

pardon; and at length they threw down their weapons, and cried, "God save king Edward." Robert Ket and his brother were conveyed to London; and being convicted of treason, were hanged at Norwich. Others were hanged upon the oak of reformation. But more were spared than was agreeable to the terror-stricken landlords of East-Anglia. Warwick answered their exhortations to revenge with a sagacious reference to their own interests: "Is there no place for pardon? What shall we do? Shall we hold the plough ourselves; play the carters and labour the ground with our own hands?" Hob and Dick were to be accounted as of some value in the commonwealth.

After Somerset had gained the battle of Pinkie, in the autumn of 1547, he returned, as we have seen, suddenly to London, leaving to others to reap the harvest of his victory, if any were to be reaped. The results of that great scattering of the Scottish power were not favourable to the English influence. The nobility of Scotland resolved to apply for assistance, to France; and at the instigation of the queen-dowager, the young queen Mary was offered in marriage to the Dauphin of France. In 1548 Haddington was taken by the English under lord Gray of Wilton; and several other minor successes were accomplished. But in June a large force, partly French and partly German, arrived at Leith; and an army of Scots, with these auxiliaries, marched to recover Haddington. A parliament, or convention, that was hastily assembled, ratified the treaty for the marriage; and the child-queen was received at Dunbarton on board a French vessel which had entered the Clyde and then sailed to France. In August, Mary was solemnly contracted to the Dauphin. The war was continued with various success; but on the whole was unfavorable to the English. Haddington was relieved, after the garrison had endured the greatest suffering by famine. The English fleet was repulsed by the peasantry in several attacks upon the Scottish coast. At the time of the insurrections of 1549, the government of Somerset was preparing to carry on the contest with renewed vigour. The French auxiliaries who remained in Scotland had become distasteful to the people, and the king of France was more intent upon recovering Boulogne than of aiding his Scotch allies. The war with Scotland was, however, too burdensome to be vigorously pursued by England; the Scots recovered many of their strong places; and even Haddington was evacuated on the 1st of October, in the year of England's domestic troubles.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Position of domestic affairs after the suppression of the insurrections.—Somerset accused of lenity.—Confederacy against the power of Somerset.—Edward carried from Hampton Court to Windsor.—Somerset deserted.—Lord Russell with the army of the West takes part against him.—He is conveyed to the Tower.—Articles exhibited against him.—His humiliation and release.—Parliament assembled.—Law against unlawful assemblies.—Anabaptists excepted from a general pardon.—Burning of Joan Bocher.—Cranmer and the king.—Articles of belief.—Canon law.—Bonner, Gardiner, and other bishops deprived and imprisoned.—Resistance of the Princess Mary to the new Services.—Release of Somerset.—His second fall.—His execution.—Foreign Churches in England.—Peace with France and Scotland.—Power of Northumberland.—Illness of king Edward.—Marriage of Northumberland's son to Lady Jane Grey.—Edward determines to alter the succession.—His death.

WARWICK has returned to London. The slaughter of Dussindale has given him political power as well as military renown. If Somerset had listened to the advice of Paget to go himself against the rebels with four thousand Almain horsemen—to give them no good words or promises—to hang the disaffected in every shire without redemption—he might have held his office in safety. But Paget knew the nature of the man: "Your grace may say, I shall lose the hearts of the people." Somerset clung to his popularity—and fell from his high place, on the first assault of a faction that he had mortally offended by the "lenity" and "softness" with which Paget reproaches him. This frank monitor imputes to these qualities that the king's subjects were "out of all discipline, out of obedience, caring neither for Protector nor king, and much less for any other mean officer. And what is the cause? Your own lenity, your softness, your opinion to be good to the poor; the opinion of such as saith to your grace, oh, sir, there was never man had the hearts of the poor as you have. Oh, the commons pray for you, sir; they say, God save your life. I know your gentle heart right well, and that your meaning is good and godly; however some evil men list to prate here, that you have some greater enterprize in your head that lean so much to the multitude."* Strype observes upon this letter,—"Paget's temper, naturally disposed to severity, and confirmed therein by the methods he had observed in bishop Gardiner

* Strype, Eccles. Mem., vol. ii. part ii. 431.

under whom he had been bred, led him to principles of government perhaps too rigorous, and by some wise men in those days disliked; as thinking it not safe to hold such a strait hand over the commons, and to press and keep them under in a kind of slavery, which English spirits would not, nor could, digest.* The temper thus imputed to Paget is one that has always found favour amongst the large class who see, or affect to see, nothing but evil in strengthening the influence of the democratic principles of our English constitution; and thus it has been somewhat the fashion, even with historians who write without a strong religious bias, to impugn the character of Somerset. But in an age in which the humblest were trampled upon without mercy or justice, it is something to find one in the highest place earning the hatred of the great by his desire to have "the hearts of the poor." The rarity of the example ought to make us examine with a charitable caution the motives and actions of a man who almost stood alone in the attempt, however impolitic, to build up the state upon a broader foundation than the interests of the privileged classes. The favourite doctrine which was inculcated upon the young king was that "the ambition and tyranny of the nobility were much more tolerable than the insolence, inconstancy, peril, and ignorance of the multitude In the monarchy or estate of a prince, if the prince be good, like as he keepeth his commons void of power, even so he preserveth them from the tyranny of the nobility If the tyranny of the nobility be more tolerable than the insolence of the multitude, much more tolerable then is the prince's tyranny than the commons' power." These maxims are from a discourse made by William Thomas, clerk of the council, "for the king's use." † They were the maxims which had been gradually raising up the ancient limited monarchy of England into a despotism; after the organized power of the feudal nobility, which had held the monarchy in check, had been destroyed. They were the maxims which endured for a century longer, till the other dreaded power had become organised; and a terrible experience of their fallacy became a warning for all after ages.

The record in Edward's Journal of this period of his reign is evidently retrospective. It was written after the power of his uncle had passed away; and when the king was under opposite influences. The coldness with which he speaks of the transactions of 1549 is very remarkable; and if this does not manifest

* Strype, Eccles. Mem., vol. ii. part i. p. 285.

† *Ibid.*, part ii. p. 376.

the truth of Mr. Hallam's suspicion that he had "not a good heart," it somewhat establishes the other belief that he had "too much Tudor blood in his veins."* Edward's narrative is very compact; and we may as well follow it, giving illustrations as we proceed.

"In the mean season in England rose great stirs, like to increase much if it had not been well foreseen. The council about nineteen of them, were gathered in London, thinking to meet with the Lord Protector, and to make him amend some of his disorders." Holinshed has related in what manner the council were gathered in London: "Many of the lords, as well counsellors as others, misliking the government of the Protector, began to withdraw themselves from the court; and, resorting to London, fell to secret consultation for redress of things, but namely for the displacing of the Lord Protector. And suddenly, upon what occasion many marvelled but few knew, every lord and counsellor went through the city weaponed: and had their servants likewise weaponed, attending upon them in new liveries to the great wondering of many. And at the last a great assembly of the said counsellors was made at the earl of Warwick's lodging, which was then at Ely-place in Holborn, whither all the confederates in this matter came privily armed." † After this demonstration the rival powers instantly came into collision. The documents in the State-paper Office connected with this story, bearing date from the 1st to the 14th of October, are no less than forty-six in number. ‡ In these is to be traced the authentic history of the most rapid and complete revolution that was ever effected in the government—a revolution which was accomplished with consummate boldness, and with an equal amount of craft and treachery. Before the publication of the more interesting of these papers, very little precise information of this event was "to be found in our most popular general historians, or even in the pages of Burnet, Strype, or Fuller." § On the 1st of October a proclamation appeared with the signature of Somerset, commanding all the king's subjects with all haste to repair to Hampton Court, "in most defensible array, with harness and weapons, to defend his most royal person, and his most entirely beloved uncle, the Lord Protector, against whom certain hath attempted a most

* "Constitutional History," ed. 1855, vol. i. p. 85, note.

† Chronicle, p. 1057.

‡ See the List, analysed in "Calendar of State Papers."

§ Tytler, vol. i. p. 252. Mr. Tytler justly claims the merit of thus opening the historical truth "in the original letters of the times."

dangerous conspiracy." The king and Somerset were at Hampton Court; and with them were Cranmer and Paget; Petre and Smith, the two secretaries of state; and Cecil, the private secretary of the Protector. Warwick and his associates obtained possession of the Tower of London, removed the lieutenant, and placed one of their own friends in his place. The Journal of Edward relates the counter-movement on the part of the Protector: "The next morning being the 6th of October and Saturday, he commanded the armour to be brought down out of the armoury of Hampton Court, about five hundred harnesses, to arm both his and my men; with all the gates of the house to be rampier'd—people to be raised." From Hampton Court on that day the Protector wrote to lord Russell, the privy seal, who had the command of the army in the west of England, and required him to hasten with his power "to the defence of the king's majesty." The answer must have been a death-blow to Somerset's reliance upon any effectual support in the hour of his necessity. Lord Russell and sir William Herbert replied, in a joint letter, in which they say that, "having this day received advertisement from the lords, whereby it is given us to understand that no hurt nor displeasure is meant towards the king's majesty, and that it doth plainly appear unto us that they are his highness's most true and loving subjects, meaning no otherwise than as to their duties of allegiance may appertain; so, as in conclusion, it doth also appear to us, that this great extremity proceedeth only upon private causes between your grace and them." They therefore declare that they have levied a power to ensure the safety of the king, and the preservation of the State, "which, whilst this contention endureth, by factions between your grace and them, may be in much peril and danger." There is one sentence in this letter which shows the extreme imprudence of Somerset, in appealing from the hostility of the nobility to the support of the people: "Your grace's proclamation and billets sent abroad for the raising of the commons we mislike very much. The wicked and evil disposed persons shall stir, as well as the faithful subjects." Warwick and his confederates had endeavoured to obtain the countenance of an organised body, the aldermen and common-council of London: and had demanded from them the aid of two thousand men. Somerset had sought to move in his favour the scattered population,—slow to move except under bold leaders, and difficult to control when set in motion. A copy of one of the billets sent abroad has been preserved: * "Good people—In the name of

* No. 12, vol. ix. in State Paper Office.

God and King Edward, let us rise with all our power to defend him and the Lord Protector against certain lords and gentlemen, and chief masters, which would depose the Lord Protector, and so endanger the king's royal person; because we, the poor commons, being injured by the extortion of gentlemen, had our pardon this year by the mercy of the king and the goodness of the Lord Protector; for whom let us fight, for he loveth all just and true gentlemen which do no extortion, and also the poor commonalty of England. God save the king and my Lord Protector, and all true lords and gentlemen, and us the poor commonalty." There was another handbill, dropped in the streets of London, inscribed on the back, "Read it, and give it forth." Thus was it sought to move the public opinion, in days when it was of small avail; and could produce little but riot and disorder, if stirred into action. But even these rude attempts to create a public voice were not without their effect. In a letter to the lords of the Council at London, dated the 9th of October, Russell and Herbert say, that in their journey towards London, "the countries were everywhere in a roar that no man wist what to do."

On the night of the 6th of October Edward was moved to Windsor Castle: "That night, he says in his Journal, "with all the people, at nine or ten o'clock of the night, I went to Windsor; and there was watch and ward kept every night." The proclamation of Somerset, that all loving subjects should repair to the king in most defensible array, had been neutralised by the decision of Russell and Herbert—no doubt a previous arrangement—to take part with the enemies of the Protector. In their letter of the 9th from Andover, they say, "God was the guide of our journey; for if we had not been here at this time, there had been raised five or six thousand men at the least, to have gone to Windsor; besides the uncertain rage that the commons might have taken upon this occasion. But, as God would, the gentlemen of these parts, hearing of our being here, have stayed upon our setting forwards, and divers of them have sent to us for our opinions, wherewith we have satisfied them." Somerset, the day after he removed the king to Windsor, wrote a letter of conciliation to the lords at London, in which he said, "ye shall find us agreeable to any reasonable conditions that you will require; for we do esteem the king, and the wealth and tranquillity of this realm, more than all other worldly things,—yea, than our own life." On that day, the 7th, these lords addressed a letter to those few of the council who were at Wind-

sor, in which they say, "if the said duke will, as becometh a good subject, absent himself from his majesty, be contented to be ordered according to justice and reason, and disperse that force which is levied by him, we will gladly commune with you. . . . Otherwise, if we shall see that you mind more the maintainance of that one man's ill-doings than the execution of his majesty's laws and common order, we must make other account of you than we trust we shall have cause." The threat worked its intended effect. The king, writing no doubt under direction, on the 8th, pleads for his uncle in these words; "We pray you, good cousins and counsellors, to consider, as in times past you have every of you in his degree served us honestly at sundry times, so hath our said uncle, as you all know; and by God's grace may, by your good advices, serve us full well hereafter. Each man hath his faults; he his, and you yours; and if we shall hereafter as rigorously weigh yours as we hear that you intend with cruelty to purge his, which of you shall be able to stand before us?" If these were Somerset's words, he must have known that they would be wasted upon Rich, the crafty chancellor; upon Southampton, expelled by himself from that office; upon Warwick, his deadly rival. They had with them St. John, Northampton, Arundel, Shrewsbury—powerful nobles, some of whom hated Somerset as much for his support of the innovations in religion, as for his hasty temper; but most especially for his popularity. Cranmer, Paget, and Smith were still around the falling man. They made one more effort to break his fall. They wrote, that he was indifferent about his office, provided the king and the realm were well served; but that as he was called to the place, by their advice, and the consent of the nobles of the realm, it was not reasonable that he should be thrust out in violent sort. They add, "Marry, to put himself simply into your hands, having heard as he and we have, without knowing upon what conditions, is not reasonable. Life is sweet, my lords, and they say you seek his blood and his death." The one friend who remained to him, "faithful found among the faithless,"—Sir Thomas Smith,—exhorted them to moderation: "I trust no man seeketh his blood, who hath, as ye know, rather been too easy than cruel to others." He has a touching allusion to the death of Somerset's brother as if he would infer that the Protector had not to bear the odium of that state-necessity—by praying to them "that this realm be not made in one year a double tragedy." And these appeals were in vain. The power was in the hands of those who

could command a military force far outnumbering those who wore "the armour brought down out of the armoury at Hampton Court." They wrote two secret letters. One to the young king was calculated to flatter him into the belief that the exercise of his authority would restore the realm to a perfect quiet, by the removal of Somerset from his protectorship and governorship: "These titles and special trust were committed to him during your majesty's pleasure; and upon condition that he should do all things by advice of your council." The other letter to Cranmer, Paget, and Smith, was intended to terrify them into obedience to a secret message which was sent to them by sir Philip Hoby, who had recommended himself to the lords in London by playing false. Sir Philip Hoby was also the bearer of a public message to Somerset and the council at Windsor, that the lords meant no ill to the duke, either to his person or his goods. Sir Thomas Smith, who is the authority for this, says that, "upon this, all the aforementioned there present wept for joy, and thanked God, and prayed for the lords. Mr. Comptroller [sir William Paget] fell down on his knees, and clasped the duke about the knees, and weeping, said, 'Oh, my lords, ye see now what my lords be.'"* Upon this, Somerset consented that his guards should be removed, and his servants dismissed. The next day he was arrested, with the one honest friend of the council, sir Thomas Smith, and his secretary Cecil. It is one of the painful passages of Cranmer's life that his name is signed, with that of Paget, to the exulting communication to the lords that their victim is secured;—"and, for because his chamber was hard adjoining to the king's bed-chamber, he is removed to the tower which is called the lieutenant's, which is the high tower next adjoining to the gate of the middle ward—a very high tower: and a strong and good watch shall be had about the same."

On Monday, the 13th of October, the duke was brought to London as if he had been a captive, carried in triumph." Thus Hayward writes. In the "Chronicle of the Grey Friars" there is a bitter record of the fall of this champion of the Reformation: "Item, the 14th day at after-noon was brought the traitor from Windsor, with a great company of lords and gentlemen, and many horses, with their men with weapons: and came in at St. Giles' in the Field, at his desire; for because he would not come by the place that he had begun; and pulled down civers churches and

* Harleian MS. quoted in Tytler, vol. i. p. 239.

the cloister in Paul's, to build it withal."* "The place that he had begun" was Somerset House. In the proclamation issued by the council against the Protector, it was alleged, "that he was ambitious, and sought his own glory, as appeared by his building of most sumptuous and costly buildings."† The accusers of Somerset had themselves desecrated too many churches and cloisters, to object to the fallen man that he had committed the spoliation in which every courtier had been engaged from the first hour of the suppression of the abbeys. But in the eyes of the people, especially of those who clung to the ancient faith, his destruction of the charnel-house of St. Paul's—although it was an abomination in the heart of a populous city—would be held as sacrilege; and the removal of the great cloister, covered with pictures of "the Dance of Death," would excite the indignation of many who had gazed upon "the loathly figures of our dead bony bodies," as More describes them, there painted in the time of Henry VI.; and had read "the metres of poesy of the Dance," by John Lydgate. But with us of the present day, who lament over what we regard as a wanton destruction of a curious work of art, it must not be forgotten that these pictures were opposed not only to the puritanic feelings of the Reformers, but, like many other matters belonging to the ancient Church, were not consistent with a strict morality. The verses of Lydgate were founded upon what Warton calls "a sort of spiritual masquerade, anciently celebrated in churches;" and some of the figures, as handed down in exquisite wood-cuts, ill accorded with serious ideas, and occasionally overleaped the bounds of decency.‡ Nevertheless the statesmen of the Reformation too often outraged the better feelings of our nature in their zeal against what they called superstition; and Somerset, armed with his brief authority, did not play more fantastic tricks than any other great man would have played in the same office. Putting aside these tokens of an irreverent rapacity, there is little to be found in the Articles exhibited against him which calls for the indignation of after times. The law-officers would complain that he had interfered with their delays of justice; the members of the council that he had insisted too strongly on his own opinions; the nobles and gentry that he had said "that the avarice of gentlemen gave occasion for the people to rise, and that it was better for them

* Publication of the Camden Society, p. 65.

† Holinshed, p. 1048.

‡ Douce, "Illustrations of Shakespeare," vol. iv. p. 131.

to die than to perish for want."* But in these Articles there is nothing objected to Somerset that could be construed into treason; and scarcely anything that could be proved as an abuse of the authority with which, wrongly or rightly, he had been invested. In those days the sovereign was his own minister; and Somerset stood in the place of the sovereign. In the very heat and turmoil of the movement against him, the Protector sends out an order to the governor of Calais to dispatch gunners to Boulogne, which was threatened by the French. The order is, indeed, countersigned by Cranmer, and three other councillors that were with him at Hampton Court on the 4th of October; but we cannot doubt that the Protector acted upon his own responsibility in this matter, as he must have done in every case of emergency. On the 13th of October, the letters patent to Somerset, for the governorship of the king's person and the protectorship, were revoked. His almost regal authority was at an end. There can be no doubt that if the shadow of a charge of treason could have been preferred against him, Somerset's head would then have been forfeited. He remained a prisoner in the Tower till the 6th of February, 1550; when he was released upon payment of a fine of ten thousand pounds; having signed articles of submission, humiliating in the extreme. Life was sweet to the degraded man. Cecil, Smith, and others of his friends, were also released.

On the 4th of November the parliament assembled. Such outrages as had occurred in the summer were to be restrained in future by the terrors of the law; and a statute, fearful enough in its enactments, was rapidly passed. All persons assembling to the number of twelve, having an intention to offer violence to members of the privy council, or to alter the laws for religion or any other statutes, who did not disperse upon proclamation, were to be held guilty of high treason. If twelve persons should assemble for attempts to break down the fences of any inclosure; or unlawfully to have common way in any inclosed ground or park; or to destroy deer; or to pull down houses; or to abate rents,—such attempts were declared to be felony, without benefit of clergy. Forty persons assembling for such acts were held to be traitors. Any persons under the number of twelve, so assembling, were liable to fine and imprisonment. Copyholders refusing to assist in dispersing such assemblies were to forfeit a life interest in their copyholds; and farmers were to forfeit their farms to the land-

* See the Articles in Burnet. No. 46 of 'Records.'

lords.* A proclamation to disperse, under the Riot Act of the present day, is in nearly the same terms as those of the proclamation given in this statute of Edward VI. The gradual but certain operation of the system of inclosures, in promoting the employment of profitable labour in the place of the old modes of chance subsistence upon uncultivated wastes, produced a disposition to tranquillity far more certain than statutory enactments. The riots for the restoration of the old services and ceremonies of religion were equally appeased by the growing prevalence of the reformed doctrines. The government must have felt itself strong in the support of a majority of the people, when they procured an Act to be passed for all images to be removed from churches, and all missals to be delivered up.† The Statute of Vagabonds was repealed in this parliament, as wholly inoperative from its severity. A statute that made his fellow-man a slave was not likely to be enforced by the English gentleman or yeoman.‡ A Subsidy was granted; and a General Pardon declared for all offenders, especially those concerned in the late rebellions, with the usual exceptions. But there was one special exception, which is remarkable—an exception of those who had offended in certain heresies and erroneous opinions, namely,—“that infants ought not to be baptised, and if they be baptised they ought to be re-baptised when they come to lawful age: that it is not lawful for a Christian man to bear office or rule in the commonwealth: that no man’s law ought to be obeyed: that it is not lawful for a Christian man to take an oath before any judge: that Christ took no bodily substance of our blessed Lady: that sinners after baptism cannot be restored by repentance: that all things be, or ought to be, common and nothing several.”§ These were the alleged doctrines of the Anabaptists, whose sect had been so relentlessly persecuted in 1535. At the time of this Act of General Pardon, there were several such persons in prison. The repeal of the statutes against heretical opinions was not held to exempt them. The most famous instance of the renewed severity against the holders of these opinions is that of Joan Bocher. Her fate is thus recorded in king Edward’s Journal: “May 2. Joan Bocher, otherwise called Joan of Kent, was burnt, for holding that Christ was not incarnate of the Virgin Mary; being condemned the year before, but kept in hope of conversion. And the 30th of April, the bishop of London and the

* 3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 5.

† *Ibid.* c. 10.‡ See *ante*, vol. ii. p. 487.

§ 3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 24.

bishop of Ely were to persuade her; but she withstood them, and reviled the preacher that preached at her death.” The statement of Fox, with reference to the conduct of the young king and Cranmer in determining the fate of this resolved woman, has found a place in almost every history. It is thus presented to us by one of the most unprejudiced of historians: “The execution was delayed for a year by the compassionate scruples of Edward, who refused to sign it [the warrant]. It must be owned with regret that his conscientious hesitation was borne down by the authority and importunity of Cranmer; though the reasons of that prelate rather silenced than satisfied the boy, who, as he set his hand to the warrant, said, with tears in his eyes, to the archbishop, ‘If I do wrong, since it was in submission to your authority, you must answer for it to God.’” * Many statements that the later historians have been accustomed to receive from the elder, without the means of disproof—and many which future writers will continue to receive and transmit—rest upon evidence as unsatisfactory as this “stain upon Cranmer’s memory, which nothing but his own death could have lightened.” † We owe to the sagacity as well as the diligence of antiquarian inquirers of our own time that many apocryphal statements have been exploded, and many historic doubts cleared up. If the allegation against Cranmer that he pressed the execution of the sentence against Joan Bocher be not wholly removed by the following statement, it is perfectly clear that the touching contrast between the king and the archbishop must no longer be related: “Amongst the minutes of the business transacted by the council on the 27th of April, 1550, is the following: ‘A warrant to the lord chancellor to make out a writt to the shireff of London for the execuçon of Johan of Kent, condemned to be burned for certain detestable opinions of heresie.’ It appears from these words, that, in conformity with the ordinary legal practice of the period, Joan Bocher was executed upon a writ *de heretico comburendo*, addressed to the sheriff of London, and issued out of chancery, upon the authority of a warrant signed, not by the king, but by the council. It would have been contrary to constitutional custom for the king to have signed any such document; it is quite clear, from the entry quoted, that, in point of fact, he did not sign it; and the narrative which the worthy martyrologist was misled into inserting, and Cranmer’s difficulty to cause the king to ‘put to

* Mackintosh, “History of England,” vol. ii. p. 273.

† Hallam, “Constitutional Hist.” vol. i. c. 2.

his hand, and the tears, by which subsequent writers have declared that his submission to the stern pleading of his spiritual father were accompanied, all vanish. That no doubt may remain upon the subject I will add,—I. That it was not customary for the king to attend meetings of the council. II. That whenever the council desired that the king should be consulted or communicated with, an entry was made upon the council-book similar to the following, which occurs on the same day as the preceding: 'It is agreed by the whole counsaill, that the king's majestie should be moved for the restitution of the duke of Somersett unto all his goods, his debts, and his leases yet ungiven.'* The third point in the defence of Cranmer as to this special charge, is that, on the 27th of April, when the warrant was issued, the archbishop was not present at the council, which was attended by the lord chancellor, and twelve other members.* But to believe that either Cranmer, or Ridley, or Latimer were opposed to the execution of Joan Bocher, the anabaptist, or George van Paris, the Arian (who was burnt at the same period), is to imagine that they had reached that enlargement of opinion which belongs to a different state of society. Mr. Hallam has truly said, "Tolerance in religion, it is well known, so unanimously admitted (at least verbally) even by theologians in the present century, was seldom considered as practicable, much less as a matter of right, during the period of the Reformation." † But we must bear in mind that intolerance was the very opposite of indifference; and that when we look back upon the errors and crimes, either of catholic or protestant, we must make some allowance for an earnestness that saw only one way to truth. ‡ There can be nothing more signally illustrative of the difficulties which the earlier Reformers had to contend with, when they departed from the canons and traditions of an infallible Church, than the questions attempted by them to be regulated and settled which yet remain matters of difference amongst zealous and learned Christians. It is no part of our duty to enter upon an examination of these controversial points. But in the sixteenth century, as now, they furnished occasion for heats and animosities which the pious and peaceable would desire to have separated from the religion of love. The forty-two Articles of Belief set forth in the reign of Edward VI., were conceived in a spirit of compromise, which was well calculated to establish a Protestant Church as op-

* This interesting statement is given by Mr. Bruce, in his Preface to an edition of Roger Hutchinson's Works, 1842.

† "Constitutional Hist." vol. i. p. 95.

posed to a Roman Catholic, by bringing men of opposite opinions upon metaphysical points within its fold. But when the broad distinctions between the old and the new doctrines came to be of less practical importance than the diversity of opinions between Protestants themselves, the Articles, however revised and explained, became stumbling-blocks to the conscientious; and went on, from age to age, interrupting that unity of the Anglican Church for which good men ought to pray. Again, the material forms and symbols of the Church were lasting points of fierce dispute. Hooper, one of the more strict Reformers, who had lived much abroad, and who testified to the strength of his general convictions by perishing at the stake in the reign of Mary, very early raised a schism by refusing to be consecrated in the usual episcopal robe which strictness went forward in a subsequent period, into a fierce contest about the use of the surplice. Questions more affecting the civil interests of society were raised by the statute for appointing commissioners to compile a new body of ecclesiastical laws; the ancient canon law "having not of long time been put in ure [use], nor exercised by the reason of the usurped authority of the bishop of Rome."* A book was compiled by Cranmer, which never became law, but is of authority as pointing to the principles of the first Reformers. The Law of Divorce is one of the most important of the subjects of which this code treats. The proposed law did not regard marriage as indissoluble. Divorce for adultery, might be pronounced by the ecclesiastical courts, with liberty to marry again by the party sinned against and not sinning. Divorce was also held lawful in cases of mortal enmities, the desertion of a husband, his lasting cruelty, or his prolonged absence. In our own day it is one of the laudable objects of legislation to carry out some of the principles which were thus promulgated, if the change can be accomplished without making the dissolution of marriage a cloak for licentiousness, or weakening the force of parental duties by making the relations of husband and wife too easy of relaxation. The system of a special act of parliament, in individual cases, to be preceded by an action at law, is the barbarous expedient of a century and a half after the Reformation, which long remained a crying disgrace amongst us.

Bonner, the bishop of London, was deprived of his see at the time when Somerset and the council became at mortal variance. He was committed to the Marshalsea, where he was a prisoner

* 3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 11.

during the remainder of Edward's reign. Ridley was subsequently appointed to the bishopric. Gardiner, the bishop of Winchester, who had been a prisoner for some time in the Fleet, was released in 1549, and ordered to preach before the king at Paul's Cross. He preached so boldly and offensively that he was committed to the Tower. In 1560 he was examined by the council, and we find Somerset amongst those who were to probe his opinions. The history of these discussions, in which Gardiner conducted himself with his usual spirit and ability, will be found in the ecclesiastical historians.* In the end, he was deprived of his bishopric, and was confined in the Tower till the accession of queen Mary. The order of the council for his final imprisonment, in 1551, is not of a magnanimous complexion. It is alleged that he had called his judges "heretics and sacramentarians;" and it was therefore resolved that he should be removed to a meaner lodging in the Tower; that he should send to no man, and hear from no man; that his books and papers be taken from him; "and that from henceforth he have neither pen, ink, nor paper to write his detestable purposes." It would have been more honourable to the free spirit of Protestantism if Gardiner had been allowed to continue his paper war with Cranmer, without this cowardly suppression of his opinions. He was secluded for four years from all intercourse with the outward world, or the slightest knowledge of passing affairs. Heath, the bishop of Worcester, and Day, the bishop of Chichester, had objected to the removal of altars; and they were committed to prison and deprived. Tonstall, the bishop of Durham, was sent to the Tower upon a charge of misprison of treason. There is some slight justification for these courses. The severities of the government against religious opponents present this difference between the proceedings of the previous and of the subsequent reign—they stopped short of bloodshed. No Roman Catholic was put to death in the time of Edward VI. The offences of the deprived bishops were political offences; and under a more despotic system the penalties of treason would assuredly have fallen upon them. The position of domestic affairs was one of extreme danger and difficulty; and in no point was it more dangerous than in the firm determination of the king's elder sister not to conform to the changes of religion. The inflexible character of Mary presented an embarrassment that could not be grappled with by any ordinary means. An entry in Edward's Journal in 1551, shows how painful

* See particularly Strype, "Memorials of Cranmer," vol. i. c. 10.

and delicate was the position of the youthful king: "March 18th. The lady Mary, my sister, came to me at Westminster, where, after salutations, she was called, with my council, into a chamber; where was declared how long I had suffered her mass, in hope of her reconciliation, and how, now being no hope, which I perceived by her letters, except I saw some short amendments I could not bear it. She answered, that her soul was God's, and her faith she would not change, nor dissemble her opinion with contrary doings. It was said, I constrained not her faith; but willed her not as a king to rule, but as a subject to obey; and that her example might breed too much inconvenience." The entry in the Journal of the next day, shows how Mary was fortified in the bold avowal of her opinions: "The emperor's ambassador came with a short message from his master, of war, if I would not suffer his cousin, the princess, to use her mass." An English ambassador was sent to the emperor to remonstrate against his interference; but Mary relaxed nothing of her determination. Her comptroller, and other officers of her household, in August, 1551, were sent to her residence, Copt Hall, in Essex, to forbid her servants hearing mass. They returned, bringing a most characteristic letter from the princess to the king, of which one paragraph will show the tone: "And now I beseech your highness to give me leave to write what I think touching your majesty's letters. In deed they may be signed with your own hand; and nevertheless in my opinion not your majesty's in effect; because it is well known (as heretofore I have declared in the presence of your highness) that although, our Lord be praised, your majesty hath far more knowledge and greater gifts than others of your years, yet it is not possible that your highness can at these years be a judge in matters of religion. And, therefore, I take it that the matter in your letter proceedeth from such as do wish those things to take place which be most agreeable to themselves; by whose doings (your majesty not offended) I intend not to rule my conscience."* Four days after this letter had been received by the king, the lord chancellor and two others of the council were sent to Mary; and a full report of their mission is extant. The princess did not abate a jot of her resolution, or of her contempt for the ministers of her brother. She would obey all the king's commandments, her conscience saved; "but rather than she will agree to use any other service than was used at the death of the late king, her father, she would lay her head on a

* Ellis, First Series, vol. ii. p. 177.

“lock and suffer death.”* There was a bitter sarcasm in her deportment, mixed with this solemn steadfastness. As the members of the council were leaving her house, she called out of a window, desiring that they would send back her comptroller. “For,” said she, “since his departing, I take the accounts myself of my expenses, and learned how many loaves of bread were made of a bushel of wheat; and I wish my father and my mother never brought me up with baking and brewing.”

On the 31st of March, 1550, there is this entry in king Edward's Journal, “My lord Somerset was delivered of his bonds, and came to court.” On the 10th of April, Somerset was restored to a place in the council. On the 3rd of June, lord Lisle, the son of Warwick, was married at Shene to Ann, the daughter of Somerset; and the king was present at the bridal. And yet, within a few weeks of this alliance, we find that a jealousy of Somerset's influence in public affairs is beginning to manifest itself. In a letter from Richard Whalley to Cecil, dated 26th June, 1550,† the writer details a conversation with “my lord of Warwick,” in which Warwick “showed most plainly the inward grief of his heart, with not a few tears,” at Somerset's proceedings in attempting to procure the release of the bishop of Winchester and lord Arundel; and expressed his suspicion that he desired the same authority as when he was Protector. “And further, he said, alas! Mr. Whalley, what meaneth my lord in this wise to discredit himself, and why will he not see his own decay therein? Thinks he to rule and direct the whole council as he will, considering how his late governance is yet disliked? neither is he in that credit and best opinion with the king's majesty, as he believeth, and is by some fondly persuaded.” During the early part of June, 1550, the bishop of Winchester had been repeatedly examined by the council, Somerset being always present; and on the 14th we have this entry in Edward's Journal: “the duke of Somerset, with five others of the council, went to the bishop of Winchester; to whom he made this answer: ‘I having deliberately seen the Book of Common Prayer, although I would not have made it so myself, yet I find such things in it as satisfieth my conscience, and therefore, I will both execute it myself, and also see other, my parishioners to do it.’” Upon this submission of Gar-

* Eius, First Series, vol. ii. p. 182.

† Mr. Tytler gives this letter under the date of 1551. From the “Calendar of State Papers” we find that it is bound up in vol. x. of Edward's reign, in its chronological order, amongst papers ranging from February 21 to October 26, 1550. The variation is material.

diner we may well believe that Somerset, inclined as he was to moderate proceedings, might attempt to procure his release. During 1550 Somerset appears to have been re-establishing his power. In December he has a hundred guards assigned him, although Warwick and other nobles have only fifty. But in February, 1551, a storm is gathering, as we learn from this brief entry in Edward's Journal. “Mr. Whalley was examined for persuading divers nobles of the realm to make the duke of Somerset Protector at the next parliament, and stood to the denial, the earl of Rutland affirming it manifestly.” The jealousies of the retainers of Somerset and Warwick began to manifest themselves in open conflicts; and some of Somerset's servants were sent to the Tower. These symptoms of disquiet appear to have subsided for six months; and Somerset was to be found in council and about the person of the king. On the 11th of October, the marquis of Dorset was created duke of Suffolk, and the earl of Warwick was created duke of Northumberland. On the 16th of October, Somerset, having that day taken his seat at the council, was arrested and sent to the Tower with his duchess, and many of his friends. The charges against him were that, on the 20th of April, he conspired to depose the king, to seize the government, and to imprison the earl of Warwick; and the indictment also alleges a second plot of a similar nature, to be executed on the 20th of May. The long interval between the concoction of this plot and its discovery would alone induce a suspicion that the evidence, as it was called, was manufactured by him who had a decided interest in removing Somerset, to carry forward the bold conceptions of his own ambition. On the 1st of December Somerset was brought to trial before the lord-steward and twenty-seven peers, on a charge of high treason, by conspiring to seize the king; and of felony, under the Act of the preceding session against unlawful assemblies, in purposing, with others, to imprison the earl of Warwick, a privy councillor. He was acquitted of the treason, and found guilty of the felony. In the king's Journal many details of the progress of the discovery of this alleged plot are given, but they furnish little help to the elucidation of a mysterious struggle between two political rivals, which, in happier times, would have ended in a change of ministry. This Journal, however, furnishes a proof of the popular love for Somerset. Being acquitted of treason he went out of Westminster Hall, “without the axe of the Tower. The people, not knowing the matter, shouted half-a-dozen of times so loud, that from the hall