

circumstances distinct from Rome, is an insult to common sense, and a flat contradiction of historical facts known to any school boy. As well might we affirm that the dew-drop absorbed in the cloud, or the river merged in the ocean, is distinct from the cloud or the ocean. We are told in note 36, page 17 that Egfrid imprisoned Wilfrid for "appealing to Rome." If that proves anything, it is just the opposite intended. Why should a British ecclesiastic appeal from the secular power to Rome, if the British Church at that time were not part and parcel of the Romish Church? Why should a British Prelate, independent of the Roman Pontiff, ask his aid in either secular or ecclesiastical concerns? The allusion in the same note to the Constitutions of Clarendon is quite unfortunate for the view sought to be upheld. The reverend gentleman has failed to comprehend intelligently the circumstances which convened the Council that promulgated the Constitutions of Clarendon. At that time—A. D. 1164—the clergy, not unlike certain classes of modern clergy, claimed "immunities" from all civil control. They claimed exemption from civil prosecutions, even though charged with the commission of heinous crimes, and in these *ultramontane* pretensions they were upheld by Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Council of Clarendon was assembled by Henry II. for the express purpose of deciding the struggle between the civil and ecclesiastical powers. The priestly encroachments became so menacing, that the civil prerogatives of the Crown were endangered. Among other things, it was decreed "that Churchmen, accused of any crime, should be tried in the civil courts." This was one of the great objects sought after. Becket and his clergy were, at that time, submissive tools of the Pope, and were quite willing, nay anxious, to sacrifice their country and its civil liberties to the arrogant demands of papal usurpation. The merest tyro in historical knowledge is fully aware that the Bishops participating in this Council were averse to the promulgation of its edicts. We also know that Pope Alexander III. annulled the anti-clerical ordinances when presented to him by the King for ratification, and absolved the Bishops from their engagements. In this transaction assuredly, there does not appear to have been much of a "vigorous protest of the old British spirit on behalf of their ancient faith and Church." Fancy a British king, and one as bold and enterprising as Henry II., protesting on behalf of an ancient faith and Church, by asking