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Usually, ‘Halcyon Days’, times of prosperity and affluence are fond reminiscences. We hope that their characteristics will prevail in your life making your New Year serene. The Halcyon Days are reckoned as a spell of fourteen days falling around the Winter Solstice.

The name and accompanying lore originated in ancient Greece, αἰλίκυνος (Gr.) and alcedo (L.), meaning kingfisher, a non-passerine bird prevalent near water (especially the [Grecian] archipelago, and those of SE Asia), often crested, and taxonomically diverse, being of some twenty genera and 150 species. Some are piscivorous and others insectivorous. One Australian variety, on account of its loud morning call is called the ‘laughing jackass’ or, more respectfully, ‘kookaburra bird’. According to Greek fable, the bird nests around the Winter Solstice and calms the waves, requiring calm waters for conception and during incubation. Whether the kingfisher’s reputedly floating nest benefits from seasonally tranquil waters, or the bird, as reputed, calms the waters is of no moment here.

In Greek mythological lore, Halcyone, the daughter of Aeolus, distraught with grief for her drowned husband, Ceyx, threw herself into the sea, but the gods in their pity changed her and her husband into kingfishers. We may also aptly attribute the halcyonian characteristics of tranquillity and peace to the Liturgical Seasons preceding and following the Solstice.

Advent is a season of expectancy and nocturnal stillness; anticipatory quiet before the arrival (Advent) of the Incarnate Son of God. There is also the contrast between night and daybreak, life without or Before Christ and the Christian Era. “The King shall come when morning dawns / And earth’s dark night is past” “Cast away the works of darkness / O ye children of the day.” Once the Christ-child is born, there is stillness just as the angels greet the Holy Family. “On the feast of Stephen”, 26 Dec., when “Good King Wenceslas went out,” the day after celebrating our Lord’s Nativity, we commemorate the first martyr of the Christian Church, whose stoning is recounted in Acts. We go from the manger angels’ singing to the fierce shouting of an angry mob. The next day we commemorate S. John the Evangelist, who makes it clear (S. John 1) how Jesus came to be incarnate, although He existed before the creation. In awe, we genuflect that He “was made Man”. We meditate on the Incarnation, God stooping down, The Son taking human form, finding himself in a common human
situation, the birth of a child. But this child, more miraculous than any other, looks humbler than most, lying there in his newborn beauty, in the midst of filthy animal stalls, by some accounts in the manger from which animals ate their hay. He was put where he fit. “Thy bed was the sod / O thou Son of God.”

The next feast to be celebrated in the stillness of early Christmastide commemorates the slaughter of the Innocents, a special kind of martyrdom. Other martyrs have died for the Faith, or for a tenet of the Faith, but the Innocents died for the Incarnate Lord Himself. The Innocents were infant boys aged two and under, killed on Herod’s orders lest any of them prove to be the Savior. There had been rumors about a great King, and Herod didn’t want anyone seizing his power, pathetic and limited as it and he were, wholly dependent on the imputed authority of the Roman emperor. He was a puppet ruler.

(Brief quotations from Christmas hymns are from The Hymnal, 1940.)

Dear Society Members and All Clients of the Martyr King: We published our first issue in March 2009. With that issue, Lee Hopkins began his service on the Editorial Committee of the Email Communiqué. In addition to his contributions in that capacity, he had been writing articles and book reviews for SKCM News since he volunteered in 1995, having enrolled in 1994. Beyond the literary sphere, he provided key input, drawing on his advertising and communications experience, to the Strategy Task Force, as to Society strategy and operations. For these reasons and to commend his zeal for the Cause and desire to make it and our Patron more widely known, in 2009 the Board of Trustees elected him an Inaugural Member of the Order of Laud. It is with our appreciation and gratitude that we relieve Lee of his Editorial Committee responsibilities. The Editor for one acknowledges Lee with respect for his accomplishments and suggestions, for making challenges and for imparting his wisdom, all for the good of our common Cause, and raises to Lee a toast of Napa Valley’s finest, on some days, a mellow merlot, on others a bold, multi-faceted meritage.

Now joining the Editorial Committee of the Email Communiqué is Suzanne G. Bowles, already known to you from her book reviews in SKCM News, to which she has been contributing for exactly ten years, her first article (on the funeral of King Charles at Windsor) having been in the Dec. 2000 issue. Suzanne earned the Ph.D. in History from Syracuse University and is presently Associate Professor of History at William Paterson University in Wayne, NJ, where she teaches and pursues her research. Her specialties, early American history, naval history, Anglican and American religious history, and British royalty, provide the subjects for her publications in the scholarly literature and have resulted in a number of books. A member of Saint Michael’s Episcopal Church, Wayne, Sue presently serves on Vestry. –MAW

**Historical Biases about King Charles I**

It seems to the Editor as though in every issue he repeats the fact that inadequate historical fairness and truth have been employed in writing about King Charles I. This is not true across the board, and it is not entirely true even of the most biased invective. Authors who are not at all grounded in reality lose first their credibility and then their audience. A little reality goes a long way. The astuteness of the populace during the Stuart era may not surpass that of today. While literacy is higher now, and the information resources are more numerous and more widely available, ordinary citizens are no more motivated to do fact-checking or to investigate things on their own. Most people form opinions based largely on feelings and emotions, not on facts. This is why popular judgments of politicians are often wrong. Being photogenic or likable is not enough. For the same reason, an *ad hominem* argument, which appeals not to the intellect, but to passions, prejudices, and emotions, is classed in the study of logic as a fallacy. To impart a better understanding of our Patron, we need not counter prejudice with prejudice. We are content with the truth. What does the foregoing tell us about arguments concerning King Charles based on his short stature, his speech impediment, his aestheticism, whether he was prudish or stubborn, or that he was fond of Shakespeare? When he said or did something, did the fact that it was *he* who...
said or did it determine whether it was right or wrong? Or was it the statement or the action itself?

We have no fear in suggesting that someone read the Bible. Likewise when inquirers ask us to suggest books, we do not resort to a ‘reading list’ of propaganda: We have found that talking to an interested person directly is the best approach, when supplemented with an inquirer’s own self-directed program; this has worked again and again, because it lacks any external bias.

After a hard day’s work and attendant problems of family, friends, and finances, there are also the obligations of our Faith. These can be overwhelming, making it tempting to put one’s feet up rather than read about one’s congressman. To be an informed citizen is the responsible goal, for ourselves, our peers who don’t or can’t do so, and for our children, but it is not easy. Prayer is not easy, either, or at least, most people don’t find it easy. Other tasks intervene, it is another demand on our time and unlike specific tasks, we may feel no sense of accomplishment afterwards, and perhaps even further behind in our routine. The reality of trading off another activity, to pray instead, is only one of the distractions. We may think, ‘I should be doing such and such.’ Any little sound, light, sensation, pain, or emotion that we notice may distract us. Potential distractions become less compelling when we become more accustomed to talk with Our Lord, Our Lady, or a Patron Saint, or ourselves, among the rooms of our Interior Castle, as S. Theresa of Ávila says, as we meditate or engage in contemplative prayer.

‘Rebels’ includes all those who opposed King Charles I. Their opposition was for many different reasons. The Editor knows that some readers think that his characterization of these opponents is too harsh. This month another author makes an entrance to speaks on the subject. He was non-partisan, and a historian. He was not even C of E, but a Jew.

**Isaac D’Israeli on the Rebels: Introduction**

In general, the Rebels of the 1640s seemed malcontent and grouchy. Their eventual leader and ruler of Britain, Cromwell, definitely was, as was the rebels’ PR man, John Milton, Latin scholar, poet, and government employee during the Commonwealth. Formally Milton held the office of Latin Secretary to the Council. As such, he dealt with government affairs at the highest level, and with matters of great sensitivity. Official documents and correspondence had to be put into Latin that was proper and formal, nuanced but clear. Much of it was only hack work. We all have some acquaintance with Milton’s poetry, which has many felicitous and powerful turns of phrase.

The essayist Macaulay was moved to write an essay on Milton in 1825, when he was 25 years old and Milton was 151 years dead. The occasion was the publication of *De Doctrina Christiana*, written in Latin, and first printed after a delay of one century and a half. The essay itself is not our subject here. (1) It is mentioned to note Macaulay’s comment that Milton’s poetry *acts like an incantation. Its merit lies less in its obvious meaning than in its occult power. There would seem, at first sight, to be no more in his words than in other words. But they are words of enchantment. No sooner are they pronounced, than the past is present and the distant near.* The essayist pursues his point with more examples, then goes on to say that Milton’s poetry in English is surpassed by that in Latin.

Some months ago we mentioned that Milton coined the word, ‘Pandæmonium’, and our admiration for his success in it. Many coined words just don’t sound ‘right’, but this one is perfect, as its widespread adoption demonstrates. The word’s use in the first instance was a proper name—Hell’s capital city—referring to Hell’s infernal disorder and pervasive chaos, literally, ‘demons all around’. Chaos is as characteristic of evil as Order is of good. (Some fifteen to twenty years ago, American Region member The Very Rev’d Charles Caldwell, Ph.D., wrote a book on the importance of Divine Order, which has many aspects. In the book, Prof. Caldwell suggested that deviations from it are behind society’s deterioration.) The word now appears as ‘pandemonium’, just as the spellings of words like esophagus and aesthetic have changed. I do note that the peculiar name, ‘daemon server’, for whatever-it-is that sends email delivery failure notices, has retained the ‘æ’.

Only a few days ago, by accident, I ran across the following satisfying lines. They follow the end of the poem’s Second Book, where Jesus and Satan have been talking together. The Son of God closed with a summary or conclusion:

> “. . . Satan stood, . . . confuted and convinced / Of his weak arguing and fallacious drift”.

_Paradise Regained, Beginning of Third Book_
Now we are ready to reveal Milton’s lines that, to the Editor, give evidence of Cromwell and Milton’s impatience, their readiness to discard their allies and find new ones. Milton’s words refer to the factions among the rebels seemed to be unmanageable, and their opinions, difficult to control:

“... a barbarous noise environs me ... / But this is got by casting pearls to hogs /
That bawl for freedom in their senseless mood, / And still revolt when Truth would set them free.”

On the Same (1645-6) [being the Detraction which Followed upon his] Writing Certain Treatises

[Milton’s words drip with sarcasm. He shows prejudice against Scots and RCs. —Ed.]

“... shallow Edwards and Scotch What-d’ye-call!”
“Your plots and packing, worse than those of Trent ...”
“New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large.”

On the New Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament (1646)

That there is a prevalent bias regarding the Martyr-King is a fact. We present this month a few paragraphs from Vol 3 (1830) of Isaac D’Israeli’s Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First, King of England, a 5-volume work published over a period of several years. The author was the father of the famous British Prime Minister, conservative political theorist, and romance novelist, Benjamin Disraeli (BD), who spelled his name differently, and whose baptism as a child enabled his political career, although his Christianity was purely nominal. The dour and usually reclusive Queen Victoria and he formed a personal friendship.

Isaac D’Israeli (ID) was a notable figure in history, both per se and as an academic pursuit. He stressed the importance of consulting primary references, a desire which was not always required. That methodology was not required then, when many ‘respectable’ histories were based on the secondary literature and the author’s opinion. As a Jew, Isaac experienced some prejudice, and perhaps even more because he was a free-lance writer, not an academic. Later in life he was to some extent vindicated by the award of an honorary doctorate from Oxford, an institution he, like most Englishmen, esteemed and respected. Even today, The Oxford Companion to English Literature (4th Ed., 19697) dismisses his works as ‘discursive’; those mentioned are of less consequence than the five volumes on King Charles I. ‘Discursive’ is considered synonymous to ‘ cursory’, yet its definition relates to focus on a subject’s details, involving contemplation and study of particulars. Would it not seem that study of details is the basis of forming historical judgments? ‘Don’t bother me with the facts.’

D’Israeli was polite, eloquent, and straightforward in communicating his views, as these quotations from his Preface to Volume III show:

“In the whole compass of our history no subject is more difficult to treat than the present; it is so, because the passions of two great parties, never to be extinct, are more interested in the results, than in their philosophy or their candour. But I have not written these commentaries as a partisan; I leave every reader to his adopted historian. As for myself, I have adopted every historian, otherwise I could not have become acquainted with the secrets of all parties. I was attracted to the life and reign of Charles the First because I considered them rich in all that interests the moral speculator, and I have composed these volumes solely as the history of human nature.”

“On the publication of my first volumes, a gentleman, versant in our history, formerly a distinguished member of our diplomatic corps, and moreover a Whig of the old school, told me that I had misconceived the character of Charles the First. As I am not fortunate in impromptu replies, I hope he will not find too tedious, these volumes, which are written to prove, that it is probable, that he has himself misconceived the character of this Monarch.” [Acknowledgements of sources follow.]

“There was one more source of information ... I was advised to seek ... the State-paper Office, to which former historians have always been admitted. It would be graceless in me, not to add that I was honoured by a promise of aid at some distant day; a promise, which is now, equivalent to a refusal.”

At that time many ‘respectable’ scholars produced works that drew mostly on the secondary literature, which provided the background and framework of the subject, as accepted at the time of writing. It was supplemented with their informed opinions and speculations. All of it was subject to emphases and suppressions, school of thought, hidden agendas, and biases, personal and of his academic department, patrons, and other interested parties. How much have things changed? Is the new research of any significance? How does the author try to influence his readers, and how openly?
ID’s style is matter-of-fact, suited to conveying historical and biographical information, but over-punctuated by today’s standards. It stands in contrast to the florid style of his son Benjamin’s romantic novels. Let us hope that the remaining four volumes of these Commentaries will be reprinted soon. This month we present some of ID’s observations about the Rebels, and next month, his treatment of the King’s Beheading. Then, in February, we will present excerpts of another recently republished volume, Hilaire Belloc’s 1933 biography of King Charles I. It is one of a dozen biographies of French and English personages of the XV to early XIX Centuries (Saint Joan to Napoleon I), from this versatile author known for his children’s books, essays, and works of history, religion, and sociology known for their opinionated digressions. Unlike D’Israeli’s ideal, Belloc’s history was secondary, not to say derivative, and partisan. His agenda was worn on his sleeve, for all to see.

From Isaac D’Israeli’s Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First, King of England, Vol. III (1839), Chapter XIII.

"Critical History of the Puritans Concluded.—of the Perplexing Contradictions in their Political Character, and Why They Were at once the Advocates, and the Adversaries, of Civil and Religious Freedom."

D’Israeli begins his discussion of this topic, in which he briefly characterizes each faction among the rebels, with a reference to Guizot (French statesman and historian, 1787-1874), who thought that the Puritans had the good cause, but that this was ironic considering he could think of nothing good to say about them! In his evenhandedness, some of his points probably at odds with some of our readers’ views (yet we have no reluctance to quote them), ID goes on, “In my opinion, and in despite of so much impure alloy, their cause was the good one, and it was that cause whose defeat would have been a defeat, whose triumph prepared a triumph, for reason and humanity. At the same time the general character of this party shocks and repulses one. I have no taste for that passion so arid and sombre, and for those minds so narrowed and stubborn, who have no feelings in common with mankind; their bilious enthusiasm disfigures man, as I think, and shrinks him into so diminutive a size, that in viewing his sincerity and his moral energy they lose much of their greatness. These Puritans however were sincere, energetic, devoted to their faith and their cause, though their sentiments are so little attractive, and their opinions raise our contempt. They first rose up against tyranny. We may not like them, but we must speak of them with esteem, and we may yield them our gratitude, if we cannot our sympathy.

“. . . I would not decide whether they fare better in his hands, than in Mr. Hallam’s ‘coldness rather inclining to irony’ [Ellipsis is used only to avoid undue length and reluctantly. The Editor is aware that some cynics and skeptics might conclude that ID’s thoughts were being hidden. Far from it; our intent here is to reveal his thoughts on the rebels. If his political cause lies with them, it would serve to strengthen the credibility of his negative comments on them. The content of any ellipsis will be provided to any concerned reader who cannot find the text on line. I found the full text of all five volumes on line, with ease. Try googlebooks or the like. –Ed.]  

“A modern critic of a loftier mood writes of these Saints with a saintly spirit. In this debate of mortal Puritanism, we shall find, that Heaven itself is evoked, and the genius of the modern critic comes, ‘In a celestial panoply, all armed.’ Never before, for Neal in the creeping and slumberous style of his history has ‘no thoughts that breathe,’ were the Puritans so solemnly inaugurated in an apotheosis of Puritanism. To me is left the ungracious task of developing mere human truths where beatitude is placed before us.

‘The modern critic has discovered that ‘the Puritan was made up of two different men; the one all self-abasement, penitence, gratitude, passion; the other proud, calm, inflexible, sagacious.’ In this dual man, one was he who would dash into pieces the idolatry of painted glass, break down antique crosses of rare workmanship and burn witches—the other was he who would ‘set his foot on the neck of kings,’ and, so we are told, ‘went on through the world like Sir Artegale’s iron man TRalus with his flail crushing and trampling down.’ These Puritans ‘looked with contempt on the rich and the eloquent, on every nobleman and every priest.’ Yet they themselves were ‘rich and eloquent; rich in bishops’ lands, and eloquent in a seven-hours’ sermon.

‘Many singular specimens might be produced. Mr. Vynes said in his prayer, ‘O Lord, thou hast never given us a victory this long while, for all our frequent fastings. What dost thou mean, O Lord! To fling us in a ditch and there leave us?’ . . . Another exclaimed, ‘O God, many are the hands that are lift up against us, but there is one God, it is thou thyself, O Father! Who dost us more mischief than they all.’ . . .
“It must be confessed that if the Modern Critic be a great poet in history, we cannot discover an equal knowledge of history in his poetry.”

(1) The words quoted describe evocation, a good talent for a propagandist to have. Several Miltonic topics are planned for this publication; the time and sequence of their appearance will be dependent on availability of writing time and their relevance, difficulty, and urgency compared to other subjects. Those contemplated include (a) Macaulay’s essay on Milton, (b) *Ikonoklastes*, Milton’s unsuccessful rebuttal of *Eikon Basilike* and (c) others of interest, your suggestions and feedback being always welcome.