



email

Communiqué
of the
Society of
King Charles
the Martyr,
Inc.

The Society's
American
Region

U.S.A. & CANADA

ISSN 2153-6120

[WWW.SKCM-
USA.ORG](http://WWW.SKCM-USA.ORG)

EDITOR, MARK A.
WUONOLA, PH.D.

[WUONOLA@
EARTHLINK.NET](mailto:WUONOLA@EARTHLINK.NET)

March, 2010

Dear Fellow S.K.C.M. Members: One of my favorite correspondents and most knowledgeable readers responded to the Jan./Feb. issue of this publication, marking its first anniversary with this March issue, with some corrections. When I told him that the corrections were welcome, I was being serious. To speak selfishly, how does one learn if one is not open to correction? Speaking altruistically, you, our readers, deserve to receive correct information *or a correction*. Accordingly, we open with *Errata*.

Errata

It is not any of the Acts of Uniformity that excludes Roman Catholics from the Throne. (Jan./Feb. 2010 *Communiqué*, p. 2) The Acts of Uniformity (1549, '52, '59, & 1662, modified slightly in the XIX Century and radically in 1965 by the Alternative and Other Services Measure) relate primarily to requirements for public worship and use of the BCP. They do contain a provision requiring clergymen to repudiate armed rebellion against the King and the National Covenant.

Respecting the Throne and line of succession, all non-C of E adherents were (and still are) excluded by the Act of Settlement (1701). It requires future sovereigns and their consorts to "join in Communion with the Church of England as by law established".

The 1701 Act 'settled' the Crown on the Electress Sophia of Hanover, establishing the House of Hanover. Sophia was the daughter of Elizabeth, Charles I's elder sister. The son of Sophia and Ernest, Elector of Hanover, King George I ascended the Throne in 1714 when Queen Anne died, and was the first of the Hanover Dynasty to reign. The Act was put into place in 1701 to resolve ambiguities about the succession before William III died (1702). He and Mary II were first cousins, both grandchildren of James VI & I.

Lest this monthly e-publication be termed the *Tangential Tribune*, your editor now takes us back to Charles I. The heir-apparent, Henry, Charles's elder brother, died of typhoid in 1612. Charles was chief mourner at his funeral. Elizabeth left England in 1613 to join her husband, Frederick V, Elector Palatine; she and Charles would never see each other again. (Elizabeth returned to England in 1661 and died the same year.) To top off a triad of tragedies, Charles's mother, Anne of Denmark, died in 1619. Charles was chief mourner at her funeral. He had lost the three people to whom he was closest. From the age of 12, Charles was mentored by King James, who took the responsibility very seriously. James was described by Sir Francis Bacon as "the best tutor in Europe".

"The King is Dead, Long Live the King!" After his father died at Theobalds in 1625, it again fell to Charles to be chief mourner at a royal funeral. Planned by Charles himself, with the assistance of Inigo Jones, James's obsequies are said to have been the most elaborate ever. Ironically, for King Charles there were none, use of the Prayer Book having been criminalized. In future issues: King James mentors Charles, "Train to Reign", continued apologetics, and more Milton when the editor has the stomach.

Let us participate liturgically in our Lord's Passion, atoning sacrifice, and glorious Resurrection,

As always, I am,
Your fellow votary of Saint Charles,
Mark Wuonola

Late News – The Rev'd Canon Marshall V. Minister, R.I.P.

We heard just yesterday of Father Minister's recent death in Omaha. He was a Life Member, since 1951, and an Inaugural Member of the Order of Bl. William Laud (2009) More details will appear in our next issue. Canon of Omaha after being rector of Saint Charles, King and Martyr in Fort Morgan CO, Fr. Minister had been a fighter pilot in the storied 93rd Bombardment Group. Fr. Minister was Vicar of Saint Paul's Mission in Fort Morgan. In partnership with the parishioners, who approved the change unanimously, their bishop's support for the new dedication, to Saint Charles, was secured. It was implemented together with the church's attainment of parish status, in 1951. The formal dedication, when the church's debt was formally discharged, by the Bishop of Colorado, 26 April 1957 is a key milestone in the American Region's history. Thus Fr. Minister was responsible for the first Caroline church dedication in the New World. (Not in the Western Hemisphere as is sometimes said—several of the early dedications in England are of

churches West of the Greenwich meridian.) It is remarkable that in this same issue of the Communiqué are reported some recently discovered details of the dedication of the First American Shrine on 29 Jan. 1897.

Apologetics

Our excerpts of articles and sermons continue from the Dec. 2009 and Jan./Feb. 2010 issues. We have been discussing the common situation of being called to speak about Saint Charles, or having the subject come up in a casual discussion. People will ask you questions when they know you're interested in Charles and things Carolinian*. A questioner will often have something on his mind, something he's 'always wondered about'. (Those words are a red flag, often serving as a preface to a question designed to trap or 'stump' you. A good counter-measure is to begin your response by saying that you have [or had] always wondered about it, too.) Although it is natural to feel the fighting spirit when cornered, you will think better if calm. Don't permit yourself to become defensive, argumentative, or angry. *That* is a negative witness, for sure. If you don't know, say so and look up the subject. Do the same even if you're pretty sure, but not 100% sure. Offer to bring your interlocutor a copy of an article on the subject; then find one that makes a good witness. Perhaps you can find something by an author of whom he has heard. Does it go without saying that giving incorrect information undermines credibility? If that's not taken as a rhetorical question, one can reasonably conclude that it doesn't always do so. Look at what political leaders sometimes get by with. When you discuss Caroline's subjects, don't go past the borders of your knowledge. But of course, beware, because many of the sources you might consult have swallowed the Whig history they've read or been taught, while even the best sources often bear vestiges of it. I treasure my set of the Eleventh Edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1910-11) but its article on Charles I is prejudiced, not subtly and slightly, but blatantly. Take a look at it sometime. Even Dame Veronica Wedgwood isn't error-free. It is clear from her writings that she respected King Charles. Heh! That's damning with faint praise, isn't it? It was not my intent to impugn that author who has done so much to acquaint readers with King Charles. It is the case that she is careless with details—details of which there is no question. It takes no time to fact-check 'facts' that have been knowingly supplied (Why don't I just say it. They've been made up.) by the author, whether carelessly, in haste, thought to be inconsequential, in the exercise of literary license, or because an imaginary 'fact' somehow surpasses actuality in beauty, romantic appeal, irony, gruesomeness, or rhetorical impact, whatever the hidden agenda might be.

After all, Cromwell respected King Charles. You may exclaim, "What?"

It is clear from many sources that Cromwell, cynic and opportunist that he was, admired what he felt was the King's ability to fool most of the people most of the time, to bend Abraham Lincoln's often-quoted aphorism. Cromwell didn't really believe a word of what Charles said. Cromwell thought it was all merely buncombe that his father, James I, had imparted to the Prince. What Cromwell admired about Charles was (as he thought) that he could fool the people so well. Such a rationalization would undoubtedly have occurred to Cromwell. It would explain *Eikon Basilike's* popular appeal when compared to *Ikonoklastes*, the poet Milton's lame rebuttal to *Eikon*. Had Charles been a faithless opportunist, he could have just said that trends in society obviated the need for faithfulness an oath, or that an oath was "an evolving paradigm" as a Massachusetts magistrate said a few years ago. It might be noted that Milton used that very argument when asked to explain why *Ikonoklastes* didn't make the *New York Times* best-seller list. So did that wretched Attorney John Cooke (counsel to the 'High Court of Justice') who slapped together the specious 'Tyrannicide Brief', eponym of the title of the book David Butler so deftly reviewed in the Dec. 2009 *SKCM News*. Propagandist to the end, still justifying the regicide, and with arrogant condescension to the 'people', Cooke wrote to his wife from prison (Sept. 1660),

"We [namely, the rebels —*Ed.*] fought for the public good and would have enfranchised the people and secured the welfare of the whole groaning creation, if the nation had not more delighted in servitude than freedom."

Did not the 'groaning creation' realize that it was freedom for Cromwell's goons to enter their residence on the day formerly called Christmas searching for any evidence of papist festivities such as the traditional roast goose or plum pudding. He thereby demonstrated his contempt for the people, a fact worth noting well. (The House of Lords and the Bench of Bishops were abolished by rather straightforward measures. Was a decade's time insufficient for the Lord 'Protector' to enfranchise the people? Did they require

'reeducation' first?) Not practicing what he preached, Cooke advised his daughter, Freelove, shortly before his execution, as follows:

"I pray thee never learn any pride, but be humble and meek and courteous and wait upon 'God's ordinances."

His hubris in the first quotation is a stark contrast to the humility he counsels in the second quotation. Which words reveal the *real* John Cooke? Did Cooke think women should aspire to virtue, leaving opportunism or 'pragmatism' to be practiced only by deceitful men?

To Cooke and Cromwell, the underlings' only function was to supply the (bogus) rationale for the social and governmental changes he championed, that is, to help them. To put it bluntly, like totalitarian dictators everywhere, he thought that 'ordinary' people were stupid and disposable. Cromwell wasn't stupid, and wasn't ordinary, either (*Laus Deo!*). He realized how wrong he had been to use regicide as a tactic to accomplish his enthronement as a dictator. I think it likely that he realized this before the beheading, as he saw his loyal partisans distancing themselves from the proceedings, but in his pride couldn't change course. OK, perhaps he had no sense of right and wrong; let's replace 'wrong' with 'ill-advised'. Unlike the many ambiguities and urban legends detailed in the last issue*, a story that is unverifiable but has more than a 'ring of authenticity' about it, says that a man came at night as many did to pay his respects to the beheaded King.** The man wore a cloak, its hood pulled forward and tightly held, ostensibly to conceal his face and muffle his voice. Slowly he walked around the King's leaden coffin. The man stopped deliberately at one point, muttering, "Cruel necessity." After 1660 it came to be known from the guards' first-hand accounts that the man was Oliver Cromwell. They were not uncertain of their conclusion, but even then stated it cautiously. Nothing was said at once, because under the 'Protector', the less said, the better concerning such things. After the Restoration, the paranoia induced by totalitarianism persisted.

Whig historians enjoy using this story. They think that it makes their hero look good, human, and compassionate. While they see it as evidence of a Cromwellian modicum of conscience, I see it as an obviously staged event at which his identity was intentionally ineffectually disguised. The Whig historian implies that Cromwell *had* to kill Charles for some reason, but no higher power ordered the King's death. One cannot consider the 'High Court of Justice' a higher power because it was Cromwell's creature; he ordered that macropodine body to reach a certain verdict and to impose a certain sentence. After all, the Whig historians are propagandists. Cromwell was heard to say, "I will cut off his head, with the crown on it!" to those who suggested a less severe sentence. I like the story not because it can be spun to Cromwell's benefit—but because of its *verismo*. Those Whig historians' who claim that because his expectation was that he wouldn't be recognized, his guard was down, thus providing a rare glimpse of his real self.

Along with other bits one reads, it appears that Cromwell didn't want 'to look bad'—probably out of insecurity and vanity. He didn't want it to be known that he wore iron body armor under his clothes; he removed it only behind locked doors. As we often emphasize, he was not stupid. In fact, stupidity is not among the seven deadly sins, is it? No, based on my reading on the subject, it seems probable that even before the trial was over, Cromwell realized that it was a bad move. Remember that Cromwell was operating in a 'time warp' compared to everyone else. He had instructed the judge in advance what verdict the court would reach (guilty of treason) and what sentence would be imposed (death by beheading). As I mentioned, too, in the previous issue, the death warrant had been signed in advance. Delays then necessitated changing it—altering the date and coercing two new signatories. They were needed to sign over the erasures because those two signatures wouldn't do: the identities of the two who absented themselves from the still-ongoing proceedings and left town were commonly known. Why was this an issue? Because the sentence had to be carried out within a certain number of days after the sentencing. Otherwise it would be obvious that the verdict specified on the death warrant had been written before the judge pronounced the sentence. Why couldn't a new, proper death warrant be drafted and signed? Physical coercion was required to convince just two signatories to perjure themselves and commit forgery by signing an improperly dated document stating a verdict that the judge had not yet uttered. It is clear from contemporary documents that it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, again to obtain the requisite number of signatures from the 'jurors' hearing the arguments in the case.

All this fits together then. As with the death warrant time warp explained above, Cromwell likely realized that either exile or imprisonment would have been a better sentence to impose than beheading, but felt that to change his mind would have made him 'look bad', just as when certain legal 'I's were dotted and

'T's crossed right under the shadow of gross improprieties. And when he muttered, "Cruel necessity", he knew that the capital sentence had not been a necessity—if only he had not jumped the gun, prematurely completing the death warrant, signatures and all. Similarly, he would have lost face if the capital sentence had been reduced or clemency had been exercised.

It then seems obvious that Cromwell's *sin* was not *stupidity* (which is not a sin), but *pride*. He didn't want to look bad. He had to keep up appearances. He didn't want anyone to know that the death warrant had been prepared prematurely, before the verdict was reached and a sentence imposed. Those who hold up Cromwell as the father of democratic government don't mention it, but the altered warrant is now on exhibit for all to inspect. One hopes he is embarrassed, but doubts it.

Unverifiable hearsay that they are, the facts are susceptible of many interpretations. "Cruel necessity" may have been a subtle form of ostentation, not unlike the un-subtle extemporaneous public prayer he bellowed out in an Irish church, thanking God for His help and His demonstration of His favor in effecting that day's victory, the victory where on his orders all those Irish priests were hanged upside-down. He was attempting to make his 'piety' and 'favor with God' generally known. In his arrogance he thought he could tell posterity how to interpret events. Perhaps "Cruel necessity" was meant to become common knowledge, his 'disguise' meant to be ineffectual, his voice meant to be recognized, in that room in Saint James's where the King's body lay. Who other than Cromwell would have dared to give voice to such a thought/

Did Oliver Cromwell know what he actually thought on a given day? It infuriated him that as events unfolded, what he thought one day did not look right the next day. He tried to control what others should think but couldn't control his own thoughts. We'll never know what he thought: Einstein's brain was preserved for *post mortem* study, but after the Restoration, Cromwell's provided avian nutrition.

* Another simple point on which sources disagree is how long our Martyr's body was exhibited. No less an authority than Clarendon says the body was available to be viewed for several days, but the majority of historians agree that the King's body was embalmed on the evening of the 30th and the ordinary wooden coffin encased in the leaden coffin and soldered shut immediately. The story of Cromwell's visit is not affected in either case. More of these historical errors in a future issue. There are many; they are euphemistically called 'inaccuracies' by historians. My view is that a measurement of some sort, *e.g.*, Charles's height, may be inaccurate, but a question having an answer that is yes or should be expressible in prose as a statement that is either right or wrong (erroneous),

* 'Caroline' generally refers to Charles I, Charles II, or both, and is derived from the Latin *Carolus*. 'Carolingian' generally refers to the Emperor Charlemagne (Charles the Great) although its origin is uncertain; possibly it originated with Charles Martel, Charlemagne's grandfather, or with Charlemagne himself. The distinction between the terms is not hard and fast: 'Caroline' is not uncommonly used in relation to Charlemagne or the French kings Charles but 'Carolingian' is used for the English kings Charles only rarely. The etymology of 'Carolingian' may explain or at least rationalize this asymmetry of usage: 'ing' is a German patronymic suffix, logically used in connection with the Holy Roman Emperor. The *Libri Carolini* or 'Caroline Books' exemplify the application of 'Caroline' to Charlemagne, being four volumes written for that emperor containing arguments against the 2nd Nicene Council and sent by him to Pope Adrian I. The word 'Carolingian', parallel to the name of the predecessor Merovingian Dynasty, is synonymous with 'Carolingian'.

'[A] Carolinian' is a native or inhabitant of, or the adjective for, the Carolinas. In France, supporters of Charles X, and in Spain, supporters of Don Carlos and his successors are called Carlists. The name Charles means strong/manly. Carl, Karl, and Carlo are equivalents, in addition to those already mentioned, and the diminutives, Charlie, Charley, and Charlot. Feminine forms are Carla, Charlotte, Carlotta, Carlotta, Carlota, and the diminutives Lotte and Lotta. Among U.S. males' Christian names, 'Charles' is tenth in prevalence at about 1.5%, based on the 2000 census, while among American Region S.K.C.M. members it is at least three to four times that.

** The soldiers who stood guard allowed many visitors to do this. Really? Yes they did: for money. A monetary inducement would get you a few minutes in the presence of the King's body, a lock of the King's hair, a piece of ensanguinated linen, or a piece of the block (as mentioned in the Jan./Feb. issue)—'a chip off the old block', as it were—a chip with blood on it was very desirable. Some of those seeking these opportunities were pious and loyal supporters of the King and his Cause, while others were motivated by idle curiosity, rejoicing at the rebels' temporary triumph, or morbid motives. One of the soldiers was overheard (perhaps in a pub) saying said that he wished there were many more King Charleses to be beheaded so he could continue to make such good money.

Today these souvenirs, relics as we would say, are rarities. They were put into lockets, rings, or little frames. Few have survived, most of them probably having been lost because they were hidden during the Commonwealth, never to be retrieved, or discarded by persons not knowing what they were. A locket containing a few tiny strands of hair or a piece of blood-soaked fabric, if its chain of custody is well-documented, typically brings £2 - 4,000 at an auction house such as Christie's or Bonham's. Some are bought by private collectors or for display in museums; others are bought by private collectors or for veneration by pious societies such as ours. Your editor is aware of only two that have come up for sale in over two decades' time.

Our parent, U.K. Society purchased one such relic at auction back in the 1950s to add to its collection displayed on the altar at each year's 30 January Banqueting House gathering. After the solemn celebration of the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, one of the relics is offered for veneration. Let us give thanks that these were not stored with the archival materials destroyed in the Blitz.

The above discussion pertains to relics of hair and blood, primary relics. Secondary relics are more plentiful; they include articles such as pieces of the Garter Robe worn by the King to the scaffold and removed just before he lay down. Other secondary relics remain intact, such as shirts and other articles of clothing worn at his beheading. These are of course much rarer than articles of clothing worn by the King during his life. A complete list was published serially in *Church & King* in the 1950s. Perhaps as a result of the publication of this information, a large piece of the scaffold Garter Robe and the Garter Star embroidered on it were associated with each other. The details of that detective work will be the subject of a future article.

Apologetics: Why Commemoration of the Royal Martyrdom Is Important

Editor's comments on this essay, its author, A. Pierce Middleton, and his mentor, Samuel Eliot Morison

It is unfortunate that so few historians—professors, scholars, researchers, and free-lancers—know “both sides of the story” and are able or choose to avoid bias. So far our featured quotations from sermons delivered to, and articles written for our Society's American Region have appeared here anonymously. This feature has appeared twice but no guesses of authors' or preachers' identities have been submitted. The anonymity is to make it easier for you to evaluate the articles, sermons, and excerpts without being distracted by any knowledge about their authors, *pro* or *con*. Here we make an exception. The following essay is by recently-deceased 76-year member, The Rev'd Canon A. Pierce Middleton, Ph.D. In 1933 he matriculated at Edinburgh University (where and when he joined S.K.C.M). Following that, he pursued his doctorate at Harvard under the direction of Prof. Samuel Eliot Morison, who stood at the apex of XX Century American historians, and was an ardent sailor and horseman. He was known to deliver his lectures at Harvard in riding attire, his crop close at hand.

Morison was a versatile scholar, neither the sort to learn ‘more and more about less and less’, nor the sort to fancy himself an omniscient generalist, nor the propagandist whose entire *oeuvre* serves his agenda (whether hidden or not), political, religious, sociological, linguistic, methodological, whatever. Morison's Pulitzer Prize winning *Admiral of the Ocean Sea*, a biography of Christopher Columbus, was one among his output of more than three dozen books. Among these are the masterful two-volume set *The European Discovery of America*, five volumes of Harvard history, his 15-volume *History of U. S. Naval Operations in World War II* (To enable first-hand observations, he was directly commissioned into the U. S. Navy, attaining an Admiral's rank.), and the overview *Oxford History of the United States*.

At the time of his book on Columbus, the revisionists were already saying that Columbus did not know where he was going, didn't know where he was when he made landfall, and was on a mission to exploit and enslave the natives he encountered, racist and imperialist ignoramus that he was. Modern historians, who have the resources to be the most sophisticated are often the greatest oversimplifiers. I think it was Morison who wrote that anyone who had sailed in mid-ocean or who had used celestial navigation knew the Earth to be spherical, not flat. Actually a big part of Columbus's mission was to evangelize the inhabitants of lands he found. Missionaries as well as explorers, the Spanish discoverers took the Catholic religion wherever they went. As our Lord and Savior commanded, they went and they baptized, just like Saint Paul in the northern Mediterranean, Saint Augustine in Britain, Saints Cyril and Methodius in Russia, Saint Thomas in India, Saint Mark in Egypt, Saint Boniface in Germany, Saint Henry in Finland, Saint Francis Xavier in the Far East, and the Spaniards, Portuguese, English, Dutch, and French in the Americas. Didn't our Lord say something about that? “Go forth into all nations, baptizing them” Did Saint Paul of the Glorious Company of the Apostles or our Lord Himself issue an Executive Order nullifying the Great Commission? I must have missed that. Perhaps historians in our post-Christian age can't believe that anyone would have taken such a mandate seriously, even a Dominical one. After all, many Christians have so little regard for their faith that they can't stomach evangelization of those of other faiths despite our Lord's and Saint Paul's position on the subject. None of these could understand why Charles would bother about his oath.

A ship's captain was usually close to the priest. There was always a priest, usually the best educated man on board; the captain consulted him on a variety of topics. This is evident in place naming. Each prominent topographic feature and each place a party went ashore was named, the saints of the church

calendar appearing in order (the coast of California is a good example). Most sailors in those days were men of faith, aware of the ocean's power and of the imminent risks they might suddenly face.

Both Admiral Morison (as he preferred to be called) and Pierce (Canon Middleton preferred) were matter-of-fact, unaffected, and unbiased; their only agenda was to inform their readers honestly, and to interest them in the subject area about which they had chosen to write. Both were drawn to and fascinated by maritime subjects. Both were communicants of the Church of the Advent, Boston, Middleton while in graduate school, and Morison, for most of his life, living a block from the church.

Canon Middleton was editor of *The Anglican*, the magazine of The Anglican Society. Society member Canon J. Robert Wright is currently its president and Father Cody Unterseher, *The Anglican's* editor. The following article appeared as an editorial in *The Anglican* and was reprinted in Volume 1, Number 1, of *SKCM News* (June, 1974). He died on 18 October 2009. May his soul rest in peace. *Amen*.

***Restoring King Charles the Martyr to the Prayer Book
by The Rev'd Canon Arthur Pierce Middleton, Ph.D.***

1974

In providing the Church with an otherwise excellent calendar of saints, the Standing Liturgical Commission has unaccountably made one almost unpardonable mistake, *i.e.*, omitting King Charles the Martyr on 30 January. Certain facts relative to the Royal Martyr are beyond dispute: 1) He lived and died a faithful and devout communicant of the Church; 2) in an age of licentiousness, his personal life was spotless; 3) he could have saved his life had he been willing to abandon the apostolic character of the Church of England; 4) stunned by remorse at his martyrdom, the English people began almost at once to venerate his memory; and 5) at the Restoration of Crown and Church in 1660 King Charles was formally canonized by the Convocations of Canterbury and York and Parliament, authorizing a collect and propers for use on 30 January.

This black-letter holy day was kept with great regularity in England and in the American Colonies until the decline of interest in the royal Martyr in the late XVIII Century. The struggle against monarchy in America in 1775-82 put an end to its observance here. In England the Evangelical Movement found other outlets for its enthusiasm. The Whig historians, imbued with liberal principles, identified Charles I with the divine right of kings and Cromwell with championship of representative government. In 1859 Queen Victoria ordered King Charles the Martyr's day dropped. But the more objective historians of our century have corrected their bias. The King acted within the constitution and law of the land; Cromwell and the Puritan party were rebels and innovators. It was not Charles but Cromwell who abolished Parliament and set himself up as a dictator. The miscarriage of justice by the Regicides exceeded anything done in the Court of the Star Chamber. The King did defend the rights of the common people, whereas the Puritan party was the representative of the rising power of the bourgeoisie.

Prime Minister Disraeli said of King Charles: "Never did a man lay down his life for so great a cause—the cause of the Church and the cause of the poor." His Liberal opponent, Gladstone, hesitated to go so far, but was obliged to admit that "It was for the Church that King Charles shed his blood upon the scaffold." Even more telling is the considered opinion of the Church historian, Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London: "Had Charles been willing to abandon the Church and give up episcopacy, he might have saved his throne and his life. But on this point he stood firm; for this he died and, by dying, saved it for the future."

Surely the Church should restore King Charles to its calendar. How many saintly kings have there been who were prepared to die for it? The redoubtable Bishop of Arizona has memorialized the House of Bishops to restore the observance of 30 January as his day. I heartily endorse his request and hope that the General Convention will put its stamp of approval upon it.

Editorial note. When it was first established in the U.S., our Society should have made 30 January's inclusion in the Prayer Book its first priority. When a painting of the Martyr King was unveiled on 29 Jan. 1897 at Philadelphia's Church of the Evangelists, which was S.R.O., filled to overflowing, with worshipers standing outside on the street. An expression of support was sent by the Presiding Bishop, Dr. Williams. That prelate wrote, "I have no doubt that I entirely agree with you in your esteem of King Charles I." The President of the 'Lower House', Dr. Dix, wrote "I am in cordial sympathy with the occasion". Bishop Perry of the Diocese of Iowa, historiographer of the Episcopal Church, preached. The celebrant of first vespers was Fr. Robinson of Evangelists; he was assisted by Dr. Mortimer and Fr. Moffett, rectors of Philadelphia's

Saint Mark's and Saint Clement's. The Bishop of Delaware, the personal proxy of the Superior of C.S.S.S., and the vicar of Saint Bartholomew's, Brighton (England) were also Present. Eight more U.S. bishops and the Superior of O.H.C. sent letters of support. A prayer modified from one in the State Service was sanctioned for use on the occasion by the Bishop of Pennsylvania.

The painting, after van Dyck's "King Charles in the Robes of State", was executed by Oswald Fleuss of London, from a watercolor by Queen Victoria's own artist, whom she ordered to produce an "exact copy" of the rarely seen original at Windsor Castle. Her Imperial Highness enthusiastically supported the project to place a portrait of King Charles in a church in the former colonies. The Martyr King's likeness is larger than life-size, its proportions magnified by the building's diminutive breadth. He is robed in white and wears his earthly crown while bearing a martyr's palm

More about this event will appear in the future. We are grateful to our resourceful contributor, Richard Mammana, who transcribed this account, found in the Harvard Library (*Catholic Companion*, Feb., 1897), and to our faithful supporter, the Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, for bringing the photograph in the 1904 Guidebook to the Church by the Rev'd Henry R. Percival, S.T.D., its rector 1880-1903, to our attention. These members' contributions illuminate an important event in our Society's largely unknown early history.



SEND EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE, SUGGESTIONS, AND INQUIRIES BY EMAIL OR POST TO DR. WUONOLA.

EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ **EDITORIAL BOARD:**

LEE HOPKINS (SAN FRANCISCO), J. DOUGLASS RUFF, ESQ. (CHEVY CHASE), & MARK A. WUONOLA, PH.D. (BOSTON)

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