XV.—*The “Remonstrance” of Anne of Cleves. Communicated by the*
REV. WILLIAM DUNN MACRAY, M.A. F.S.A.

Read Jan. 29, 1880.

When, in words which were prompted by others, Queen Anne of Cleves had declared, upon receiving the report of Convocation against the validity of her marriage with Henry VIII. that she at once accepted and approved their sentence, although she also declared that her case was a very hard and sorrowful one from the great love which she bore to the king; and when, further, she had written (under similar dictation) to her brother to announce this her acquiescence, and to assure him that the divorce need not cause any cessation of friendship between him and the sovereign who now called her “sister” instead of “wife;” it was no wonder that the separation appeared to excite little attention or sympathy either at home or abroad. The happy temper of equanimity which enabled Anne to bear her lot so calmly, with such fortunate results of peace and comfort for herself to the end of her days, prevented the arousing of any such interest as might have been wakened had she made some passionate appeal to her countrymen and friends, or refused to lay down at the king’s bidding the rank to which he had called her. Only once (as it was supposed) when, in a short year and a half after the divorce, her successor was in the Tower awaiting her own condemnation, was there any step taken to urge the claims of Anne; and we may well believe that the then abortive negotiation of her brother’s ambassador, who in December 1541 sought to enlist the sympathies of Cranmer and of the Earl of Southampton in her behalf, was one which had hardly been undertaken with her knowledge and approval at a time when the perils of royal wifhood were being so evidently demonstrated.

But in the Minutes of the Privy Council, under the date of 29 January, in the following year, 1542, there is an entry which seems to have been hitherto entirely overlooked, and which points to some public appeal then newly made on her behalf :—" Letters were receyvede from Mr. William Pagett, the King's Highnes embassadour in Fraunce, with the copie off a declamation made in Fraunce in the name of the Lady Anne of Cleves." No more is added, but it appears that this excited some alarm and uneasiness, and that the ambassador was at once directed to apply to the French King for the suppression of the obnoxious book. For, on 26 February, Paget writes to his royal master from Paris ^a that, in pursuance of the letter from the Council in respect to his proceedings with the French King touching the book whereof he had lately sent a copy, he had had an interview with Francis, wherein, in reply to an enquiry, " What news out of England ?" he had said that he had none but what he had learned in France itself, having there heard tell of a book made in French, in the Lady Anne of Cleves' name, wherein the author very slanderously and unjustly seemed to touch the King's honour, and therefore he desired that some order might be taken for the stay and calling in of the same. " What booke is it? (quod the Kyng). Who made it? Is it printed?" " A very folishe booke, Sir (quod I) made by Mons^r Dyvry, Conte Bryan's brother; I am in doubte whether it be printed or no." " Mary (quod the Kyng) I will set staye for the printyng of it incontinent, and also take ordre for the recoverey of so many copies as be out of them." " Sir, (quod I) thenne shal your Highnes doo according to thamitie betwene the Kinges Majestie my maister and you." " Jesus! (quod the Kyng) what ment he to make it? I thinke verly the Duke of Cleves knoweth not of it." " If he did (quod I) *il a tort*, considering the goodnes the Kinges Majestie my maister hath shewed to him and his." " No, surely (quod he), he knoweth not of it, for it wer a folie of him, and specially now at this tyme; for men's affections do alter, and the Lady Anne is yet of age to bear childern; and albeit the winde hath bene contrarie, it may fortune to turne." " Sir (quod I) of thinges to cum touching that parte I knowe not, but of thinges that be passed therin I am assured my maister hath done nothing that hath bene dissonant eyther from God's lawe, man's lawe, reason or honestie; and I thinke your Highnes thinketh the same." " Who, I? (quod he) in faith I never thought otherwise, sythens I was furst enformed of the matier, and so I thinke still, and spake it not for no such purpose, for I knowe my good brother is a Prince of great wisdom and

^a *State Papers*, Hen. VIII. part v. p. 660.

experience, and knoweth what he hath to do well ynough in these thinges, and no man lyving wissheth him better thenne I, and fayne would I that our amitie, albeit it be great, were yett greater."

The book, of which Paget thus seems to have forwarded to England only a manuscript copy, as one out of many which he believed were in circulation, was, however, actually printed; but whether before or after his application for its suppression does not appear. And printed not only once, but twice; and not surreptitiously and in secret, but with the names of the printers, although without a date. And from France it passed into Italy, and there, after Henry's death, in 1558, appeared at Bologna clothed in an Italian version by one "Cap. Gio. Battista dei Grillandari," a Florentine, who dedicated his translation to Lucretia of Este. But, strange to say, no mention has ever been made by any English writer who has treated of the history of the time, of this attempt to enlist the sympathy of Europe in Anne's favour, and the passages in the records of the Privy Council and in the State Papers have either altogether escaped notice, or have been passed over as referring to some ephemeral and lost production, respecting which inquiry would be vain. But whatever was the "order" taken by Francis I. for its suppression, the book still exists, and well deserves notice. In its very title, however, there is a strange error, which may partly account for the general ignorance of it. The Title runs as follows: *Loraison et Remonstrance de haulte et puissante Dame ma dame Marie de Cleves, sœur de treshault et puissant Seigneur, le Duc de Juilliers, de Cleves, et de Gueldres: Faicte au Roy d'Angleterre et à ceulx de son Conseil. Joannes a Luxemburgo III. faciebat.* That Anne is here called by the name of her mother, Mary, may possibly be one of the causes why inquirers into the history of Anne have missed meeting with the book. The error shows evidently that the author was not inspired by the supposed appellant, and must of itself, if found in the copy sent to England, have cleared her from all suspicion of complicity, which would otherwise have certainly led to unpleasant "interpellations." And the contrast between the tone of her supposed plea and the real feelings which she personally exhibited is one of complete and welcome inconsistency. Her advocate represents her as dissolved in tears, overwhelmed with sorrow, contemplating even the possibility of suicide, resisting to the utmost the wrong, the dishonour, the causeless injustice, done to her. But the real fact was, as an eye-witness, none other than the French ambassador, Marillac, informs us, that "the Lady of Cleves, so far from being troubled at what has befallen her, appears as happy as ever she was in her

life. * * * The Lady of Cleves shows herself perfectly happy. Her brother's ambassador tells me she is in the best spirits in the world."^a

But what is known of "Joannes a Luxemburgo III.?" Who was this author? The very name and description are at first sight somewhat of a puzzle.

"John of Luxembourg" was the third son of Charles of Luxembourg, Count of Brienne, Ligny, and Roussy. In 1525, at the age of ten years, he was elected Abbot of Ivry, in the diocese of Evreux (whence it is that he is called "Mons. Dyvry" by Paget), because, the monastery being poor and ruinous, the monks were desirous to secure as their head a member of such a wealthy and powerful house as that of Brienne; and Pope Clement VII. confirmed the election, on condition that a third part of the revenues of the monastery should be employed upon repairs, upon the purchase of sacred ornaments, and upon the support of the poor, and that the Prior should have the management of the house until the boy-Abbot should reach the mature age of eighteen. At the time of the publication of our book he had become Bishop of Pamiers, and it is to this that the numeral "III." on his title-page makes reference; amongst the possessors of that see he was "John the Third." He had been appointed administrator of the diocese in 1540, when only twenty-five years of age; but it would seem by his style that he must have been consecrated previously to the printing of the book, in which case, if it were printed before 1545, his minority in age must again have been dispensed with. He died in 1548 at Avignon, and was there buried. His appeal on behalf of the divorced queen may possibly have been first written in 1540, when the separation was under discussion, but not put to the press at any rate until the close of 1541, when her brother was entertaining the hope of her possible restoration, but probably some years later. It was printed, as its colophon tells, "a la Rivou par Maistre Nicole Paris, maistre ès arts, tres humble et obeissant Serviteur & Imprimeur de hault et puissant Seigneur, Messire Jean de Luxembourg."^b For the young and lordly Bishop of Pamiers was a man of learning and literature, as well as of taste and eloquence; and, in his zeal for the advancement of the studies which he loved, he brought from Troyes and employed within cloistered walls

^a Notes to Froude's edition of Thomas' *Pilgrim*, 8vo. Lond. 1861, pp. 154, 155.

^b Brunet (*Manuel du Libraire*), who speaks of the book as being very rare, supposes that it was printed about 1545, because a Troyes book bears the name of Nicolas Paris as its printer in that city in 1544. But the monastery of "la Rivou" and the city were near enough to have admitted of his superintending presses at the two places simultaneously.

Master Nicolas Paris, a scholar of academic degree, as his own private printer. To his abbacy of Ivry Bishop John III. added that of the Cistercian house of La Rivour, or l'Arrivour, situated in the village of Lusigny, some nine or ten miles from Troyes; and hence it is that the imprint of his book bears the name of a place almost unknown in typographical geography, "La Rivou."^a In 1547, the year before his patron's death, Master Nicolas printed here an edition of Bude's treatise, *Institution du Prince*, with notes and other matter added by the Abbot, in which the book is described as "imprimé à l'Arrivour, abbaye du dict Seigneur." The original edition of the book with which we are now concerned is a small quarto of fifty-three pages; and it was reprinted at Paris itself, with the same title, renewing the same mistake in the name of "Marie," by one Arnoul l'Angelier, in a small 16mo volume, also without date.

What the motive can have been which induced a Roman Catholic Bishop thus to enter the lists as the sole champion of a Lutheran princess, at whose downfall all those of his own faith in England had rejoiced, can only be conjectured. There is no apparent evidence of any family friendship or alliance between the houses of the Counts of Brienne and the Dukes of Cleves; and the fact of the mistake as to Anne's Christian name seems to show that the writer had no personal acquaintance with the lady whose cause he advocated. Is it not possible that the tract was really written with the subtle idea of provoking a quarrel between the English "Defender of the Faith," and the prince who was one of the leaders of the German heretics, of irritating the former, as it indeed succeeded in doing, and of rousing in the breasts of the Lutherans a strong sense of the wrong that had been done, not merely to an individual but to them and to their cause as well, in the expulsion from the English throne of one who would have favoured their movements, and in the substitution of a devoted adherent of the older form of faith? If written, as its whole construction and argument imply, when the proposed separation was yet under discussion, and if written then with the hope of so exasperating Henry at the appearance of foreign interference as to preclude the chance of a reconciliation, it may have been laid aside when the

^a The name is found indeed in the second volume, or supplement, of Dr. Cotton's *Typographicae Gazetteer*, but the learned archdeacon was ignorant of the real locality. In two, at least, of the great English monasteries, St. Alban's and Tavistock, the art of printing was early practised; but such instances were rare, and to find it established in so obscure a house as was La Rivour is no small proof of the Abbot's love for learning and the arts. It is duly entered in P[ierre] D[eschamps'] *Dictionnaire de Géographie à l'usage du libraire; supplément au Manuel du Libraire*, 1870, under its Latin form of "*Ripatorium*," but the title of our book is incorrectly given as *Oraison funebre de Marie de Clèves*.

rapid progress of events plainly made its publication unnecessary, and may have been at last brought to light only when the embassy of the Duke of Cleves in December 1541, renewed the fears of his sister's possible restoration, and made this display of zealous championship from an unexpected quarter come in at a very opportune season for thwarting what it professed to advocate. Such a conjecture appears sufficiently to account for the phenomena of the authorship of the tract, of its open publication not merely in a province but in Paris itself, despite the French King's professed intention to prohibit and suppress it, and for the fact that those who noticed it did not regard it as in any way proceeding from, or being authorised by, the Lady Anne herself. If this conjecture as to the date of publication be erroneous, it may then be that, while written with the same supposed motive and intended for publication at that time, the interference of the English ambassador and the consequent action of Francis I. may have hindered its publication until both the English and French kings had been removed by death in 1547, and that its appearance then was due simply to its literary merit, or to its author's idea of its merit, and not to any deep theologico-political design.

But it is time to proceed to give some account, in an abridged abstract, of the contents of the tract. It is written under the form of a personal appeal from Anne herself, and this character is sustained throughout with all appearance of naturalness, with great spirit and with occasional touches of real eloquence. The tone is tender and feminine; the learning which it occasionally parades such as might have been affected in compliment to Henry himself, although, certainly, there is no evidence that in this respect any more than in others Anne was suited to his taste; the flattery as gross as was customary, although beneath it all there are sharp insinuations and reproaches which must have nettled the touchy monarch not a little.

The appeal, directly addressed to the King, begins by the Queen's declaring to him that 'if tears and grief could remedy her misfortunes, she would not fail to employ them for the recovery of the goodwill which he ought to bear to her, seeing that she is a helpless stranger, who has left her native land, and the parents who so delicately nourished her, and the servants who loved and honoured her and who still regret her departure. But since she knows that great kings have always those beside them who represent their every wish as lawful, she has no hope except in his own goodness and equity; his own knowledge and sound judgment are her best defence, and if these fail, the eloquence of the greatest orator in the world would only render her very blameable in pretending to speak against what he might please to do. If those who trust in virtue can never be

deceived of their hope, she then, in betaking herself to his virtues, which are so numerous, cannot possibly despair of safety; but, nevertheless, as all her love is for him alone (not for his riches or possessions), she only desires that his pleasure may be done. As for the questions whether, having espoused her first by ambassadors whom he had commissioned, and then, after contracts duly ratified, having espoused her himself with the solemnities of the Church, he can now repudiate and leave her, she will not make her rights an occasion of quarrel with one whom she only desires to honour and serve. If love makes her too passionate in the course of her speech, he must only blame himself who has made so lively an impression upon her. If she were to tell all the reasons for the affection which she bears to him, whom she chose in preference to many great princes and lords who courted her, then all the great ladies in Europe would be glad at her trouble, in the hope of arriving themselves at that happiness which she thought would have been her for life, and for which, if regained, they will envy her.

‘The honour with which she was at first received, the rich apparel with which he desired her to be arrayed, the letters written by his own hand which his ambassadors delivered, all these she recalls to his remembrance. But she would rather never have lived than that on her account it should hereafter be said that his faith (so holy and inviolable), his constancy (honoured by all the kings in Europe) and his good judgment (which can direct others so well and worthily) had all been contaminated and defiled by the bad treatment, the wrong and the injury, exhibited by him to her.’ She then turns to the Lords of the Council, and appeals to them to speak the truth to their Prince without fear or favour of either side, or regard to any inconvenient results; and undertakes to prove to them very easily that alike by the old Law, by their Christian profession, and even by the rights recognised amongst Pagans, the King cannot justly leave her. Hereupon she goes back to the first institution of marriage at the Creation and to its divine sanctions. ‘Its validity depends upon the mutual consent of the parties, stamped with the approval of the Church; and this consent the King cannot deny that he gave. Is she now, in return for her plighted troth, to be robbed of honour and covered with shame? Will it be any credit to him that people should say that after he had sent for the sister of the Duke of Juliers as his wife, he now makes it a matter of discussion whether he can leave her and send her back again? Who in the whole world will be found so shameless and devoid of sense, who so deficient in reason and the knowledge of justice, as to maintain that by divine, or human, or natural law, the King can do it lawfully? True, among those ancients who had no knowledge of God, repudiation was allowed;

but that law has no force now. He has no just occasion of complaint against her, unless it be that she is entirely devoted to him and bears him the greatest goodwill, and therefore will not permit a separation. If this be an inexpressible offence, then let her life pay for it.

‘But some one may say, “Wives are given to men to obey them and to do what they choose to order,; if then the King chooses to leave you and take another, ought you to go contrary to his will?” There is some force in this; but then unjust orders have no validity, and they who obey another’s vices themselves commit an offence, being the rather bound to remonstrate. If the King were to order her not to love him, obedience would be simply impossible.’ Hereupon, the writer breaks out into an apostrophe to Love, in which Love is implored to answer on her behalf to whatever may be said against her. ‘If it be said that she is not so personally attractive in the King’s eyes as he desired to find her, let it be replied that she did not seek the King but he sought her; it was at his earnest solicitation that she obeyed the commands of her relatives. And if she does not possess so much of that external beauty which consists in a certain proportion and harmony of the body as many other women (while yet there are very many who in that respect have not so much reason to be contented as she has), let it be represented that such changeable beauty of the body is the least of the perfections which one can have; that the true, divine, and permanent beauty is that of the soul; and that it should be enough if a wife bring to her husband’s house well-regulated temperance in all things, and a sure and perpetual chastity, together with the goodwill and affection which she ought to bear him.’

Now follows a sharp sketch of the opinions expressed abroad about Henry, which with its pungent plainness of speech, none the less plain for being exhibited under the form of profuse flattery, must have touched him to the quick.

‘She must own that many of her relations and friends had tried to prove her constancy before her marriage by speaking evil of him, and so to divert her from her purpose. But she took their interference in ill part. When, for instance, some asked her if she thought she could endure the tempers of, and live comfortably with, a King who was suspected of having already treated three wives very badly, she answered them as best she could, according to what she understood the actual truth to be; saying, that one of them had been abandoned with very great regret, as everybody knew, only to satisfy his conscience because he preferred the depriving himself of his greatest delights to the offending God; that the second had been punished for her gross misconduct, as justice, reason, and equity allowed, and that as for the third, the saying that she had been ill treated by him was

indeed an ill saying, for never had wife had greater reason to felicitate herself with her husband, and that her death had happened only after giving birth (to the great joy of the whole English nation) to a very fine son who, it was thought, would succeed not only to his father's inheritance but to his great virtues. Then another had asked her (in order to put her in a passion, or try her patience) how she would bear the King's humours, which, as the questioner said, were too difficult for her or anybody else to understand, and what remedy she would employ if he were to love some other lady, or how she would bear it if he were to prove jealous. But she quickly satisfied the querist with the assurance, that she would be so entirely obedient to the King's humour as that everything which he wished should please her, and that her only happiness in the world would be to esteem everything that he liked; that to gain his love she would become like the fabled Proteus, and change herself into all forms, so that by becoming entirely conformed to his desires it could not fail but that she should be far more agreeable to him than any of those whose company he might (with scandal and sin) desire to use. She knows indeed that men are given to women to be their lords and masters, and that a greater license in pleasure is allowed to them, and that human laws do not enjoin upon them like continence and equal chastity with women. Men have the management of great and difficult affairs, they have to provide for all the political necessities of nations and for the welfare of subjects; but women have but to observe the one law of honour, and to make their husbands' wish their good. They ought never to give any one the opportunity of speaking ill of them; lest it should happen to them as it did to Hermione, the wife of the King of Thebes,^a of whom Euripides speaks in his tragedies, where she laments that she had ever been so foolish as to believe those who detracted from the praises of her husband, her jealousy and easy credulity involving her in no little calamity. But, seeing that it was very difficult to satisfy those who persisted in their endeavours to test her, she told them, in order to give them the fullest assurance of her own intentions, that she would be like the prudent Emilia, the wife of Scipio Africanus, who during his life never evinced any jealousy or caused any scandal about a slave whom he loved, and after his death honourably treated and provided for her, because she thought it would give pleasure to his spirit in the other world; and who was wont to say that when men exhibited affection for others than their own wives, it was but from some fleeting feeling which vanished like smoke, and that, for all that, love would not at

^a The writer here appears to confound Hermione, or Harmonia, wife of Cadmus, with her later namesake.

all diminish, because it can only extend to things good and praiseworthy, and is an enemy of all vice and iniquity.

‘And when she was asked how she would bear it, supposing, on the other hand, he were jealous of her, she replied that she would always show him such signs of affection, would be always so near him and make so little count of all the world beside, that she would reckon the time, the day, the hour, lost, in which he did not command her willing service ; so that she assured herself there would be no need for them in England of the temple dedicated at Rome to the Goddess Viriplaca, whither husbands and wives resorted when they had fallen out in order to tell their several stories, and then to be reconciled ; for she would so fashion her manners and life to suit his nature that he would hardly know that she was not his very self.

‘Thus no arguments of others prevailed with her, and those who had been careful to dispute with her on the matter greatly applauded her reasoning ; for the affection which she bore him made her speak more ably than any skill or teaching could have enabled her to do. And they said that all that they had done had only been with the view of guarding against future inconveniences, and that in thus doing they acted the part of good kindred and true friends and wise advisers. But she, poor woman that she is, could never have supposed for an instant that she could have fallen into the sad condition in which she is now, a result so unexpected and so contrary to the anticipations she had indulged. For since the first entering upon the treaty of marriage, as well as since the time when he first received her kindly at his court, she is not conscious of having committed any offence for which he could justly say that she deserves that this question should be brought forward, as it is now, without any other reason except that he has the power to leave her and take a new wife. No one could have foreseen such a misfortune, for those things which proceed from mere arbitrary whim and not from reason must be referred to what we call chance ; and no advice or forethought can provide against them. It will be much harder for her now to give him up, after having had the privilege of knowing him in some small degree, than if that privilege had never been hers. For she has seen that in him there are such perfections that were she to reckon them up, she would think that she knew every good thing and every virtue that there is in the world ; and did she but know them perfectly she would need no other medicine to remedy all her ills and to minister entire comfort. And let him not think that in thus saying she exposes herself to blame for flattery. For the love which she bears him cannot but be good and true, whether it come from the heavenly in-

fluences of the planets under which they were born, or from the temperament in which she most nearly approaches him, [!] or from familiarity with him, which has nevertheless been too short for forming a perfect judgment of his endowments. If it be from heaven, then the Author of all things preserves its vitality, and disposes her to love him; if it be from the close affinity of their temperaments, then it is impossible that he, who is the thing she most desires in the world, should hate her; if from the knowledge which she has of his virtues and praiseworthy qualities, these are so great that they cannot permit anyone to do her injury. But should she be deceived in her hope and lose her rightful cause (in which, however, she can never fail if truth and justice remain in the world, or change not in their name and in their effect altogether) she will not be the first woman who has been deceived by men. For it is common with women to receive ill in return for good. And so she will have at any rate that consolation of the unfortunate which consists in thinking how many have suffered like herself, whose examples will teach her to follow them in fortitude and constancy. She will lay to heart the example of those women of India who, when their husband is dead, come weeping before the judges and princes of their country, declaring what cause they have for grief; and she who can prove that she was the most loved, and is pronounced so to have been, then humbly thanks the judges, and goes joyfully, clad in her best array, to share her husband's funeral pile; while the other wives spend all the rest of their days in tears, and judge themselves unfit to be seen. But alas! her case is altogether different! She, loving him too well but not being at all esteemed by him, can only have her place amongst the unhappy ones who have lost all the fruit of their regard. But in proving the truth of woman's love, the only difficulty lies in choosing instances out of the multitude that occur; one can find abundance of women ("although you men pretend that we are faint-hearted and fearful") who have been willing to die for their husbands. For instance, Alcestis the wife of Admetus, King of Thessaly, suffered death in his place. To this purpose also there is an ancient story of one of Henry's own predecessors, a King of England named Robert, who in a battle with the Syrians had received a great wound from a poisoned sword. After his return to his own country it was judged by well-informed and experienced surgeons that the wound was incurable, unless perchance the poison could be sucked out by some one to whom in that case it would speedily prove fatal instead; and when the king conscientiously refused to allow anyone to be put in such danger he was succoured in his necessity by his own wife, who secretly in the night, having removed the bandages from the wound without his

being aware of it, did that which the doctors had ordered ; and, having sucked out the poison, she was found herself the next day choked and dead.^a

'This story has given her great comfort, for she believes that when he knows that her good-will is not less than that of which she has thus made recital, he will feel some inclination to treat her well, and not cut her off from his society. But if it should be otherwise, to what an extremity will she be reduced ; for what can she then do ? The law forbids her doing violence to herself, to send her soul back to heaven whence it came ; yet she cannot live in the world without dying daily in deaths far more cruel than words can describe. The death of the body, in proportion to its violence, is the sooner over ; but, when the soul is agitated with passion and torment, it, because it is immortal, is the more grievously afflicted. Could it but perish like the body, the vehemence of her affection would, she verily believes, many times already have delivered her out of all her sufferings. Or, if the Athenian custom still prevailed of allowing persons to take poison who could show that there was no just cause for their continuing to live, she assures him and his Council that she would so order her speech that he and every one who heard her would say that no person had ever more reason to wish to die than she has. For what of pleasantness remains for her in the world if that which formed the stay of her life is parted from her for ever ? What hope can she ever have of comfort, if of that happy offspring which she thought to have had of him, and which she trusted to see stretch, like a beautiful tree, its branches even to heaven, the very roots are torn up from the earth by violence ? if a sudden tempest, a sudden change of will, lay waste the fruits which were

^a This version of the apocryphal story of Prince Edward and Eleanor is interesting, as removing it still further into the region of mythical tradition. I have not been able to trace the source from which the writer derived the name of Robert ; the story does not appear among the legends told of Robert *le Diable* of Normandy, neither was he the sort of personage likely to have inspired such tender affection. It seems probable, however, that, in some form or other, the narration (based upon some real occurrence) may have obtained currency through the medium of romance, and have been told of different heroines. As connected with Edward it first appears (as is well known) in the History of Spain by Rodericus Santius, Bishop of Palencia in the latter half of the fifteenth century, who relates it ("ut vera perhibent annalia") in the fourth chapter of his first book, where he is speaking of the virtues of Spanish women. It was from this source that Camden first introduced it into English history. Sanuto, the Venetian historian of the Crusades, who returned from a fifth visit to the Holy Land in 1306, only thirty-five years after Edward's attempted assassination, merely remarks about it that he was cured "with difficulty ;" and the French chronicle ascribed to Baudoin d'Avesnes, who died in 1289, says that he was cured by the help of God and by a certain stone, efficacious against poison, which was given him by the Hospitallers (*Rec. des Hist. de France*, xxi. 178).

already ripe and ready for gathering ?^a What can she do if that beautiful vessel filled with choice flowers and carefully guarded all through the winter until the spring be broken up and scattered ? Would to God she had never known him, and that his virtues had consequently not become so dear to her, or that the day of her birth had been the day of her death. If grief ought to be proportioned to the loss which causes it, then her grief should be infinite, for infinite in value is her loss. The more Reason tells her that what cannot be cured must be endured, the more her pent-up grief gains force from the knowledge that her wound cannot be healed, and becomes hydra-headed in its many forms and occasions. It is no pleasure to her thus to indulge in complaints and tears ; would that she could diminish them. Undeserved grief is indeed incurable, and especially when its cause is contrary to the claims of nature, to reason, and to equity. And it may easily be believed that she has not committed the whole goodness of her cause to her words, which are all too weak and too badly arranged to have sufficient power of persuasion in opposition to the violence with which she is threatened. Even if she had the power, she would not wish in anywise to use it in relation to a thing forbidden by all the laws of that equity which ought most chiefly to reign amongst princes, who, more than others, are bound to maintain it.

‘To conclude as she began (that she may not weary him with further speech), she will place the whole strength of her Remonstrance in his mercy and pity, which she holds in so great reverence and esteem that she believes they will serve her far more than all the laws and rights which she could allege. For the longest argument which she could employ will be of no avail, except to bring to his recollection that which he already knows and perfectly understands. He is his own best adviser. As he is always reckoned the first in royal dignity, so may he cause himself to be reckoned by the wise and virtuous the first in knowledge and prudence and good judgment. And the more wisely he manages this affair, which is of such consequence to him, the more will he make it evident to every one, and especially to foreigners, that reason has exercised more authority with him than the false persuasion of those who wish to diminish his goodwill towards her ; and he would thus manifest the exact contrary of that which many suspect, viz. that no new affection (by which wise men ought never to be carried away,

^a There would seem to be reference here to a condition which may have given rise to the subsequent report of the Queen's having been delivered of a son after the divorce, by which report the King was greatly troubled. See *State Papers*, vol. i. pp. 697, 706. Can it have been the case that there was really a miscarriage ?

if it be not good and reasonable) has had power to divert him from the way of truth. If he suffer anyone to do her wrong or injustice, she assures him that the blame will be imputed to himself alone, in whose power her life, her death, and all her hope are placed; and even if these were not in his power she has such confidence in him that she would put them all in his hands, to do with them as might seem to him good. And she, on her part, would render to him all such obedience as it might please him to enjoin. Let him then take pity of her scalding tears and show compassion for her sorrow. Let him give place to her great and perfect love, and grant that by his kindness she may live content. Let him retain this his most humble servant, this his creature, who was only born for him; and let him not use such cruelty as that she, without having done him any ill or offence, should be repudiated and divorced, and so rendered the most miserable and unfortunate wife in the whole world.'

"And you, my Lords the Judges," exclaims the supposed authoress, turning herself in conclusion to the Lords of the Council who were to decide her fate, "take you care so to advise your Sovereign Lord the King as that the increase of his reputation, the preservation of his honour, and the augmentation of his esteem, as well as the duty of your own consciences, may be alike held in safety. For, as far as in me rests, I remit all my defence only to his own purpose and goodwill."

So ends the professed Remonstrance of the Lady Anne of Cleves. If it be not really an historical document, it is at any rate a curiosity of literature, and may probably be taken as representing the general feeling with which the divorce was regarded abroad. Although styled "a very folish booke" by the ambassador, who was diplomatically wise enough to make light of it to the French King even when requesting its suppression, there are sufficient sharp sayings and sound arguments to have made Henry feel very uncomfortable at being thus opposed before the face of the world, especially when the disputant was beyond his reach. As to its real object, one can only repeat at the close of this abstract the theory before suggested. The marriage was a device of Cromwell's for strengthening the interest of the Reforming party; to overthrow Cromwell and undo his work was the desire of the favourers of the old religion. Hardly, then, would a foreign bishop enter into a question with which it does not appear that he had any personal concern, and assume, on abstract grounds of equity, the character of spokesman for her whose cause he espoused, if he would thereby run counter to the

projects and wishes of his own friends. But, reckoning on the passionate and impulsive character of Henry, on his impatience of all interference and specially of all foreign dictation, and on the stubbornness of his will, the author may well have judged that the subtle device of apparent interference from abroad and the exposure of Henry's unfaithfulness to the world would raise such a storm of anger and resentment in the breast of the King as would be fatal to all chance of a reconciliation, and would help to complete the discomfiture of Cromwell. It is not a pleasant thought, nor one readily entertained, to imagine that the passionate and earnest appeals made in the name of the injured Queen could be written in a spirit really adverse to her supposed interests; nevertheless, such a thought appears to suggest the simplest solution of what is, in any point of view, somewhat of a puzzle. It would be strange if the book were merely written as a rhetorical exercise. But it is very satisfactory to know that she who was the object of this advocacy, whether real or pretended, was, after all, happier in its failure than she ever would have been in its success; that she, whom the French ambassador declared to be esteemed and loved by the English people “as the most gentle and gracious princess they had ever known,” so far from being made miserable by the treatment she met with from her consort, amused herself thereafter “in all possible ways” (ways which would commend themselves to her French critic), “with dresses and entertainments,” and showed herself “perfectly happy.”

[Since this paper was read to the Society the writer has been favoured by Robert S. Turner, Esq. of the Albany, with the description of a manuscript volume in his valuable library which contains this *Remonstrance*, together with other treatises by John of Luxemburg. The volume is a small quarto, on fine vellum, of eighty-eight leaves, beautifully written, with illuminated initials, and contains:—

1. “Remonstrance faite par la seur du duc de iulliers au Roy dangleterre et a son conseil.” The name of “Jehan de Luxembourg” is subscribed at the end.
2. Address, “A la royne de Navarre,” fol. 43. Signed as before.
3. “Remonstrance faicte par les confederez de lempereur aux estatz tenus a Valdolic sur la reddition de Mylan,” fol. 59.
4. “Responce aux remonstrances faictes a lempereur par aucun de ses confederez et subjectz sur la restoration du duche de Mylan,” fol. 66. Signed as before.

On the first page of the volume are the arms of the family of Croy, dated 1618, with the insignia of the order of the Golden Fleece, and the mottoes, "Je sous tiendray Croy, J'ayme qui m'ayme." The book-plate of "Mademoiselle Térèse d'Yves" is inserted, and the book bears the number "382" as the reference to (probably) some sale catalogue in which it appeared.

The *State Papers* of the year 1556 contain references to a somewhat curious passage in the subsequent life of Anne, of which however no definite particulars are given. Her brother William, Duke of Cleves, complains to Queen Mary, in a letter dated 5 Aug., that his sister entertains in her family two persons, Jasper Broickhusen with his wife, together with a third, one Bastard of Wylich, who by their pernicious doctrines and marvellous impostures appear to have driven her mad; all means have been used to procure their removal, but in vain; he therefore begs the exercise of the Queen's authority for their expulsion from England. On 10 Sept. following the Council write to King Philip, "Touching the request of the noble prince, the Duke of Cleves, for the putting of one called Brockhusen, with his wief, and one other, from the service of the Lady Anne of Cleves, and from this realme, the Queenes Majestie willing us to have speciall care of this mater, we have alredy endeavred to informe ourselves of such particuler causes and maters as wherby with your and the Queenes Majesties honour, and as litle offense to the said Lady Anne as may be, this thinge may take the same ende that the said Duke requirethe, whereof we trust within fewe dayes to make suche final ende as shall be to your Majesties good satisfaction." (*Domestic State Papers*, Mary ix. No. 28. See also C. P. Cooper's Appendices to *Report on Fædera*, Appendix E, p. 356.) Nothing further appears on record with reference to the matter, nor has the name of this Brockhusen been met with elsewhere.]