

change was brought about by the beauty of Anne Boleyn. Whether this be so or not, the fact is that, desiring to marry Anne Boleyn, he wished to obtain a divorce from his wife, Katharine of Arragon. The Popes had long established their authority to grant divorces; and had granted several to reigning monarchs for public reasons. But the Pope declined to grant Henry his request. Whether for this reason or not, the king procured Acts of Parliament which separated the Church of England from the Church of Rome and made the king himself supreme head on earth under God of the Church of England. But though Henry separated himself from the spiritual dominion of the Pope, he continued to use the title given him for defence of the Pope's doctrines. And so have all his successors, Protestant as well as Catholic. I do not know that any more curious circumstance can be cited than this—and one scarcely knows how to characterize it—perhaps, as loyal subjects, the best thing we can do is to let it alone and say nothing about it.

It was but the other day (the first of January, 1877) that Queen Victoria was proclaimed "Empress of India." The title has little or no constitutional significance; it was, it is understood, assumed for its effect upon the Indian people, although some still have a suspicion that it was intended to show that the British Sovereign is not in any sense inferior to the Emperors of Germany, Austria or Russia. It is impossible with the time at my disposal to discuss its real bearing.

Her Majesty was authorized to make this addition to her Royal style and titles by an Act of Parliament passed in 1876 (39 Vic., c. 10).

What memories of heroic valor and equally heroic suffering are awakened by these words "Emperor of India"—memories of Timour and Aurangzeb, Mogul and Mahratta, Vasco de Gama, Clive and Warren