



REMEMBER!

Email
Communique
of the
Society of
King Charles
the Martyr,
Inc.

The Society's
American
Region
USA & CANADA

WWW.SKCM-
USA.ORG

EDITOR, MARK A.
WUONOLA, PH.D.

WUONOLA@
EARTHLINK.NET

Jan./Feb., 2010

ISSN 2153-6120

Dear Fellow S.K.C.M. Members: Your Editor has retired from the governance of the American Branch of the Society after nearly 22 years as American Representative and 1½ years as the First President of the newly incorporated American Region (April 2008). This change will enable him to devote more time to the **History**. He started to seek out, collect, and organize relevant information in 1988 and undertook systematic work in 2008. At the beginning of 2009, its outline was presented to the Board.

Progress on the **History** has been too slow. The work is time-consuming; some of it is tedious. It is frustrating that few of those having

relevant information consider it to be of much importance, while to us it is vital and urgent. However, the difficulties and frustrations are little compared to the gratification and satisfaction that come with finding historical information of which we were previously unaware.

Hardly any U.S. archival records date earlier than 1970. The most significant early records are the regular notices in *The Episcopal Church Annual* and its predecessors (1895-1918, 1952-present), several newspaper articles from the 1890s, fairly regular reports in *Church & King*, which was published 1937-39 (we have none of these issues) and since 1948 (quarterly until about 1970), and of course *SKCM News*, begun by Eleanor Langlois in 1974. We also have copies of the American Region mailing lists for 1974, 1981, and 1985. These are more important than one might think: The first two are thanks to the foresight of Fr. Swatos, who saved them—and also was able to find them! We have complete financial records since 1988 but before then, none. Our membership data are good beginning in 1974, excellent since 1988, and complete since 1995 thanks to Bill Gardner. We know of two nearly complete runs of *The Living Church*, one at the publication's Milwaukee WI headquarters and the other at TEC's archives in Austin TX; unfortunately neither is presently accessible to researchers. Space is the limiting factor at both places. It is well that another complete set has been identified. Only one of the sets is indexed, and it, one of the inaccessible sets, only partially.

Two important U.S. parishes have records bearing on our early history. Saint Mary the Virgin, NYC, is known to have had regular commemorations as early as 1896, when a newspaper article called it "An Insult to the Republic". (The observance has been faithfully kept at Saint Mary's: For date of commencement, continuity, and duration it holds first place in the Americas.) Two other parishes are known to have held commemorations in the 1890s, the O.H.C. church in Manhattan at Avenue C & East 4th St., and the Percival Church of the Evangelists, Philadelphia (location of the first American shrine); neither parish now exists, but archives may. In addition to Dr. Thomas McKee Brown, Saint Mary's first rector (1868-98), Dr. George H. Houghton, rector of Transfiguration, may have commemorated 30 Jan. Both rectors supported the Society, its leaders, and commemorations.

Dr. van Allen, recently designated American Region Founder, became rector of the Church of the Advent, Boston, in 1902. There he fostered the commemoration as he had at his less prominent New York parishes from the Society's U.S. establishment in 1894. The earliest of these documented was in 1898 at Grace Church, Elmira, but his name appears as a Society contact in the *Annual* already in 1895 when he was at Trumansburg.

The Advent's commemorations are well documented, archival materials having been made available most generously by the rector of the Advent, Fr. Allan Warren, and documents at Saint Mary's, by Fr. Stephen Gerth, its incumbent. We have little doubt that on 30 January 1895, the first Royal Martyr Day to occur after the Society's American establishment, was the occasion of a celebration, details of which are yet to be discovered. If you know of any relevant facts or have leads or suggestions, please bring them to our attention. There were most likely celebrations before the Society's foundation, too. Dr. William Barroll Frisby, Fr. van Allen's predecessor at the Advent, Fr. van Allen himself, and other prominent Bostonians and New Yorkers were members of the Order of the White Rose in the 1880s. Ralph Adams Cram was the Order's American Prior (Ralph von Cram as he styled himself at that time, early in his career). Isabella Stewart "Mrs. Jack" Gardner occasionally hosted gatherings at her Boston palazzo, Fenway Court, with dinner and a service in the chapel. This is not incongruous—evening masses were uncommon then.

Our Society is devotional in nature; its sole purpose is to honor King Charles the Martyr and to unite his votaries. The Order of the White Rose is more dynastic and has a broader appeal, including among its special worthies Saint Margaret of Scotland, Mary Queen of Scots, King Charles the Martyr, and the Stuart claimants. These latter, called pretenders or styled 'in pretense' by their opponents, have a romantic appeal. They are James II (after the so-called Glorious Revolution replaced him with William of Orange and Mary, precipitating the Nonjuring dispute), James III (the

SOCIETY OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR, INC., BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Rev'd William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D., *President*
J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., *Secretary, Treasurer, VP, and General Counsel*
The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, *SSC, D.D., Episcopal Patron*
John R. Covert, *Webmaster*
A. Donald Evans, *Chapter Liaison* *Effective 17 Nov. 2009,*
William M. Gardner, Jr., *Asst. Treasurer* *except 8th Board seat added and*
Paul W. McKee *Fr. Monroe elected 26 Jan. 2010*
The Rev'd Canon James G. Monroe, Ph.D., *SSC*
Non-trustee rôles:
David D. Butler, Esq., *Assistant Secretary to the Board*
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., *Publications Editor*

'Old Pretender'), Charles III (the 'Young Pretender', Bonnie Prince Charlie), and Henry IX (Henry Benedict Cardinal Stuart, Cardinal Duke of York, or Cardinal York; dean of the College of Cardinals who participated in four papal conclaves). The Act of Uniformity excluded RCs from the British Throne (and still does). When making a toast, a Stuart loyalist held his wine glass over his water glass, meaning "[To] the King over the water" when proclaiming only, "The King". (*Vide infra*, ¶ beginning 'Opinions': The Society does not hold, advocate, or imply support of any position mentioned here, or any political position, ecclesiastical or secular. *-Ed.*)

One file passed on by Mrs. Langlois documents efforts to add the 30 January commemoration of King Charles to TEC's (then PECUSA's) calendar. The matter was raised every triennium by Mrs. Langlois (five times; and six further times under her successor) with the involvement and support of Bps. Harte and Wantland. In the 1990s, Bps. Iker and Ackerman added their voices. The Anglican Society, of which Canon Prof. J. Robert Wright is president, formalized its support in 2002. Nonetheless the proposition continued to fail. In some cases it was deflected by parliamentary maneuvers and sadly, sometimes collegiality and irenicism were lacking. **Bp. William C. Wantland**, an attorney and participant, has graciously agreed to draft the History's chapter on these initiatives and their disposition. We thank him and are delighted that he will provide authoritative, informed, first-hand accounts of each.

It is also gratifying that **Mrs. Nancy Ehlke** of Annandale VA has volunteered to assist with the History. Her interests and skills are ideal for the job: professionally, she is a reference librarian. She will take on assembly of the chapter on churches and chapels dedicated to Saint Charles, votive shrines, and depictions of him in North American churches. The work will require research, extensive correspondence (including email and telephoning), and importantly, persistence.

Depictions are of many types, including statues, bas-reliefs, stained glass windows, murals, paintings, and graphic and textile arts. Cities, geographical features, and other things named after King Charles will also be listed. Most of the cities are named not after the Royal Martyr, but Saint Charles Borromeo, and some after King Charles V of France (Charleroi PA). Three that *are* named after our Charles are the Charles River in Massachusetts, Cape Charles VA, and the Carolinas. In analogy to the composer *Clemens non Papa*, our Martyr might be dubbed *Carolus non Borromeo*. After many appeals for volunteers, we are delighted that Nancy will draft this chapter of the History. She will try to find photographs of as many of the dedications and depictions as possible to illustrate the chapter richly.

In the next issue an outline of the **History** and a draft list of the known depictions and dedications will appear. You will be invited—implored—to inform us of any and all others of which you know (even hearsay is admissible) and to help us obtain photographs. .

Our need for information relates to dedications, shrines, and depictions (description of the item, its provenance, and photos), and to anything whatsoever about the Society before 1970, especially the 'hidden' years, 1900-50. (The listing in the *Annual* ceased after 1918 until about 1950. We do not know whether or not this means the Society went into a period of inactivity.) The search is for any information on special celebrations, whether sponsored by the Society or not, chapter meetings, personal documents, church programmes, and any other information of which we may be unaware. Information from diverse sources is particularly useful, since it is illustrative of general opinion in the Church and around the country. Even apart from the History project, it is our responsibility to be aware of all of these, to be true to our Objects. They are evidence of the veneration of our Patron and serve to increase knowledge of him

Opinions are divided. The 31 Jan. issue of *The Living Church* contained a splendid essay on the Royal Martyr. Its author, Benjamin Guyer, a graduate student of British History at the Univ. of Kansas, takes a historical and devotional perspective. The Daniel Mytens 1631 portrait of the King, the *Eikon Basilike* frontispiece, and an anonymous etching of the beheading illustrate the essay. The striking likeness by Mytens adorns the front cover, too. A section of a van Dyck portrait is incorporated into our ad in the same issue. We thank *TLC's* editor and advertising manager for their consideration; we commend Mr. Guyer for his essay's devotional perspective of King Charles the Martyr. Mrs. Greville-Nugent said, "The Society is emphatically non-political." We continue to be a devotional society. Our members, of diverse churchmanship and politics, all venerate the Martyr King, taking him as a Patron Saint for various reasons.

Because of timing conflicts, the January and February issues of this publication are delayed, for which we apologize, and combined. In addition to our usual content, we have included some provocative points about King Charles's Coronation, surely one of the happiest days of his life, and that day, 3 days short of 23 years later, when he was beheaded. Of it, we first think, "It was sad. It was unjust." Let us remember that the Royal Martyr said that it was his "second marriage-day", because he soon would be espoused to his blessed Saviour. Perhaps since Senhouse's and Donne's sermons, but clearly since he wrote to Ormonde from Oxford, he knew that martyrdom was a possibility, and increasingly, a likelihood: He wrote, "I must reign a glorious king or die a patient martyr."

It is remarkable that although King Charles and every detail of his life have been studied by scholars, devotees, and detractors, many details are unknown or ambiguous. It is understandable that a figure of his renown has inspired fanciful stories of exaggerated and legendary proportions, and that a controversial leader has inspired distortions of truth, praise and invective. James I is often criticized for inaction; Charles was a man of action. Many of his actions and his rationale for them are criticized by historians, one school thinking him stubborn and the other, faithful.

It is easily understood that hyperbole and embroidery, minimization and omission of deficiencies, and distortions and half-truths characterize the writings of partisans. It is puzzling, however, that important, non-ideological details of events witnessed by many are remembered differently.

Some of the items listed here are, or should be, simple facts. Others, in their interpretation or over-interpretation, have become portentous. Some were used as the basis of propaganda, some as hagiography, and some seemingly as puzzles. Some contain elements of superstition. We condescend easily when we criticize XVII Century rationalizations as superstitious, but are today's conspiracy theories any less irrational? Hindsight may play a part in the interpretations of some. Each item would make a good subject for an article in this publication or in *SKCM News*. I hope at least one will be of personal interest to you, inspiring you to volunteer to research it and write about it.

The Coronation – 2 February 1626 – The King was 25. He had been married the previous year.

“It was a very bright, sunshining day.” (Laud’s Diary)

- Sudden fall of snow. As the magnificent procession moved from Westminster Hall to the Abbey, a sudden snow flurry left a deposit of what today’s meteorologists very professionally call “the white stuff” on the King’s shoulders. There must have been some wind, because the King’s Majesty walked under a canopy borne by the Barons of the Cinque Ports. This snow paralleled the snow flurry that turned the Martyr King’s pall white before his interment. (A question for etymologist-members: Why is a pall not white to start with? A pallium is of white sheep’s wool, not black or purple. A pallid complexion is pale, not dark or florid. One turns pale when he hears an appalling bit of information. The snowfall on the day of the Coronation is often called miraculous. Whether or not any particular meaning is associated with the form of precipitation, no miracle needs to be invoked to explain snow on 2 Feb.
- The color white. Why was white worn by Charles? (Note, the white satin attire was doublet and hose, visible at the anointing once his robes were removed, not an outer garment. Thus, only its removal was required for the actual anointing.) Often-heard explanations: Charles chose it himself rather than the usual purple because it symbolized purity. An insufficient quantity of purple fabric was available. Some considered white to be a bad omen. (Much like numerical ‘meanings’, one color has many interpretations.) Shortage of fabric was presumably offered as a reason, despite its challenge to credulity, to counter the inference that to choose white would have been stupid. The name ‘White King’ was applied to King Charles on account of his white attire, not for any other reason. This is proved by writings contemporaneous with the 1626 Coronation.
- Delay of the Coronation. Why was the Coronation delayed nearly a year? Charles’s accession was in March 1625. Did it take that long to agree on the ceremonial details? (Charles took a personal interest in every detail: the wording of the entire ceremony, especially the oath, with consideration for historical precedents, the exact (re)formulation of the oil of anointing, &c.) Was there a reluctance to proceed because of a general fear of public disapproval? Was Henriette’s participation a factor? (*vide infra*) Was it because the plague was rampant?
- Sermon text. The Bishop of Carlisle, who had been the Prince’s tutor, was chosen to preach by King Charles out of respect and because he was generally considered to be a good preacher. His sermon text, “Be faithful unto death. . .”, was the subject of comment then and still is. Does it mean simply, ‘Be firmly faithful throughout your life’? Or did it foretell that his faithfulness would lead to his death? Or did it instead foretell Bp. Senhouse’s own imminent death? To say that the choice of sermon text was inappropriate is extreme. It seems to me unexceptional, unless viewed with paranoid hindsight. The solemnity of the coronation oath and the significance of the entire rite would seem fully to justify such a text. Having the entire sermon would be desirable. (John Donne, Chaplain to Charles I, explicitly made Senhouse’s supposed point in his first court sermon to the young King, saying “The last thing Christ bequeathed to thee was His Blood. . . refuse not to go to Him the same way, too, if His Glory require that Sacrifice.” Imagine a genius such as Donne preparing sermons primarily for one’s own edification!) A substantial article on Donne for *SKCM News* would be most welcome.
- Henriette not crowned. Did Henriette not participate in the ceremony because of reluctance to join in Anglican worship? Or was her participation discouraged by her chaplains? To forego the prestige of being crowned Queen seems an unlikely choice to make. Because she feared it would exacerbate concern about diminished enforcement of the Penal Laws and thus make life more difficult for the King? She was surely not uninterested, watching from Whitehall Palace as the Royal Barge embarked, as it ran aground on the muddy banks of the Thames near its destination and had to be freed, as its occupants disembarked, and as the Royal Procession made its way from Westminster Hall to the Abbey. She and her retinue watched, eagerly anticipating the King’s emergence .
- Laud’s rôle. Laud stood in for the Dean of Westminster. Was the Dean indisposed? Was there antipathy between him and the King? At the time, Laud was Bp. of St David’s, which see did not entitle him to play any part in the ceremony. Was he already a favorite of the King? He was soon translated to St Albans and in 1628 to London. Has any of you knowledge of the explanation for this?
- Lack of response at the Recognition. The King, bareheaded, was presented to the Estates by the Abp. of Canterbury. First he was presented to the people, in the North and South transepts, then to the nobility on the East, and finally to the clergy in the Choir, to the West. When Abp. Abbot first requested this recognition of Charles’s Kingship, why was the silence deafening? Were they reluctant? Intimidated? Subject to stage fright? Taken off-guard? Hard of hearing? Or was the bishop’s voice feeble? One eye-witness, who did not speculate on the reason, said that the people “hesitated when to begin the acclamation” and that the Earl Marshall, Lord Arundel, had to prompt them.

- Dove descending. At his Coronation Charles exhibited one of very few documented instances of his Royal anger. (What were others?) One of the sceptre's silver doves came loose and fell to the floor. The King demanded it be replaced at once. When the jeweler expressed doubt of that command's feasibility, the King essentially told him to do it at once or he'd find a jeweler who could! In the event, a duplicate dove was found! It was attached in good time, but the accident was nonetheless viewed as a dark portent. It's too bad they didn't have duct tape. Do you have a spare dove on hand? Imagine everything going perfectly in a five-hour ceremony.

The Decollation – 30 January 1649 – The King was 48. He had been under house arrest for several years.

“When at last the King appeared on the scaffold, the sun had broken through the clouds and was shining brightly.”

- Delay of the beheading. It is often said that the delay from noon to two was a result of the realization that an Act was required to prevent Charles II from automatically becoming king upon his father's death. I recently read that this precaution had been taken the previous weekend, in anticipation that many members of the House would find it best to be out of town when the regicide was carried out. My source stated that the delay was due to the difficulty of enlisting an executioner. But facts are sketchy since even before the Restoration it was inadvisable to admit to having filled that rôle. Most peculiarly, one author, a minority of one, doesn't accept that Charles pardoned his persecutors, saying that when the two executioners asked him for pardon, the King refused, saying that he couldn't pardon them because they hadn't done anything wrong (yet).
- Beheading skill. How is it that Charles's admonition to “hurt not the blade [or axe]”, “Do not hurt the axe, though it may me” is variously rendered despite the presence of three stenographers? It is variously said to have been directed toward the headsman, or to a person “standing so close his cloak nearly touched it”. With these words, Charles surely recalled his ill-starred grandmother, whose headsman's incompetence necessitated three blows.
- The axe; the Death Warrant. An axe that either *is* or *is very like unto* that used for King Charles's beheading is at the Tower of London. Called the ‘bright axe’, it appears to have been forged as a single piece, the edged head and helve (handle). It brings one very close to the event we commemorate on 30 January to inspect that axe and the Death Warrant (parts of it, also forged), and to meditate on them. The axe is said to have been the one also used to behead Strafford and Laud (1641 and 1645, plenty of time to sharpen it between its few uses). It was surely not the Parliamentarians, the rebels, who brought in ‘good government’. They made a mockery of ‘reform’ (always a word to be wary of) by their many abuses of the law even *before* they took ultimate power. They had already abolished Bishops, the House of Lords, the Book of Common Prayer, and even Christmas. Here in Massachusetts, our wonderful ‘Pilgrim Fathers’ in imitation of the ‘Protector’ forbade its observance here, too.
- The Headsman. The identity of the Headsman has never been determined. This despite a published confession and a suspect's confession after the Restoration. When the Royal Martyr's head was held up, by the second executioner present, the usual announcement “Behold the head of a traitor” was not said, supposedly because the headsman's voice would have been recognizable. A daily journalist wrote that “when the deputies of that grim Serjeant [*sic*] Death appeared with a terrifying disguise, the King with a pleasant countenance said he freely forgave them.” Perhaps he wouldn't object to the many pubs named, for him, ‘The King's Head’. (This name has always made me uncomfortable. Yet I wonder, “Are there any cephalophoric statues of our Martyr? –*Ed.*)
- The King's Head. Although the following two events are occasionally mentioned, I have never seen them remarked on. On the scaffold, after it was held up, the head was dropped. When, 164 years, 2 months, and 2 days later, the coffin was opened (1 April 1813), the head was held up for careful inspection, long enough that a detailed sketch of it was made. It was dropped when being replaced, presumably by one of the workmen. The detailed account written by Sir Henry Halford, King George III's physician, who had charge of the exhumation and inspection of the body of King Charles I, does not mention this indelicate detail, presumably out of embarrassment.
- Apophysis. Halford also writes in his account that only facts, not opinion are recorded. Following that statement is a speculation, *identified by him as such.*
- “Remember!” Our Society's motto, “Remember”, is one of the biggest puzzles. In a very trivial sense, what is there to remember? After all, we do not know *what* was meant—only Bishop Juxon knew. The most plausible explanation is that it was a reminder to Bishop Juxon to give something, perhaps the George or perhaps one of the letters or jewels that had just been entrusted to him, to someone in particular, or to tell someone something. For us, the word has taken on broad significance, an imperative to remember why Charles died, and in a larger sense, to remember how important is the rule of law. England's only subjection to tyranny was from within.
- The ‘George’. If the King's ‘Remember’ indeed referred to the George, remember that while plausible it is a supposition. Nowhere was the uncertainty removed, as it might have been by a word from Juxon. Rather, the supposed subject of that imperative, the George itself, compounds our maddening uncertainty. Its identity is elusive. So-called because it depicts the Patron of the Order of the Garter, Saint George, the George for everyday wear is called the ‘Lesser George’. Plausibly, our Martyr wanted Juxon to remember to give it to Charles II; there is no evidence to support that meaning, or that it ever came into Charles II's hands. There are several contenders for the actual George. There is even a book, *The Scaffold “George” of Charles I* by Sir Ralph Payne-Gallwey, Bart. (1908) The two main contenders both came eventually into the hands of the Crown, one from a noble family and the other,

royal: from the estate of Henry Benedict Cardinal Stuart (Henry IX), the last claimant in a male line of the Stuart Dynasty.. He died in 1807 and had signed his will, "Henry R".

- The block, the bunting, and the window. There are at least three common misconceptions about the beheading itself. These are not really controversies or disagreements, but simply wrong beliefs that won't be dispelled, much like urban legends. Nowhere is it argued that any of the following three mistaken views is correct. (The third is sometimes implied in writing.)

Why is it so compelling to attend an execution? Is it as compelling as looking at an accident on the other side of the interstate highway? Perhaps one of our sociologists can explain its magnetism for us, like a sports team's victory parade, a defeated politician's concession speech, the pummeling of a prize fighter, or aping Caesar's 'thumbs down' denoting a defeated gladiator's fate. To share exhilaration or to enjoy witnessing humiliation, pugilism, or cruelty is more easily understood than to observe with acclamation a disemboweling, drawing and quartering, or beheading, *i.e.*, taking delight in the misfortune of another on account of the spectacle and often with no concern as to whether a punishment is deserved or not, or cruel and unusual, concerns of the U.S.'s Founding Fathers. Why is it so difficult to think of positive examples? What do these examples of *schadenfreude* say about our shared humanity? (Is there an English synonym for *schadenfreude*? Is there a counterpart word for experiencing joy as a result of another's *good* fortune? (not an antonym as it reverses only one half of the definition. Is there a word for a cynic's tendency to ridicule public spectacles that most people enjoy? The Olympic torch-lighting ceremony is a good example, being a largely made-up ceremony of undue solemnity, considering the tradition underwent a discontinuity of about two millennia, and especially on the occasion at which there was difficulty lighting it.) Do human hearts and minds and souls have even an inkling that "no man is an island", or did the librettist to *Candide* get it right when he captured humanity's mindless depravity in the inane lyric, "What a glorious day / for an *auto-da-fé!*"?

- We have seen illustrations that incorporate the following mistakes so often, they are etched into our minds. Therefore it is important that what we 'see' in our 'mind's eye' is correct. After all, the Martyr's beheading is the scene most often envisioned when we meditate on the events of his life. We, his votaries, ought to envision it as it was. We know that King Charles didn't panic, he didn't struggle, he didn't even whine. The rebels were prepared for the possibility that their prisoner would struggle. Rope was at hand to tie him to iron staples that had been driven into the scaffold. But "He nothing common did, or mean / Upon that memorable scene", as the Puritan poet Marvel truly put it. In the same poem, a paean to Cromwell, Marvell's words confirm the shape of the block, "He lay his comely head / Down as upon a bed." At a block of the usual design, his posture would be kneeling. In fact, in one depiction of the scene, the block looks altogether like a *prie-dieu* at first glance
- The chopping block was unlike that generally depicted. It was *not* a high block, *not* like a tree-stump in appearance, *not* the sort common in cartoons. Nor was it the "big black block" used by G&S's Lord High Executioner in the Mikado's capital city, Titipu, where, imparting "the sensation of a short, sharp shock" he wielded his "cheap and chippy chopper". The block was a piece of lumber (18" long and 6" in height) with a slight, curved depression carved at the centre of the top to accommodate the victim's neck. It does not survive, having been at once cut into pieces, which were sold as souvenirs or relics. A Dutch engraving (Pickart, 1730), as few do, shows the block correctly, but omits the following detail, the bunting. Why is the incorrect block so pervasive? It could be simple inattention to detail. Or was the block modified by artistic license, so the victim's face could be seen in the scene?
- Black bunting had been hung on the railings of the scaffold ostensibly to obstruct onlookers' view of the gruesome event. That the hangings were emplaced is incontrovertible; 'why' is not known with surety. The reason most often hypothesized is plausible, namely, to avoid inflammation of the masses' emotions and consequent rioting. If so, this reason shows that the rebels already knew that the populace was on the King's side.
- The window removed to provide access to the scaffold was not a window of the Hall, proper, but a window of the side building that contained the stairs. Even those Philistines chose not to deface that masterpiece of Inigo Jones (although they perpetrated worse enormities including commission of overt sacrilege). In 'O Horrible Murder' (1998), Robert B. Partridge comprehensively clarifies this long-held misconception. While we hope the misconception will be cast aside, there is little chance of it. It seems that contemporaries didn't mention it because it seemed a trivial point, or because it was obvious to them that the timeless façade of Inigo Jones's masterpiece would not have been violated, or because most observers were architecturally tone-deaf.

One need not rely on superstition or resort to fabrications to enhance the story of King Charles. As is often said, 'Truth is stranger than fiction.' Consider the irony of the King's trial being held in Westminster Hall: It is the same venue at which he sat, enthroned, just before his Coronation procession to the Abbey, to inspect each of the instruments and appurtenances of the Kingly Office—the swords, the spurs,, scepter, orb, and the crown itself..

I am sorry to have commented at such length—I had envisioned a few bullets of a sentence each and have gone on for several pages—but nonetheless hope that there are some things of enough interest that the curiosity of each reader is aroused. On a personal note, I greatly enjoy and value my correspondence and interactions with American Region members. I hope they will continue. Fr. Barrie Williams and Robin Davies (S.K.C.M.-U.K. President and Chairman) and

David Roberts (R.M.C.U. Secretary) are supportive, fraternal, generous with input and advice, and valued coworkers for our Patron and his Cause. As always, I remain, a fellow client of Saint Charles and your fellow worker in our Cause,

Yours in Christ,

Mark A. Wuonola. Ph.D., Editor

* Under totalitarian rule, words take on different, often opposite meanings (*vide* L. Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*, also 1984 and *Animal Farm*). For example (avoiding Caroline cases and current events), the *World Bank* is nothing like a *real bank* where deposits and withdrawals of one's own funds are made, and where loans are made and paid back. Instead, loans are forgiven long after the funds have been diverted from their agreed, (purportedly) legitimate purposes (generally to aid the perennially impoverished populace) to purposes such as (not actual World Bank examples) lining the pockets of corrupt dictators—swelling Arafat's bank accounts, laying up supplies of comestibles and condiments to complement the contents of Idi Amin's freezers, and the like—and even U.N. officials.

Let us solemnly remember this year, its 350th Anniversary, what the Restoration means. In Britain, it celebrates the Restoration of Church and King. Even here, however, the Restoration is relevant, because it is an occasion to celebrate the end of religious intolerance*** and liberation from the rule of a tyrant so arrogant as to consider himself the people's 'Protector'. Here in North America, citizens of the U.S. and Canada enjoy religious freedom and government—a constitutional republic in the U.S. or the parliamentary government of one of the Queen's Realms—descended from that of Charles II, not from the bleak dictatorship of Cromwell. Yet schoolchildren are taught that Charles I was bad, and that 'good' Cromwell was a father of the modern democracies!

** Charles did wear his Lesser George every day except when formal, Garter regalia were required. The eight-pointed star on the shoulder of the Garter cloak or robe worn by King Charles in that best-known of the iconic van Dyck portraits is the Garter Star. Appearing on it and frequently seen elsewhere is the Order's motto, "Honi soit qui mal y pense"

*** Here, we will not address the vestiges of religious prejudice encountered today. It is difficult even for impartial historians to put aside the XXI Century perspective on Roman Catholicism and to understand the vitriolic anti-RCism of the XVII Century.

30 Jan. 2010 • 361 Years since the Decollation § 2 Feb 2010 • 384 Years since the Coronation

In early 2009, at the time of these important Caroline anniversaries, we circulated to a small audience three emails with historical, reflective, and frankly devotional content. We weren't really conscious that they were 'trial balloons', but favorable comments made them the prototypes of this e-publication's first issue in March, 2009.

It is remarkable that accounts of the King's passion and martyrdom, as we would hagiographically term the time of King Charles's imprisonment or house arrest, his transport back to London (Saint James's Palace), confinement under heavier guard, 'trial', and 'execution' although recalled by many participants and observers and recorded in many places, contain so many contradictions. There were a number of court stenographers, who used a form of shorthand, present at the legal proceedings where the unprecedented, preposterous charge of treason was 'adjudicated' by a court without legitimacy to reach a predetermined verdict. Even though the jurors comprising the so-called High Court of Justice were largely the members of the Rump Parliament, called the Rump of a Rump since it was purged of those who might ask awkward questions or not accede to the sentence (death by beheading), specified in advance by Oliver Cromwell, some of them left town in disgust before the macropodine court's proceedings were complete. As a result, at least two of the signatures on the warrant were erased and new signatures written in their places. The new signatories had to be threatened, just as some of the original signatories had been verbally threatened, and some, even physically coerced. The date and other details were also altered. Many of these fraudulent modifications are plainly visible on the original, once exhibited in the Jewel Tower, as is the axe, at the Tower of London. (The Death Warrant is now housed in the House of Lords Library.)

Perhaps those who had no stomach to continue as jurors were moved by the King's dignity, composure, articulate delivery of the few comments he was allowed to make, or his succinct, powerful words themselves. Or, perhaps they had become conscious that they were participating in a huge fraud, in which a few juridical niceties were conspicuously observed, while wrapped in the biggest of 'big lies'. There was deliberate, agreed intent to refer to 'the prisoner' as 'Charles Stuart', with no deference or use of royal titles accorded. When the head of the King's cane fell off, no one rose, necessitating him to rise and pick it up himself. However, even the judge blurted out 'Your Majesty' by accident. The soldiers were ordered to blow pipe-smoke at the 'prisoner' as he was brought in and taken out of the hall, to spit on him, and to utter insults. In addition to these sophomoric indignities, some of the soldiers shouted out, "God Bless your Majesty!" One of these honest men was severely disciplined by his superior, who was upbraided by the King, quick of tongue, for the disproportionality of the discipline imposed.

Charles was very intelligent and witty. He spoke Latin fluently. He was an accomplished horseman, golfer, played 'bowls', collected coins and medallion art, and the greatest appreciator of art ever—as attested by van Dyck, Rubens, Velázquez, Inigo Jones, &c., and by the Hermitage and Louvre today! However, his slight stammer and appropriate, kingly reserve in speaking were said by his opponents to be signs of stupidity—it was whispered that he was retarded!—and his faithfulness to his oath interpreted as stubbornness. The former accusations, kept alive by Whig historians, persist, while the suggestion that clearly he should have ignored his oath only provides evidence, as if more were needed, of the Cromwellians' opportunism and that their dictum was 'the end justifies the means'. During the King's imprisonment Colonel Pride was introduced to His Majesty, who replied, "Aptly named." One can hardly deny the

significance of the King's reply during the Court's final denial of his request to voice or summarize his objections, "I will speak after the sentence—Ever!"

There were three such stenographers present on the scaffold to record the King's words. One reason for this was the rebels' incorrect supposition that Charles would be inarticulate and stammering, or humiliated by pathetic pleading, if not condemned by his own words. On the other hand, the drummer-soldiers around the scaffold had been stationed there to keep the crowd from hearing, and thus being moved, or even incited by the King's final message. In some accounts, there were several statements, addressed to the spectators in general, or to individuals—the headsman, the Puritan clergy, etc.— and even an exchange with Bp. Juxon himself, that *followed* the imperative, "Remember", directed to Bp Juxon for no known reason, although plausibly thought to relate to the disposition of the George. This and many other confidences, Juxon faithfully took to the grave. Perhaps it was of more significance than we think.

***Advancing the Cause and our Object,
"To win general recognition of the great debt owed by Anglicans to King Charles"***

First appearing in the Dec. 2009 *Communiqué*, our selected excerpts of articles and sermons continue. They are denoted 'I' and 'II' below. May I first observe what splendid contributors have enriched *SKCM News* over the years, and thank them for their work and witness, in some cases posthumously. As you read them, evaluate their persuasiveness and consider using their facts and reasoning yourself when a conversation turns to the Martyr King we venerate. Accounts of your experiences are invited, as are your comments. Both will benefit your fellow members.

Christian Unity has been on our mind, the Octave of Christian Unity having been observed 18-25 Jan. King Charles and Abp. Laud worked for unity among Catholic and Orthodox Christians, "that all may be one, as our Lord and the Father are one." Laud and the King himself carried out personal correspondence with the Ecumenical Patriarch, other of the Eastern Patriarchs, and the Pope; formal discussions were held by Ambassadors and special envoys. Had the Kingdom not been beset by the Rebels, what results might their efforts have achieved?

I. Saint Charles's Example

King Charles I of England need not have died if he had been willing to accede to the remodeling of the national church according to the dictates of the state under Oliver Cromwell. . . .It is clear that if the King had not given his life there would be no Anglican Communion as we know it today. . . .

I should like to suggest that King Charles the martyr is not just "the Anglican Saint", but also in a real way the saint for the XX Century: An exemplar of peculiar and powerful significance for all of us.* For S. Charles died attesting, also, that the only just order of society is that which mediates the Divine Order. . . . What today appears writ large in that cultureless totalitarianism which offers 'liberation' out of the barrel of a gun, appeared writ small but clear in the order of Oliver Cromwell in Charles Stuart's time. . . .In Charles we have an example of implacable resistance to a totalitarian society severed, at its root, from the Eternal. Surely nothing could be more relevant to our days when, as it seems, "things fall apart, the center cannot hold, mere anarchy is loosed upon the world."

Yet, valuable as this is, perhaps there is yet another way in which Charles offers us an example of utter relevance. That is in the sunlit days, even during the war when the court was removed to Oxford, of music and masques, in the patronage of artists like Rubens and van Dyck, and in the high laughter, in victory or defeat, ever after associated with the very word "Cavalier". This high gaiety was borne headlong into American history by bold and careless horsemen like Turner Ashby, Kyd Douglas, and J. E. B. Stuart, and it is the spirit of the "Cavalier" which Faulkner, in the character of the Sartoris family, offers as an answer to the evil banality of the Snopeses. Surely if laughter and music are impossible, even in a dark time, then we are already defeated. Again, what better example for this grimmest of centuries than the court of King Charles the Martyr?

. . . Charles I offers a precious image of unyielding resistance and also, beyond all expectation, of joy. His last word to his chaplain, Bishop Juxon—"Remember!"—seems to resound today [1986] ever louder and with more compelling authority.

* Study of the Martyr King's words at his 'trial' and on the scaffold, all of which were recorded by court reporters, shows that King Charles realized that he faced certain doom but nonetheless establishes his clear recognition of the larger significance of his situation: When questioned in a vain attempt to use the King to establish the legitimacy of the 'court', he said only, "I perceive I am before a power." Since the verdict to be reached had been predetermined, the King's testimony would have been at best irrelevant, or caused delay, or at worst, damaged the rebels' public appearance, he was given hardly any opportunity to speak. On one of the occasions, he said, "I am not permitted to speak: Imagine what justice other men may have." Denied a final opportunity to be heard, after the verdict and sentence had been

announced, he proclaimed, "I will speak after the sentence: EVER." Minutes before his decapitation, he said, "I am the martyr of the people." In fact, the entire matter was conducted in the manner characteristic, then and now, of rebels and totalitarian usurpers. Under a thin veneer to create a semblance of legitimacy, it was so because they said it was so. The charges were unprecedented in law. The House of Commons had been purged of any who might object. Twice. That 'Rump' of a Parliament abolished the House of Lords. (They also abolished Episcopacy and the Bench of Bishops, use of the Book of Common Prayer, and any non-dominical celebrations, such as saints' days and even Christmas, and any sports such as those allowed by the *Book of Sports*.) Those comprising the 'court' and its presiding officer had no legal authority. The death warrant, signed in advance, several of the signatories having been threatened or physically coerced, was then altered above their signatures. A number of them left London after the verdict, or even before. This required further alterations of the death warrant, replacing their signatures with new ones. These alterations are visible still. Despite the apparent abandonment of the Rule of Law, it was important to keep up appearances. The rebels attended to some details scrupulously, thinking somehow to disguise the Big Lie. [—Ed.]

II. The Society's Uphill Battle

A pro-Puritan bias exists here in the U. S. along with an anti-royal and anti-Stuart attitude. It has become very deeply ingrained over the years and extremely difficult to eradicate. In many instances its basis is more emotional and cultural than rational. Thus it is difficult to overcome. Certainly the members of the House of Bishops should know better but obviously they do not. The clergy of the Episcopal Church, to a large extent, have a rather superficial knowledge of English history, especially in matters of church and State.

Requiescant in pace

The Rev'd Canon Dr. Dixon Barr, *Obit.* 16 Oct. 2009, of Louisville KY, a nationally known educator and genealogist, was a stalwart Society member. His many affiliations and accomplishments will be detailed in the June 2010 *SKCM News*.

George H. Blackshire, *Obit.* 5 Oct. 2009

William F. Clark, *Obit.* 8 Oct. 2009, of Brooklyn NY, was a supporter of all the Catholic Devotional Societies, and member of S. Clement's, Philadelphia. He is survived by his wife Suzanne, also a Society member.

Frederick L. Gratiot, *Obit.* 10 July 2007, of Hoboken NJ, was active in evangelizing for the Society's Cause. He traveled throughout the Diocese of Newark, placing our information/membership flyers in tract racks.

The Rev'd Canon A. Pierce Middleton, Ph.D., *Obit.* 18 Oct. 2009, *Aet.* 93, of congestive heart failure. A **76-year member**, he studied history at Harvard with Samuel Eliot Morison, and straightaway was appointed director of Colonial Williamsburg. After ten years, he received Holy Orders, serving primarily in the Diocese of W. Mass., where he figured in the movie based on Arlo Guthrie's ballad, *Alice's Restaurant*. He served as editor of The Anglican Society's magazine, *The Anglican*. He retired near Annapolis; its waters were the setting of his doctoral thesis, published as *Tobacco Road* and still in print. He joined the Society in 1933, the year he matriculated at Edinburgh University.

The Rev'd Canon Robert H. Pursel, Th.D., *Obit.* 23 Nov. 2009, *Aet.* 67. Father Pursel was the rector of All SS. Selinsgrove PA for 24 years; he retired in 2009. A long-time Society member and friend of S. Clement's, he died on S. Clement's Day.

The Rev'd Philemon Sevastiades of Duluth MN, *Obit.* 27 Aug. 2004, *Aet.* 48. Fr. Sevastiades was ecumenical officer of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. He was working on his Ph.D. at Columbia University at the time of his death. His wife and two children survived him.

The Rev'd Craig Young, SSC, *Obit.* 14 Dec. 2009, *Aet.* 51. Fr. Young, 15 years rector of Church of the Epiphany, Columbia SC, frequently ministered at the Mayesville chapel of Saint Charles, K.M., and to our Charles Towne, Carolana, Chapter.

Errata

Contact information for **The Guild of All Souls** (*SKCM News*, Dec. 2009, p. 38) was incorrect. To join the Guild (annual membership, \$5; life \$20) write to Secretary-Treasurer Fr. John A. Lancaster, SSC, P. O. Box 721172, Berkley MI 48072. The Warden of the Guild is The Rev'd Dr. Ralph T. Walker, SSC, OL.

The subject of an obituary on p. 28, the Very Rev'd Dr. John Paige Bartholomew, late dean of the pro-cathedral, Hastings NE, was *not* a Society member. The Very Rev'd John Bartholomew, who *is* a Society member and an Archpriest of the Russian Orthodox Church, is very much among us in the Church Militant, rumors of his demise having been greatly exaggerated. Mark Twain's phraseology helps an editor to apologize for an obituary error, among his worst nightmares.

2012 Annual Mass Select Preacher

We are pleased to announce that **The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL)** and long-time Society member, has accepted our invitation to preach at the XXIX Annual Mass, 28 Jan. 2012, at Nashotah House.

Listings in TEC's Clerical Directory

Researching our members' changes of address within this naughty world and their dates of passing from it has been of critical importance for the History and the Necrology. The main purposes of the research are twofold: (1) to enable us to pray for the soul of each departed member and (2) to re-establish contact with 'lost' members. Most members who are lost have become so because of carelessness in paying dues (although we allow several years of 'grace') or inattentiveness to changing their address when moving, always a hectic time. U.S. citizens move every three years, on the average. Postal forwarding is far from perfect. When moving, it is best to notify the publications to which you subscribe and the organizations to which you belong of your new address, the date when it is effective, and to do so *directly*. Organizations such as those of 'higher learning', that contact you primarily to raise money, seem to have their own ways of knowing your new address—almost as soon as you know it yourself. When contacted, very few members seem to have become lost because of disagreements with us.

In our research, the *Clerical Directory* (CD), published by TEC every two years, has been valuable. It is not perfect, but is very useful. When a TEC priest leaves The Episcopal Church, his listing is removed with remarkable efficiency. Deaths are listed efficiently, since to continue pension payments any longer than required is the Church Pension Fund's number one phobia. Their website lists deaths month by month but they are not posted promptly. The online listings go back only 5 or 6 years. CD, TEC's counterpart to the C of E's *Crockford's*, contains useful, short biographies, full of abbreviations. A priest's career details, when compared with the addresses on our mailing lists, permit identification of those with common names. There is no consolidated list, although the *Annual* has a necrology in each edition. The facts for CD biographies are provided by the clergyman himself and updated for each new edition. *I have noticed that many S.K.C.M. members do not include the Society among their affiliations. Include S.K.C.M. the next time you update your information. This will increase our profile. It is an easy way to witness to The Cause.*

Notice of Southwell Lecture at Fordham University – 4 March

The upcoming **Saint Robert Southwell, S.J. Lecture** entitled "The Redecking of the Altars" has been announced for **6 p.m. on Thursday 4 March 2010**, at the Rose Hill campus of Fordham Univ., NYC, by Prof. Susan Wabuda, Ph.D., F.R.A.Hist., a friend of the Society. The lecture is subtitled "**Ceremonialist Style and Parish Conflict in the Court of Charles I**" and will be delivered in the Flom Auditorium of the William D. Walsh Family Library.

The Southwell lecturer, **David Cressy, Ph.D., Humanities Distinguished Professor of History of Ohio State Univ.**, seems to take a similar approach to Mr. Guyer's in his *Living Church* essay (see p. 2), as I infer from the lecture's title, a variant of the title of Eamon Duffy's masterpiece chronicling the English Reformation, *The Stripping of the Altars*.

For more information, please contact Susan Wabuda, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History at Fordham. Telephone: (718) 817-3945; email: wabuda@fordham.edu ; website: www.fordham.edu/southwell . For directions to Fordham University's Rose Hill campus, please visit www.fordham.edu/directions .

2010 • Gatherings This Year • A.D. MMX

The Charles Towne, Carolana Chapter sponsors a commemoration of the Decollation of King Charles the Martyr, at the **Mayesville SC Chapel of Saint Charles, King & Martyr at 11 a.m. Saturday 6 Feb. 2010**. The Patron of the American Region, Bp. Ackerman, will be present. We thank Richard Hines, Benefactor, for his generosity and hospitality. Luncheon will follow.

We heard from the Rev'd Kent L. Haley, Benefactor, of a 30 Jan. commemoration at **S. Timothy's (ACA/TAC), Salem OR**, arranged by the Rev'd Brandon Filbert. The filbert, more commonly called the hazelnut, has long been one of Oregon's highest value agricultural products, now contending with grapes, the basis of Oregon's superb wines.

XXVII Annual Mass

Solemn Mass in the Presence of a Greater Prelate
The Rt. Rev'd John L. Rabb

11 a.m. Saturday 30 January 2010

Grace & Saint Peter's Church, Baltimore MD

The Rev'd F. S. Thomas, SSC, Rector

Mozart Missa brevis in G, K. 140

Preacher, Canon W. Gordon Reid

Rector of S. Clement's, Philadelphia

Luncheon Reservations, \$15 per person

Checks to 'GASP', memo line, 'SKCM'

Send by 20 Jan. to Grace & Saint Peter's Office

707 Park Avenue, Baltimore MD 21201

Semiseptcentennial of the Restoration
Solemn Mass in the Presence of a Greater Prelate
The Rt. Rev'd Daren K. Williams
11 a.m. Saturday 29 May 2010
Saint Barnabas Church, Omaha NE
The Rev'd R. F. Scheiblhofer, Rector
Harwood Office for Holy Communion in A^b, Op. 6

Preacher, Bishop Williams
Ordinary, Diocese of the West (ACA/TAC)
Luncheon Reservations, \$15 per person
Checks to 'Saint Barnabas Church', memo line, 'SKCM'
Send by 19 May to Saint Barnabas Parish Office
P. O. Box 31155, Omaha NE 68131



SEND EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE & SUGGESTIONS BY EMAIL TO DR. WUONOLA.

EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ EDITORIAL BOARD: LEE HOPKINS, J. DOUGLASS RUFF, ESQ., & MARK A. WUONOLA, PH.D.

MEMBERSHIP [\$15 ANNUAL DUES] AND INQUIRIES: J. DOUGLASS RUFF, SECRETARY,
5500 FRIENDSHIP BLVD., SUITE 2009 N, CHEVY CHASE MD 20815-7212

361ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROYAL MARTYRDOM • A.D. MMX • 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION