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From this view appears to deserve in their turn, it is a great question if the mode
whether they are in any act repugnant. The
reasoning on which it is brought upon the con-
cent is generally shewn that the two laws in question
are the one of those that rest from a Constitution
and the other from a superior legislation.

The question then is (properly speaking) a question
of constitutional law, but since the law which is
the subject of it is one of those of which
appears to be evidence of the extent of a super-
ior jurisdiction to a fundamental one, it seems to have
some claims to be considered here.

Yuletse this being by itself a difficult point and the
representations have been considered as the evidence
from the same authority; as long as this is the case
the word repugnant may be looked upon as signify-
ing mere is alteration. Representations may accordingly
be simply over opposition to the claim in the case.
This example encodes the prose text as a `<div>` inside the `<body>` of a `<text>` structure. It distinguishes between a main heading ("[Limits]"), and a subtitle (the phrase "Repugnancy, what", in the right margin), by means of the `@type` attribute on the `<head>` element. Since this is a prose text, the basic structural units are encoded as paragraphs (`<p>`), with line breaks encoded as `<lb/>` where they occur. Note how the usage of `<lb/>` is pointed out in a comment; although not the formal way to do it (that's what the `<tagUsage>` element in the header is for -- see TBE module 2, The TEI Header), it may serve as a valid reminder for future encoders. The sixth text line starts with a sequence of a deletion and addition: "on" is deleted (marked with the `<del>` tag), and replaced with "emane" (encoded as `<add>`). This sequence might as well have been encoded as a whole as a substitution, and wrapped in a `<subst>` element. This example features another interesting combination of deletion and addition on the penultimate line: the phrase "A law which" was started as a replacement for the phrase starting with "Repugnancy". It was added above the line, but deleted again, without ever becoming an effective replacement. This is reflected in the encoding by encoding the addition first, but marking its contents as deleted:

```xml
<!-- ... -->
Repugnancy <del xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0"/>
  <add>A law which</add>
</del> may
<!-- ... -->
```

A final point of interest is the use of empty `<gap/>` elements to indicate places where the transcriber has deliberately left out text. Often these are deletions that have been crossed out beyond readability. Note, how the reason for these omissions is not stated (which could be done in a `@reason` attribute).

When two laws appear to disagree in their terms, a great question is often made whether they are or are not repugnant. The occasion is generally where the two laws in question are on the carpet. The one from a legislature superior to the other from a superior legislature. The question then is a question of constitutional law; but since the word which is the subject of it is a word which appears to be expressive of the aspect of a superventitious law to a primordial one, it seems to have some claim to be consider’d here.

Hitherto the primordial law has been consider’d as the emanating from the same authority source: so long as this is the case the word repugnant may be looked upon as synonymous to alterative. Repugnancy is accordingly a law which may accordingly be simply revocative or reversive; and in either case...
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