

CHAPTER XVIII.

A great field of English history now to be entered upon.—The clergy visited with heavy penalties for submitting to Wolsey as legate.—The pope's sentence on the divorce still protracted.—The pope threatened.—Frith and Tyndale, the reformers.—Act regulating payment of Annates to Rome.—Retirement of More.—His official character.—Severe laws.—The prisoner's cauldron.—Laws against gipsies.—Laws against vagabonds.—Infamous severity of the statute against vagabonds of 1536.—Henry and Anne Boleyn in France.—Marriage of Henry with Anne.—Cranmer elevated to the primacy.—He pronounces the marriage of Henry with Catherine unlawful.—Coronation of queen Anne.—Catherine's refusal to accept the title of Princess Dowager

WE are entering upon a great field of our history, in which, amidst the most crooked and uncertain paths, we have to feel our way at every step. Those who have set forward on this difficult journey with the most determined resolution to see nothing but good in the wide prospect before them, have obliterated many of the traces of the dangerous and thorny roads by which a desirable end was to be reached. Those who have shut their eyes to this good have been ever looking back upon the level plains out of which they have emerged into this rugged and in many respects desolate region. More than three hundred years have passed since the greatest revolution in our country,—the reform of religion,—was commenced in England. More than a hundred and fifty years have passed since it was thoroughly accomplished. The passions and prejudices which belonged to such a mighty change still survive amongst us, in a modified shape. They still give a colour to our political feelings and to our religious life. Let us endeavour to tell this wondrous story with a strict regard to the evidences upon which a true narration must be founded; and, above all things, let us, in every statement, never attempt to compromise our natural hatred of oppression and cruelty, by regarding them other than as the means by which the "Divinity that shapes our ends" saw fit to accomplish a paramount good by the strong hand of evil instruments.

In January, 1531, the parliament met after a long prorogation. The manifest abuses of the church had been restrained by the statutes of 1529; and the failure of its feeble resistance had shown

how weak it was to stand up against any new attack, however unjust. Wolsey was ruined for having violated, with the king's consent, the statutes of *præmunire*. The clergy were now subjected to prosecution in the King's Bench for having obeyed the power of Wolsey as legate, which obedience was held to bring them within the charge of being his "fautors and abettors." The church felt its danger; and in convocation it was resolved to avoid the forfeiture of the moveable property of the offending bishops and others, by offering the king a large sum of money. To effect this compromise an act was passed by which the king grants, "out of his high goodness and great benignity," a pardon to his spiritual subjects, they having "given and granted to him a subsidy of one hundred thousand pounds."* This act extended to the province of Canterbury, that of York had to pay a smaller sum in the following year. But there was a great preliminary difficulty in effecting this compromise. It was required in the grant that the king should be styled "the protector and only supreme head of the church and clergy of England." The acknowledgment, after much contention, was made, with the addition of the words, "as far as the law of Christ will allow." Dr. Lingard holds that the introduction of these words served to invalidate the recognition. The acknowledgment, whether conditional or otherwise, was probably intended to intimate to the pope that little regard would be paid to his authority if the procrastination of the divorce were longer continued. This measure had now been more than three years in agitation, and it appeared as far as ever from a conclusion under the papal authority. Henry was in dread of being cited to Rome; and in April, 1531, desires his ambassador, Dr. Benet, to use every means "to put over the process, as long as ye may;" and yet, "as of yourself privily to say to the pope, that ye be advertised from your friends out of England, such as be learned in the laws and of our council, that it were the plainest entry the pope might make to the destruction of his whole authority, to strike upon this point to call us to Rome."† The king desired that the cause should be decided in an indifferent place, by indifferent judges. The emperor was wholly opposed to the process being removed from Rome; and urged the pope to make no more delays in the matter.‡ The emperor had with the pope "a voice potential." We cannot trace the course of these tedious negotiations, which all tended to one end,—the destruction of the papal power in

* 22 Hen. VIII. c. 15. † State Papers, vol. vii. p. 297. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 317.

England. Henry saw this clearly enough; and told his ambassador to say to the once honoured pontiff,—“here lieth a great number in wait to hear of open dissention between the pope and Us; and as soon as that trumpet bloweth, they will think a most propice [propitious] occasion to strike at his power, which is in all points abhorred, as he and other his predecessors hath used it.”* Yet at this period was the king so far from connecting his impatience of the papal power with any favour to the doctrines of the reformers, that he has instructed Vaughan, his ambassador in the Netherlands, “to advise a young man named Frith, to leave his wilful opinions and errors, and return into his native country;” and, through Cromwell, has also desired that good and wholesome exhortations for his conversion and amendment should be given to Tyndale. Frith did return; and, as Cranmer very unfeelingly wrote in 1533, was “to go unto the fire.”† Tyndale remained in the Netherlands, to be first imprisoned, and then strangled, by the persecutors of the reformers there, in 1536, after having published his admirable translations of the Scriptures, which the “Defender of the Faith” proscribed. We cannot forbear extracting a passage from the letter of Vaughan to Henry VIII., describing the noble answer of this eminent man to the ambassador’s offer of Henry’s “pity and compassion:”—“I assure you,” said he, “if it would stand with the king’s most gracious pleasure to grant only a bare text of the scripture to be put forth among his people, like as is put forth among the subjects of the emperor in these parts, and of other Christian princes, be it of the translation of what person soever shall please his majesty, I shall immediately make faithful promise never to write more, nor abide two days in these parts after the same, but immediately to repair into his realm, and there most humbly submit myself at the feet of his royal majesty; offering my body to suffer what pain or torture, yea, what death, his grace will, so this be obtained; and till that time I will abide the asperity of all chances, whatsoever shall come, and endure my life in as many pains as it is able to bear and suffer. And as concerning any reconciliation, his grace may be assured, that, whatsoever I have said or written in all my life against the honour of God’s word, and so proved, the same shall I, before his majesty and all the world, utterly renounce and forsake, and with most humble and meek mind embrace the truth, abhorring all error, sooner at the most gracious and benign request of his royal

* State Papers, vol. viii. p. 208. † Hen. VIII. c. 17.

majesty, of whose wisdom, prudence and learning, I hear so great praise and commendation, than of any other creature living. But if those things which I have written be true, and stand with God’s word, why should his majesty, having so excellent a gift of knowledge in the Scriptures, move me to do anything against my conscience?”*

That a great crisis was approaching in the papal relations of the English church, must have been sufficiently apparent to the ecclesiastics and statesmen of 1532, in the passing of “An Act concerning the payment of Annates to the court of Rome.” The statute recites that the Annates, or first-fruits of archbishoprics and bishoprics, “were first suffered to be taken within the realm for the only defence of Christian people against the infidels, and now they be claimed and demanded as mere duty, only for lucre, against all right and conscience.”† This statute limits the payment upon the papal bulls for consecration to five pounds for each hundred of yearly value; and in the case of the denial of such bulls provides for consecration in England without the papal authority. But, the king’s quarrel with Rome not yet having come to a final rupture, Henry was empowered to give or withhold his assent to the Act, by letters patent. The statute, to use the familiar language of modern times, gave the king power to put on the screw. How this qualifying power was to be used may be seen in a letter from the duke of Norfolk to Benet, of the 22nd of February, 1532: “Notwithstanding the infinite clamours of the temporality here, in parliament, against the misusing of the spiritual jurisdiction; yet in his highness doth remain to stop all such effects; and will do so, unless ill and unkind handling enforce him to consent to the same.”‡ The king did not confirm the Act of January, 1532, till July, 1533, when he had finally broken with Rome. It was not in the interest of his people, who were injured by the papal exactions, that he put an end to them. Henry had entered upon a bold course, not without very serious danger. If his strength of will had been supported by any higher principle than that of the most intense self-love, we might go a great way with his admirers in giving due praise to his constancy and courage in “this great argument.” Those who were in his confidence made no resistance to the papal domination except with reference to the king’s personal griefs. “You may surely affirm to his holiness,” writes Norfolk to Benet, “that notwithstanding the church

* State Papers, vol. i. p. 303. † 23. Hen. VIII. c. 20. ‡ State Papers, vol. vii. p. 349.

hath in this realm many wringers at their high authorities, yet nothing hurtful shall be done, unless the fault be in him in proceeding wrongfully and ungrately against the king." * In this, we see none of the unshackled action of a representative government—none of the just influences of a people long nurtured in habits of freedom. We see that if the one despot were propitiated, the church might abuse "its high authorities," how many soever were complaining under them.

As we proceed in the history of this reign we shall have to relate the enactment of tyrannical laws, and the unlicensed perpetration of cruel and sanguinary deeds, which sufficiently indicate the unbridled will of the head of the government. During the administration of Wolsey, with the exception of the execution of Buckingham, we have no record of legal slaughters, and little encroachment upon popular liberty. The change is supposed to have been produced when the ascendancy of Wolsey, through his able administration of public affairs, and his adroitness in making his sovereign believe that he was the real pilot of the state vessel, was removed. Sir Thomas More, who succeeded Wolsey as chancellor, was a thoroughly conscientious minister; but he was in a false position. He held the great seal only about two years and a half, and then resigned his office. Retiring, with small provision of fortune, but richly endowed with a contented and happy nature, he wrote to Erasmus, that "he had obtained what, from a child, he had continually wished—that, being freed from business and public affairs, he might live for a time only to God and himself." During his tenure of high place, the persecution of heretics was not violent. Erasmus has said, that it was a sufficient proof of his clemency that while he was chancellor no man was put to death "for these pestilent dogmas." But he took part in the examination of heretics before the council; sanctioned their imprisonment; and caused a boy and a bedlamite to be whipped for "ungracious heresy," according to his own statement. That More, at this period, should have manifested a devoted attachment to the doctrines of the church without entertaining some of its persecuting spirit, was scarcely to be expected, even from his beautiful nature. But there is nothing, even in the statements of the zealous and credulous historian of the Protestant martyrs, to warrant a modern writer in saying of More, "no sooner had the seals changed hands

* "State Papers, p. 349.

than the Smithfield fires recommenced." * We have already mentioned the case of William Baynham, sometimes called Baynard. He suffered death by burning at Smithfield, according to Fox, on the 30th of April, 1532. There is a "Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London," in which such events are minutely recorded; and the only entry of this nature, from the removal of Wolsey from the chancellorship to the appointment of More's successor, is this, of the 23rd year of Henry, 1532; "And also this year was William Baruard, a man of law, and two more with him, burned in Smithfield for heresy, *in May*." More surrendered the great seal on the 16th of May. We ought to pause upon this contradiction to the date given by Fox, before we decide that Erasmus stated what was untrue.

Whilst More was chancellor, and in that capacity the framer of new laws, it may be worth inquiring whether, in matters unconnected with ecclesiastical affairs, we can trace an equally savage spirit as that which is subsequently forced upon our notice. We are asked by the historian of this period to regard a statute of 1531 with especial attention, "because the temper which this Act exhibits is the key to all which has seemed most dark and cruel in the rough years which followed; a temper which would keep no terms with evil, or with anything which, rightly or wrongly, was believed to be evil, but dreadfully and inexorably hurried out the penalties of it." † The statute thus prominently put forward as indicating the temper of the nation and of the parliament—"the English were a stern people,"—was one which arose out of the attempt of one Richard Rouse to poison the family of the bishop of Rochester; and it was enacted that poisoning should be deemed high treason, without having any advantage of clergy, and that Richard Rouse, and all future poisoners, should be "boiled to death." We are told by the historian, that "the poisoner's cauldron was the fresh expression of the thought of the parliament of the Reformation." ‡ And yet the crime of poisoning was so punished, ten years before Henry VIII., "considering that man's life, above all things, is chiefly to be favoured," caused the statute to be passed. We have the following undoubted record under the 13th year of Henry: "This year was a man sodden in a cauldron in Smithfield; and let up and down divers times till he was dead, for because he would have poisoned divers per-

* Froude, History, vol. ii. p. 83.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 289.

‡ *Ibid.*

sons."* In the same Chronicle we have a record of the fate of Richard Rouse, in which the same horrible barbarities, probably relics of an earlier period, were practised as in 1522. "This year [1532] was a cook boiled in a cauldron in Smithfield, for he would have poisoned the bishop of Rochester, Fisher, with divers of his servants; and he was locked in a chain, and pulled up and down with a gibbet at divers times till he was dead."† Certainly this punishment was not "the fresh expression of the thought of the parliament." Was it any peculiar result of the energetic and reforming spirit in the parliament, as the historian holds, that a statute was passed "concerning Egyptians?" The act says, without any covert meaning that "many outlandish people, calling themselves Egyptians, using no craft nor faict [practice] of merchandise, have come into this realm, and gone from shire to shire and place to place in great company; and used great subtle and crafty means to deceive the people; bearing them in hand that they by palmistry could tell men's and women's fortunes, and so, many times, by craft and subtilty have deceived the people of their money, and also have committed many and heinous felonies and robberies."‡ This description of the gipsies might apply to the times of George III., and even later, as well as to the times of Henry VIII. The historian regards these fortune-telling impostors as "ready-made missionaries of sedition," who, "in telling fortunes, might readily dictate policy."§ They were to depart out of the country, upon pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of goods, under the statute of 1531. There is a letter of Cromwell, six years later than this statute, in which he desires the president of the marches of Wales to cause the Gipyans "to depart beyond the sea, or to execute them, in default of obedience, without hesitation."|| The statute dealt with them mildly. When Cromwell wrote this letter, England was under the reign of terror. But that they were regarded as political agents cannot be inferred from the charge against them, expressed in that letter, of "falsehoods, felonies, and treasons." Treason, in 1538, was a word of very wide signification. There is another statute of 1531, which is regarded by the same writer as pointing, as well as the statute for the Egyptians, "to the growth of a disturbed and restless disposition, the interruption of industry, and other symptoms

* "Grey Friars' Chronicle," Camden Society, p. 30.

† *Ibid.*, p. 35.

‡ Froude, vol. i. p. 293.

§ 22 Hen. VIII. c. 10.

|| Ellis, First Series, vol. ii. p. 100.

of approaching social confusion; and at the same time they show us the government conscious of the momentous nature of the struggle into which it was launched." This other statute is "An Act concerning punishment of beggars and vagabonds." We might believe from this talk about "interruption of industry,"—"social confusion,"—"momentous struggle,"—taken alone, that the parliament of the 22nd year of Henry VIII. was the first that had attempted to deal with that great question of vagabondage, which had arisen out of the transition from feudal service to free labour. On the contrary, the same writer, in another part of his work, has very fully traced the course of legislation as to beggars and vagabonds.* Nearly a century and a half had passed since, by the 7th of Richard II., it was enacted that vagabonds should be put in the stocks, or sent to goal, there to remain "till the coming of the justices for deliverance of gaols," who would do with them what "best shall seem by the law." The statute of the 11th of Henry VII. "against vagabonds and beggars," retained the stocks, but dispensed with the prison, as too expensive.† The statute of the 22nd of Henry VIII. authorises justices to give a license to impotent persons to beg, within certain limits; but those who solicited alms without such letter under seal, were to be whipped and set in the stocks. But if any person, "being whole in body, and able to labour, was found begging, every such idle person was to be whipped at the end of a cart, and enjoined to return to the place where he was born, or where he last dwelt for three years, and there put himself to labour like as a true man oweth to do." He was to beg his way home; but if he wandered from the prescribed way, or exceeded the prescribed time, in his perilous journey, he was "in every place to be taken and whipped." One who has spent a long, thoughtful, and active life in labouring for the cure of pauperism with the truest regard for the poor, has justly said of this statute, "No provision is made for sustaining the weak, or for helping the strong to find employment; and therefore, notwithstanding the severity of the punishments awarded, the statute was sure to fail of accomplishing the object for which it was designed."‡ The legislators were wholly unprovided with any resource for those able-bodied persons who desired to work, but could find no employer. It was not the fault of the legislators. There was no surplus capital to stimulate employment. The la-

* Froude, vol. i. p. 66 to 78.

† See *ante*, vol. i. p. 560, and *ante* p. 244.

‡ "History of the English Poor Law," by Sir George Nicholls, vol. i. p. 120.

bour-market was full. But in five years more there was a fiercer temper to be displayed towards the unhappy wanderer; and we know well to whom to ascribe its origin. There is a letter from Thomas Dorset, curate of St. Margaret's, Lothbury, to the mayor of Plymouth, in which he informs that mayor that "the king's grace came in among the burgesses of the parliament, and delivered them a bill, and bade them look upon it and weigh it in conscience; for he would not, he said, have them pass on it, nor on any other thing, because his grace giveth in the bill." The writer then goes on to state the contents of this bill: "There shall be a provision made for poor people. The gaols shall be rid; the faulty shall die; and the other shall be acquit by proclamation or by jury, and shall be set at liberty, and pay no fees; and sturdy beggars and such prisoners as cannot be set a work, shall be set a work at the king's charges, some at Dover, and some at the place where the water hath broken in on the land, and other more places. Then if they fall to idleness, the idler shall be had before a justice of peace and his fault written. Then if he be taken idle again in another place, he shall be known where his dwelling is, and so at the second mention he shall be burned in the hand; and if he fall the third time *he shall die for it.*"* The date of this letter is uncertain. It must have been written before the passing of the statute of 1536, which materially varies from this account of Henry's bill, as derived from "a burgess of the parliament." The particular clauses of the act of 1536, which contain some salutary regulations as to "a provision made for poor people," will be noticed in a future chapter. But one clause sufficiently shows that "he shall die for it" was looked upon as the great cure for the evil of "rufflers, sturdy vagabonds, and valiant beggars." Whipping for the first offence. If after having been once taken and whipped, and a second time apprehended, to be whipped again, and "the upper part of the gristle of the right ear clean cut off." If taken a third time, so mutilated, he shall be committed to gaol, and at the next quarter sessions, if indicted of wandering, loitering, and idleness, and found guilty, "he shall have judgment to suffer pains and execution of death as a felon, and as an enemy of the common wealth." †

* This letter was first published in "Excerpta Historica," p. 289. It is also printed in "Suppression of the Monasteries," p. 36.

† 27 Hen. VIII. c. 25. Mr. Froude has fallen into an error in stating that "the sturdy vagabond" was, by the earlier statute, condemned, on his second offence, to lose the

• "The blind mole casts
Copp'd hills toward heaven, to tell, the earth is throng'd
By man's oppression; and the poor worm doth die for it." •

The evil was beyond the cure of legislation, for it was an economical evil. The wickedness was in proposing so awful and yet so futile a corrective of an almost unavoidable condition of society.

The letters of the bishop of Bayonne present us a vivid picture of the court of Henry in the summer of 1532. In July he writes from Amphyll to "the Great Master" in France—de Montmorency—to show him how confidential and familiar is his intercourse with the king and Mistress Anne. It is intended that there shall be a meeting in the autumn between Henry and Francis; and the ambassador writes that he well knows that the greatest pleasure which the king of France could offer to his brother of England, was, that he should invite him to bring the Lady Anne in his company to Calais; and that in the same way Francis should bring the queen of Navarre with him to Boulogne. "I cannot tell you," says the subtle minister, "whence this advice comes, for I have made oath not to do so." Let not the queen come, he adds—the queen was the sister of the emperor—for Henry so hates the Spaniards that he would as soon see the devil; and above all "keep away all imperialists; and all those who are reported to be mockers and jeerers, for such are hated of this nation more than anything in the world." The bishop is in high good humour. The king rides with him every day to the chase; and Mistress Anne, and the bishop in a hunting jacket and cap which she has given him, stand together to shoot the deer as they pass in the green alleys of Amphyll park. † At this season the king was in progress; and we find that the hounds were carried in a cart from hunting-ground to hunting-ground; and that the smith of the household went about with locks and bolts from place to place, to make the king's chambers secure: "Paid to the smith that carryeth the locks about with the king, in reward, 7s. 6d." ‡ On the 11th of October, Henry, with the Lady Anne, who had been created marchioness of Pembroke, landed at Calais; where they remained, with a most numerous attendance till the 13th of November. The two kings met in a valley between Calais and Boulogne, on the 20th of October; and Francis brought his two whole or part of his right ear (p. 77). That punishment was distinctly limited to persons "using crafty and unlawful games and plays, and some of them feigning themselves to have knowledge in physic, physiognomy, palmistry, and other crafty science."

• Pericles, act i. scene 1.

† Legrand, tom. iii. p. 555-557.

‡ "Privy Purse Expenses," p. 238.

sons, who had been redeemed from their captivity as hostages after the battle of Pavia. But he did not bring the queen of Navarre. He danced with the Lady Anne, who after supper, at a feast at Calais, came in "with seven ladies in masking apparel;" and "the lady marchioness took the French king, and the countess of Derby took the king of Navarre; and every lady took a lord;" and "the French king talked with the marchioness of Pembroke a space." The chronicler, who devotes many pages to the account of these festivities, disposes of the great event which follows, in a few words: "The king, after his return, married privily the Lady Anne Boleyn, on Saint Erkenwald's day, which marriage was kept so secret that very few knew it." * We have better evidence than Hall's, as to the time of this marriage. Saint Erkenwald's day was the 14th of November, the day on which the king returned to Dover. Cranmer, in a letter of the 17th of June, 1533, writes to Hawkins, the English ambassador at the emperor's court, after describing queen Anne's coronation on the 1st of June, "But now, sir, you may not imagine that this coronation was before her marriage, for she was married much about St. Paul's day last, as the condition thereof doth well appear by reason she is now somewhat big with child. Notwithstanding it has been reported throughout a great part of the realm that I married her; which was plainly false, for I myself knew not thereof a fortnight after it was done." † St. Paul's day—the day on which the old monkish rhymes tell us it "be fair and clear, it doth forbode a fruitful year"—is the 25th of January.

At this season, then, was the union of Henry and Anne completed by the forms of the church, without waiting for the divorce of queen Catherine by the papal court, or otherwise. The rumour of this extraordinary event travelled abroad, how few soever might know of it. It was known at Brussels on the 22nd of April; when the queen asked Hackett, the ambassador, if he had any news out of England? "I told her grace, as it is true, that I had none. She gave me a look, as though she should marvel thereof, and said to me, 'J'ai des nouvelles qui ne me semblent point trop bonnes,' and told me touching the king's marriage." ‡ Cranmer, having been long absent on his mission, returned to England in November, 1532, with a reputation for "prudent and gentle demeanour." § The aged archbishop of Canterbury, Warham, who preceded

* Hall, p. 793.

† Ellis, First Series, vol. ii. p. 89.

‡ State Papers, vol. vii. p. 451.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

Wolsey as chancellor—the friend of Erasmus—the prelate who presented a remarkable contrast to Wolsey in his simple habits and his contempt of riches—died in August, 1532. Cranmer was offered the primacy. He for some time steadily refused, alleging his own unworthiness for so great a charge. There was an obstacle which must have weighed upon his conscience, though he eventually broke through it—he was married. At last, however, he consented. He was too necessary for the policy of the king to allow his own scruples to have any force against the royal will. He was appointed by papal bull, in February, 1533,—the last bishop of the English church who received the pall from Rome. He was consecrated on the 30th of March; and in taking the oath, still in force of obedience to the pope, he publicly protested that by this oath he did not intend to restrain himself from any thing he was bound to, either by his duty to God, or the king, or the country.*

The great object of Cranmer's promotion to the highest ecclesiastical office in the realm was soon apparent. Cranmer himself writes that in the matter of the divorce, "the convocation had determined and agreed according to the former consent of the universities." The course of proceeding for the archbishop was resolved on "by the king and his learned council." † On the 11th of April Cranmer writes a letter to Henry, in which he states that "the rude and ignorant common people" are not a little offended about the "uncertainty of succession;" and are angry that the clergy do not provide a remedy for "such inconveniences, perils, and dangers as the said rude and ignorant people do speak and talk to be imminent." He therefore implores his highness, "for the exoneration of my conscience towards Almighty God, to licence me, according to mine office and duty, to proceed to the examination, final determination, and judgment on the said great cause." ‡ The king graciously grants such licence. Cranmer repaired to Dunstable. Queen Catherine was summoned to an ecclesiastical court held there on the 8th of May; she refused to come; and being declared contumacious, the final sentence, that the marriage of Henry was null and void, was pronounced on the 23rd of May.

In the proceedings at Dunstable queen Catherine resolutely refused to take any part. Cranmer went through the forms of

* The ancient guard-room of Lambeth Palace is now hung with portraits of archbishops, amongst which the earliest is that of Warham, by Holbein.

† Ellis, First Series, vol. ii. p. 35.

‡ State Papers, vol. i. p. 390.

his office with a show of impartiality. Bedyll, the clerk of the council, writes to Cromwell, "my lord of Canterbury handleth himself very well, and very uprightly, "without any evident cause of suspicion to be noted in him by the counsel of the said lady Catherine, if she had any present here."* But there was a necessity for the final despatch of the divorce which would brook no delay. Henry, with an impatience that circumstances had rendered natural, had issued his orders for the coronation of queen Anne on the 1st of June. On the 23rd of May, Cranmer writes to the king, "I have given sentence in your grace's great and weighty cause;" and he adds that he had sent a procuracy "concerning the second matrimony;" on which subject he desires to know the king's further pleasure, "for the time of the coronation is so instant, and so near at hand, that the matter requireth good expedition to be had in the same." †

Cranmer has himself fully described the grand ceremonial of queen Anne's coronation: "The Thursday next before the feast of Pentecost, the king and the queen being at Greenwich, all the crafts of London thereunto well appointed, in several barges decked after the most gorgeous and sumptuous manner, with divers pageants thereunto belonging, repaired and waited altogether upon the mayor of London, and so, well furnished, came all unto Greenwich, where they tarried and waited for the queen's coming to her barge. Which so done, they brought her unto the Tower, trumpets, shaums, and other divers instruments all the ways playing and making great melody, which, as is reported, was as comely done as never was like in any time nigh to our remembrance. And so her Grace came to the Tower on Thursday at night, about five of the clock, where also was such a peal of guns as hath not been heard like a great while before. And the same night and Friday all day, the king and queen tarried there; and on Friday at night the king's grace made seventeen knights of the Bath, whose creation was not only so strange to hear of, as also their garments stranger to behold or look on; which said knights the next day, which was Saturday, rode before the queen's grace throughout the city of London towards Westminster Palace, over and besides the most part of the nobles of the realm, which like accompanied her grace throughout the said city; she sitting in her hair upon a horse litter, richly apparelled, and four knights of the five ports bearing a canopy over her head. And after her came four

* State Papers, vol. i. p. 395.

† *Ibid.*, p. 396.

rich charettes, one of them empty, and three other furnished with divers ancient old ladies; and after them came a great train of other ladies and gentlewomen: which said progress, from the beginning to the ending, extended half a mile in length by estimation or thereabout. To whom also, as she came alongside the city, was shewed many costly pageants, with divers other encomiums spoken of children to her; wine also running at certain conduits plentifully. And so proceeding throughout the streets, passed forth unto Westminster Hall, where was a certain banquet prepared for her, which done she was conveyed out of the back side of the palace into a barge and so unto York Place, where the king's grace was before her coming, for this you must ever presuppose that his grace came always before her secretly in a barge, as well from Greenwich to the Tower as from the Tower to York Place.

"Now then on Sunday was the coronation, which also was of such a manner.

"In the morning there assembled with me at Westminster Church the bishop of York, the bishop of London, the bishop of Winchester, the bishop of Lincoln, the bishop of Bath, and the bishop of Saint Asaph, the abbot of Westminster with ten or twelve more abbots, which all revested ourselves in our pontificalibus, and, so furnished, with our crosses and crosiers, proceeded out of the abbey in a procession unto Westminster Hall, where we received the queen apparelled in a robe of purple velvet, and all the ladies and gentlewomen in robes and gowns of scarlet, according to the manner used before time in such business. And so her grace, sustained of each side with two bishops, the bishop of London and the bishop of Winchester, came forth in procession unto the church of Westminster, she in her hair, my lord of Suffolk bearing before her the crown, and two other lords bearing also before her a sceptre and a white rod, and so entered up into the high altar, where, divers ceremonies used about her, I did set the crown on her head, and then was sung *Te Deum*, &c. And after that was sung a solemn mass, all which while her grace sat crowned upon a scaffold which was made between the high altar and the quire in Westminster Church; which mass and ceremonies done and finished, all the assembly of noble men brought her into Westminster Hall again, where was kept a great solemn feast all that day; the good order thereof were too long to write at this time to you."*

* Letter to Hawkins, ambassador to the emperor; Ellis, First Series, vol. i. p. 36.

Having this authentic description of a pageant so gorgeous at the moment, so typical of worldly vanities to look back upon, we may spare to translate the marvellous relations of Hall, essentially the court chronicler, into modern imagery. We pass over his banners and streamers, his tapestry and escutcheons, noting only one or two passages that the archbishop, not so familiar with what touched the people, has forborne to notice. When the queen landed at the Tower, the king "received her with loving countenance at the postern by the water-side and kissed her, and then she turned back again, and thanked the mayor and citizens with many goodly words." The expression of Cranmer, "she sitting in her hair," is explained by the chronicler: "her hair hanged down, but on her head she had a coif with a circlet about it, full of rich stones." At the banquet, the queen was served with great variety of dishes; and by way of contrast to modern manners, we may mention that two countesses stood, one on each side, during all the dinner, "which divers times in the dinner-time did hold a fine cloth before the queen's face when she list to spit." While Westminster saw these festive solemnities, there was another queen at Amptill, solitary, sick at heart, yet sustained by her unconquerable will to defy the oppression with which she was pursued. There is no more touching picture than the report of lord Mountjoy, her chamberlain, of the demeanour of this resolved princess, when on the 3rd of July, persons from the council waited on her to deliver certain articles on the king's behalf. She called her chamberlain and all her servants into her privy chamber, for, she said, she thought it a long season since she saw them. She was lying upon a pallet, having "pricked her foot with a pin, so that she might not well stand nor go, and also sore annoyed with a cough." The commissioners began to read their charge. "But as soon as we began to declare and read, that these articles were for our instructions to move unto the Princess Dowager, at the first she made exception to that name, saying that she was not Princess Dowager, but the Queen, and the King's true wife."* No entreaties, no threats, could ever move her from this declaration. The divorce was founded upon the implication that her maiden white was not truly worn at her marriage.† She persisted to the end in contradicting that material averment in the process against her. In the very tenderest point in which she could be touched, that of her love for her daughter, she was immovable. When it

* State Papers, vol. i. p. 397. † See *ante*, p. 246.

was urged that her resolve to bear the name of Queen should be "an occasion that the King should withdraw his fatherly love from her honourable and most dearest daughter, the Lady Princess," she answered, as to the princess, "that she was the king's true begotten child, and as God had given her unto them, so for her part, she would render her again unto the king, as his daughter, to do with her as shall stand with his pleasure; trusting to God that she would prove an honest woman. And that neither for her daughter, family, possessions, or any worldly adversity or displeasure that might ensue, she would yield in this cause, to put her soul in danger."*

* State Papers, vol. i. p. 400.