is reason to suppose that the nucleus is composed, if not of solid matter, at any rate of matter in a state of considerable condensation. Nor have we altogether got rid of a comet when we have disposed of its nucleus and its tail. We know that many, if not all, comets are followed by trains of meteoric matter, for it is the collision of portions of this meteoric matter with our atmosphere, that gives rise to the phenomena of shooting or falling stars as often as the earth passes through a part of its orbit which is intersected by the orbit of a comet, at or near the time when the comet's train is going by. And if we grant for the sake of argument that the effect of the rush of the comet's tail into the sun, even at the enormous velocity possessed by it at its perihelion passage, would be insignificant, we can hardly suppose that the impact of the nucleus of the comet as it plunges deeper and deeper into the sun's surface at each successive approach, and that of the meteoric train, can fail to have some effect in raising the temperature of the sun. For heat, according to the well-known definition, is only "a mode of motion." In other words, the sudden arresting of a mass in rapid motion develops an amount of heat proportioned to the velocity with which it is moving. And if a few scattered particles of a comet's train, entering our atmosphere with a velocity of thirty or forty miles in a second, develop sufficient heat to cause a blaze of light that will illumine the whole landscape on a dark night, and that has been known in some cases even to outshine the sun at noonday, what must be the effect produced by the nucleus of a comet (that of Donati's comet was estimated to be 1,600 miles in diameter) or by the whole mass of its train plunging into the sun with a velocity of more than 300 miles in a second? The answer to this question would involve considerations which would lead me far beyond the scope of the present article, and indeed the problem is too complicated to be disposed of in a few concluding sentences, even if we had the materials—which we have not—for arriving at a complete and satisfactory solution.

G. T. Ryves.

ON "THE CLAIMS OF THE CONVOCATIONS OF THE CLERGY."

To the Editor of The Churchman.

Sir,—I have considered the answer which Dr. Hayman has done me the honour to make, in your number for November, to my article on the Claims of the Convocations of the Clergy, which appeared in your numbers of July, August, and September.

I hope that my reply will not be much longer than the answer.

The proposition upon which Dr. Hayman and I are at issue is more fully expressed in the language I used in the July number (p. 294) than in the passage which he has quoted from the September number (p. 440). In the former, I said that the establishment of Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy—

> was the declaration of the great constitutional principle, that the nation has a right to prescribe for itself whatever system of public worship it shall think fit, and whatever forms of prayer, and ceremonies of devotion, it shall think proper to use, by whomsoever composed; and that that right may be so exercised by the nation, without the assistance of either of the two provincial Convocations of the clergy, or of any other clerical co-operation whatever; and even in direct opposition to all the bishops of the realm for the time being, and, therefore, necessarily in opposition to the Convocations of which they form essential component parts, without whom the Convocations themselves could not be constituted.

I had also said in July (pp. 293-4), that the power of Parliament was absolute, subject only to the moral limit which I mentioned; and that absolute power must reside somewhere; and I had afterwards (p. 297) quoted Blackstone, to show that it is one of our strongest constitutional principles, that Parliament is uncontrollable; but that it would not be so, if the Convocations could control it.

Dr. Hayman calls these statements a "novel theory" (p. 152).

He does not dispute the fact that all the bishops did oppose the Elizabethan statute; nor does he, *in terms*, resist the irresistible inference, that that opposition proved that the statute *must* have been passed without the assent of either of the Convocations. Later on, however, he adduces a document to show that "Convocation" did, in fact, assent to the statute. The effect of this document, and of some further evidence of my own, as to the fact of this assent, will be discussed hereafter.

In the meantime, Dr. Hayman says (p. 152):—

> The Elizabethan statute, upon which this novel theory is wholly built, was, *if* enacted without the consent of Convocation, utterly without justification in precedent; and, so far from striking the key-note of the constitutional doctrine on the subject, was, *if* passed under the conditions represented, wholly unconstitutional.

The two "ifs" are italicized by me. He afterwards[1] says the Elizabethan statute—

> is doubly invalid; once, as a temporal statute, because it had not the support of the spiritual peers; and again, because it deals with matter with which it was, by every precedent, unconstitutional to meddle, without the Convocations having previously advised.

I had cited a passage from Blackstone,[2] to show that a statute will be both constitutional and valid, although all the Lords Spiritual dissented from it. Sir Edward Coke and Selden, whom Blackstone quotes, had said the same thing before, and had cited several instances to prove it. The *dissent* of the Lords Spiritual necessarily involves the *non-assent* of the Convocations, as already explained.[3]

It is impossible for any lawyer of experience to treat as an open question the constitutionality or validity of a statute which has been the foundation of the public worship of the nation for 323 years; having been continued in force by our present Act of Uniformity.

---

[1] P. 154. [2] Sept. p. 439, 1 Blackst. Com. 156. [3] Sept. p. 439.

A "justification in precedent" is never essential to any statute; although the existence or non-existence of precedent may influence the members of the Legislature in passing it, or in declining to pass it. When passed, it *makes* a precedent, if there was none before.

It is, therefore, perfectly "constitutional" to avoid going back beyond the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity: and if that Act was really novel, it becomes confusing, as well as unnecessary, to go back to earlier times.

A proof of the confusion, as well as of the needlessness, of so going back, is afforded by the evidence of earlier times, which Dr. Hayman adduces to show want of precedent and unconstitutionality.

Dr. Hayman seems even to deny that Parliament is absolute; because he says (p. 151) that—

> no such notion as that of investing Parliament with the absolute power of Church legislation was present to the mind of Henry VIII. and his advisers;

and afterwards (p. 152) he uses the expression:—

> If the absolutism of Parliament is a true doctrine.

Are we, at this day, to justify disobedience to an Act of Parliament, because Henry VIII. or his advisers would not have proposed it? Or because it is contrary to what Dr. Hayman elsewhere describes (p. 152) as—

> Some other *dicta* of King Henry the Eighth?

Dr. Hayman refers (p. 151–2) to a case, as proving, in effect, that the absolutism of Parliament is not a true doctrine. It is that of the authority given, by the Act of Submission, 25 Henry VIII., cap. 19, to thirty-two Commissioners, half clerical, half lay, and continued afterwards for a time, to sort out the existing ecclesiastical laws, by retaining some, and rejecting others; and then, to the king, to assent to the result of their work; whereupon, the retained parts only were, thenceforth, to be in force, and the rejected parts were to be treated as repealed. This royal assent was never given; but Dr. Hayman thinks it clear that, if given, it would have been a making of law *by the King himself or the Commissioners*, and not by Parliament; whereas the contrary would have been the legal effect, because it is a fundamental legal principle, that the execution of a power derives its force, not from the person or persons executing it, but from the instrument creating it;—in this case the Act of Parliament.[1] Besides which, the effect of the king's assent was to be, not to make any new laws, but to confirm the rejection of old ones.

When Dr. Hayman proceeds to the evidence of the necessity of convocational concurrence in church legislation, he relies strongly on recitals and preambles to several old Acts of Parliament. Such recitals, in *any* Acts, are no further important, than as they show the meaning of the words in which Parliament has legislated. In *old* Acts, they are often inaccurate, and, often, mere *flourishes* of language, which, if taken apart from the object to which they related, might be made to prove anything and everything. Their use is never extended, at the utmost, beyond the general objects of the *enacting* parts of the statute in which they are found.

An instance of this is afforded by the Act 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, which Dr. Hayman mentions (p. 151) preventing appeals to Rome, in four sets of causes; which became of little importance in the very next

---

[1] See Sugden (Lord St. Leonards) on Powers, *passim*.

year, when, by Statute 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, *all* appeals were taken away from Rome. The four sets of causes were Tithes, Oblations, Wills, and Matrimony. The only object of the flourish of language in the first of them, was to gratify the "Spiritualty," by telling them, or rather by making the Lords Spiritual say of themselves, that they were as competent for the final determination of such causes as the Pope could be.

Of a similar kind is the parenthetical expression, upon which Dr. Hayman relies (p. 153) in the present Act of Uniformity (1662), that the Prayer Book of Elizabeth was "compiled by the Reverend Bishops and Clergy." It is needless to inquire whether this is strictly accurate; for it amounts only to a passing eulogium upon the Book of Elizabeth; and its practical bearing, if any, is only a justification of Parliament's choice, in substituting that Book for other Service Books of a different tendency, *which had also been adopted by Bishops and Clergy*—namely, the Roman Catholic "Uses" of the time of Henry VIII., which were then in force; having been revived, as from the 20th of December, 1553, by the Statute of 1 Mary, session ii. chapter 2.

Even the notorious Statute of 32 Henry VIII., c. 26, always considered personal to him, by which he was empowered to declare, of his own will, provided he had certain assents—not necessarily of "Convocation," as will be shown—what religious doctrines were to be "believed, declared, and obeyed," seems to Dr. Hayman (p. 153) to contain a constitutional principle, valuable for use at this day; for he treats it as evidence of the general law of the land, existing *before* that time, instead of evidence of the violent character of Henry VIII., for he says that—

> This right of the Spiritualty, here so plainly set forth, remained intact up to 1540, as this Act shows; [and] it is incumbent on the opponent to show when they lost it, so as to create a new point of departure in 1559. This has not been done, and I believe cannot be done.[1]

The authority given to Henry VIII. by this Act is more arbitrary than Dr. Hayman states it to be, for the only concurrence made necessary was that of "the said archbishops, bishops, and doctors, now appointed, *or other persons hereafter to be appointed*, by his royal majesty, or *else* by the whole clergy of England," which latter is a body evidently too large to ascertain the concurrence of.

Dr. Hayman finds,[2] in an Act of 1540, 32 Henry VIII., c. 25. the expression "to *make* a synod universal of the realm," and says that these words show that I "flatly contradicted" this Act, when I asked, What is "the sacred synod of this nation?;" and when I added that this nation had had no such synod since the days when Papal Legates were allowed to hold councils here, and that the English Constitution, *since the Papal power in England ceased*, knows only one national synod—namely Parliament.

Dr. Hayman makes out the supposed contradiction, by saying, that the Papal power "ceased, in England, by the successive statutes of 1529–34—this was six years later, 1540."[3]

The Papal power was, certainly, *interrupted* by the statutes of 1529–34; but it did not *cease*, until after the accession of Elizabeth. It was never greater, in England, so far as the law was concerned, than when Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole died on the same day, the 17th of November, 1558.

In Pole's character of Legate *à latere*, he held one or more Legatine Councils in England, particularly one held by Royal Licence, on the 2nd

---

[1] P. 153. [2] P. 153. [3] P. 153.

of December, 1555, and several subsequent days:[1] and on turning to the records of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation, in 1555, it will be seen that a summons for a Legatine Council superseded the appointed meetings by prorogation of the Provincial Convocations of the Clergy: for the Canterbury Convocation had been prorogued to the 15th of November; and the record says that before that time had approached, Cardinal Pole summoned both Provinces (*utramque provinciam*) to a Legatine Synod, to be held on the 2nd of December.[2] The Act of Submission of the Clergy, 25 Henry 8, c. 19, had then been repealed.

Dr. Hayman adduces no instance of a "Sacred Synod of this nation" having been held after Cardinal Pole's time; and therefore my original statement would be unaffected by showing (if it could have been shown) that there had been such a Synod in 1540; but it is a great object with Dr. Hayman to prove that the present ecclesiastical system is *not* that of Elizabeth, but that of Henry VIII.: and, for that purpose, he adduces (p. 153) the instance of the dissolution of the marriage of Anne of Cleves, on which occasion he finds, in the Act of Parliament for that purpose, 32 Henry VIII. c. 25, the expression above mentioned, "to *make* a Synod Universal of this Realm." That expression is used, not by the Act of Parliament itself, but by the two Archbishops, when they made a report to the King, which the Act sets forth, of the result of a reference made to them and all the other Prelates, *and the whole clergy of both provinces;* which result was, that they had determined that he had never been lawfully married to Anne of Cleves; whereupon the Act dissolved the marriage. The report recites the terms of the reference; upon reading which, it will be seen that *it was not a reference to either or both of the Convocations*, but to the whole clergy of both Provinces; a special reference, which the Archbishops say that they have acted upon, so as "*to make* a synod universal of the realm;" an assembly meeting for that special purpose only, and not being, then, or afterwards, either or both of the two established Provincial Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm.

It is always to be remembered, *that the Church Legislation of Henry VIII.'s time*, so far as it is now in force, *derives its force* not from its original enactment, but *from its renewal in Elizabeth's time*, before which it had been wholly swept away.

Dr. Hayman says (p. 152) that he passes over "the Philip and Mary period." But that must not be; for the church-legislation of that period was much promoted by the Convocation of Canterbury; and the results of that legislation had a great influence upon the passing of the Uniformity Act of Elizabeth.

The session of Parliament convened for the reconciliation of England to Rome met on the 12th of November, 1554, and continued till the 16th of January, 1555 (N.S.).[3] In the course of that session, the Lower House of Canterbury presented a petition to the Bishops, in which, among other things, they prayed as follows:—

> And that the *Bishops and other Ordinaries* may, with better speed, root up all such pernicious doctrine, and the auctors thereof, we desire that the statutes made anno quinto of Richard II., anno secundo of Henry IV., and anno secundo of Henry V., against heretics, Lollards, and false preachers, may be, by your industrious suit, revived, and put in force, as shall be thought convenient, and, generally, that *all bishops and other ecclesiastical ordinaries* may be restored *to*

[1] See Wilkins's "Concilia," vol. iv. p. 130, &c.
[2] See Cardwell's "Synodalia," ii. 445.
[3] See the Heading of the Statutes in the Record Commis. Ed. 1819.

their pristine jurisdiction, against heretics, schismatics, and their fautors, in as large and ample manner, as they were in *the first year of King Henry VIII.*[1]

In accordance with this "desire," the Convocation of Canterbury, as *a whole*, petitioned the King and Queen, that the Bishops' former jurisdiction, which had been abrogated, might be revived; which unquestionably meant the same jurisdiction as the Lower House's petition had desired; because the ordinary jurisdiction of the Bishops' Courts had not been taken away. The Convocation, by the same petition, asked that, for the sake of peace, it might be left to the arbitrament of the Cardinal Legate *à latere* (Pole) to confirm the grantees of the spoils of the monasteries in their possessions; a condition obviously meant to propitiate the lay Lords in Parliament, in favour of the revival, just asked for, of the old statutes of heresy. This Convocational Petition is fully set out in the Reconciliation Act, 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8; and it may also be read in Cardwell's "Synodalia."[2]

The revival of the three old statutes of heresy was accordingly made, as from the 20th of January, 1555 (N.S.) "for ever," by stat. 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 6; and the confirmation of lay rights to monastic spoils was embodied in the Reconciliation Act, 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8. The respective positions of chapters 6 and 8, on the Roll, are unimportant; as, in those days, and long afterwards, the practice was for all chapters of a statute to receive the royal assent at one time—the end of the session.

Of these three old heresy statutes, thus revived, the first and third had been used as auxiliary to the second. They related to the detection and imprisonment of heretics; but the second—viz., 2 Henry IV. c. 15, prescribed the mode of trial and punishment. That statute had been in uninterrupted force, from 1401, for more than 130 years, until, by 25 Henry VIII. c. 14, it was repealed, with the substitution of other enactments, scarcely less severe, also repealed before Mary's accession.

Under the statute 2 Henry IV. c. 15, any bishop, *or* his commissary, might declare *anything* to be heresy; might pronounce any person, upon any evidence, to be an obstinate heretic, if he or she refused to abjure, or a relapsed heretic, after abjuration, and might send for the sheriff of the county, or the mayor of the town, to be present, to hear the sentence of obstinacy or relapse pronounced; whereupon it became the absolute duty of the sheriff or mayor, in either of those cases, to carry away the heretic, and put him or her to death, in the fire, *without any other authority whatever, royal or otherwise.*

This is no exaggeration. It is the language of long and intimate familiarity with the precise terms of the statute 2 Henry IV. c. 15, and with the actual course of the proceedings taken under it.

Under this revival, all those deaths in the fire took place, which we call "The Marian Persecution," except Cranmer's: for no severities beyond detention in prison, and their accompaniments and consequences, had before taken place, since Mary's accession. It is probable that all these deaths were liked, well enough, by Mary; but she was not the doer of them; except by warning the sheriffs to attend to their duties in this respect. Their number, according to the lowest accounts, was 284, or 283 if Cranmer's case be deducted;[3] but, even if less, they must have been much more than an average of one every week, during the three years and three-quarters for which they continued; up to Mary's death.

---

[1] Cardwell's "Synodalia," ii. 434–5. [2] Vol. ii. p. 440.
[3] See 2 Rapin, folio 48, and Notes.

Is it *possible* to believe that the people of England, at Elizabeth's accession, when a new Parliament was necessarily called, would not return to it representatives pledged to insist upon the repeal of the Act of Revival?

That Act *was* repealed, in the first session of that Parliament, by a clause in the Supremacy Act, 1 Elizabeth c. 1. Was the assent of the Convocation of Canterbury essential to that repeal? It was certainly not given; and yet the revival had been made at their instance.

The same Parliament, in the same session, substituted the Elizabethan Ritual for the Roman. We have already seen, and shall presently see, more distinctly yet, that that substitution would not have been made, if the Convocation of Canterbury could have prevented it.

But Dr. Hayman adduces a curious reason for a belief,[1] that "the Convocation" did really give their assent to the passing of Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity before it became law. It consists of a document in the State Paper Office, which he describes as being in "a known handwriting, which dates it, approximately, 1608."[2] It is taken from the book of the Rev. J. W. Joyce, called "The Sword and the Keys," 2nd ed. p. 25; where Mr. Joyce says of it that, "if genuine and authentic," it "tends directly to corroborate the position now maintained," viz., the necessity of convocational concurrence.

We find, in Mr. Joyce's book, that the exact words of the paper, slightly abridged by Dr. Hayman, begin thus:—

> The Book of Common Prayer, published primo Elizabeth, was first resolved and established in the time of King Edward VI. It was re-examined, with some small alterations *by the Convocation* [my italics], consisting of the same bishops and the rest of the clergy, in primo Elizabeth; which being done *by the Convocation* [my italics], and published under the Great Seal of England, there was an Act of Parliament for the same book, which is ordinarily printed in the beginning of the book.

Then Mr. Joyce states that this memorandum, which he calls "this State Paper," "is in the handwriting of Sir Thomas Wilson, the first Keeper of the State Paper Office, established by King James I, in 1608; and the date of the document may, therefore, thus be approximately assigned." Then he states that the writer of the paper had "first detailed the names of the Bishops who, from banishment, returned to England on the death of Queen Mary, and the accession of Queen Elizabeth," and that the writer had then written what has thus been quoted; and then Mr. Joyce proceeds thus:—

> Upon this evidence, therefore, it appears, *while it is admitted that the Elizabethan Prayer Book was not submitted to that Convocation which met Jan. 24, 1559, concurrently with Queen Elizabeth's first Parliament* [my italics], yet that the book was authorized by a Synod or Convocation of English Bishops, unjustly and uncanonically deprived in the last succession, but now restored to their rightful authority, and of the rest of the clergy.

In the margin of this statement, opposite the words "while it is admitted," &c., are these two references—viz., "Conc. M.B. iv. 179;" "Strype's Ann. i. 56" (meaning, by "Conc. M.B.," Wilkins's book, intituled, "Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ."

This passage assigns a very different meaning to the words of the paper from what must have been meant by the writer, when he twice mentions "the Convocation"—namely, that the second Book of Edward VI., now about to be made, with a few alterations, the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, was re-examined and altered by the same bishops

[1] P. 155. [2] *Ibid.*

who had approved it in Edward VI.'s time, and had been deprived by Queen Mary, and had now returned from exile, and of "the rest of the Clergy," and that those Bishops had now been "restored to their rightful authority."

Of this supposed revision by the exiled bishops, no evidence whatever is adduced, nor of the revision by the "rest of the clergy." It is admitted that this supposed "Synod or Convocation of English Bishops" consisted of persons different from "that Convocation which met Jan. 24, 1559, concurrently with Queen Elizabeth's first Parliament," and which *must* have been the only legal Convocation for each province; and, therefore, they could have no Convocational authority: and as to their being "now restored to their rightful authority," if *that* had been the case, they would have been members of the House of Lords, and would have *supported* the Elizabethan Book there, instead of *opposing* it, as we have already shown that every one of the bishops in the House of Lords did; and the fact that they were *not* restored at this time, is quite certain; and it is expressly declared by Strype, Mr. Joyce's own authority, in a passage closely following upon the reference which Mr. Joyce makes to him, in which he says, after tracing the proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury (so far as its existing records allow) to its end, at the dissolution of the Parliament, on May 8, 1559:—

> All this while, the clergy that favoured sincere religion were but private standers by, and were not consulted with, ... there being neither any order taken for the restoration of the old Protestant Bishops to their Sees, whereof there were four surviving, nor of the inferior clergy, that married wives under King Edward and were deprived under Queen Mary, to their former dignities and benefices.[1]

As to revision by "the rest of the clergy," there is no evidence at all. Such a revision, if made, would be wholly beside the question, as it would not be by the Lower Houses of the Convocations then regularly assembled; but, besides Mr. Joyce's admission that the Book was *not* submitted to the Convocation of Canterbury, there is clear evidence that the Lower House of that Convocation did all they could to prevent the book from being adopted. That evidence is contained in the very passage from "Conc. M.B.," usually called Wilkins's "Concilia," which Mr. Joyce vouches. It is in Latin there, and was published in 1737; but it is also contained in English, in the very passage which Mr. Joyce vouches from Strype's "Annals," published in 1725. The Latin version is also given in Cardwell's "Synodalia," published in 1842.[2] Both Wilkins and Cardwell take it, independently of each other, from the Register of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation.

Mr. Joyce states, in the same page of his book (p. 25), that "the fact that the Convocation Registers were burnt in the disastrous fire of London, in 1666, has rendered any satisfactory investigation of this subject extremely difficult." The burning, however, was confined to the Registers of the Lower House; and it will be from the Registers of the Upper, that the views of the Lower will now be stated, as embodied in certain *Articuli Cleri*, sent by the Lower to the Upper, and the proceedings upon them.[3]

These *Articuli Cleri* contained declarations of opinions of the Lower House, which they desired the President of the Upper House to present to the *House of Lords*, and which he did present, accordingly, to the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, when sitting in the House itself; which

---

[1] 1 Strype, 56, ed. 1725.
[2] Vol. ii. p. 490.
[3] See 2 Card. Syn. 490, &c.; 4 Wilk. Conc. 179; 1 Strype Ann. 56.

propositions the President reported to the Lower House that he had, in fact, presented to the Lord Keeper, who, as the President said, appeared to receive them thankfully, *but returned no answer at all (omnino)*. The President (acting) was Bonner, Bishop of London; the Lord Keeper was Sir Nicholas Bacon.

The propositions will be seen to be such as were quite inconsistent with the Book about to be adopted by Parliament. The Lower House prefaced them by a statement that it had come to their knowledge that many religious doctrines, particularly those below written, had been brought into doubt, and, therefore, that they felt it a duty to state their faith, as followed. They were obviously meant as a protest or warning against the intended Book.

The propositions were these:—

1. That in the Sacrament of the Altar [after the words spoken] there is really *(realiter)* present, under the species of bread and wine, the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary; also His natural blood.
2. That, after consecration, there remains not substance of bread and wine, or any other substance, except the substance of God and man.
3. That in the Mass is offered the true body of Christ, and His true blood, a propitiatory sacrifice for living and dead (*verum corpus, verus sanguis*).
4. That to the Apostle Peter, and his *legitimate successors in the Apostolic See*, as to the *Vicars of Christ, is given the supreme power* of feeding and governing the Church Militant of Christ, *and of confirming his brethren*.
5. That the authority of treating of and defining those things which belong to faith, sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline, has always hitherto belonged, and ought to belong, only to the pastors of the Church, whom the Holy Spirit has placed, for this purpose, in the Church of God, *and not to laymen*.

Strype has observed that—

The three former of these were solemnly disputed at Oxford, the first year of Queen Mary, as the great *criterion* of Popery, against Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer.[1]

The promise in Magna Carta, that the Church shall be "free," which Dr. Hayman quotes (p. 155), must, of course, be read in the light of subsequent legislation. One (at least) of its meanings was, that Church-property should be free from taxation, a meaning well understood in former times; for instance, in the year 1554, when the Lower House of Canterbury, *quoting Magna Carta*, prayed to be relieved from the burden of "first fruits, tenths, and subsidies."[2]

The reply to all Dr. Hayman's denunciations of the consequences of the notion that Parliament, in making a certain Prayer Book the Prayer Book of the Nation, claims to define religious doctrines, and to impose them upon the clergy, is, that Parliament undertakes no such functions, except so far as to decide which of several sets of forms shall be used in the nation's churches by those who choose to attend them.

Yours faithfully,

R. D. Craig.

---

[1] 1 Strype, Ann. 56.

[2] See Cardwell's "Synodalia," vol. ii. p. 435.