

The History of the Divorce of *HENRY VIII*  
and *KATHARINE* of ARRAGON.

With the Defence of Sanders. The Refutation of the Two first Books of the History of the Reformation of Dr. Burnett. By Joachim le Grand. With Dr. Burnett's Answer and Vindication of himself.

**W**EE have not as yet seen any more than the first Part of this Work, which was published the Fifth of this Month. I know not whether a Man may judge of the two other Parts by this, which seems at first but an Abridgment of the two first Books of the History of the Reformation by Dr. *Burnet*, though the Author promises to refute them in the two following Volumes.

First, It seems that *M. le Grand* foresaw that Men would have this Idea of his Work, which is the Reason he has put before that History a preliminary Discourse, where he endeavours, yet without telling his Design, to divert the Reader from having any such Thoughts. He relates at first a Conference that he had with Dr. *Burnett*, in the King's Library, in the Presence of *M. Thevenot*, and *M. Anzout*. The Makers of Dialogues frequently introduce two Persons, one of which puts the Question, and the other Answers: One is the Master, and the other is the Scholer: Or at least, they make him more learned that teaches, than he that propounds

the Difficulties. But in the Relation of this Conference we find quite the contrary. Mr. *Burnett*, who, according to the Authors Character, is a Person of a quick piercing Wit, laborious, indefatigable, and most capable to defend the Reformation; whose Expressions are always free, bold and full of fire; and who speaks upon this Occasion with an Eloquence that charms them that hear him: Yet this Mr. *Burnett* leaves the principal Points undetermined, or else consents and submits every thing that is opposed against him. But *M. Le Grand*, who propounds his Difficulties after a plain humble Manner, and rather as Doubts than as real Objections, makes evident, quotes, attacks, and at length leaves Mr. *Burnett* with hardly a Word to say for himself.

There is no Wonder to be made, that so soon, as *M. Le Grand* began to write, he should so suddainly overturn a Man of that Learning and Reputation as Dr. *Burnett*. For though never any Man wrote with more Cunning, or knew better how to link and chain one Event to another; yet, as the Author says,

he never studied the History of England. He that romaged all the most considerable Libraries of the Kingdom, to fetch out Registers and authentick Records and Acts, and Copies of Dispatches, Memoires and other Manuscripts of those times, out of which to compose his History; who has printed a Volume in Folio of those sort of pieces, in justification of what he says; he to whom the whole Nation, and the Parliament it self, gave publick Testimonies of the esteem which they had for his Work. But the Reason that M. *Le Grand*, alledges for his Adversary's Ignorance in the History, is because he does not refute the Errors which M. *Varillas* has committed in several Things that concern'd *England*, in his first Book of the History of Heresy; having no other Design than to criticize upon the Ninth, which only relates to the Reformation, as appears by the Title, *A Critick upon the Ninth Book of the History of M. Varillas, where he speaks of the Revolution, &c.*

Mr. *Burnet* and M. *Varillas* being such defective Historians in M. *Le Grand's* Opinion, there is no Wonder, if he threaten them, to raise up a Third, that shall make them lose a good Part of the Reputation which they have gotten. And that which confirms his Hopes is this, because 'tis plain, That those Authors are very Negligent, and that their last Works are less valuable than their first. As for M. *Varillas*, since it could never be believed that a Historian, so partial, could write after a rational manner, I never gave my self the Trouble to compare his Works together; and so I cannot say whether his Answer to his Adversaries Critick, be better or worse

than his Histories. But as for Mr. *Burnet's* Travels into *Italy*. I must take the Liberty to inform the Publick, that M. *Le Grand*, who cites that Book to confirm what he writes, made his Judgment upon the French Version, though Mr. *Burnet* hath declared, That he had but too frequently mistook his Meaning.

As to the Memoirs which the Author made use of, he says nothing but what he has taken out of the Letters and Dispatches of *Francis I. Henry VIII. the Cardinals, Woolsey and Grandemont, the Bishops of Auxerres, Maion, Tarbes, &c.* Where we find that M. *Le Grand* makes two Persons of Cardinal *Grandemont* and the Bishop of *Tarbes*, whereas they were but one and the same. As for the Letters and Dispatches, &c. of *Henry VIII. and Cardinal Woolsey*, a great many of them being in English, as may be seen in Mr. *Burnet's* Collection, perhaps they might be of little Use to our Author; for we are apt to believe that he did not understand the Language; as well for that by the Judgment which he makes of the *Travels into Italy*, as by what Mr. *Burnet* shews in the Letter which follows this Extract, it appears that M. *Le Grand* never cast his Eyes upon that Collection of Pieces which is added to the English Edition of the History of the Reformation of *England*.

Secondly, The Divorce of *Henry VIII.* is too well known to make an Extract of it. We shall therefore make some Remaks, which will absolutely undeceive those who may imagine that M. *Le Grand's* Book is an Abstract of one part of Mr. *Burnet's*. In short, the Method and Design of those two Books is extremely different, as well as the Memoirs upon which they are ground-  
ed.

ed. 1. M. Burnet has no other Aim in Writing the History of *Henry VIII.* than to represent how the Proceedings of that Prince, whose irregular Conduct he does not undertake to justify, levelled the Way to that Reformation which was made under his Successors; M. *Le Grand* makes *Henry* to be always in the wrong, as if he had never done good. 2. M. *Le Grand* bestows his Encomiums upon those that he thinks deserve them, though never so great Enemies of the Reformation, as *Fisher*, *Moore*, and *Cardinal Poole*. He never dissembles the Faults of those that contribute most to the Reformation, as *Cromwel*, *Cranmer*, the *Duke of Somerset*, &c. because he has observed by an infinite Number of Examples out of sacred and Ecclesiastical History, That God never makes use of perfect Instruments for the execution of his Designs. M. *Le Grand* seems to have had very opposite Ends. All those that contributed to advance the Reformation, are very ill handled by him in his History; where he gives them the honourable Title of *False Prophets*, particularly to *Ann Bolen*, and *Cranmer*, whom he calls the *False Prelate*; and *Cromwell*, whom he abuses, a *Man as ignorant as ever was in the World*. This Minister, who is never permitted to justify himself, is condemned under pretence of having exceeded his Master's Orders, in granting Passports for the Exportation of Money and Corn. But Heresy was the capital Accusation that was laid to his Charge. Nevertheless the Author assures us, *That the Impeachment against him was grounded particularly, upon several Letters that were found among his Papers, wherein he acknowledged that he held pri-*

*vate Correspondences with the Princes of Germany, unknown to the King.*

Now in regard that History is but a Texture of Original Letters, and that every Politician has his particular Remarks upon an Affair which he does not well understand, no wonder that M. *Le Grand* represents so variously the Designs and Inclinations of those who had the greatest Share in that Negotiation. He says, *That Francis I. was weary at last of the Capriccio's of Henry VIII. and consented to the definitive Sentence, which condemned him to retake his Wife under Pain of Excommunication.* Nevertheless he observes, that after that Sentence, *Francis I. sided with Henry VIII. in all his Affairs with all the Zeal imaginable. That Francis I. would not bear the Proposal of Clement VII. That that Pope had promised before to do for the King of England all that lay in his Power: That the Pope made some Scruple at it, but at length gave him his Promise.* But all these new Promises could not make the Holy Father forget those that he had made at the beginning of the Process to the General of the *Cordeliers*, the Emperor's Agent. *Clement* himself acknowledged that he had promised that he would never pronounce Sentence upon the Divorce, and that he would do nothing in that Affair without giving *Charles I.* Notice. If the Church of *Rome* be so excessively tied to Decisions, the Court of *Rome*, on the other side, is as little tied to Promises. And therefore we must confess that the Complaisance of that Church goes sometimes a very great way. *In those Ages*, saith our Author, speaking of those that followed the *Tenth*, *The Discipline touching Marriages was not so severe*

severe as afterwards. Kings put away their Wives upon slight occasions, and never sought for any Pretence. Afterwards they were desirous to have one, and it was as easie to find one; because they could not marry with a Kinswoman on this side the Seventh Degree: So that Princes that could not allie themselves indifferently with all sorts of Persons, finding themselves all united in Blood, and coming to dislike their Match,

proved their near affinity, put away their Wives and took others. So that there were some Princes who had Two or Three Wives living, and Princesses that had Two or Three Husbands. This was practised in the Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth Ages; and in these times of Darkness and Ignorance it was, that these Shoals of Canonists and Scholastick Divines became so numerous.

*A Letter to Monsieur Thevenot, being a full Refutation of Mr. Le Grand's History of HENRY VIII's Divorcing KATHARINE of Arragon. With a plain Vindication of the same by Dr. G. B.*

**P**ermit me, Sir, before I pay you all those marks of Respect which are your due, to assure you that I am so well perswaded of your Probity and Sincerity, that maugre the difference of perswasion that is between us, nevertheless I dare adventure to submit to your Judgment in the Contest, that seems to be between me and *M. Le Grand*, in a matter that has no small relation to Religion. Opinions, and the speculative Consequences which Men draw from matters of Fact, appear very much different, according to the different Idea's which Men have of the Things: But the matters of Fact themselves have but one Face, and present themselves after the same manner to all that seek the Truth. Therefore in regard that our dispute moves altogether upon matters of Fact, I am apt to believe I can hazard nothing

in taking you for my Arbitrator.

During our last Residence at *Paris*, having had the Honour to visit you several times, I had time to observe with how much Justice you made your self the subject, and the esteem, and admiration of all the World. I was convinced of it more particularly by the Civilities which you heap'd upon me, and by the pains you took to bring me into a Conference with *M. Le Grand*, in your own and the presence of *M. Auzout*. I was the less scrupulous when I found my self in a place where I could expect nothing but fair dealing from a person that lived in the House of a Man no less considerable for his extraordinary Vertues, than for the great Employments with which he was entrusted, and who frequently conversed with the Learned *M. Bulteau*, who as often visited the famous *M. Baluze*, whose Sincerity equals

equals his profound Learning, a thing rarely to be found in our Age: And, which was more than all the rest, a Friend of *M. Thevenot's*. This made me look upon *M. Le Grand*, as a Person that had all those noble Qualities that were to be expected from a fair Adversary.

I should give you too great a trouble to recal to your memories all those little Things that were uphe'd in your Preferences, and at which you your selves were so much distasted, that you confess'd ingenuously how much you *were ashamed* to hear them. You made this acknowledgment not only to me, after *M. Le Grand's* departure, but to several others also; and you were so well satisfied in this, that though what had been propounded, was not worth the talking of, yet that I had fully answer'd the Discourse, as mean and frivolous as it was. *M. Auzout* desired likewise at the same time, that I would make no noise of it; to which request I was readily induced to condescend: For to say the very truth, I did not find that my Adversary was a subject worthy my Triumph, or the pains of boasting in publick a Victory over him. And therefore as to what I have deem'd requisite to insert of our Discourse, among the Remarks which I have made upon some passages of the History of *M. Varillas*, I have managed *M. Le Grand* with all the Circumspection that he could expect from me. Though, if in the pursuit of this Discourse, I happen to wound him more to the quick, he must thank himself, and not lay the blame on any body else.

I can easily brook all those Reflections which he has made upon my Ignorance, and shallowness of Capacity, more parti-

cularly upon what he says, *That I never studied the History of the Laws of England*. For thus he expresses himself after he had bestowed great Praises upon me, and such as I never deserved. Nevertheless, by the sudden change of his Pen, he seems to look upon me as a Person of little worth. But that same Thick skull'd, and common Artifice of some People to praise those whose Reputation they have a design to destroy will never surprize men of Understanding; nor will hainous and dirty reproaches pass among them under the Covert of a few generous Encomiums. I must be contented with that small measure of Knowledge and Capacity, which come to my just share, especially now that I have to do with a person of so mean a Talent, as *M. Le Grand* appears to be by this same Treatise of his.

I could only wish that they, who would be better inform'd of the truth of that celebrated Passage of the History, which is the subject of our Dispute, would give themselves the trouble to read what *Sanders* and my self have written, and then peruse the History of *M. Le Grand*. I am assur'd they will conclude, That there must be some fault in the Title Page, where he promises the *Defence of Sanders*, and the *Refutation of the Two first Books of my History*. The whole substance of his Work agrees altogether with mine, unless it be in some parts, where he shews that *great Art* of his, wherein I yield him willingly to out-do me. In all things else he so perfectly concurs with me, that I am tempted to believe, He only took his Pen in hand, to fulfil those Offers which he made me in your Presence, to fur-

nish me with *Memoirs* sufficient for the Confirmation of what I have wrote upon this Subject. True it is, I have not read any more as yet than the First Part of his Book; nor can I imagine how he can justify *Sanders*, whom he has abandon'd during the whole course of his History. He forsakes him in the whole History of *Ann of Boloign*, and in all the progresses of the Story that depends upon it, though it be the chief Head of *Sander's* Accusation, and which he presses most vigorously, as being a Nullity in the Title of Queen *Elizabeth*, and consequently an Original pretence for Rebellion. He acknowledges also the *Decretal Bull*, nor does he insist upon the Carriage of *Sr. Thomas Moore*. In a word, if you examine the Fourscore Faults of which I have accus'd *Sanders* in my Additions, you will find that *M. Le Grand* has confessed above Seventy, and confirms what I have maintained in opposition to him. Which will most evidently appear, if his work shall ever be thought worthy a larger Examination.

I say nothing of his Style, for that his Readers without much consideration or study, will easily find it to be the Style rather of an Advocate that pleads a Cause, than of a person disinterested, that cordially and barely relates matter of Fact. For to argue with heat and passion, and reproach his Adversaries, are unpardonable faults in an Historian. Besides that, there is something so sacred in the very Ashes of Kings, that they are never to be spok'n of but with great Caution; and if at any time there be an unavoidable occasion to blame some of their Actions, softer Terms are to be made use of,

than those of *Lye* and *Imposture*. Add to this, that the principal Point, and upon which the whole Question moves, being, Whether the King's own Cause ought not rather to be judged in *England*, and by his Clergy, than at *Rome*, and in the Consistory; that Man can never be thought to act conformably to the Gallican Church, who takes part with the Pope upon this occasion. It is rather to be wondered at, that at a time when there is so little respect given at *Versailles* to the *Vatican Thunder*, and where the ancient Custom is renewed of appealing from the Pope to the General Council; I say, it is a wonder, at such a time as this, a Subject of this nature, should not be handled with more freedom and sincerity. Perhaps this is one of the little Tricks of those sort of People, which *M. Talon* has more frankly described, than I have a design to do, who make hideous portraictures of the Actions of *Henry VIII.* to observe the glory of those of *Lewis the Great.* And perhaps our Author is neither so great a Politician, nor so well knowing in Affairs, as to have such distant prospects in his Eyes, or else this work being his first Essay, he did not study the Point with that Application which was requisite, believing that trouble to no purpose while he has to do with a person, *that gives no better* proofs of his Understanding than myself. I shall therefore insist only upon six of his principal Errors, which are nothing to the great number of mistakes which he has committed, and which I could easily make appear, had I the Liberty to enlarge my self in a writing that must be inserted into the *Universal Library*.

I. He calls in question the Contents of the Decretal Bull, which Cardinal *Campeggio* brought, upon this Ground, That having been only shewn to the King and Cardinal *Woolsey*, no Body can tell what it was; and if had been a definitive Sentence in that matter, the Legates Commission had been at an end, and the King would have contracted his Second Marriage, as formerly *Lewis* the XII. did, without expecting any other proceedings.

Had Monsieur *Le Grand* given himself the trouble to read that Bull which I have published, he might have spar'd himself so many useless Remarks. The Bull was contriv'd in *England* and sent to *Rome*, where, though some few Alterations were made, it appeared nevertheless by all the Letters, that were written reciprocally from *Rome* and *England*; that the Bull which was given to *Campeggio* was in substance the same. Certain it is, that Bull declared the King's Pretences to be just, gave power to the Legates to examine the Truth of them, and to pronounce Sentence upon the proofs that should be made before them. For though this Bull implied a definitive Sentence of the Pope, upon a supposition of the Validity of the King's Pretensions; nevertheless it left many things for the Legates to do. They were to inform themselves, 1. Whether the King had not desired this Marriage himself. 2. Whether it would not occasion a War between *Spain* and *England*, should a Dispensation be granted. 3. Whether this Dispensation had been annull'd by the Protestation which the King made against the Marriage, when he came to be of Age. 4. Whether any of the

Princes, in favour of whom the Dispensation was allow'd, were Dead before the Marriage was consummated.

It is apparent that that same Bull for the dissolution of the Marriage between *Henry* and *Catharine*, being only granted upon supposition, that all the matters in Question were as the King maintained them to be, had been void in case he could not have prov'd his suggestions; which is the thing that confounds all the Author's Arguments.

But I must confess that M. *Le Grand* has something of Reason on his side in what he says concerning *Rodolphus*, whom I believe to have been *Campeggio's* Bastard. He proves out of *Sigonius*, who writes the Life of that Cardinal, that *Rodolphus* was his Legitimate Son. *Sigonius* is a very good Author, and I acquiesce in his Authority. But had M. *Le Grand* cast but his Eyes upon the *English* Edition, he would have seen that it was not without sufficient Ground, and not out of any design to blacken the Reputation of C. *Campeggio*, that I call'd *Rodolphus* Bastard; since I quote the very Discourse wherein he is so call'd, which was compos'd by Sr. *William Thomas*, Secretary to the Privy Council, under the Title of *The English Pilgrim*. I had the misfortune not to have seen the Life that was written by *Sigonius*, so that it is only a fault of Omission, which the Author would aggravate into a malicious Invention. And I make this acknowledgment of my Error so much the more frankly, because it is the only mistake among all the rest of which the Author accuses me, that is well grounded.

II. M. *Le Grand* labours to destroy the Authority of the Decision of the

*Sorbonn* in favour of *Henry*. But in regard this Decision was printed the Year following, and acknowledged for true and real, since no person in those times taxes it of being counterfeited, we have no reason now to suspect it; for neither does Cardinal *Poole*, who was then at *Paris*, when it was made, nor any other Writer of the *Roman* Communion, tax the King of Imposture upon that occasion. Add to this that the Bishop of *Tarbes* being continued to solicit in *Henry's* behalf at the Court of *Rome*, after he was made Cardinal, and that the King had publickly acknowledged before the Legates, how privy that Prelate had been to his Scruples conceived upon his Marriage, has given an undeniable Confirmation of this matter, whatever our Author says to the contrary. The same thing is to be said of the *Sorbonn*; for that never having been charged with falshood in the particular of this Decision, there is no question but that they made it. So that all Mr. *Le Grand's* Arguments can never prove any thing more, than only that it has occasioned great Disputes, and that *Beda* was a real promoter of Sedition. By the way, we may observe that the Ecclesiasticks of *France* were very ill satisfied with the Conduct of *Francis* the First, who had sold their Liberties by the *Concordate*, of which the University of *Paris* was so sensible, and for that reason full of Male-content. And therefore it might be perhaps that so many of the *French* Clergy were so ill affected to *Henry's* Cause, because they knew that *Francis* the first so passionately supported his Interests. After all, the Author confesses, That he found in the scrutiny

Fifty three voices for the Divorce, and Forty two against it; and Five, that were of Opinion that the matter should be referr'd to the Pope. And this is sufficient to justify the printed Decision, which only says, That the greatest number of Doctors were for the Divorce, and declared the Marriage illegal, which may serve for an Explanation of the words of the Letter of the first President, *That that same Declaration would do the King more hurt than it would advance his Affairs*; In regard all the other Universities had judged in his Favour, whereas the Opinion of the *Sorbonn* favour'd him only by the plurality of voices.

III. The Author, who pretends to publish an extract of the Reasons which the Favourers of *Henry* alledged against his Marriage, has forgot the Principal, and that which supported all the decisions of the *Romish* Church; that is to say, *That the Scripture, explained by Tradition, is the Rule according to which all Controversies are to be determined*. They alledged a perpetual succession of Provincial and General Councils, of Popes, and the Chief of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers; particularly, the Four most famous Fathers of the *Western* Church; whereas the Imperialists had neither Father nor Doctor on their side. Nevertheless the Author says no more, but that the English quoted the Canons of some Provincial Councils concerning Incontinency; with certain passages out of *Tertullian*, *St. Basil* and *St. Jerom* about Virginity, and against second Nuptials. I am sure the Reader must here take notice, That there is something wanting in this Relation which is more essential to an honest Man, than



than a great flock of *Capacity*. For the *Canons of Councils* and the *Passages out of the Fathers* which they quoted, speak expressly of the *Degrees of Marriage*, forbidden in *Leviticus*. He names *Three Popes* whose *Letters* they produced; but he passes over in silence the *Chief*, in reference to *England*, who was *Gregory the Great*. For the *Saxons* being converted at what time he held the *See*, this *Pope* gave express *Order* to *Austin* the *Monk* to disannul all *Marriages* that had been contracted with *Brothers Wives*. Now *England* having submitted to this *Law*, upon its first embracing *Christianity*, they who defended the *Kings* scruples looked upon this as the *Principal Foundation* of his *Cause*. So that if *M. Le Grand* would have acquired the *Reputation* of a sincere *Historian*, he ought to have mentioned this *Particular*. Moreover he should not have passed over in silence as he does, all that was alledged against the *Power* which the *Popes* assume to themselves of dispensing with all *Ecclesiastical*, and every the *Divine Laws* themselves. Nor ought he to have forgot that other great *Reason* urged by the *King*, that according to the *Canons of the Council of Nice*, the *Determination* of that matter belonged of right to the *English Church*, and not to the *Pope*. If the *Author* be a *True Member* of the *Gallican Church*, he ought to grant these *Maxims*; and if he would be thought a *Faithful Historian*, he ought not to pass them over in silence. But tho he do not set down all the *Kings* *Reasons*, he adds several *New Reasons* to the *Queens* pleading, which her *Advocates* never dream'd of, and we do not meet with in any *Story* or

*Relation* of that time. They all tend to prove that the *Rules* touching the *degrees of Consanguinity* have not been always observed in *Marriages* with the same *Exactness*. But the *Church* is governed by *Rules* and not by *Examples*.

As for the *Law of Deuteronomy* which permits a *Man* to *Marry* his *Sister-in-Law*, if her *Husband* died without *Children*, it has been always consider'd in the *Christian Church*, as an *Exception* to the *General Rule*; so that in regard it was only made in favour of the *Jews*, and with reference to their *Right of Succession*, it was abolish'd together with their *Republick*; whereas the *Laws of Leviticus* concerning this *Matter*, are to be look'd upon as *Laws* that are *Moral* and *Universally received*. In a word, if you will take the pains to compare the *Books* that have been written upon this *Subject*, with the *Extracts* which *M. Le Grand* and my self have given of them, you will presently find that he writes with no *Sincerity* at all, who descends to a *Nicety*. For my part I shall not Envy him the *High Opinion* he has of his, so long as *Men* will but acknowledge me to have writ sincerely, and without the *Byas* of *Interest*.

IV. Our *Author* says that the *Parliament* abolish'd the *Oath* which the *Bishops* swore to the *Pope* at the time of their *Consecration*; and form'd another which they were to swear to the *King*. But this is not that which he calls understanding to the *Bottom*, the *Laws* and *History of England*. For the *Truth* was this. They read in that *Assembly* the two *Oaths* which the *Bishops* took, the one to the *Pope*, the other to the *King*; and in regard they found them to be *Contradictory*,

Contradictory, as being two Oaths of Homage and Fidelity, which could only be sworn to one Sovereign; they abolish'd that which was made to the Pope, and let that stand in its full vigour which was sworn to the King. I have given an undeniable Example of their Oaths sworn to the King by the Bishops in former Ages, which is to be seen in an Act at the head of the Collection of the Pieces that justify my History. If M. Le Grand had only the *French Translation*, where those Pieces are not, he might have consulted the *English Edition* at Mr. *Bulstean's*, where they are all to be seen. He might have there seen in the Act which I cite, *Cardinal Adrian* renounce not only all the Clauses of the Bulls which were contrary to the King's Prerogative, or the Laws of *England*; but also swear an Oath of Fealty to the King, in the same Terms which our Kings have since continued to receive them from the Bishops. The Oath to the Pope, which is an innovation not known till before the XIIIth Age, contains besides, so many large and unlimited Clauses, which neither accord with the Doctrine of the *Gallican Church*, nor with that submission and duty which Prelates owe their lawful Prince, since it is apparently an Oath of Homage and Fidelity to a Foreign Power.

V. Mr. *Le Grand* labours might and main, to make *Cranmer* to be look'd upon as one of the most wicked men in the World. He accuses me for making him a Gentleman, but I have said nothing of it, though I well knew him to be so; not believing that Quality considerable enough to be mentioned in

the Eulogies due to the memory of so great a Personage. He cannot believe, "That *Cranmer* was in *Germany* when "*Warham* died, nor that he was named in his Absence to be Bishop of "*Canterbury*; nor that he stay'd Seven "*weeks* after he received the News of "*his* Nomination, because he assisted "*at* the Marriage of the King with "*Ann Bolen*. He cannot allow what I say, "That this Affair went on slowly, since it was but three Months between "*September* and "*January* before "*this* Prelate was known to be exalted "*at Rome*. Nor will he be perswaded, "That the Provincial Synod of "*Canterbury* pronounced any positive Sentence upon the Marriage of the King. See here more mistakes than *Varillas* himself could have been guilty of. For in the Criminal Process against *Cranmer* which is Printed, we find that he calls his Judges to witness, with what reluctance he accepted the Primacy of *England*; and that he did not return out of *Germany* till Seven Weeks after the King had signified to him his Intentions. Nor did the Bishops who knew his Judges, and who had been Eye-witnesses of his behaviour at that time, say any thing to it, as not being able to contradict what he said. Twelve Weeks passed from the Twenty third of *August*, that *Warham* dyed, to the Fourteenth of *November*, that the King was married; so that although the Courier had staid Fifteen days by the way, *Cranmer* might have delay'd his departure for seven Weeks, and yet have come time enough to be at the Nuptials of the King. But our Author, to change Five Months into Three, excludes

cludes September and January out of his Account, for this only Reason, That he found it requisite to retrench them. As for the Judgment of the Synod of *Canterbury*, the Sentence of Divorce has it in express Terms, That the two provincial Synods of *England* had decided the King's Cause.

But *M. Le Grand*, above all things makes it a Crime in *Cranmer*, that he took an Oath of Obedience to the Pope when he was consecrated; and for that he made a Protestation, by which he gave divers Restrictions to the said Oath. But he reports all that he says concerning this Matter, upon the Authority of certain passionate Scriblers, and quite contrary to the Faith of the publick Acts. The Protestation of the Archbishop was read twice before the Altar, while he was consecrating, and it is clear that he had no design to make use of Equivocals, since what he did, he did in publick, and for that the Bishops usually made Protestations, by which they renounced all Clauses of their Bulls which were contrary to the Kings Prerogative. It seems the Canonists, accustomed to this doubling Equivocation, had so much Power over *Cranmer* as to encline him to take the Oath, and restrain it by a publick Protestation, made at the same time; so that if he did any thing amiss in so doing, it was rather a Defect of Judgment in that Prelate, than any want of sincerity.

VI. The Author says that the King pardoned *Moore* and *Fisher*, the Business of the *Maid of Kent*; and though he confesses that the first ridicules her for an idle silly Nun in one of his Letters, yet he seems not to have seen a long

long Letter of *Moore's*, which I published in my justifying Pieces belonging to the Second Volume, where he speaks of the pretended Revelations of that religious Wench, as one of the most horrid Impostures that ever were. As for *Fisher*, whatever the Author says, he was condemned for favouring that Imposture. To this *M. Le Grand* adds, That the Chancellor having demanded of *Fisher* and *Moore*, what they thought of the Statutes made in the last Parliament, they would make no Answer, only they said, That being cut off from civil Society, they minded nothing but their Meditation upon their Saviour's Passion, which Answer cost them their Lives. Here is a Corruption of History, which I shall not call so bad as it deserves; which is so much the more odious, for that writing things as they were transacted, and according to publick Acts, he could represent them after a manner so favourable to his own Cause. These two great Men were condemned at first by virtue of a *Præsumptio*, which is loss of Goods, and perpetual Imprisonment, for having refused to take the Oath concerning the Succession, by reason of the Kings Marriage according to an Act of Parliament. After that they were farther prosecuted, because they opposed the King's Supremacy, or his Title of the supreme Head of the *English Church*. There is one thing too in *Moore's* Process which might be sufficient to make a Man guilty of High Treason, where he says, That a Parliament can both make a King, and depose a King.

Now in regard I have confin'd my self within these Six Heads, I shall go no farther; but the abundance of *Mary's*

*Magis amica veritas.* And though M. Le Grand imagine that I am jealous of my Productions, were not the Interests of Religion intermixed therewith, I could easily abandon mine. But I will not now push this Censure any farther; neither do I know whether I shall write any more upon this Subject, not being able to determine any thing in that matter, till I have seen the Three other parts of this work, and the effects it

will produce in the World. I shall conclude with humble request to pardon the Liberty which I take of addressing this Letter to you, and that in so publick a manner, not believing a man could otherwise so properly give a censure upon a Printed Book.

I am, Sir, &c.  
Hague, 20. of June.

---

F I N I S.

---