

galling chains which poor Anglicans have to kiss, I here give a few extracts from that degrading and infamous law—"The Law on the Royal Supremacy." "We decree that the Queen now hath, and that she, her heirs and successors in the Royal dignity, shall have, from henceforth, full power of nominating and substituting whatsoever persons they please; which persons acting in the stead, and by their authority, shall exercise the same Ecclesiastical jurisdiction according to their (the Royal) pleasure; shall visit individuals, punish heresies, schisms, errors and abuses; or exercise any other right or power which ever could, or ought to be exercised by any Ecclesiastical Magistrate." It is further decreed,— "That the clergy shall not assemble in any Synod on letters or mandates, other than the Royal letters and mandates; neither shall they pass or execute any Canon, Law, Synodal, or Provincial Constitution, without the express consent of Her Majesty and her license for the making, promulgating, or executing of such canons, under penalty of imprisonment and fine, to be imposed at the Queen's pleasure." It is decreed, "that no one shall go out of the kingdom, and territories of Her Majesty, to any visitation, convocation, or congregation, which shall be holden on the cause of religion; but that all such shall be holden by Royal authority within the kingdom." It is moreover decreed, "that the bishops shall not be created, by the nomination, or choice of any person, or by any authority other than the Royal authority; neither shall they hold or exercise episcopal jurisdiction, and authority, unless at the pleasure of the Queen; neither is their authority derived otherwise than through her, and from Her Royal Majesty."

If in the face of these impious *usurped* laws Anglicans say, "they are free men," it is plain to the world that they know not in what true liberty consists. The very constitution of Christ's Church absolutely prevents such authority as is here claimed for mere temporal rulers, to be in any other hands than those of her own legitimate pastors. The self-same law governs the Christian Church, and was laid down by God himself for the Jewish synagogue. "The lips of the priests shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth." (Deut. 17:8-10.) To say the least, it is more becoming, and preferable in every way, that authority such as this should be exercised by a man, whose very profession qualifies him to exercise it for the general good, than it should in the hands of one whose sex itself (the Holy Scripture being witness) disqualifies her from meddling in ecclesiastical matters. St. Ambrose, A.D. 390, in the end of his oration against Auxentius, says, "We must render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's. Tribute belongs to Caesar, this we do not deny. The Church belongs to God; therefore it should not be handed over to Caesar, for the Temple of God cannot become the right of Caesar. * * * A good emperor is within the Church, not above it. He endeavours to aid, not to coerce her." (Epist. ad Auxent.) St. Athanasius, A.D. 320, says, "For if this be the judgment of bishops, what has the emperor to do with it? But if, on the other hand, these decisions be concocted under the menaces of Caesar, what need have men of the title of bishops? When since the beginning of time was the like heard of? When did the decision of the Church receive its force from the emperor, or when was the like recognised as a decision?" (Epist. ad vit. solit. agent.) In the same epistle St. Athanasius says to the Emperor Constantius, "I beseech thee, and remember that thou art mortal—dread the day of judgment,—preserve thyself pure against that day,—meddle not with ecclesiastical matters, neither dictate to us on such subjects; but rather learn these things of us. To thee God has committed the imperial sway; to us he has entrusted what appertains to the Church. And as he who would traitorously decry your authority, as emperor, disobeys the divine ordinance; so in like manner, do you beware, lest arrogating to yourself what belongs to the Church, you become guilty of a heinous crime. 'Render,' saith the scripture, 'to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are

God's.' Therefore, it is not lawful for us to possess temporal dominion; neither have you, oh emperor, power over the incense, and sacred things." (Epist. ad vit. solit. Agent.) Wherefore from the above the complete falsity of this proposition is apparent to every candid, and unprejudiced mind.

T. D.

TAKE CARE OF YOUR TONGUE.

It behoves a man to be on his guard as to that unruly member, the Tongue, and to keep the gate of prudence well under lock and key. Apart from the wrath to come for moral obliquity, it is certain to put him within reach of that undesirable wrath at hand, the strong arm of the law. True, the sword of justice no longer cuts off the offending member, but it prunes down the possessions of the owner by damages and costs, and mayhap deprives him of liberty in the deep dungeon.

So let the angry and the indignant have a care lest the word be fatal. The letter indeed killeth, but the unwritten word is not without its sting. Repress also the threat, the menace, with or without the uplifted finger; these be causes of actions ending in damages for assault and battery. The dangers of the tongue and pen by themselves are neither few nor trifling, and, as a rule, are more ruinous than when the incensed party takes the law into his own hands, and metes out what he considers justice, without the delay and annoyance of a regular appeal to the courts.

The good name with which the law clothes every one is a lasting but a removable garment. The owner may put it aside for a time and resume it later. During this interval, if he is not living under a cloud, he may be without any of that sort of clothing which is useful only for himself, and, as Shakespere has it, of no use for his neighbour to steal. When your neighbour steals from you, or forges your name and is sent to prison for seven years or so, you must guard your tongue when he bids you the time of day on his return. He has resumed his good name—he is in *statu quo ante* and will be presumed to begin a new clean page. He has paid for his moral obliquity and the State gives him up his character. It may be a little tarnished, it is true, but that is all the more reason for you to be lenient. His is the frailty that he did not stand the test. So, if you were to say, "there goes Smith, the returned convict," he could have his action, and would put you in for damages and costs.

In such a case, a man's indignation may lead him to greater excesses; and so, if you make a rush at him to be even with him in blows, he would sue you for assault, though you thought better of it and stopped short six feet away from him.

"There goes old S.," said a man (subsequently the defendant) "who was naturalized by serving a term in the Penitentiary of New York State." The truth was that S. did serve part of a term of two years in the State prison, but the conviction was reversed after the law's delay by an appellate court and S. liberated. A similar case was that of another designated as "an ex-penitentiary bird from the State prison at Auburn." The defendant in both these cases came to grief and suffered in damages and costs.

And if a man comes out of a hospital or an insane asylum the desire of spreading information about him must be done with caution. Unless his conduct would warrant it, you render yourself liable by saying that such a one was not in his right mind, or that he was suffering from a contagious disease. It is not actionable to say that a student coming out of college knows nothing, but it would be otherwise to talk that way if he had his diploma and was licensed to do or practise anything. It would be a high and a mighty crime to speak thus of the professors, because it is their business (whatever the fact may be) to be not ignorant but to be learned in what they profess to teach. Clergymen have the additional immunity from a bad tongue, that to say of one, he is immoral, without more, would render you liable, provided the clergyman were in receipt of a stipend. To say that a clergyman