On the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady, I'm pleased to share with you the following two reviews by the editor of the SKCM News, Mark Wuonola, Ph.D., who reports that the News should be reaching you toward the middle of this month. They are both by Dr. Wuonola with the assistance of Dr. Suzanne G. Bowles of the history department of William Paterson University, and Father Donald Langlois, son of Eleanor Langlois, American Representative 1972-87.

Fr. Bill Swatos

Movie: ‘The King's Speech’

When King Edward VIII abdicated, it is said that the British government considered by-passing his shy, stammering brother, ‘Bertie’, Albert the Duke of York, for one of their younger brothers, the Duke of Gloucester or the Duke of Kent. According to a Reuters story (London, 20 June 1985) based on Michael Thornton’s book Royal Feud, the Duke of Gloucester was excluded because of “a taste for alcohol that was growing steadily more pronounced”, and “the Duke of Kent, though debonair and wed to a beautiful princess, was known to have dabbled in drugs and to be bisexual.” Stanley Baldwin, the then Prime Minister, is said to have concluded, “the Yorks will do it very well”. Of course, the reference to ‘the Yorks’ includes both the Duke of York and his wife, later Queen Elizabeth, who was known to most of us as ‘the Queen Mum’. (The Yorks are shown above in their wedding photograph.) ‘Bertie’ went on to become King George VI, and rose to the occasion to become a great wartime king. He and his Queen formed a close personal friendship with Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt. Part of the friendship’s basis was President Roosevelt’s informal, American style: He served the King and Queen of England hot dogs when he
entertained them at his Hyde Park residence! Also, President Roosevelt was churchwarden of his Episcopal church, and both FDR and King George were cigarette smokers.

*The King's Speech* portrays the Yorks before and after the abdication, and at the beginning of their warm, natural, and noble leadership of Britain during the dark days of World War II, the Battle of Britain with its relentless fire-bombing of London. Who can forget the photos of Queen Elizabeth, standing in the cavernous underground junction of several tube lines, holding her large purse? The King and Queen refused to abandon their people in London and leave for the safety of a country get-away: Solidarity was the word. The Third Reich's nightly incendiary bombing endangered Saint Paul's Cathedral and mostly destroyed Saint Andrews-by-the-Wardrobe in the City, along with most of the Society of King Charles the Martyr's archives, dating back to the Foun dredess, stored there. Of course, Coventry Cathedral was entirely destroyed, and major damage was inflicted, *inter alia*, on Exeter and Chichester Cathedrals on the South coast. The intense, ongoing fire-bombing might have been demoralizing for Britons but for the model set for them by King George VI and Queen Elizabeth.

Early in 2011, there was much speculation in the press about the movie, *The King's Speech*, which was seen to be on track for an Oscar based on its success, having been named the year's outstanding film by the Producers Guild of America. It had also won the ensemble cast award from the Screen Actors Guild, as well as an individual award for its star, Colin Firth, and a prize for its director, Tom Hooper, from the Directors Guild of America. Movies recognized by the Producers, Screen Actors, and Directors Guilds have generally gone on to win 'The Oscar'. This was the case with *The King's Speech*, which was nominated for 12 Academy Awards and on 27 Feb. 2011 won four: Best Picture, Best Actor (Colin Firth), Best Director (Tom Hooper), and Best Original Screenplay (David Seidler).

In most films where the appearance of the character portrayed is known to many movie-goers, casting is important, but Firth bore little resemblance to King George VI, and the overly used Helena Bonham Carter bore only a little resemblance to Elizabeth, and exhibited practically none of her charm and vivacity. She was better cast with Johnny Depp in 'Sweeney Todd', where the Fleet Street couple's lack of emotion heightened the humor as one customer after another was dispatched with the 'Demon Barber's' straight razor and mechanically slid, after a spurt of fake carotid arterial blood, through a perfectly-positioned trap door from the specially-designed tilt-back barber chair into the cellar, to join Depp's previous victims, all to be made into meat pies for the shop's unwitting cannibal-customers. Did they resemble curried chicken pies or gelatinous pork-pies?

As Society members, we are of course interested in the similarity between George VI and King Charles I, who also had a stammering disability. Both were helped by speech therapists. Charles never completely overcame his until he spoke (with notes) on the scaffold just before 2 p.m. on 30 January 1648/9. George managed to do so quite successfully, but by becoming a chain-smoker.

In the case of Charles I, his natural reticence and polite deferral to others (a style recently called 'participative management' in corporate America) led his enemies to conclude that he was weak, such that they took advantage of him. The fact that he did not speak up immediately, that he let others speak before he voiced his opinion or conclusion, in contrast to the blustering, preemptive style of his father, King James I, made some of his enemies even conclude that he was retarded. This of a man who wrote and spoke English masterfully, loved Shakespeare, conversed with ambassadors in fluent Latin, and bantered with his mother-in-law, Marie de Medicis, the dowager Queen of France, in French.

Neither Charles I nor George VI was fully prepared to assume the monarchy, nor for that matter was Henry VIII. Henry's elder brother, Arthur, died in 1502, when the musical, theological, and bookish, but athletic Henry was ten and became heir-apparent; Henry
acceded to the throne in 1509 on the death of their father, King Henry VII. Henry later
married Arthur’s widow, Katharine of Aragon, which required the permission of the pope,
as this was a prohibited union, like Herod marrying Herodias, his brother Philip’s widow, or
marrying one’s deceased wife’s sister. It must have particularly rankled the pope when
Henry asked for the annulment of that, his first marriage, earlier permitted only by papal
dispensation.

Prince Charles was about the same age when his older brother Henry died (presumably
of typhoid, although poison has been proposed as the cause, not unreasonably, as enemies
of the Stuart dynasty, extreme protestants, and haters of Scots in general had plotted to
poison the entire Royal Family, King James, Queen Anne, and their children), and had until
he was twenty-four to prepare to accede to the throne, for which he was well-prepared by
King James I, ‘the best tutor in Christendom’, as Sir Francis Bacon called him.

But in the case of ‘Bertie’, the abdication of his older brother David, King Edward VIII for
less than a year, was unexpected. Primarily, it came down to the inability of C of E
authorities (and, politicians thought, the British people) to accept King Edward VIII’s desire
to marry the twice-divorced Wallis Warfield Simpson. We are told by some biographers
that this was one of the great love stories of the XX Century, and perhaps it was. As the
Duke and Duchess of Windsor (which titles they were eventually but reluctantly granted by
George VI, sans ‘H.R.H.’) lived on into old age in self-imposed exile in France, it can be said
that they did remain together gracefully for life. Other biographers cite as underlying
reasons David the Prince of Wales’s fondness for gambling at Monte Carlo and alleged pro-
Nazi sympathies. These were not inconsiderable factors as the threat of the ‘Thousand-
Year’ Reich loomed large over Europe. As the song in ‘The Producers’ goes, “It’s springtime
for Hitler in Germany / It’s autumn in Poland and France”, and the English knew they were
next.

The movie’s principals’ wardrobes are excellent, especially Firth’s: He wears the kingly
attire well. Overall, ‘The King’s Speech’ is to be commended, as it has brought a
sympathetic portrayal of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth, the late Queen Mother,
parents of Queen Elizabeth II, to the public eye.

The Glory of Christ by John Owen

The Glory of Christ by John Owen, Hervey Mockford, Ed. Grace Publications Trust, 139
946462 13 5. [This book was donated to the Society by John A. E. Windsor, Benefactor.]

We have heard of Hooker, Donne, Andrewes, and Hammond, but the author of the book
reviewed here is less well known today, although he is described on this edition’s cover as
“one of the most prominent theologians England has ever had.” John Owen (1616-83) grew
up in a quiet Oxfordshire parsonage, entered Oxford University at the age of twelve, gaining
a B.A. in 1632 and an M.A. in 1635. Owen lived through the years of King Charles I’s
personal rule, the Great Rebellion, the decollation of the Royal Martyr, the ‘Commonwealth’,
and the Restoration. But this book is completely apolitical.

“Meditations on the Glory of Christ was the last of many books that Owen wrote. He died
as it was being printed in 1683. [Its first edition appeared in 1684.] It was written, he tells
us, ‘for the exercise of his own mind when weakness, weariness and the near approaches of
death’ were calling him away from this earth.
“As Owen says: ‘A continual view of the glory of Christ will have the blessed effect of changing us more and more into the likeness of Christ. Perhaps other ways and means have failed to make us Christ-like. Let us put this way to the test’.”

The book, with many references to Holy Scripture (unfortunately in this edition, from The Revised Authorized Version), is highly recommended as a devotional aid. Organized into sixteen short chapters, with titles like 'The glory of Christ shown by the mystery of his two natures', 'The glory of Christ as mediator: His love', ‘The glory of Christ illustrated in the Old Testament', 'The difference between faith's present view of the glory of Christ and our seeing it in heaven', and 'How Christians may find fresh grace to renew their spiritual life'.

Editor Hervey Mockford has modernized the English of Owen’s original to produce a readable, unaffected text of use to today’s serious reader. A few quotations from the work will serve to impart the quality, simplicity, and piety that characterize its flavor. In his ‘Preface’ (p. 1), Owen summarizes, “The purpose of this book is to tell how the Bible describes the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . If our future happiness means being where Christ is and seeing his glory, there is no better preparation for it than to fill our thoughts with that glory now. So we shall gradually be changed into that glory.”

“In this life there is such a close relationship between the soul and the body that we try to put out of our minds all thought of their separation from each other. How is it possible, then, to have such a readiness to die as the apostle Paul, when he said I have ‘a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better’ (Phil. i: 23)? Such readiness can only be found by looking by faith at Christ and his glory, and being sure that to be with him is better than this life.” (Preface, pp. 4-5)

In Anglo-Catholicism great stress is placed on the Incarnation. Many churches have a depiction of the Annunciation by Gabriel to Our Lady, often in stained glass. We genuflect during the Credo at “Et incarnatus . . . est”, at the mention of the Incarnation in the Last Gospel, and at the third versicle and response of the Angelus. “The glory of Christ’s two natures in one person is so great, that the unbelieving world cannot see the light and beauty which shine from it. Many today deny the truth that Jesus Christ is both Son of God and Son of Man. But this is the glory which ‘angels desire to look into’ (I Peter i: 12)”, writes Owen (Ch. 3, p. 20).

“That they may behold my glory” (S. John xvii: 24)—this is central to Owen’s book, and is the main reason to meditate on The Glory of Christ. “Once having known the love of Christ, the heart of the believer will always be restless until the glory of Christ is seen. The climax of all Christ’s other requests for his disciples is that they may behold his glory. So I assert that one of the greatest benefits for a believer in this world and the next is to consider the glory of Christ.” (Ch. 1, p. 7)

In Chapter 6 (pp. 34-5), Owen writes beautifully, “Let us look at the glory displayed in the gospel: Jesus Christ is crucified before our eyes (see Gal. iii: 1). We understand the scriptures only so far as we see in them the suffering and glory of Christ. The wisdom of the world sees nothing there but foolishness. ’Bur even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing, whose minds the god of this world has blinded, who do not believe, lest the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine on them’ (II Cor. iv: 3, 4).”

The late rector of All Saints, Ashmont, Boston*, The Rev’d John Ritchie Purnell, was wont to say, holding The Holy Bible aloft, “Every word in this book is about Jesus Christ.” Owen writes (Ch. 8, p. 38), “We know that the Old Testament is about the Lord Jesus Christ. Let us consider some of the ways in which the glory of Christ was foretold. First, a beautiful order of worship was given by God to Moses and through him to the people of Israel. There was the tabernacle (and later the temple) with the holy place, the ark, the mercy seat, the high
priest, the sacrifices and the sprinkling of blood. But these were a mere shadow, looking forward to Christ as the one sacrifice for sin and his continuing activity as our great high priest. The Spirit of Christ was also in the prophets who spoke ‘beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that would follow’ (1 Peter i: 11).”

In addition to providing useful devotional reading to inspire laymen’s prayer and meditation, Owen’s book is recommended as a resource for preachers. It is no exaggeration to say that each paragraph provides enough material for one instructive and moving sermon. “No-one in this life has the power, either spiritually or bodily, to see the glory of Christ as it really is. When some reflections of his divine glory were seen on the Mount of Transfiguration, the disciples were confused and very much afraid. If the Lord Jesus came to us now in his majesty and glory, we would be incapable of receiving any benefit or comfort from his appearance. The apostle John, whom he loved, fell at his feet as dead when he appeared to him in his glory (Rev. i: 17). Paul and all those who were with him fell to the earth when the brightness of his glory shone on them as they journeyed to Damascus (see Acts xxvi: 13, 14).” (Ch. 12, pp. 58-9)

* where we will gather at the kind invitation of its present rector, The Rev’d Michael J. Godderz, SSC, for the American Region’s XXX Annual Mass at 11 a.m. on Saturday 26 January 2013