
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

final destination; nor can we expect, from the application of any such method, that the unseen and the spiritual will be so illuminated that the whole will be reduced to order, theology placed upon a scientific basis, and scepticism almost made a thing of the past.

J. EUSTACE BRENAN.

ART. VI.—ANNE BOLEYN.

Anne Boleyn. A Chapter of English History, 1527-1536. By PAUL FRIEDMANN. Two volumes. Macmillan and Co. 1884.

WE have been agreeably surprised by a study of these volumes. We were prepared for those details of laborious industry which characterize Teutonic research; but we thought that the task Mr. Friedmann had set before him was a work of supererogation. What could our author, we asked, have to tell us which Mr. Brewer[1] and his accomplished co-editors had not already told, which had escaped the inquiries of Mr. Froude, or which even was not to be found in the superficial erudition of Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Two Queens"?

The pages before us give an answer in the affirmative. The field indeed, thanks to State Paper investigations, to transcripts from foreign archives and to examinations of the private manuscripts of our own county gentry, had been well gleaned. But Mr. Friedmann, though the last to go over the familiar ground, has collected material well worthy of being garnered. His work is based upon the correspondence of Eustace Chapuis, the ambassador of Charles V. to England; and it throws some new light upon the period. Let us add that Mr. Friedmann writes with the ease and elegance of the cultured scholar, and that he is as lucid in his arrangement of facts as though he had not hailed from the Fatherland. We are bound to add also, that, in our opinion, he attaches undue weight to the letters of Chapuis (to a large extent partizan gossip), and as to several matters follows the Imperialist ambassador too closely.[2] The great blot of Mr. Friedmann's

[1] See CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 183. The two volumes of Professor Brewer's Prefaces, edited by Mr. Gairdner, are a treasure-trove of information. (The "Reign of Henry VIII.," by Professor Brewer, published by Mr. Murray.) We gladly repeat our recommendation.

[2] To many of our readers, perhaps, it is known that an abstract of the correspondence of Chapuis in regard to Anne Boleyn was given by Mr. Froude in the revised edition of his "History of England" (12 vols. Longman. 1870). In an appendix to vol. ii., entitled "Fresh Evidence

work, however, is his treatment of Cranmer. Of the statements which he makes with regard to the Archbishop, not a few, as it seems to us, rest upon no foundation.

The story of the life of Anne Boleyn, like that of Mary Queen of Scots, never fails to interest us. Her beauty, the vicissitudes of her life, her terrible end, make her the central figure round which much of historical and political activity revolves, and we are repelled whilst we are fascinated. Seldom has dawn been more brilliant, sunset more clouded. Anne was the daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn by his marriage with Lady Elizabeth Howard, a daughter of the Duke of Norfolk. In after years, when about to be raised to the throne, Anne courted the derision of the old aristocracy by pretending, through the aid of the kings-at-arms, that the Boleyns were sprung from a very ancient stock, and that her ancestor was a Norman lord who had settled in England during the twelfth century. As a matter of fact, her great-grandfather, Geffrey Boleyn, was a wealthy London merchant, who from being an alderman and a knight, in due time became Lord Mayor. Sir Geffrey married a daughter of Lord Hoo, and his eldest son married Margaret Butler, one of the daughters of the Earl of Ormond. There was blue blood in Anne Boleyn's veins.

When Mary Tudor went to marry Louis XII. of France, Anne, though quite a child,[1] crossed the Channel, as an attendant upon the future queen. France was now to be her home for several years. Here she grew up, learning French and Italian, and acquiring all those arts and graces by which she was afterwards to shine. In 1521, Sir Thomas Boleyn recalled his daughter. She was now a graceful young woman of some eighteen years, handsome, with fine black eyes and hair, and with the well-shaped hands of which her daughter was so proud. Quick, witty, fond of admiration, and knowing how to please, she soon became a favourite, and, thanks to her connection with the Howards, she obtained a good position at court. The events of her life from 1523 to 1526 are not exactly known. More than one offer was made for her hand; and it was said that she was actually betrothed to Sir Henry

about Anne Boleyn," Mr. Froude tells how he looked for the despatches of Chapuis in Brussels and at Simancas, and looked in vain; but at length he discovered them in the Austrian archives. Mr. Froude remarks that Chapuis was a "bitter Catholic"; and although the correspondence found in Vienna is indeed a rich vein of information, yet in regard to such matters as the independence of the Church of England and the Royal Supremacy, the bias of Chapuis and the other writers should be borne in mind.

[1] Anne was born, probably, in 1502. It was in 1514 that the Princess Mary crossed the Channel.

Percy, eldest son of the Earl of Northumberland. In 1525 her father was created Lord Rochford; and as he held an office which obliged him to be nearly always at court, Anne spent a good part of her time with him in the vicinity of the royal palace. "It is pretty certain," says Mr. Friedmann, "that, in 1526, Henry had fallen under the fascination of the handsome girl." It was known that he was on bad terms with his wife, Catherine of Aragon, and that he ardently wished to have a legitimate son. It was rumoured that the King sought to be divorced, and was about to seek another wife.[1] Vain and ambitious, Anne saw before her the dazzling prize of a crown, which it only required tact and patience on her part to secure. From a brilliant coquette she now became a political personage. Her empire over the King was supreme, and all the more absolute, because she would be satisfied with nothing less than the most honourable conditions. Either Henry must marry her, or must make up his mind to lose her. He hotly vowed he would not lose her; yet to marry her he must first be free from Catherine.

Divorce such as now exists was out of the question in the days of Henry VIII. Marriage was a sacrament in the Roman Church and was held to be indissoluble. Hence, when a wearied husband was desirous of getting rid of his wife without killing her, he had to prove that his marriage had never been good and valid. If he was wealthy and powerful, the court granted his prayer, and there was an end of the matter. "The courts before which such cases were brought," says Mr. Friedmann, "were most corrupt." They were "always ready to please the strongest." Mr. Brewer cites but one example, that of the Duke of Suffolk, who was three times divorced, and twice committed bigamy; who began by marrying his aunt, and ended by marrying his daughter-in-law. Indeed, during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., the repudiation of a wife was a matter of almost daily occurrence.

No allusion to the King's idea of a divorce occurs in the State Papers before 1527. "It is only in the spring of 1527," in fact, "that the divorce is first seriously mentioned." Henry then consulted some of his most trusted counsellors about the legality of his marriage with Catherine. She was, he said, his brother's widow; he had infringed the law laid down in Leviticus, and the curse of heaven had been upon his union by his loss of child after child. The supple and servile Wolsey,

[1] When, in 1514, he had quarrelled with King Ferdinand, his father-in-law, it had been said that he would divorce Catherine, who had then no child living. The political troubles of 1526 were in some respects very similar to those of 1514, and they naturally gave rise to the same reports. Friedmann, vol. i., p. 47.

seeing in what direction the royal wishes lay, gave it as his opinion that the scruples entertained by Henry were well founded. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Warham, concurred. Then it was asked of the Bishops whether a man might marry his late brother's wife? The Bench did not prove so subservient as had been anticipated; the answer returned was that such a marriage, with Papal dispensation, would be perfectly valid. In face of this reply the two Archbishops were unable to decide in Henry's favour; and even had they done so, Catherine would still have the right of appeal from their judgment to that of the Pope. And now ensued pleadings and cross-pleadings, intrigue upon intrigue, and incessant recriminations. We have no intention of telling a thrice-told tale as to the details of the divorce. Suffice it to say that after nearly seven years' delay Henry vowed he would marry Anne in spite of the Pope, and proceeded to put his threat in execution. Late in the January of 1533[1] (according to Mr. Friedmann, following Chapuis), he secretly married Anne in presence of a few of his most confidential attendants; the ceremony was performed, it was said, by an Augustinian friar. Thus Henry took the law in his own hands, and, though his marriage with Catherine had not been officially annulled, linked himself to Anne Boleyn. The consequence of this marriage was the rupture with Rome.

The sentence of excommunication fell lightly upon the heart of Henry.[2] If the Pope proved himself vindictive, the King, now guided by Cromwell, knew that he could retaliate, and the result of the struggle would not end in a victory for the Vatican. In June, 1533, he appealed from the Pope to the next general free council. In the same month Anne was crowned. On Sunday, the 7th of September, Anne's child was born; it was a girl. Intense was the King's irritation at what he considered "a mischance and a humiliation" (p. 230). Had a prince been born, the opposition to the marriage would have been overcome, for many an Englishman would have abandoned the cause of Mary for that of a Prince of Wales; but the choice lay between two girls, and the nation preferred Mary.

The position of Henry was embarrassing. On the Continent he had angered Charles and yet had not propitiated Francis; the Pope refused to cancel his decree of excommunication; at home the people were by no means contented. Chapuis, who called Anne "the wet-nurse of heresy," carried on his intrigues against her with even greater zeal. From this date may be

[1] The date of his marriage, says Professor Brewer, is a mystery.

[2] According to Mr. Friedmann, Henry lacked courage. It is true, of course, that he was apt to rely on some favoured counsellor; but our author, we think, makes too much of it.

traced the coolness on the King's part which was subsequently so apparent. As yet, however, though latent, it was not visible to the outside world. As time went on, matters grew worse.

At the close of the year 1534, there was no secret as to the estrangement of the King.[1] The Queen's position became indeed most unhappy. No atmosphere is so sensitive as that of a court. Anne Boleyn had never been a favourite; her rise was considered as an insult to the old nobility, who never forgave her. She was haughty and arrogant; she had offended the greatest power on the Continent, for Charles was naturally most indignant at the treatment his aunt had received, and she had consequently been the cause of much loss of trade with Flanders, our merchants fearing retaliatory measures from the Emperor. The courtiers took their cue from the monarch, and proved how empty and insincere is human homage. Her circle of acquaintance became narrower every day; foreign ambassadors snubbed her; the most open court was paid to the Princess Mary as the real heiress of the old line, and the little Elizabeth was crushingly ignored.

Early in 1535, the French ambassadors reported the unpopularity of the Queen. The common people, they wrote, were extremely angry against Anne, abusing her in no measured terms for the danger and distress into which she had brought the country. The upper classes were nearly all equally bitter; some on account of the changes in religion, others for fear of war and of ruin to trade; others, and by far the greater number, from loyalty to Catherine and Mary.[2] Englishmen had no wish to see Elizabeth on the throne with Anne Boleyn and Lord Rochford as her guardians and as regents during a long minority. (Vol. ii., p. 127.)

The King fondly believed that the hatred of his subjects was mainly directed against Anne, and that if she were not in his way, he might still triumph over his enemies. Why should he not put her away? He had discarded Catherine,

---

[1] With the usual coarse bluntness which characterized him, Henry made no secret of the change in his affections. He neglected his wife, and paid openly the most marked attention to a young and very handsome lady at court. Who she was Mr. Friedmann has not been able to discover, as neither Chapuis nor the French ambassador mentions her name in the despatches which have been preserved. The only thing certain is that she was *not* Jane Seymour.

[2] The acquittal of Lord Dacres by the Peers (May, 1534) excited much attention. An acquittal in cases in which the Crown prosecuted for high treason was very rare. In September, 1534, according to the Imperial ambassador, a conspiracy against the King was formed, and the Emperor's assistance invoked by disaffected English nobles. It was proposed to marry James V. of Scotland to his cousin, the Princess Mary.

why should he not discard Anne? The idea once suggested was all the more attractive, from the fact that Anne, worn out by anxiety and disappointment, had now lost her good looks. The volatile and heartless monarch laid the case before "some of his most trusted counsellors" (vol. ii., p. 55), and asked their opinion. If Anne was discarded, they replied, Catherine must be taken back, and Mary must be acknowledged as his heir and successor: there was no alternative.

In February, 1535, says Mr. Friedmann, "the English opponents of Henry's policy" were in high spirits. At a great dinner-party, the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, Sir W. Weston, Prior of St. John, Lord Abergavenny, "and other influential adherents of the Papacy, were present. Palamede Gontier [the French envoy] told them of the *auto da fé* at Paris lately, when Francis himself with his sons had marched in the procession, and had watched the torturing and burning of a good number of Protestants. The English lords were delighted to hear of this, and praised Francis for what he had done. There could be no doubt, Gontier wrote to Chabot, as to what they themselves would like to do in England." There was no doubt, indeed, as to the sympathies of these English nobles. If it be true, as the Imperial ambassador wrote, that they even appealed to the Emperor to "conquer" England, and "offered to unfurl his standard" in their native land, one desire that moved them and so warped their patriotism, was to have the power of "burning" Protestants.

On December 3rd, 1535, Chapuis, calling upon Cromwell, was told of the dangerous illness of Catherine; a messenger had just reported it to the King. When the ambassador was leaving Cromwell's house, however, a letter from de Lasco, Catherine's physician, was handed to him, with reassuring intelligence. On the first day of January he paid a visit to Kimbolton; and when he left, Catherine seemed in better spirits. On the 7th the unhappy Queen died.[1]

When the news was brought to Henry, "he took little care to hide his pleasure." He praised God Who had delivered them from all fear of war; there was no need now for the Emperor to meddle with English concerns; the cause of dissension had been removed; all would be well in the future.[2]

---

[1] The morning he left Kimbolton, Chapuis had some serious talk with de Lasco. Had the doctor any suspicion of poison? De Lasco shook his head, and said he feared something of the kind; for after the Queen had drunk of a certain Welsh beer, she had never been well. "It must be," he added, "some slow and cleverly composed drug, for I do not perceive the symptoms of ordinary poison." He thought she might get over it.

[2] Vol. ii., p. 165. Chapuis to Charles V.

"The only pity is," cried Lords Wiltshire and Rochford, "that the Lady Mary is not keeping her mother company."[1]

And now rumours began to spread. Was Catherine poisoned, or did she die from natural causes? Suspicion, if we are to credit Chapuis, points to foul play. But Chapuis, we know, had for a long time been afraid that the Princess Mary would be poisoned. Even if it be admitted that he reported precisely what he heard, not a tittle of evidence to support the accusation can be found. And after the letters which appeared in the *Athenæum* a week or two ago, there remains little doubt, we think, that Catherine died of heart disease.[2]

Mr. Friedmann's arguments in support of Chapuis appear to us inconsistent. In the beginning of November, he says, the King manifested an intention to have a Bill of Attainder brought in at the next Session of Parliament (p. 170). The King spoke very violently about it; and "those who knew his obstinacy seem to have been of opinion that he would carry out his purpose." Chapuis was afraid that a Bill would be forced through Parliament (p. 149). Thus, according to our author, Henry's mind was made up: Catherine's death was to be brought about by an Act of Attainder.

Mr. Friedmann proceeds to point out, however, that the "obstinacy" of the King would have brought on a rebellion. "It is quite certain," he asserts, "that the introduction of a Bill of Attainder would have been the signal for instant revolt. In such circumstances even Chapuis would have favoured an insurrection; and the conspirators, driven to extremity, would have acted unanimously and enthusiastically." "As the King had hardly any real adherents," adds our author, "and as he could not rely on the few troops he possessed, the conspirators

---

[1] Next day the King appeared in the gayest of dresses—all in yellow, with a white feather in his cap. Little Elizabeth, who was at court, was on that day taken to mass with extraordinary pomp, trumpets blowing before her, and numerous servants following. In the afternoon a ball was given at court, at which the King was present. He was in the highest of spirits, and by-and-by sent for Elizabeth, whom he carried round the room in his arms, showing her to the courtiers. Balls and jousts succeeded one another, and the court rang with gaiety. (P. 165.)

[2] In the strictest confidence the embalmer (the chandler of the house) told the Bishop of Llandaff, "who was required by the customs of the Church to remain with the body," that on opening the corpse he found all the internal organs perfectly healthy save "the heart, which was quite black and hideous to look at." All this the chandler, writes our author, asked the Bishop to keep strictly secret, for his life would be in danger if it became known that he had spoken. Dr. de Lasco, a Spanish subject, says Mr. Friedmann, was somewhat biassed. Atequa, the Bishop of Llandaff, was also a Spaniard. Chapuis thought Anne Boleyn, as well as the King, was guilty.

could scarcely have failed to triumph even without assistance from the Low Countries."

Of a proposal which was likely to lead to such a result as this, Mr. Friedmann tells us, Henry's councillors could not approve. If there was to be civil war, the more obnoxious of them would fall as victims to the popular fury, and the rest might have to disgorge their ill-acquired wealth. Henry's threats, Mr. Friedmann is certain, "must have filled them with alarm." When the royal councillors heard his angry vow (in November), when they became aware that he really meant to bring in the Bill, when they weighed the consequences, "they must have come to the conclusion that it would be necessary to use every means in their power to avert the catastrophe. And there was but one way in which Henry could be prevented from doing what he proposed. Catherine, at least, must be dead before the assembling of Parliament" (p. 173). The conclusion of this argument of assertions, strange to say, is *not* that the councillors poisoned Catherine, believing that the King would be obstinate about a Bill of Attainder, but that Chapuis had grounds for charging the murder on the King himself.

The last chapter in the history of Queen Anne was (Jan. 1536) now to be written. The King had fallen under the fascination of a new "favourite;" he was anxious to raise Jane Seymour to the throne. He spoke of his marriage with Anne as invalid; why should he not, he asked, be divorced again? But Cromwell was opposed to any agitation for a divorce; he thought that it was neither in his own interest nor in that of Henry. To have applied for a divorce would have been to "proclaim to the world that the King, on entering the holy bonds of matrimony, was careless whether there were impediments or not; it would have been to raise a very strong suspicion that the scruples of conscience he had pleaded the first time were courtly enough to re-appear whenever he wanted to be rid of a wife" (p. 240). And as for the secretary himself, Anne, if divorced, would remain Marchioness of Pembroke, with devoted friends; they would be hostile. Some other means, therefore, reasoned Cromwell, must be adopted for the discarding of the Queen. Anne was vain, a coquette; insatiable, like most such women whose beauty was on the wane, of flattery; she should be watched, and her conduct would soon afford Henry the opportunity desired. Thus Cromwell, as he afterwards told Chapuis, began to plot for the ruin of Anne.[1]

[1] "Difficulties and dangers," writes Mr. Friedmann, "were to be invented, that Cromwell might save the King from them. Anne was to be found guilty of such heinous offences that she would have no opportunity of avenging her wrongs. Her friends were to be involved in her fall, and

The plot once invented, the details were swiftly carried out. It was not difficult in a dissolute court to collect evidence sufficient for its purpose against a woman of somewhat coarse tastes, who, fond of admiration, was under the impression that all of the sterner sex who crossed her path were fascinated by her charms.

On April 24th, 1536, a commission, kept strictly secret, was signed by the King. Peers, judges, and high officials were empowered to make inquiry as to every kind of treason, by whomsoever committed, and to hold a special session to try the offenders. That this was "virtually a death-warrant for Anne," says our author, "Henry must have known or at least suspected; but his conscience remained quiet: the deed would be done by others." A case was made out. Sufficient "evidence" for the purpose of Cromwell was secured. On May 2nd Anne was charged with the most abominable misconduct, and arrested, and taken to the Tower.[1] Into the unsavoury details of the trial that ensued we decline to enter, and shall content ourselves with briefly alluding to the result.

On the 15th of May, in the Tower hall, the Court assembled. To the terrible charges, Anne gave an indignant denial, and she spoke so well that before an impartial tribunal, says our author, she could scarcely have been convicted. But her efforts were of no avail. She was adjudged guilty. The Duke of Norfolk thereupon gave sentence that Anne, Queen of England, was to be burnt or beheaded at the King's pleasure. The prisoner heard the sentence without blenching, and having obtained leave to say a few words, she declared that she did not fear to die. The thing which grieved her most, she said, was that the gentlemen included in the indictments, who were absolutely innocent, should suffer on her account; and all she asked was to be allowed a short time to prepare for death. She was then led back to her apartment.

The date of her execution was fixed—May 18th. From two o'clock that morning she remained in prayer with her almoner. At the celebration of the Communion, both before and after receiving the host, she declared on the salvation of her soul that she had never been unfaithful to the King. Not till the

---

the event was to be associated with horrors that would strike the imagination of the King, and withdraw the attention of the public from the intrigue at the bottom of the scheme. Calamity was to be brought upon her, too, in a way that would satisfy the hatred with which she was regarded by the nation, and take the ground away under the feet of the conspirators" (p. 242).

[1] As to the King's behaviour just then, Mr. Friedmann writes: "He could not hide his joy that means had been found to rid him of Anne and to enable him to take a new wife. Never had the Court been so gay . . . . Henry's raptures provoked general disgust."

following day, however, was the execution to take place.[1] She complained to the constable of the delay; she had hoped, she said, to be past her pain. During the night a platform had been erected on the Green. It rose but a few feet from the ground, for it had been deemed inexpedient to build up a high scaffold, which could be visible from afar. In the courtyard were some leading members of the Privy Council and the Lord Mayor with the Corporation; standing behind them was the crowd. Anne wore a dressing-gown of grey damask, which she had chosen because it was low round the neck, and so would not hinder the executioner's work; for the same reason she had tied up her hair in a net over which she wore her usual head-dress. On ascending the platform she stood before the block, and permission was now given her to address the crowd; this she did very simply, and in a few words. She had not come, she said, to preach, but to die. She desired those present to pray for the King, who was a right gentle prince, and had treated her as well as possible. She accused nobody on account of her death, for she had been sentenced according to the law of the country. So she was ready to die, and now asked the forgiveness of all whom she had wronged. She asked the bystanders to pray for her. Then she knelt down, took off her head-dress, and one of her attendants bound a handkerchief round her eyes. After this her ladies also knelt down, silently praying, while she repeated the words, "O God, have pity on my soul!" The executioner now stepped quickly forward and took his aim; the heavy two-handled blade whistled through the air, and Anne's head rolled in the dust. The remains were taken up by the ladies, wrapped in a sheet, laid in a plain coffin, and carried to the Tower Chapel. There they were buried with scant ceremony; no inscription, except a few letters, was put upon the grave, and the exact spot of Anne Boleyn's last resting-place was soon forgotten. It was discovered only a few years ago.

Such was the end of a strange and eventful career. "For a moment," says our author, "it seemed as if Anne would leave no trace in history; but the schism of which she had been the first cause, and to which in one form or another the ruling powers were already deeply committed, could not be undone. Her influence survived, too, in the little girl at Hunsdon, who grew up to be very like her. From Anne the English people received one of the greatest of their rulers."

[1] The hangman of Calais, the only subject of Henry who knew how to behead with a sword, had been sent for, as Anne, faithful to her French education, considered it more honourable to die in that way than to be burnt. The executioner may have been late. The delay was probably due to a different cause. All foreigners were excluded from the Tower.

The Anne Boleyn of Mr. Friedmann does not differ materially from the Anne Boleyn of Mr. Froude. Mr. Friedmann terms her "incredibly vain, ambitious, unscrupulous, coarse, fierce, and relentless." Of the charges brought against her, however, he considers her innocent, though indirectly he accuses her.[1]

If it be admitted that the "gospel light" was not, as sung by Gray, reflected from her eyes, Protestantism can well dispense with such a supporter. The more the history of the Reformation period is investigated, the clearer stands out the fact that leaders in court and ecclesiastical councils, as a rule, cared little for political and religious freedom, and much for personal greed and ambition. Thoughtful and devout observers on the Continent and in England were disgusted at the enormities of the religious orders, the selfish arrogance of the Vatican, the degrading puerilities which a vicious superstition had engendered. The Church of Rome had long possessed the field, and the moral state of the court of that "Defender of the Faith," Henry VIII., or of the court of that most Christian King, Francis I., may well be considered when judgment is being formed of the character and career of Anne Boleyn.

Reviews.

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., Oxon., D.D., Ph.D. Two vols. Second edition. Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884.

A REVIEW of the second edition of a work, as a rule, is a sort of summary, giving opinion in short compass, without entering into details of criticism. But to every rule there are exceptions. The work now before us is one of no ordinary character. It is a "Life of Christ," and it has its own peculiar features, as "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah." It is a work which displays remarkable ability and acuteness, independent thought as well as laborious research, while its language is lucid, stately, and impressive. Its descriptions of social and religious life in "the times" of the Messiah are often as pictorial as they are precisely accurate. A veritable treasure-house of Jewish learning —its value as a *present-day* work can scarcely be overrated. For ourselves, it was a matter of regret that a work of such a character was not, owing to circumstances, reviewed in these pages soon after it appeared. The

[1] "Whilst I am strongly of opinion," he writes, "that the indictments were drawn up at random, and that there was no trustworthy evidence to sustain the specific charges, I am by no means convinced that Anne did not commit offences quite as grave as most of those of which she was accused. She may have been guilty of crimes which it did not suit the convenience of the Government to divulge."