

correct decisions, and conclusive of the point. Further on he adopts an observation of Coleridge, J., in *Regina v. Chadwick*. "We are not on this occasion inquiring what God's law is, or what the Levitical law is. If the Parliament of that day (Hen. 8) legislated on a misinterpretation of God's law we are bound to act on the statute which they have passed." Lord Cranworth admitted that the statutes on this subject were "in a confused state," but comes to the conclusion and holds that it is "to 28 Hen. 8, c. 7, s. 11 (i.e., s. 7, according to the Statutes of the Realm), though repealed, that we are to look to see what marriages the Legislature has prohibited as being contrary to God's law." Lord St. Leonards said: "We are not at liberty to consider whether the marriage is contrary to God's law, and detested by God; for our law has already declared such to be the fact, and we must obey the law. That law has been so clearly and satisfactorily explained by the learned judges in the case of *The Queen v. Chadwick* as to render it unnecessary to observe further upon it or to trace the repeals, and re-enactments of the law to which I have referred." Lord Wensleydale (who was the judge who, as Baron Parke, delivered the judgment in *Ray v. Sherwood* above referred to) refers to the note to that case, and as he then proceeded to deal with the matter more at large, it may be well to quote his words. He said: "The state of the law appears to be this:—the two statutes in which the term 'Levitical degrees' is explained are the 25 Hen. 8, c. 22, where they are enumerated, and include a wife's sister, and the 28 Hen. 8, c. 7, in the ninth section (i.e., the seventh, according to the Statutes of the Realm) of which are described by way of recital, the degrees prohibited by God's laws in similar terms, with the addition of carnal knowledge by the husband in some cases, and with respect to them the prohibition of former statutes was re-enacted. The whole of this Act, 25 Hen. 8, c. 22, was repealed by a statute of Queen Mary; and so was part of 28 Hen. 8, c. 7, but not the part as to prohibited degrees. That part was repealed by 1 & 2 P. & M., c. 8. But by the 1 Eliz., c. 1, s. 2, that Act itself was repealed, except as therein mentioned, and several Acts were revived, not including the 28 Hen. 8, c. 7; no doubt, because it avoided the marriage with Ann Boleyn. But by the 10th section of the 28 Hen., c. 16 (which, in the second section referred to marriages prohibited by God's law as limited and declared in 28 Hen. 8, c. 7, or otherwise by Holy Scripture), all