



Contents White Rose Day
In future issues
Our History: Background & Outline
More on Milton
Queen Victoria and the State Services
Attitudes toward our Society and our Patron
Placing 30 January on Church Kalendars

Email Communiqué
Society of King Charles the Martyr
American Region
June, 2010 (rev.)

EDITOR, MARK A. WUONOLA, PH.D. ☉ WUONOLA@EARTHLINK.NET
ISSN 2153-6120

BACK ISSUES OF *SKCM NEWS* AND THE *EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ* ARE POSTED AT THE AMERICAN REGION'S WEBSITE, WWW.SKCM-USA.ORG

White Rose Day – 10 June

Dear Society Members and All Clients of the Martyr King: In this issue of the **EMAIL COMMUNIQUÉ**, our subject is White Rose Day, the 10 June holiday significant in many ways, one of which is King Charles I, whose cognomen, **The White King**, refers to his white attire, likened to doublet and hose, visible only at the anointing ceremony at his 2 February 1626 Coronation. –MAW (see section on King Charles I, p. 3)
The promised outline of the American Region History will appear in our July issue.



What is White Rose Day? It is odd that a commemoration that is so well-known—in a vague sense, not in detail—and that commemorates or is associated with so many different people came also to be so obscure is not known. Let us clarify its meaning. It falls at a time of year that may on occasion be a suitable opportunity for a non-Winter gathering.

We'll comment on the top four worthies associated with White Rose Day, Saint Margaret of Scotland, Queen & Widow, Mary Queen of Scots, Saint Charles King & Martyr, and King James III & VIII (son of James II & VII and claimant to the throne, called by the Hanoverians "The Old Pretender"). Mention will be made of King James II & VII, the rose as a symbol, some other interesting examples of roses as tokens of love and honor, and of the other direct line Stuart claimants.

SAINTE MARGARET OF SCOTLAND, 1046-93, CANONIZED 1251

Likely born in Hungary, **Margaret**, a Saxon, was a grand-niece of Saint King Stephen of Hungary, niece of Saint King Edward the Confessor, grand-daughter of King Edmund Ironside, and daughter of Edward the Atheling (Edward the Exile or Edward Outremer). She was educated in Hungary where her family was exiled (hence her father's nickname, meaning 'overseas') on account of the brutality of the Danish kings in Scotland. She returned to England but now, after the Norman invasion, was in another danger as one of the last of the Anglo-Saxon royal family. Thus she sought refuge in the court of Malcolm III, whom she married in due course. It was Malcolm's father, "the gracious Duncan", who is murdered by Macbeth in Shakespeare's quasi-historical tragedy of regicide, *Macbeth*. It is known with certainty that Macbeth murdered Duncan in 1040, but it is not known why. Most likely is a dispute over succession: Duncan's was the first succession in the direct line in Scotland's history.

(Duncan's predecessor was his maternal grandfather, Malcolm II.) One historian commented that the 1040 date is the only thing about the matter known with certainty. Shakespeare had no choice but 'quasi', a playwright's delight—the ultimate in poetic license. Coincidentally, the play was written to honor King James VI and I.

Charles I was born at the Dunfermline Castle (in Fife, across the Firth of Forth from Edinburgh). S. Margaret founded Dunfermline Abbey among her many charitable and religious foundations. We will treat Saint Margaret, whose story is fascinating, at length in another place.

Margaret's daughter Matilda married King Henry I of England; of the remainder of her eight children, David became King of Scots, as did Alexander. Through Margaret and Matilda, the English royals, from after the reign of Henry I until today, trace their lineage back to the Anglo-Saxon kings before the Norman Conquest.

We all make mistakes. Saint Margaret of Scotland's association with 10 June is an amusing aside. One and a half centuries after her death (16 Nov. 1093) her remains were translated on 19 June 1250 in preparation for her canonization in 1251. Baronius⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾ made an error in reading the date of her Translation, taking the nine for a cipher. Hence her main feast, that of her [relics'] Translation, made its way into the Martyrology as 10 June, not the 19th. Later, S. Margaret's June feast-day was changed to 8 July for reason(s) unknown. But it was restored to 10 June by Innocent XII at the deposed James II's request to coincide with the birthday of his son, James (III), and later to provide the basis for the 10 June celebration of White Rose Day.

S. Margaret is Scotland's only saint accorded universal observance in the Roman Catholic General Calendar. The Scots are proud of their Patron Saint (so designated in 1673), and rightly so. At the time of the Reformation, S. Margaret's relics and the remains of her husband, Malcolm III, were translated to a chapel of the Escorial in Madrid; the Jesuits at Douai obtained her head.

MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS, 1542-87

Another of Charles I's ancestors remembered on White Rose Day is **Mary Queen of Scots**, his grandmother. She led a most unhappy life, the victim of politics and a contemporary rival more powerful than she. She made several ill-advised choices, attributable to her *naïveté*, living in a hot-house environment, having few associates, and being carefully protected, albeit confined. Those who criticize her would do well to understand her unhappiness and her simplicity. It would seem that her only happiness was her relationship with GOD, her Maker and Savior and Sanctifier.

Mary's life was full of sorrow and disappointment. Her first marriage, with its fairy-tale possibilities, in 1558 at age sixteen to the fifteen year old Dauphin must have been like a dream to her. Imagine the refinement and glamor of the French Court. Francis was the son of King Henry II and Catherine de'Medici. In 1559, Henry died. Mary became Queen-Consort the next year as the Dauphin became King Francis II. The pace of things must have bewildered Mary. A dream of opulence, power, and happiness may have been thought possible. Francis, sickly and of inferior intelligence, ruled through the vicious and arbitrary agency of his manipulative uncles Francis, Duke of Guise and Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine. They abused their proximity to the throne, arousing enmity between the nobles and the royal blood. Francis unexpectedly died in 1560 of an ear abscess. For Mary, the dream was over. Two more husbands, two decades of imprisonment, a traitor's death, and humiliations by the jealous, childless Elizabeth.

In 1566, by Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, Mary became the mother of James VI. When she abdicated in 1567, James was crowned king. His guardian was the Earl of Mar, and after his death, his brother Sir Alexander Erskine. Until the age of twelve he was confined for safety to Stirling Castle. In the same year (1578) he began to govern, the Earl of Morton being driven from the Regency by Protestant extremists. But for a regent to last for eleven years was extraordinary.

Mary Queen of Scots lived a life full of events that ranged from high to low, fodder for romantic fantasy or for character assassination. Many questions about her turbulent life and her involvement in this or that can be asked, but will never be clearly answered. Such queries lead to pointless speculation. However, there is no question about her piety. Her rosary with its well worn beads is on exhibit for all to see. When it was announced to her that she had only 24 hours to live, it was her royal sense of duty that kept her up through much of the night, systematically writing to those to

whom she wished to say a last word. With these, she shared her thoughts and her confidence in GOD. Then she slept a few hours before arising on 8 Feb. 1587. Mary confronted the imminence of her death courageously. It was with composure that she led her weeping ladies-in-waiting in prayer. She was escorted to an interior room at Fotheringay, in which had been erected a raised platform, on it, only the block. The headsman was unskilled or the axe dull, since three blows of that instrument were required to hack her head off.⁽³⁾ When her head was lifted up, the wig came off.

Throughout Mary's life, no hoped-for happiness came to fruition for long. Those who advocate her Cause believe that her rough, earthly pilgrimage led her to achieve her heart's desire, eternally. Venerated locally, Mary's feast-day is 8 February.

KING CHARLES I × SAINT CHARLES, KING & MARTYR, 1600-49

Our readers surely know more about **King Charles I** than could be put into a short précis. In examining his part in White Rose Day., we will confine ourselves to recalling why he is The White King, The White Rose. It is hoped that the following will contain a few details that are new to you.

A mental image elicited when we practice visualization of meaningful scenes during contemplative prayer, is important. King Charles I's five-hour Coronation liturgy surely offers many meaningful scenes. It was the occasion of his Oath, honored from then up until his death, and falling as it does on Candlemas, an important holy day.. His 30 January martyrdom occurred almost exactly (three days short of) twenty-three years after his 1626 coronation, and in the twenty-fourth year of his reign.

Do not imagine that he wore white attire throughout the service. If you have the Dec. 2006 *SKCM News* at hand, look at its cover illustration, portraying the King processing toward the Abbey. His attire is entirely dark-colored except for ermine borders and mantle. Not an outer garment, the white satin attire was visible only at the anointing, and even then seen only by few, since the High Altar is almost entirely obscured by the Choir and other architectural features, some quite necessary, like the massive pillars. That part of the ceremony follows the Oath, the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, the Litany, and the proper prayers for the Coronation. Then, as the Archbishop intoned *Sursum corda* and the Preface of the Anointing, the King proceeded to the High Altar. "Then, standing before the High Altar he was disrobed of his upper garments by the Earl of Worcester, the Great Chamberlain. . . His Majesty's robes were taken off him, and were offered on the Altar. He stood for a while stripped to his doublet and hose, which were of white satin, with ribbons on the arms and shoulders to open them; and he appeared a proper person to all that beheld him."⁽⁴⁾

The King was anointed on the palms of both hands, the breast, the upper arms, between both the shoulders and on both the shoulders, and the crown of the head. The oil was wiped off with pure wool, except that it was covered with a linen coif on the head and linen gloves on the hands. The King used King Edward's Comb and then prostrated himself before the High Altar. He arose and donned, with Bp. Laud's help, the ancient habiliments, the Confessor's *Colobium Sindonis* (like a dalmatic), supertunic, cloth-of-gold hose and sandals, spurs, and sword. Then he was vested with the Armill (like a stole) and Open Pall (a mantle). Sitting in the chair with Jacob's stone in it, the Crown was taken from the altar and placed on his head. Then the Earls and Viscounts assembled, with their coronets, as did the Barons and bishops, bareheaded, when the King was invested with the Ring, removed the Sword, and then received the Sceptre with the Cross of S. Edward from the Archbishop, with the Earl of Pembroke, supporting his right arm, giving him the Glove with the Arms of Verdon. Finally the Rod with the Dove was placed in his left hand. We will continue with the Coronation Rite on another occasion. I felt it important to describe the context in which the brief appearance of the white doublet and hose occurred; it is quite complex to describe—after all, it's not Rite II.

KING JAMES II & VII, 1633-1701

We know the history of **King James II & VII's** short reign (1685-88), fulfilling Charles II's prediction that his younger brother's reign would last no more than three years. James began by relaxing enforcement of the laws constraining Roman Catholics, and then began to change the regulations and to exercise his power to dispense RCs from this or that regulation. He was challenged and went to court on the matter of his power to dispense RCs from the Test Act so they could hold office, gaining a favorable decision. It is generally thought that the judges had been intimidated or otherwise compromised or influenced. His changes in policy were moving at lightning speed. The rapid granting of political rights to Roman Catholics and the proposal to exempt RCs and

dissenters from the Penal Laws were shocking to many, not surprisingly since even today, 320-some years later, no Roman Catholic can succeed to the throne, nor can the monarch be married to a Roman Catholic. (It was not that long ago, after her conversion to Roman Catholicism, that the Princess Michael of Kent was required to disclaim her place in the Line of Succession.) Many felt that James was not keeping his promise to protect the Establishment.

Whether one deems it 'Glorious' or not, the 1688 departure of King James II and his displacement by William of Orange were, if not amicable, bloodless. It was not, however, like two trains passing in the night. James was apprehended by William's forces at Faversham as he was preparing to embark for France. William was merciful and allowed him to escape a second time. It was not a 'Dutch invasion' as some say, but it was distinctly protestant.

The House of Hanover did not begin until the reign of George I, since the Act of Settlement had 'settled' the crown on Sophia, his mother. The deposed James II made several attempts to regain his throne, but after suffering defeat at the 1690 Battle of the Boyne, witnessing the total destruction of the French fleet assisting him in 1692, and being humiliated when the "Assassination Plot", in which he had no part, was discovered in 1696, he lost heart and withdrew to St. Germain.

"He refused in the same year [1696] to accept the French influence in favor of his candidature for the Polish throne, on the ground that it would exclude him from the English. Henceforward he neglected politics, and Louis [XIV] of France ceased to consider him as a political factor. A mysterious conversion had been effected in him by an austere Cistercian abbot. The world saw with astonishment this vicious, rough, coarse-fibred man of the world transformed into an austere penitent, who worked miracles of healing. Surrounded by this odour of sanctity, which greatly edified the faithful, James lived at St. Germain until his death on the 17th of September 1701."⁽⁵⁾

A cause for his sainthood was introduced, made considerable progress, and then languished.

KING JAMES III & VIII × JAMES FRANCIS EDWARD STUART, 1688-1766

Remembered on White Rose Day is the fourth of our tetrad, James, son of James II and VII, styled **King James III & VIII** by Stuart loyalists and 'The Old Pretender' by the Hanoverians.. Only 'joining' the first three 'White Roses' because we have taken them chronologically, he was the first. because his 10 June 1688 birthday provided the basis for the Holiday.

James stands, in a sense, for himself and his two sons. The elder was Charles III ('Bonnie Prince Charlie', 'The Young Pretender', or 'The Young Chevalier'; born Charles Edward Louis Philip Casimir Stuart), an enduring romantic figure, styled the Prince of Wales until his father's death, and the younger, Henry IX (Cardinal Duke of York; by birth, Henry Benedict Maria Clement Thomas Francis Xavier Stuart). These three were the last Stuart Kings⁽⁶⁾ in the male line from King James I. Each was a remarkable individual; it is intriguing (but pointless) to speculate how Britain would have fared had they in turn occupied the throne.

The Vatican recognized James III & VIII and Charles III in turn as the legitimate kings of Great Britain and Ireland. Henry IX, having chosen an ecclesiastical career, did not assert his right publicly. Vatican authorities—generally His Holiness himself—have been very generous to the Stuarts over the years. King Charles I maintained cordial correspondence with Urban VIII (1623-44), who granted permission for Bernini, exclusively retained by the Pope, to accept the commission to sculpt Charles's bust. It is thought that Henrietta Maria facilitated this arrangement: She desired to present the bust to her husband as a gift; the Pope wanted to be on good terms with the British Royal Family, always hoping to advance Rome's interests in Britain; and Bernini was the world's most acclaimed sculptor.

Two further examples of the Stuart Dynasty's experience of papal benevolence will suffice. James III wished to marry the Polish princess Maria Clementina Sobieski (granddaughter of the storied warrior-king John III Sobieski) against the will of her father, John Sobieski, who had placed her and her mother under virtual house arrest in Innsbruck. A zealous Jacobite, Charles Wogan, abducted the princess using a ruse. James and Maria Clementina were married at Montefiascone in 1719. Clement XI, who openly acknowledged them as King and Queen of Great Britain, gave them an allowance of 12,000 crowns, a papal guard of troops, a villa at Albano, and the Palazzo Muti in the Piazza del Santi Apostoli in the city. Upon Maria Sobieski's early death in 1735, ten years after the

future cardinal's birth, a "splendid but tasteless" monument to her, by Pietro Bracchi, was placed in Saint Peter's by order of Benedict XIV.⁽⁷⁾ It is necessary to mention also that the magnificent monument by Antonio Canova to the three Stuart claimants was placed in the central area of Saint Peter's basilica; they are interred in the crypt of S. Peter's with James's Queen, Maria Clementina. A new sarcophagus was required in 1938, and it is generally thought that King George VI bore its cost; later, restoration of the Canova monument was paid for by his Queen, the late Elizabeth, the Queen Mother.⁽⁸⁾

James III became weak and reclusive after Maria's death. This condition worsened on account of Charles III's displeasure with and then estrangement from his father. In 1745, Henry had overcome his father's objections to go to France and assist in preparing for the '45, that year's Jacobite campaign. When he decided to return to Rome and pursue an ecclesiastical career, he obtained his father's permission, to his elder brother's intense displeasure. He nonetheless spent considerable of his own resources on the campaign and later impoverishing himself assisting Pius VI against the French revolutionaries. George III granted Henry an annuity of £4,000 to improve his situation.

Charles II most likely converted to Roman Catholicism on his deathbed. Some historians believe that he had been of the Roman communion for some years, but secretly. He had actually agreed with the French to convert, in the long-secret Treaty of Dover. Some of the more vociferous of King Charles I's opponents even circulated rumors in his day that he was a secret Roman Catholic, and cited his leniency toward RCs in support of their belief. As with all things Caroline, the number of martyrs he made varies with the source, from many to none. By all accounts there was a drastic decrease. One source, perhaps more credible by its citation of specific details, reports there was only one. Many were tried and convicted. Charles I's usual practice was to deny any appeal that came to him, and then to sign the death warrant to carry out the sentence. This deception was used to give him plausible deniability if later confronted with the facts of the case. The warrant was quickly followed by a messenger carrying a Royal pardon. According to the account of that supposed single martyrdom, the messenger was delayed *en route* and reached the scene of execution moments too late. As much news as was published in the XVII Century, much of it was sensationalist, crudely derogatory, or unbelievably libelous, and a huge proportion, wrong. Fact-checking was impossible in many cases, and disregarded by that press 'to get the story', so at this temporal distance it is not possible to make definitive judgments.

James II⁽⁹⁾ made his submission to Rome c. 1670. James III, Charles III, and Henry IX were all born Roman Catholic, James at Saint James's Palace in London (10 June 1688), Charles on 31 Dec. 1720, and Henry on 6 March 1725, the latter two at Rome's Palazzo Muti. On the day of Henry's birth, he was baptized by Pope Benedict XIII himself, perhaps accounting for his seven Christian names.

Secrets and hidden things enhance the romanticism of a story. There is a persistent rumor, of very unlikely veracity, that in order to better his chances of recovering his throne, Bonnie Prince Charlie (King Charles III) made a secret trip to London and at the Church of Saint Mary-le-Strand renounced his allegiance to Rome and was received into the Church of England.

WHITE ROSE DAY

Celebration of **White Rose Day** on 10 June is not unique among Roman Catholics or Jacobites, although the majority of our tetrad were of the Roman communion. Our Society's own Patron, King Charles (I) the Martyr remained loyal to England's established Church and was committed to its teachings and practice. As he replied to several ambassadors' and his mother-in-law's suggestions that he become (Roman) Catholic, "I *am* a Catholic." And on the scaffold, he proclaimed, "I die a Christian according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left me by my father. And this honest man [indicating Bp. Juxon] I think will witness it."

THE ROSE

On the origin of the **White Rose** symbol, it is said that in the late XVII Century, the Jacobites took up the White Rose of York as their emblem. They celebrated each year on 10 June, James III & VIII's birthday, out of thanks and hope that he would carry on their Cause after his deposed father. Fond recollection, respect, and for some, devotion to Charles I and James II & VII, as well as the great figures in the Scottish line such as Saint Margaret of Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, went without saying. A number of sources state that the White Rose was the 'badge' of the Stuart dynasty.

The white York rose is said to have originated back in the XIV Century with Edmund of Langley, the First Duke of York, York being a cadet branch of the House of Plantagenet. The rival House of Lancaster used the red rose as their symbol; hence the name 'Wars of the Roses' for the civil wars of the XV Century. These were ended by Henry VII who is said to have 'combined' the two roses to form the Tudor Rose. Most of the above seem rather weak explanations of the symbol's evolution.

Since the rose is considered the most beautiful of flowers, references to roses, their symbolic and hagiographical uses; their use as awards and gifts, tokens of accomplishment, love, esteem, patriotism, devotion and piety when they adorn an altar or shrine or crown an image, and many other things is without limit. Here we are immersed in romanticism: We may well recall the silver rose that subtly figures throughout, dominates the presentation scene when the *Feldmarschallin* receives that argenteous flower from Octavian, and even determines the name of the well-loved opera, *Der Rosenkavalier* by Richard Strauss.

Unfamiliar to some of you may be an award conferred by the Pope. It is the Golden Rose, traditionally presented to the honorand on Laetare (Rose) Sunday, the fourth Sunday of Lent. Some of the roses are fabulously ornate, the work of the finest goldsmiths, or as one Vatican source puts it, "artificers in gold".

In one of his presentation sermons, Innocent III said that, as Laetare Sunday "represents love after hate, joy after sorrow, and fullness after hunger, so does the rose designate by its color, odor, and taste, love, joy, and satiety respectively." He identified it with the "flower [that] shall rise up out of [Jesse's] root", *i.e.*, Christ. Leo XIII said that it "shows the sweet odor of Christ which should be widely diffused by His faithful followers."

Henrietta Maria was presented with a Golden Rose in 1625, the year of her marriage, at Amiens, presumably not long before her embarkation for Dover to join her husband. Other recipients from the British Isles include King Henry VI (1444), James III King of Scots (1486), Queen Mary of England (1555), and King Henry VIII, who received three, from three popes in succession.

THE ORDER OF THE WHITE ROSE

We should also touch on the occasionally-mentioned **Order of the White Rose**. Having heard the name a few times had aroused my interest. I tried for years to discover more about the Order (this was pre-Google). The most frequent answers to my query were about a Finnish order called The Order of the White Rose. The first volume of Douglass Shand Tucci's two-volume study of Ralph Adams Cram⁽¹⁰⁾ and his works is where I first found more than a few words on the Order I had in mind.

We know from Tucci that it was active in the 1880s, the decade before S.K.C.M.'s founding. The nature of its existence in the 1880s remains unclear from Tucci's tome. In one place he says that Cram and his circle "organized a local branch of the Jacobite Society, the 'Order of the White Rose'", and in another that Cram "appears to have founded [the Order] in America." Using the name Ralph von Cram, he styled himself the Order's Prior in America.

Let us briefly cite Tucci on the subject of romanticizing. He writes that "Eliot and Cram were also alike in their love of lost causes" and quotes Russell Kirk, an Eliot biographer and scholar of his poetry, who wrote that "Eliot assumed that he was casting his lot with the vanquished. . . and expected [Anglicanism's] disestablishment and disintegration." Tucci quotes Van Wyck Brooks as saying that at Harvard around 1900 "there were two popular cults among his friends, 'the cult of Dante' presided over by Charles Eliot Norton. . . [T]he other was ' . . . [the] Order of the White Rose . . . led by Ralph Adams Cram.'" Since, as Tucci reminds us, President Eliot could not stand him, Cram did not include Harvard among his favorite venues. Thus they gathered in Boston as well as Cambridge, Boston being "a very short trolley ride . . . across the river, which bears King Charles's name, after all." F. W. Coburn recalled that the mood of Boston aesthetes in the 1890s was perhaps best exemplified by one of their company, calling themselves 'symbolists', Kahlil Gibran, in his "sort of vague, mystical expression that was then the *beau idéal* of advanced Boston . . . when white roses were worn on the birthday of Charles the Martyr. . . ." ⁽¹¹⁾⁽¹²⁾

In Boston our Society and the Order had some members in common. In addition to those named above, Isabella Stewart Gardner is notable, hosting meals and holding masses and meetings of the Order at her Boston Palazzo, Fenway Court, now the Museum bearing her name. Tucci reports that at

such gatherings, she occasionally dressed to resemble Mary, Queen of Scots. A catalogue of her Fenway Court library available online reveals that her collection contains not only *Eikon Basilike*, but works by Gibran. (The collection is intact since Mrs. Gardner's will specified that nothing be changed after her death. Art thieves take note!) Two other members mentioned are Drs. William Barroll Frisby and William Harman van Allen, rectors of the Church of the Advent. It did not go quite so far as to have a shrine to the Martyr King, although a remarkable wooden statue of Abp. Laud in the Lady Chapel was purchased with Royal Martyr Day offerings. The coloring of the statue is not classical polychrome but rather impressionistic, nonetheless perfectly conveying the features and expressing the personality of that martyr of 10 January 1645. The Order's activities seem to have included the full complement of commemorations associated with White Rose Day. Perhaps the Order was (or is) not so much secret as obscure.

CONCLUSION

There are those who have dismissed any or all of our tetrad's remarkable figures as hopeless romantics, stubborn fools, even stupid, and not saints, venerated by deluded eccentrics. The lost cause has an appeal for romantics, as Tucci points out. The history of the Stuart dynasty provides more than a few examples of disappointments and lost causes, many of which are properly of interest because they were right, not because they were lost. As a Society, our interest in the history of the Stuart dynasty is because it relates to our Patron, not because of any particular political or religious position (of which many are held among our members).

People are often surprised that Mary Queen of Scots has been proposed for canonization, but it would be as a martyr. From a certain viewpoint, this is quite logical and readily justified by any Roman Catholic. She surely would have returned her realms to the Church had she been restored. In fact, her death, ordered by Elizabeth, was to remove any possibility of her restoration, because of Mary's ardent Roman Catholicism and the rivalry between the two. Religion and power or control can inspire severe conflicts. Elizabeth had the upper hand and imprisoned, or rather, confined, Mary. Correctly or not, Mary had been implicated in various plots, including involvement in Darnley's demise and a plot against Elizabeth, the last straw.

Saint Margaret presents no difficulty, as she was cut from the mold of medieval royal widows, long-suffering and exercising great philanthropy. Many suffered the humiliation of philandering husbands, but that was not Malcolm—he died tragically, with his eldest son, in a military engagement.

Our own Royal Martyr requires no further comment here for members of our Society. It might however be noted here that Charles I's sainthood is often argued against for these reasons: *I.* He was not really a martyr for the church, but for the divine right of kings. *II.* He did not lead a blameless life. *III.* He accepted his sentence as inevitable; there was no way out so no choice remained to him. We will not argue these points here and now, other than to say that he could have saved his life and retain a puppet throne had he capitulated at any time. Cromwell, as has been mentioned before, saw the value of 'keeping up appearances'.

The case of James III remains. It can be argued that because of his religion, he lost his realms and his throne. This is surely the case. War being as it is, he cannot bear responsibility for not recovering them. Things were poorly planned, and it could be argued that he fought half-heartedly to recover what he had lost. He lost hope and became despondent when he became estranged from Charles III after Henry's choice of career. Unlike his father, James II, he did not find a commitment to religion and its practice at the end of his life. Nonetheless he was the Jacobiters' first and best hope to recover the throne because in time he was closest to its loss, even though in reality the '45 had more success than James's 1715 attempt.

Remember that for unbelievers, whose point of view is worldly only, our Lord's was a lost cause, in which his death and interment *were* the end. Our faith is based on what happened next. By way of full disclosure, Our Lord told us that we would be 'marginalized', although He wouldn't have used such a vapid word: He said, bluntly and with candor, that He came not to bring peace, but a sword, and that as His disciples, we might find that our families turn against us, that our friends shun us,⁽¹²⁾ that society ridicules or persecutes us, and we suffer all manner of ill treatment, including death, but that whatever we suffer would be for His sake. Knowing the potential consequences, why would we believe in Him? Because He is "the way, and the truth, and the life". (S. John xiv: 6)

Notes

(1) Cesare Baronius (1538-1607) was an ecclesiastical historian. He became an Oratorian in 1557 and superior in 1593. In 1596 he became cardinal and in 1597 Librarian of the Vatican, where he worked on his *magnum opus, Annales Ecclesiastici*, twelve folio volumes, one chapter for each year. At his death it covered up to 1198 but many attempts to continue the work all failed. He prided himself in accuracy, but in some areas there was insufficient information, “and throughout[,] his critical powers failed to support his good intentions.”⁽²⁾ In Volume 11 he wrote in support of Papal claims in Sicily, over Spain’s. Right or wrong, his scholarship cost Baronius the papacy because he lost the Spanish cardinals’ support. He also published new and corrected editions of *Martyrologium Romanum*.

(2) F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd Ed., 1974, entry ‘Baronius’.

(3) This event came to King Charles’s mind on the scaffold: “Harm not the blade, though it may me.”

(4) The quotations here are from Fuller’s *Church History of Britain* as they appear in *The Martyr King* by C. W. Coit, who attribute the general details to Christopher Wordsworth’s *Coronation of King Charles I*. I acknowledge Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben., OL, for providing the information from Coit. “Be thou faithful unto death, and I shall give thee a crown of life.” The sermon text set the stage for Charles’s reign. The oath to which he was faithful read, “The things which I have here promised, I shall perform and keep. So help me God, and the contents of this Book.”

(5) These extraordinary words are from the anonymous author of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*’s article “James II”, 11th Ed., Vol. 15, pp. 138-9 (1911). The *Britannica* is not generally considered a hagiographic work.

(6) The respectful word for a king regarded as legitimate, at least by some, but who for some reason does not occupy his rightful throne, and who asserts his *claim* thereto or agrees that it is legitimate, is *claimant*. A claimant may actively assert his claim, be silent, or renounce his claim. Many with an arguably legitimate claim are silent, at least publicly, lest they seem grasping; a situation that obtains in some of the former Soviet bloc nations. The negative word, used to imply that the putative king’s claim to the throne is dubious or illegitimate, is *pretender*, hence the use of that term for James III and Charles III by the Hanoverians. It may be used formally, such as ‘King *N*, in pretense’. Henry IX did not press or assert his claim to the throne, although Jacobite adherents and his retinue used his kingly title; he signed his will, “Henry R.[Rex]”

(7) The words of the anonymous author of the entry “James Francis Edward Stuart” in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th Ed., Vol. 15, p. 142 (1911). The same entry is drawn on for other points related to James III.

(8) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Benedict_Stuart, accessed 10/12/08

(9) James II might be added to make our tetrad a pentad. A cause for his sainthood was raised and progressed considerably. It stalled, perhaps because of potential diplomatic sensitivity between the Vatican and the U.K. James has been venerated locally (feast-day, 16 Sept.).

(10) Douglass Shand-Tucci, *Boston Bohemia 1881-1900* (Vol. 1 of *Ralph Adams Cram: Life and Architecture*), Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995, ISBN 0-87023-820-1 thank Mr. Tucci for this lead. When researched further, the subject should afford an article for one of our publications.

(11) F. W. Coburn, quoted from an article, “Syriac Suggestions” in the *Boston Sunday Herald* of 22 April 1917. It is more likely that white roses were worn in Boston on White Rose Day (known from other sources⁽¹²⁾ to be the general practice) or Royal Martyr Day, not on King Charles’s birthday. –Ed.

(12) E.g., <http://romanchristendom.blogspot.com/2008/06/white-rose-day.html>

(13) This happened to T. S. Eliot when he embraced Christianity.



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 PER ANNUM, CURRENT AND FUTURE YEARS] AND INQUIRIES: J. DOUGLASS RUFF, ESQ., SECRETARY & VP
5500 FRIENDSHIP BLVD. STE. 2009 N • CHEVY CHASE MD 20815-7212

MEMBERSHIP INCLUDES SKCM NEWS AND CHURCH & KING, BOTH SEMIANNUAL. THIS COMMUNIQUÉ (MONTHLY) IS PROVIDED AS A .PDF FILE, FREE TO MEMBERS AND NONMEMBERS ALIKE. SIMPLY PROVIDE YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS AND TELL DR. WUONOLA’S FIREWALL THAT YOUR PURPOSE IS ‘COMMUNIQUÉ’.

MDCLX • 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION • MMX