

that when some complained to him of the new preachers—such as Barnes and others—he said that their preaching was good; and “that if the king would turn from it, yet he would not turn. And if the king did turn, and all his people with him, he would fight in the field in his own person, with his sword in his hand against him, and all others.” Whatever crimes may be laid to the charge of Cromwell, no one can believe that he was the foolish braggart which these words imply. That he was an oppressor; that he received bribes; that he had made a great estate for himself by extortion, were no doubt true. Some of the public plunder stuck to his fingers. He made as free with the lands and moneys of the king’s subjects, as he did with the wooden house in Throgmorton-street, belonging to old Stow’s father, which house he wanted out of the way when he built his own mansion: and so moved it upon rollers twenty-two feet, and seized the land upon which it stood.\* Cranmer said with truth, though not with firmness, “that he thought no king of England had ever such a servant . . . but if he was a traitor, he was glad it was discovered.” Though Cromwell was unscrupulous in carrying out the cruel judgments of his master and his base parliaments, he knew in his own case what was the justice which an Englishman had a right to demand. In his last letter to Henry, from the Tower, he says that he had been informed by the honourable personages who came to him, that “mine offences being by honest and probable witness proved, I was by your honourable lords of the Upper House, and the worshipful and discreet Commons of your nether House, convicted and attainted. Gracious sovereign, when I heard them I said, as now I say, that I am a subject and born to obey laws, and know that the trial of all laws only consisteth in honest and profitable witness. . . . Albeit, laws be laws.” The principle of attainder, without hearing or confession, was not law. He perished by attainder; having in vain written to his remorseless master—who, however, sent him a little money while in prison—“Most gracious prince, I cry for mercy, mercy, mercy.” The cry moved the heart of Henry for a moment; he dropped one tear. But the servant of twelve years was executed on the 28th of July. The divorce of Anne of Cleves had been completed four days before; and on the day when Cromwell was beheaded, king Henry married his fifth wife, Catherine Howard.

\* “Survey of London,” Thom’s edit. p. 67.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

Three priests burned as heretics, and three hanged as traitors.—Other executions for denying the supremacy.—Queen Catherine Howard appears in public.—Her shame discovered.—Cranmer’s Letter to Henry.—Mercy promised to be extended towards her.—Act of attainder against her and lady Rochford.—New law of treason.—Catherine Parr.—War with Scotland and with France.—State of Scotland under James V.—David Beaton.—The first Scottish Reformer.—Efforts to stop the progress of Lutheran opinions.—James rejects the overtures of Henry.—Invasion of Scotland by forces of the duke of Norfolk.—James deserted by his nobles.—Flight of Solway Moss.—Death of James.—Birth of the princess Mary of Scotland.—Treaty for a marriage between prince Edward and the infant princess.—The treaty broken off.—Invasion of Scotland by Earl of Hertford.—Edinburgh taken.—Kelso destroyed.—Jedburgh burnt.—Ravages of the southern districts.—Proposition to assassinate cardinal Beaton.—He is murdered in the following year.—France invaded by Henry in person.—Boulogne besieged and taken.—Attempts of France to invade England.—Francis and the emperor concludes a peace.—French make continued efforts to retake Boulogne.—Peace with France, in which Scotland is included.—Anne Askew and others burnt as heretics.—Duke of Norfolk and the earl of Surrey arrested.—Surrey convicted of high treason and beheaded.—Norfolk attainted.—Death of king Henry.

THE public executioners had ample work in the dog-days of 1540. The record of Cromwell’s fate by the chronicler of the Grey-friars is followed by this entry: “And the 30th of the same month was Dr. Barnes, Jerome, and Garrard drawn from the Tower into Smithfield, and there burned for their heresies.” The heretics were clergymen. The record then continues: “And that same day also was drawn from the Tower, with them, Doctor Powell with two other priests; and there was a gallows set up at Saint Bartholomew’s Gate, and there were hanged, headed, and quartered.” The traitors were condemned for affirming the legality of the marriage with Catherine of Arragon; one of them named Abel having been her chaplain. In the Beauchamp tower, whose walls are covered with the sad memorials of the wretched, is the carving of a Bell with an A. Below this is another memento of a condemned prisoner, DOCTOR COOK.\* He was the prior of Doncaster, and with six others was executed at Tyburn, on the 4th of August, for denying the royal supremacy. It may be doubted whether the people exactly comprehended the nice

\* Bayley, “History of the Tower,” p. 160-1.

distinctions of these punishments. These sufferers of the 30th of July—three reformers, the steadfast opponents of the pope; and three devoted adherents to the supremacy of the pope—rode out of the Tower in sorrowful companionship, one of each being placed upon the same hurdle, by express desire of the king, that his impartiality might be duly exhibited. Arrived in Smithfield, they each went their several way, three to the gibbet, and three to the stake. It was a merry time at court, whatever tears might fall in Smithfield. Queen Catherine Howard appeared in public on the 8th of August—a beautiful girl, the very opposite of “the Flanders mare,” whom Henry had rejected. Catherine, the *parvissima puella*,” as she was called, had fifteen months of what, in the language of romance, is termed uninterrupted felicity. When the little queen was travelling with her somewhat unwieldy lord in the north, in 1541, he then solemnly offered thanksgiving for the happiness he found in her society. On their return to London, Cranmer had a private audience of the king; and he exhibited a paper, which purported to be the examination of a servant of the duchess of Norfolk, setting forth the profligacy of the queen before her marriage, and alleging that her paramour formed one of her regal establishment. Let us pass over the revolting story, giving only a few extracts from a remarkable letter of Cranmer to the king. It is a touching exhibition of a sinful woman, plunged into the depths of despair:—“It may please your majesty to understand, that at my repair unto the queen’s grace, I found her in such lamentation and heaviness, as I never saw no creature, so that it would have pitied any man’s heart to have looked upon her; and in that vehement rage she continued (as they inform me, which be about her), from my departure from her, unto my return again; and then I found her, as I do suppose, far entered towards a frenzy, which I feared before my departure from her at my first being with her. . . . And as for my message from your majesty unto her, I was purposed to enter communication in this wise; first, to exaggerate the grievousness of her demerits; then to declare unto her the justice of your grace’s laws, and what she ought to suffer by the same; and last of all, to signify unto her your most gracious mercy; but when I saw in what condition she was, I was fain to turn my purpose, and to begin at the last part first, to comfort her by your grace’s benignity and mercy . . . and after I had declared your grace’s mercy extended unto her, she held up her hands, and gave most humble thanks unto your majesty, who had shewed

more grace and mercy than she herself thought meet to sue for, or could have hoped for, and then for a time she began to be more temperate and quiet, saving that she still sobbed and wept; but after a little pausing, she suddenly fell into a new rage, much worse than she was before. \* \* \* \* And for anything that I could say unto her, she continued in a great pang a long while; but after that she began something to remit her rage, and come to herself; she was mightily well until night, and I had very good communication with her, and as I thought, had brought her into a great quietness. \* \* \* \* The cause, that master Baynton sent unto your majesty, was partly for the declaration of her estate, and partly because, after my departure from her, she began to excuse, and to temper those things, which she had spoken unto me, and set her hand thereto; as, at my coming unto your majesty, I shall more fully declare by mouth.” \* The unhappy woman was thus solemnly assured by Cranmer, as he wrote to Henry, “of your grace’s mercy extended unto her. The archbishop thought that he should be able to establish a precontract with Francis Derham which would have rendered the marriage of Henry invalid. The matter was not clear; and the promise of mercy was a mere breath of idle words.

The act of Parliament for the attainder of queen Catherine Howard includes the lady Rochford as an accomplice—she who had sacrificed her own brother in the case of Anne Boleyn. Derham, and another man involved in the accusation against the queen, had previously been hanged. The king’s council on the 12th of November wrote to Paget, the English ambassador in France, stating the allegations against the queen; and “they are related with a circumstantial exactness, forming almost a contrast to the vagueness of all former proceedings of the like sort.” † The ambassador writes on the 28th of November to Henry, detailing, with the greatest coolness, the discourses he had held on this terrible disclosure with the king of France and the queen of Navarre. Francis “swore, *par la foy de gentil homme*, that he was very sorry for the chance.” But the French ambassador in London had told Francis more than Paget could communicate; particularly that “she would neither eat nor drink since the matter was known, but intended to kill herself; and that therefore knives, and all such other things as wherewith she might hurt herself, were taken from

\* State Papers, vol. i. p. 691.

† Mackintosh, History, p. 230.

her;" with many of the odious particulars of the bill of attainder. "*Par la foy de gentil homme*, quoth the king, and laid his hand upon his breast, she hath done wondrous naughtily, and I am right sorry that my good brother should have such an occasion of unquietness."\* The parliament, desirous that condign punishment should not be delayed, requested the king not to trouble himself personally to give the royal assent to the bill of attainder against the queen and lady Rochford, but to agree to the same by letters patent. So the letters patent were granted; and the unhappy women were executed on the 12th of February. In the statute there is a remarkable clause, that any single women of impure life who, before marriage with the king, should not confess the same, should be declared guilty of high treason. "To make the concealment of vices a capital offence was worthy of such a reign." † Lord Herbert says that there were no more youthful candidates for the honour of Henry's hand, after this enactment. There was no Sheherazade again to be found ready to trust the safety of her head to her power of amusing king Shahriar. Henry wisely rejected the chance of a fatal termination of another union, under this new law of treason, by obtaining the hand of a discreet widow, who had been twice before married. The maiden name of this lady was Catherine Parr. She became the queen of Henry in July, 1543. Before we enter upon her personal history, as connected with the two great religious parties into which England was now divided, we purpose to take a rapid view of the foreign relations of the kingdom to the end of Henry's reign, involving as they did a war with Scotland and with France.

The minority of James V. of Scotland was a disastrous period for his country. The regency was a constant object of contention between the factious nobles. The power of the great feudal chiefs had not been subjected, as it had been in England, to the superior power of the crown. A new element of discord was introduced by the progress of the new opinions in religion. The reforming spirit assumed a simpler character than in the neighbouring country, where it was mixed up with the personal quarrel of the king with the papal see. It was the earnest spirit of the first Lollards, revived in the doctrines of Luther, and spread through Europe by his unwearied labours. But though the reformers were dreaded for their singleness of purpose, the old ecclesiastical power was completely ascendant. The fatal day of Flodden had cut off the most

\* State Papers, vol. viii. p. 635.

† Mackintosh, p. 231.

influential of the nobles; and those who remained were inferior in wealth, and therefore in authority, to a body which possessed half the land of the kingdom. The spiritual and temporal dominion appeared consolidated when David Beaton was appointed lord privy seal. Patrick Hamilton, the first Scottish reformer was burnt by this persecuting prelate at St. Andrews, in 1528.\* As early as 1525, the Scottish parliament had enacted, that—"forasmuch as the damnable opinions of heresy are spread in divers countries by the heretic Luther and his disciples, and this realm and liege has firmly persisted in the holy faith since the same was first received,"—no stranger arriving should bring any books of the said Luther or his disciples, on pain or forfeiture of ship and goods, with imprisonment. † But the books found their way; the doctrines were preached; and what this statute calls "filth and vice" became the secret food and medicine of earnest men in busy towns and secluded valleys. And so Patrick Hamilton, high-born, accomplished, went to the stake in his enthusiastic youthfulness. Beaton soon obtained the complete control of the young king. He negotiated his marriage with Mary of Guise, after James had lost his first wife, the princess Magdalen of France. Mary of Guise was a powerful instrument in confirming the devotion of the Scottish king to the ancient church; and Henry of England in vain endeavoured to tempt him to follow his example in seizing the monastic property. James, in whose mind the cause of Reformation was associated with the idea of rebellious subjects, refused to listen to these temptations; and, as it would appear from a letter of Wriothesley to some person in the Scottish court, written in 1541, the king of Scotland had set up pretensions to the title upon which Henry most valued himself, even at the time when he was shaking the pillars of the ancient church, and pulling down its corner-stones:—"It shall like you to understand, that upon the arrival of the said Mr. Sadleir, there were conveyed hither from Scotland sundry little books imprinted; and amongst others, one entitled 'The Trumpet of Honour,' wherein, in the very titling in the first front of the book, the king your master taketh upon him a piece of the title of the king's majesty, being the king your master therein called, Defender of the Christian Faith, whereby his majesty should have great cause to think more than unkindness, if he would wil-

\* The life of "the first preacher and martyr of the Scottish Reformation," has been published (1857) by the Rev. T. Lorimer.

† The Act of the Parliaments of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 295.

lingly take his title upon him. And the conjecture is the more pricking, because he added thereto the Christian Faith, as though there should be any other than the Christian Faith; which seemeth to have another meaning in it than one good prince can think of another, much less a friend of his friend, or a nephew of his uncle, if he would show himself to esteem his friendship.\* Out of such sensitiveness, direct hostility would be pretty sure to arise.

Beaton, now a cardinal, had been to Rome in 1541, on a secret embassy. Henry determined to try the effect of a personal interview with his nephew, James; and it was agreed that they should meet at York in the autumn. Thither the king of England went, accompanied by Catherine Howard. But the king of Scotland was induced by the wily cardinal not to hold to the appointment. Henry was furious, and determined upon war. He resolved upon renewing the old claim of the English kings to the crown of Scotland; and the privy council directed the archbishop of York to search in "ancient charters and monuments" for a clearer declaration to the world of his majesty's title to that realm.† A manifesto of enormous length was issued, entitled "A declaration containing the just causes and considerations of this present war with the Scots; wherein also appeareth the true and right title that the king's most royal majesty hath to the sovereignty of Scotland."‡ The duke of Norfolk entered Scotland with a large army in 1542; after the English warden of the east marches had sustained a defeat in Teviotdale. Having accomplished the usual destruction, Norfolk retreated to Berwick, for James was assembling an army in his front. The feudal chiefs gathered round the royal standard on the Borough Muir, as they had gathered under the standard of James IV. Onward they marched for the invasion of England. There was division amongst the host. The rebellious Douglasses were on the side of England. Many of the nobles were favourable to the principles of the Reformation, which their king opposed. The catastrophe came, without any real contest between the two armies. James was deserted by his nobles: "Pleaseth your grace, the king of Scotland the last day of October was at Lauder, and the Lords and Commons of his whole realm with him. The king was very desirous to be in England, but the lords would not agree thereunto; and upon this they returned, and are dispersed, and every man gone into his country."§ The deserted James, in grief and indignation, returned to Edinburgh. An army of ten thousand

\* State Papers, vol. v. p. 191.

† Hall, p. 846.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. v. p. 212.

§ State Papers, vol. v. p. 213.

men was, however, got together, under lord Maxwell; with which he proposed to enter England by the western marches. Maxwell crossed the border. But the spirit of jealousy destroyed any chance of success, even in burning and plunder; for one who is termed the king's minion, Oliver Sinclair, produced a commission giving him supreme command. The nobles refused to serve under him, and the clans mutinied. A body of English horse came up, who were believed to be the vanguard of the great army; and in a panic the Scots fled, with the loss of a large number of prisoners—some willing prisoners, as it has been asserted. The king gave himself up to despair. He immured himself in his palace of Falkland; would speak to no one; sickened; and sank under a slow fever, heart-broken, on the 14th of December. A week before, his queen had borne him a daughter—that Mary, whose long struggles with adversity form a striking contrast to the hopelessness of her father.

The lords who were taken at Solway Moss were first harshly treated by Henry, and then propitiated by indulgences. His first object was to negotiate a marriage between his son, Edward, and the daughter or James V., and thus to effect a natural union between the two countries. His second design was to demand the government of Scotland, as the guardian of the infant queen. The imprisoned nobles concluded a treaty with him, that they would deliver up Mary, and acknowledge him as their sovereign lord. They were released, and returned to Scotland to carry out their plan. But Cardinal Beaton produced a will of James V., appointing the cardinal governor of the realm, and guardian of the queen. The earl of Arran was presumptive heir to the throne; and he possessed sufficient power to obtain the regency, and drive Beaton from his usurped authority, the will being affirmed to be a forgery. But Arran belonged to the reforming party; and the church was as yet too strong to allow a dominion that placed its dignities and possessions in imminent peril. Arran was, after some time, during which Beaton had been imprisoned, gained over to the party of the church; and he became an instrument in the hands of the cardinal and the queen-mother. In December, 1543, Beaton became chancellor, and in the following January was constituted the pope's legate *à latere* in Scotland. He was now supreme in church and state; the friendship and alliance of the excommunicated king of England was renounced; and a treaty with England, which gave Henry some of his demands, was set aside. There was patriotism

as well as intolerance in the policy of the papist faction. We can not follow the dark intrigues of this period; in which some of the reformers were prepared to sacrifice their national independence, and the Romanists to hold their power by craft and persecution. As to any political morality on either side, the Englishman or Scot who wishes to trace his hatred of dishonour to the integrity of statesmen at this great transition period, will be disappointed. The people of Scotland, according to the most acute of observers, Ralph Sadler, would, in 1543, rather "suffer extremity, than come to the obedience and subjection of England: they would have their realm free, and live within themselves, after their own laws and customs." The kirkmen were against the unity of the two realms. The nobles, he thought, "in time would fall to the obedience and devotion of the king's majesty, whereupon the earl of Angus and his brother, with other lords prisoners, do make a perfect foundation."\* Wherever we turn we find corruption and treachery; dark plots and contemptible rivalries.

Scotland was again invaded in May, 1544. The earl of Hertford arrived in the Firth with a powerful fleet, carrying a force of ten thousand men. He demanded that the infant queen should be immediately surrendered. The regent refused; and Hertford, with an additional force from Berwick, marched upon Edinburgh. One of the gates was battered down, and the city was entered and given up to conflagration and plunder. The castle held out; and some who had been willing to sell Scotland to England, appear to have felt that their duty was now to resist pretensions that were enforced by an invading army. Troops under the command of faithful Scots, and of those who had deserted the English cause, were marching upon Edinburgh in considerable numbers; and Hertford, after burning Leith, retired to Berwick. For two years the war was continued with the usual terrible inflictions upon the peaceful cultivators of the soil. The letters of Hertford in 1545, present a fearful picture of the ravages of his troops in border towns and fertile districts, which poetry and romance have made famous through every land. On the 5th of September Hertford moved with his army out of Newcastle. He had been directed to demolish the abbey of Kelso, and to construct a fortress upon its ruins. The abbey was taken by assault; but the ancient churchmen had built too strongly for the massive walls to be thrown down by such engineering power as belonged to the sixteenth

\* "Sadler to Parr," State Papers, vol. v. p. 271.

century. Hertford wrote that he could construct nothing tenable, under four or five months, out of those "buildings of stone, of great height and circuit,—which, to make any convenient fortress there, must of force be down and avoided." The noble ruin still shows that the difficulty was not over-rated. And so Hertford writes, "We have resolved to raze and deface this house of Kelso, so as the enemy shall have little commodity of the same, and to remain encamped here for five or six days, and in the mean season to devastate and burn all the country hereabouts, as far as we may with our horsemen." Razed and defaced the great abbey was; and onward went the merciless destroyer in his allotted work. Thus his narrative continues:—

"As to-morrow we intend to send a good band of horsemen to Melrose and Dryburgh, to burn the same, and all the corn and villages in their way, and so daily to do some exploits here in the march; and at the end of the said five or six days to remove our camp, and to march to Jedworth [Jedburgh] to burn the same, and then to march through a great part of Tyvydale [Teviotdale] to overthrow their piles and stone-houses, and to burn their corn and villages, with all annoyance to the enemy that we can; which in our opinions would be such a scourge and impoverishing to the enemy, as they shall not be able to recover a long season."\* Such were the "exploits" of warfare three hundred years ago,—exploits which the great believed just and honourable; and which men might still so believe if a stronger power than the will of princes and nobles had not arisen in the world—the power of public opinion founded upon the progress of knowledge. Yet even in those times there was a spirit of humanity growing up amongst the rude inhabitants of a country, accustomed from time immemorial to murderous forays. In another letter of the 18th of September, Hertford says that he had sent horsemen, who forayed, burnt, and wasted a great part of East Teviotdale; "and for the better execution thereof I sent with them one hundred Irishmen, because the borderers would not most willingly burn their neighbours." The commander is perfectly aware of the ravages he is committing upon innocent people, and he glories in them. His description presents a picture of Scotland, very different from the barrenness and imperfect culture that some assign to this early period:—"Surely the country is very fair, and so good a corn country, and such plenty of the same, as we have not seen the

\* State Papers, vol. v. p. 513.

more plenteous in England; and undoubtedly there is burnt a wonderful deal of corn, for, by reason that the year hath been so forward, they had done much of their harvest, and made up their corn in stacks about their houses, or had it lying in shocks in the fields, and none at all left unshorn; the burning whereof can be no little impoverishment under them, besides the burning and spoil of their houses.\* There is no intermission when "havoc" has been cried. From Kelso the main body of the army marched upon Jedburgh; and a detachment of fifteen hundred light horsemen advanced six or seven miles beyond "brenning and devastating the country." The abbey of Jedburgh, still glorious in ruin, met the same fate as that of Kelso, though the demolition was not so complete:—"I caused the abbey, the Friars, and town of Jedburgh and all the villages within two miles and more about the town, to be brent, where was destroyed also no little quantity of corn."

Whilst the earl of Hertford was carrying forward this ignoble work in Scotland, king Henry and his Council were busy in negotiations far more disgraceful than the most barbarous open warfare. Cardinal Beaton was calling forth every means of resisting and annoying Henry; and Henry had commanded Hertford to spare no one in Scotland, who was allied in blood, or associated in friendship, with Beaton. He did not hate the cardinal because he burned and imprisoned the movers of the Reformation. He might have destroyed all the Lutherans in Scotland without offence to the intolerant king. He was the head of the papal faction—he upheld the supremacy of the pope—he was the opponent of Henry's designs upon the independence of Scotland, and thus no means would be too base to accomplish his destruction. Whilst Hertford was carrying on his war of devastation in 1545, the Privy Council of England wrote to inform him that the king had seen some letters from the earl of Cassilis to Mr. Sadler, "one containing an offer for the killing of the cardinal, if his majesty would have it done, and would promise, when it were done, a reward." Does Henry indignantly reject this proposal to remove his enemy by assassination? The letter of the Privy Council, which is signed by Wriothesley, the chancellor; the duke of Suffolk; the bishop of Winchester; and four other counsellors, has this answer to the proposition:—"His majesty hath willed us to signify unto your lordship, that his highness, reputing the fact not meet to be set forward expressly by his majesty, will not seem to have to do in it;

\* State Papers, vol. v. p. 513.

and yet not misliking the office, thinketh good that Mr. Sadleir, to whom that letter was addressed, should write to the earl of the receipt of his letter containing such an offer, which he thinketh not convenient to be communicated to the king's majesty; marry, to write to him what he thinketh of the matter, (he shall say) that if he were in the earl of Cassel's place, and were as able to do his majesty good service there, as he knoweth him to be, and thinketh a right good will in him to do it, he would surely do what he could for the execution of it, believing verily to do thereby not only acceptable service to the king's majesty, but also a special benefit to the realm of Scotland, and would trust verily the king's majesty would consider his service in the same; as you doubt not, of his accustomed goodness to them which serve him, but he would do the same to him."\* Beaton was murdered in 1546; and if the king of England was not an accessory, it was not for the want of inclination.

The guilt of the king of England and his government, in giving encouragement to the proposal to assassinate Cardinal Beaton, is a sufficient proof of the low morality of that age. Cassilis proposed the crime as "a special benefit to the realm of Scotland." The counsellors of Henry accepted it as "an acceptable service to the king's majesty." What was denominated "subtle policy," was a cloak for revolting wickedness. In judging of the men of this period we must consider what was the standard of opinion; and thence find occasion to be thankful that a higher standard has gradually been created, by which public servants, not of individual compulsion but of a necessary conformity, regulate their actions. Familiarity with bloodshed, with treachery, with pecuniary corruption, no longer has any support in a common example. But the guilt of political agents may appear less flagrant, because more in accordance with a prevailing spirit, when we are informed that one of the most zealous of the Scottish reformers did not hesitate to sanction the assassination which a ferocious noble proposed. Henry directed that the Scottish earls, with whom he was treating in 1544 should "cause the word of God to be truly taught and preached among them, and in their countries, as the mere and only foundation from whence proceedeth all truth and honour."† One of the most effective preachers was George Wishart. From a despatch of Ralph Sadler, in 1544, it appears that "a Scottishman called Wysbert" brought him a letter, the object of which was to

\* State Papers, vol. v. p. 449.

† *Ibid.*, p. 387.

state that the Laird of Grange and the Master of Rothes "would attempt either to apprehend or slay the cardinal, at some time when he should pass through the Fife-land." The persons named in the letter were actually concerned in the murder. But Wishart had been seized while preaching in the town of Haddington; and being carried to St. Andrews, was tried for heresy before a special ecclesiastical commission, and was burnt on the 26th of March, 1546. There may be a doubt, however slight, whether Wishart the agent of assassination was Wishart the martyr. But the zealotry of those times would sometimes shut out the natural perceptions of "truth and honour," even from the eyes of the pious and enlightened. Knox speaks of the murder of Beaton in a tone of exultation; and Buchanan records it without any expression of disapproval. Beaton was murdered in the castle of St. Andrews. On the 29th of May, between five and six o'clock in the morning, armed men entered with masons and other workmen coming in to their labour. The workmen were thrust forth; the household servants driven naked from their dormitories; and the cardinal, hearing the din, came out of his chamber and was slain. The town-bell was rung; the provost and townsmen gathered round the castle; the murderers appeared on the wall, and "speered what they desired to see—one dead man?" They then brought the dead cardinal to the wall-head and hung him over the wall by one arm and one foot, and "bade the people see there their god."\*

To complete our rapid review of the foreign affairs of the kingdom we pass from Scotland to France. In 1544 Henry went to his parliament with a long tale of his griefs. Out of his inestimable goodness, and like a most charitable, loving, and virtuous prince, he had for a long time loved and favoured Francis, the French king. He had freed his children from thraldom; he had relieved his poverty by loans of money. But now the ungrateful Francis had withdrawn the pension which he had been accustomed to pay; he had confederated with the Great Turk, common enemy of all Christendom; and he had stirred the Scots to resist his majesty, contrary to their duty and allegiance. † The king, therefore, declares his intention to go to war with France as well as with Scotland—"to put his own royal person, with the power of his realm and subjects, in armour." But inestimable sums will be required for the maintenance of these wars. The faithful parliament, by this statute, again sanction the same species of robbery that the parliament of

\* State Papers, vol. v. p. 560.

† 35 Henry VIII. c. 12.

1529 sanctioned; and for the alleviation of such charges, declare all loans made to the king in the two previous years of his reign to be entirely remitted and released, and all securities for the same to be utterly void.\* Thus, with the proceeds of this swindle in his pocket, king Henry goes to the wars. He had previously propitiated the emperor, Charles V., by a compromise as to the succession to the crown, which recognised some claims in the person of the princess Mary, the emperor's niece. This was the third act for regulating the succession to the throne, which all persons were to accept and swear to, under the penalties of treason. The princess Mary had been declared illegitimate under the act of 1534. The princess Elizabeth had been declared illegitimate under the act of 1536. By this act of 1544, they were restored to their place in the succession, in default of issue of the king and prince Edward, but without any declaration of their legitimacy, which would have been to declare the divorces of their mothers unlawful. † The emperor and the king of England were now joined in a treaty for the invasion and partition of France. Charles was to claim Burgundy; Henry the ancient possessions of the Plantagenets, unless Francis would agree to certain conditions. The chivalrous French king spurned their pretensions; and so, in July, 1544, Henry put on his armour, and with thirty thousand men crossed the channel. The emperor was to enter France by Champagne, and the king by Picardy; and their united armies were to march to Paris. But no plan of mutual operations could detach the vain-glorious Henry from the pomp and circumstance of some gorgeous personal exhibition. He crossed the seas in a ship whose sails were of cloth of gold. He advanced at the head of the English and Imperial forces, to assist at the siege of Boulogne, which the duke of Suffolk was investing. "Armed at all points upon a great courser,"—as he is now exhibited in the armoury at the Tower,—he paraded his huge body before the besiegers, for two months. In vain the envoys of the emperor urged him to move forward, according to their compact. The emperor, said Henry, had taken some frontier forts, and he, the king, would have Boulogne. The lower town surrendered on the 21st of July. The upper town held out till the 14th of September. There had been a brave defence by the French governor against that portion of the English troops that were in earnest; whilst the royal showman was conducting his part of the business of war with the safer parade of a tournament. At length the great day of tri-

\* See *ante*, p. 328.

† 35 Hen. VIII. c. 12.

umph arrived; for which he had broken faith with his ally. On the 18th of September he made his triumphant entry into Boulogne, which pageant Hall describes with a corresponding magniloquence:—"The king's highness having his sword borne naked before him, by the lord marquis Dorset, like a noble and valiant conqueror rode into Bulleyn, and the trumpeters standing on the walls of the town, sounded their trumpets, at the time of his entering, to the great comfort of all the king's true subjects, the same beholding. And in the entering there met him the duke of Suffolk, and delivered unto him the keys of the town, and so he rode towards his lodging, which was prepared for him, on the south side of the town. And within two days after, the king rode about all the town, within the walls, and then commanded that our Lady church of Bulleyn should be defaced and plucked down, where he appointed a moat to be made for the great force and strength of the town." But whilst the "noble and valiant conqueror" was listening to the trumpeters on the walls, Francis and Charles, with great wisdom, had concluded a separate peace. Henry had constituted queen Catherine regent, during his absence; and her letters to him show that she attended to his affairs with diligence, by sending fresh supplies of money and men.\* He returned to England on the last day of September,—in no very placable humour, if we may judge from a letter of the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, and others, in which they entreat the council to avert his majesty's wrath, "in our departing from Boulogne as we have done; whose displeasure is death unto us."†

But if Henry was slow in his projected march to Paris, Francis was the more ready to contemplate a march to London. There is a most curious letter from Vaughan to the king of England, dated from Antwerp. February 21st, 1545, in which he enters into a minute detail of a discovery communicated to him by a Flemish broker, of the mission of three spies to England, who were paid by the French government, to report upon the practicability of a plan of invasion. Two of these, who were men of Antwerp, had sailed in a hoy, with eleven packs of canvass, to be sold in London; where the third man was to meet them, in the house of a Fleming dwelling by the Thames. The first two had charge "to view the Isle of Sheppey, Margate, and the grounds between them and London; what landing there may be for an army, what soils to place an army strongly in." For, said he, "The French king

\* State Papers, vol. x. p. 12.

† *Ibid.*, p. 114.

purposeth, with his army that he appointeth, to land in the Isle of Sheppey and at Margate; to send great store of victuals, which shall be laden in boats of Normandy with flat bottoms, which, together with galleys, shall there set men a-land. He will send with his army no great ordnance, but small; and set upon such frame of wood as neither shall be drawn with horses, nor yet have wheels. This army the French king purposeth shall go so strong that it shall be able to give the battle; and is minded, if the same may be able to go through, to go to London; where (said he) a little without the same is a hill from which London lieth all open; and, with their ordnance laid, from thence the said army shall beat the town.' The ambassador adds, "Where this hill should be so near London he could not tell me; but, as I guess, it must be about Finsbury or Moor-field."\* This tale of the spies does not appear to have been altogether a delusion; for Paget, the secretary of state, when in Flanders in the following month, received corroborative information. This project of invasion seems altogether founded upon rather imperfect knowledge as to the topography of the country. But such a scheme was not utterly hopeless; for the English government was sorely straitened for money, and the means of defence were of the weakest kind. The religious dissensions, and the bad faith of their rulers in all pecuniary engagements, had made the loyalty of the nation a matter of doubt. That the people would have rallied round the king's standard the instant that an invader stepped upon the soil we may be nevertheless certain. In the summer of 1545, however, Francis was making strenuous efforts for the invasion of England; and the coasts had been specially surveyed for defence by the duke of Norfolk. New bulwarks were being constructed, and decayed ones repaired, along the coasts of the channel. But the commonest appliances were wanting for an effectual resistance on shore. At Portsmouth, the works could not be completed for want of tools. "As for shovels and spades," writes the duke of Suffolk, "we have had some from London; but as for mattocks we have had none."† Money was equally wanting for defence. Wriothesley, the chancellor, writes that it is no use telling him, "pay, pay, prepare for this, prepare for that." He cannot pay. The subsidy is gone; the lands are consumed; the plate of the realm molten and coined. Corn is scarce and excessively dear. The country will bear no more tax.‡ The king

\* State Papers, vol. x. p. 302.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 796.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. x. p. 830.

had drained as much as he could under the old plea of a "Benevolence;" and so little was there of the voluntary principle in the matter, that an alderman of London had been compelled to serve in the Scottish war because he was stubborn in holding fast his money. But the true defence of England was not wanting in this season of peril. According to a return of this date, there was a fleet in the channel, of a hundred and four vessels, carrying more than twelve thousand men. This fleet contained every variety of craft, from the *Henry Grace à Dieu*, of one thousand tons and seven hundred men, to the *Mary Winter* of Plymouth, of forty tons and thirty-two men. But of these hundred and four vessels, only twenty-eight were above two hundred tons. The fleet was in three divisions, the *Vanward*, the *Battle*, and the *Wing*. The watchword and countersign point to the traditionary origin of our national song: "The watchword in the night shall be thus, 'God save King Harry;' the other shall answer, 'And long to reign over us.'"\* There was an indecisive action off Portsmouth, in July, 1545; and a serious misfortune in the accidental sinking of a large ship, with four hundred men, in the harbour of Portsmouth. The *Mary Rose* went down like the *Royal George*. The king was on shore, and saw his noble ship laid on her side and overset.

"It was not in the battle,  
No tempest gave the shock."

The danger of invasion was soon overpast. The French sent assistance to the Scots; devastated the neighbourhood of Calais; and made the most strenuous efforts to retake Boulogne. At length a peace was concluded in June, 1546; one of the articles of which was that Boulogne should be restored to France, at the expiration of eight years, upon the payment of two millions of crowns, and another that Scotland should be included in the pacification. The remainder of Henry's reign was not disturbed by foreign warfare.

The marriage of Henry with Catherine Parr, in 1543, was probably brought about by the party of the Reformation, as far as any party could influence the king's personal inclinations. Unless the lady had been of singular discretion her own religious convictions might have been as dangerous to her as her light-heartedness was to Anne Bullen and her impurity to Catherine Howard. The persecutions for heretical opinions went fiercely on, whilst the solid principles of protestantism were gradually establishing themselves

\* State Papers, vol. x. p. 814. The "Order for the Fleet," August 10, 1545.

in the minds of the laity as the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures came to be more widely diffused. But the anti-reforming party had contrived to interpose a barrier between the people and the day-spring. In 1543 an act was passed which limited the reading of the Bible and the New Testament in the English tongue to noblemen and gentlemen; and forbade the reading of the same to "the lower sort"—to artificers, prentices, journeymen, servingmen, husbandmen, and labourers, and to women, under pain of imprisonment.\* We shall have occasion subsequently to notice this statute which offers some curious illustrations of the state of popular knowledge. It may suffice here to regard it as a clear indication of the anomalous character of the ecclesiastical reform, as it had hitherto proceeded in England—a reform which let in the sunlight to the dark and decaying chambers of the ancient church, and then endeavoured to shut it out again, that the patchwork reparation might be concealed. The Act of the Six Articles was especially retained in full force by the statute of 1543 for the Advancement of True Religion; with the exception that there was a provision for allowing the clergy, accused of preaching contrary to the king's doctrines, to recant upon the first offence; to abjure and bear a faggot on the second offence; and not to be burned unless they refused to abjure, or committed a third offence. The chase of heretics thus became more prolonged and more amusing to the hunters. When the flying animal was caught the first time, he was saved for the chance of another run; and so of the second finding. But when the hounds a third time gave tongue, the poor wearied beast was left to the dogs.

One of the mightiest of the heretic-hunters was Stephen Gardiner. As chancellor and bishop he fills a large space in the history of the persecutions in the reign of Mary; but his earlier career is marked by his strenuous exertions to accomplish the divorce of Henry from Catherine of Aragon, by his negotiations and by his published writings. He had opposed the supremacy of the pope; and yet he clung to and asserted, with unflinching zeal, "doctrines and practices which the adherents to the pope maintain, but which protestants have rejected."† Cranmer, Latimer, and other early reformers, saw, with a truer judgment, that to reject the supremacy of the pope was necessarily to destroy the superstructure of which the papal authority was the foundation. But during the reign of Henry it was exceedingly difficult for conscien-

\* 34 & 35 Hen. VIII., c. 1.

† Maitland, "Essays on the Reformation," p. 396.