consider this subject, that hundred of difficulties at once arise when a man starts to work out the principle of tithing practically in his own mind, as it would effect him were he to adopt it himself. For example a man says, 'Should I tithe a sum of money, say, a gift just received, which has already been tithed by the giver?' 'If a tither first tithes his income and gives his children their allowance, should they tithe what has already been tithed?' And so on. So with Candid Friend's question, 'Are the clergy to tithe when "The Church does not receive from the Church"?' I might add another difficulty even if the clerical tithe were to be given to the Bishops, viz.: To whom or what should the Bishops pay their tithe?

Are not all these questions rendered quite secondary, and certainly answerable by honest titheers of the clergy, when we remember that the law of the tithe was not primarily established in order to provide certain necessary funds.

Long before the rules were issued regulating the tithing of the Hebrews and the support of

the Levites, the law of the tithe existed and was observed.

For example Jacob undoubtedly tithed his increase (Gen. xxviii. 22) from the time of his memorable vision, and in consequence in the 20 subsequent years became immensely wealthy, though the results of his 70 former years of life were that he possessed a "staff" only with which to cross over Jordan,—in other words *nil*. But to whom did Jacob pay his tithes? We don't know. Certainly not to the priesthood, for he was himself the only priest of his family, and he surely did not pay tithes to himself. To say so would be to make a mockery of his awfully solemn vow.

Again, seeing how deeply mysterious a Being was Melchisedec to whom Abraham paid tithes, we cannot suppose that Melchisedec, though he was the Great High Priest as well as King, was supported by the things which Abraham and others gave him.

So we see the primary object was not to supply necessary funds, though we are all the more amazed at the wisdom of GOD in finding so glorious a use for the funds thus religiously provided.

Then what was the primary object of its institution but to afford to man a practical way by which to acknowledge that all he receives comes from GOD, and that all he possesses belongs to GOD, Who in giving them holds him responsible for their use as His steward.

This latter truth we all admit. But, oh! how easy it is to *admit* it, that is, in words uttered by the lips, or sung in a thanksgiving. Here is a more practical way of showing it, and one which costs us something, and at the same time increases our faith in GOD as the Giver of all.

To suppose that the tenth law was instituted primarily to supply funds for GOD'S work, is to forget that GOD claims as His own "the cattle on a thousand hills," "the silver and the gold," &c., and that He surely *could* carry on the work of the Church without money, or even for that matter our agency.

When a man sees that this law is a test of his belief in GOD'S Providence, whether he be a layman, priest or bishop, he will not long make difficulties of the sort one so frequently meets with. If he cannot conscientiously pay his tithes to the Church because as a priest, he argues, he is only paying it back to himself, he can at least subscribe to foreign missions, or to educational institutions, or hospitals, or libraries, or to the support of the poor.

I am inclined to think that Aaron and all the Aaronic priesthood scrupulously paid tithes of all they received, and, it is a fitting object of need presented itself to them, they could at least burn with fire in sacrifice to GOD their tenth portion. It may be, too, that this affords one reason why on occasions there was so great a sacrifice of animal life in the different great functions of the Jewish Church.

I think "Candid Friend" makes a great deal too much of his Bishop's refusal to take his fee on the occasion of his marriage. That was probably merely an act of courtesy by one member of the cloth to a junior. I presume none of us priests ever take a wedding fee from a brother priest. But such a course is merely a professional etiquette, such as doctors show to doctors, dentists to dentists, and so forth. And even if the Bishop's quoted remark, viz., the Church does not receive from the Church, should turn out to be a well-known ecclesiastical maxim, I cannot see why that should deprive a Christian, because he happens to be in orders, of the privilege of giving of his means towards the support of the holy religion which he finds such a benefit to his own soul. If he is officially a priest, he is also a needy and sinful member of CHRIST'S mystical Body, himself requiring and receiving the benefits of grace alike with the laity. And for this he has a right to offer

his support with a grateful heart. Besides does he not as much as they require to test his own belief in, and gratitude to GOD for "giving him all the things he so richly enjoys?"

I cannot better conclude than by endorsing the final sentiment of "Candid Friend," only I will go further, and say, that without the faithful example of the clergy in this particular, it is hopeless to expect the laity, in any considerable numbers, to adopt the principle of giving the tenth of their increase. They will surely say "Physician heal thyself." "Parson practice what you preach." We may preach till we are hoarse that "the Church does not receive from the Church," and that the priests of old had no one to whom they could pay their tithes, and therefore we need not do it, but the laity will never be convinced that it is their duty if it is *not* ours.

Yours, &c.,

FIFTEEN YEARS A TITHER.

Windsor, N. S., Nov. 20, 1893.

ST. ANDREW'S DAY.

This Apostle was born in Bethsaida, and was brother to St. Peter, though whether elder or younger has not been determined; the weight of authority is in favor of his being younger than the Prince of the Apostles.

On the division of the world among the Apostles, St. Andrew had Scythia and the neighboring countries assigned to him as his province.

Having traversed Thrace, Macedonia and Thessaly, he passed into Achaia, and came to Patrae, a city of the last mentioned province.

Egeas, Proconsul of Achaia, came at this time to Patrae, where, observing that multitudes had abandoned Paganism, and had embraced Christianity, he endeavored by all arts, both of favor and cruelty, to recover the people to their former idolatries; he called the Apostle before him, and derided him as an innovator in religion, a propagator of that superstition whose Author the Jews had infamously put to death on a Cross.

Upon this, St. Andrew took occasion to rehearse the infinite love and kindness of our Lord, who came into the world to purchase the salvation of mankind, and for that, he did not disdain to die upon the Tree. Whereupon the Proconsul replied that St. Andrew might persuade those who would believe him; but, for his part, unless he was obeyed by the Apostle's doing sacrifice to the deities of the Empire, he would cause him to suffer upon that Cross which he had so much extolled and magnified. St. Andrew replied that he did sacrifice every day to God, the only True and Omnipotent Being—not with incense and bloody offerings, but in the Sacrifice of the Immaculate Lamb of God. Upon this the Apostle was remanded to prison, at which the people were so enraged that they would have broken out into a mutiny had not he restrained them, persuading them to imitate the mildness and patience of our meek and humble Saviour, and not to hinder him from that crown of martyrdom that now awaited him.

St. Andrew expired on the last day of November, but in what year is uncertain. The instrument of his martyrdom seems to have been somewhat peculiar, and is generally affirmed to have been a cross *decussate*, being formed of two pieces of timber crossing one another in the form of the letter X, a form of a cross which has become known by his name.—*Parish Guide*.

THE cross is not in our view simply a testimony of the Father's love, like the flowers under our feet, and the starry heavens above our heads; but the altar of the great sacrifice which restores man to God and God to man.