

Whitgift's order. One of the charges by the Puritans against Bishop Aylmer was for playing bowls on Sunday," (see Hallam, vol. i. ch. vii. As to persecution of the puritans, it could be shown that this was practised under Grindal, Parker, and Whitgift; its short-sighted folly and wickedness was understood by no one until enlarged upon by Jeremy Taylor and Milton.

Elizabeth directed her committee of divines, charged with the review of Edward's liturgy, "to make the people easy about the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and publicly thanked one of her chaplains who preached in defence of the *real presence*, (see Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. 1, page 138.) It must be also remembered that the "Protestation" at the end of the communion office placed there in the reign of Edward VI. by the advice of Calvin, was removed during the reign of Elizabeth, and was not replaced until Charles II. We are not writing to defend Laud, but in the interest of common, ordinary truth. "Episcopacy" and "Election" are not the only points of difference between modern theologians. Many Romanists during the 15th century agreed with some Protestants on those subjects. And again, there were *Presbyterian* Protestants who refused to receive, and expelled from their cities the English exiles, who fled, on Mary's accession, abroad; the Lutherans refused to receive them because they were *Sacramentarians*; (for so Luther called those who denied Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist), such had to find shelter elsewhere, (See Mosheim's Ch. His. cen. xvi, sec. 3.)

It is simply an outrage on common sense to attempt to persuade us that the Church which used the Baptismal office and the office for the visitation of the sick, which directed in her canons that copes or vestments should be used in Cathedral Churches at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and that "due and lowly obeisance should be done" by all in the Church, whenever the sacred name is used during divine service, long before Laud was born, was a Paradise of modern Low-churchism before his birth.

W. B.

THE MONTAGU CORRESPONDENCE.

A FEW weeks ago we re-published two letters that appeared in an English newspaper, the organ of the extreme wing of the Low church party. One of these letters was stated to have been written by Cardinal Manning. This was not the case, it was *however the production of one holding very high ecclesiastical rank in the Papal Church*. That letter was so terribly damaging to the Roman cause that it produced a flutter amongst the Papal party, and Dr. Lynch, "Archbishop of Toronto," termed it a "forgery" and a "lie with seven leagued boots." We have now before us a letter written by Lord Robert Montagu who was asked to say if these letters were genuine. We give his reply in full, letter for letter, word for word:

41 Queen's Gate, London, S. W.,

February 26th, 1886.

SIR,—I have received your letter and the two enclosures which were directed, by mistake, to the Carlton Club. My letter of Feby. 19th, 1883, (enclosure A.) is, as far as I can see, correct. It was addressed to a "Monsignor" of the Roman Catholic Church. *His answer, dated Feby. 20th, seems also correct.* As that Monsignor is alive, and as the knowledge of his name would subject him to bitter life-long persecution, I refrain from giving his name. The editor of the Dominion Churchman must have made some not unnatural mistake in ascribing to Cardinal Manning, the Monsignor's letter; probably it was because a letter of mine, addressed to Cardinal Manning, was published just before it in the English papers. I enclose a copy of it. With regard to the Monsignor's letter, I think that Dr. Lynch, who signs himself "Archbishop of Toronto," has very hastily designated it as a "forgery" and a "lie with its seven leagued boots." Doubtless he was nettled at the exposure of his Church; and I hesitate to follow his example and to say that his expressions prove that he is alike destitute of the spirit of Christ and of the feelings of a gentleman; although I may judge by his name and demeanor that he has the blood and character of an Irish nationalist. The letter is authentic and extant, and the Monsignor deservedly holds a very high position, which is mainly due to his excellent qualities and character.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

ROBT. MONTAGU.

To———Esq.

The above was addressed by Lord Robert Montagu to a prominent churchman in Toronto, who has kindly given us permission to place it before our subscribers. The title "Monsignor" is only given to Bishops and to private Chaplains of the Pope, so that the letter in question is just as significant, *possibly even more so*, than if it had been written by the pervert Manning.

We may add as a comment on these letters, that quite recently a Roman Catholic dignitary in this Province was noticed passing carelessly to and fro before the Altar, when a Protestant visitor asked: "Why do you not genuflect in the customary way?" The Roman Catholic dignitary answered, with a shrug of his shoulders, "Oh! that is all fudge." The fact is that the Papal Church is honey-combed with scepticism, not less among its clergy than laity, and the most bigoted Protestant in his criticisms of the life and dogmas of the Papal Church does not exceed in severity the private judgment and comments of Romanists themselves.

TITHES.

COMMUNICATED.

IT is generally conceded that the enforcement of the 4th commandment of the Decalogue was but a re-enactment of an old law under a new dispensation, and with new

sanctions. There never had been a time when God did not require of men the devotion of one day in seven to his worship and service

In the re-enactment of the law of the Sabbath, the language is, "Remember the Sabbath day," which implies the previous existence of the Sabbath. It is noticeable that the first mention of the Tithe, under the Levitical dispensation, is as of a thing then known, and previously existing; and not as an original enactment. "All the Tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's; it is holy unto the Lord." It is to be remembered, that this declaration was made several years before the "Tithe" was formally set apart for the support of the Levites. The Patriarchs Abraham and Jacob had, we know, ages before, given to God their portion, in the "Tithe." Perhaps it may be regarded as a further reason, for the divine origin of this system, that it was universally prevalent among the Pagans. It appears that it was the custom for the Gentiles of various names, to offer the "Tithes" of their goods, as the Arabians and Phœnicians, the Carthaginians, the Grecians, Romans, Britons and others. In "Selden's History of Tithes" we find him stating that there was an Arabian law obliging every merchant to carry his frankincense to Subuta, and there offer to their god Satis, the 10th of it which his priests receive. Nor could they sell until after the Tithe was paid. The Phœnicians, influenced probably by Abraham's example, were accustomed to dispose the tenth of their spoils of war to holy uses. The Carthaginians sent the Tithe of their Sicilian spoils to Hercules and Tyren. The Grecians including the Asians of their sort, often consecrated their Tithes to Apollo. A verse of the inscription at Delphi, sacred to Apollo, is as follows: That we may hang up Tithes and first fruits to the honor of Phœbus. Other deities besides, are represented as receiving "Tithes," as Jupiter Olympus, Neptuneus, Ischmicus, Diana of Ephesus, Juno and Pallas. Cicero says (in jest) never any man vowed Hercules a 10th in hope of increasing his wit. Carnillus vowed the 10th of the spoils "of war" to Apollo, and most carefully took order from their most learned priests to perform them. In Italy, it was always the custom to pay and vow Tithes to their deities. It is said of Cadwalla, king of the West Saxons, that before his being made a christian, about A.D. 684, he Tithed all his spoils of war to the Deity. It is said, too, that Cadwalla's ancestors, the German Saxons, whence England was chiefly filled, sacrificed to Neptune the 10th of all captives taken in their piracies. Wherever worshippers have been found, men have given gifts as a part of their worship. Even the Aborigines of our own country are said not to have been "unschooled in the doctrine of offerings." And in the language of the learned Montacutius, instances are mentioned in history, of some nations which did not offer sacrifices, but in the annals of all times, none are found which did not pay "Tithes."