

***SKCM News***

***June, 2002***

***THE MAGAZINE OF THE SOCIETY OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR, AMERICAN REGION***

***CHARLES I, ENGRAVING BY ROBERT VAN VOERST, 1636***

## Table of Contents

American Representative's Column	1
§ 26 January 2002 Annual Mass & Meeting at The Church of the Transfiguration, New York City	
§ Upcoming Annual Masses & Meetings:	
1 February 2003 at Saint Paul's Church, K Street, Washington, D.C., 11 a.m.;	
31 January 2004 at the Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, Florida	
§ Celebrations of Saint Charles's Day, 2002 § New York Chapter Celebrates Canonisation of Saint Charles § New Goods Items § Articles in this Issue § The Anglican Society	
§ <i>Eikon Basilike</i> Online § Bishop Grafton on King Charles § James R. Townsend, R.I.P.	
§ Bismarck on King Charles (p. 35)	
"The Case for Charles" – Sermon Preached at the XIX Annual Mass, 26 January 2002, at the Church of the Transfiguration, New York, by the Rev'd Canon Prof. J. Robert Wright	7
King Charles I (1625-1649): England – Paper Delivered at the Church of the Advent, Boston, 30 January 2002, by Prof. William K. Tinkham	10
The Duty of Honouring the King – Sermon preached 30 January 1780 by Charles Ingliss, D.D. (Part 2, continued from December, 2001, issue)	17
<i>The King and the Gentleman: Charles Stuart and Oliver Cromwell: 1599-1649</i> by Derek Wilson – reviewed by Lee Hopkins	25
<i>Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England</i> by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Eds.) – reviewed by Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.	29
<i>An Instance of the Fingerpost</i> by Iain Pears – reviewed by James N. Ward	30
<i>Reigning Cats and Dogs</i> by Katharine MacDonogh – reviewed by Sarah Gilmer	34
<i>Price List / Order Form for S.K.C.M. Goods</i>	insert

**2002 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Transfiguration, New York City** was held on Saturday 26 January 2002 at 11 a.m. at the Church of the Transfiguration (the "Little Church around the Corner") in New York City. The Rev'd Dr. Charles E. Miller, Rector, was the celebrant of the Mass. Music was provided by the Transfiguration Choir of Men and Boys, directed by Dr. Claudia Dumschadt, Organist and Choirmaster. The Mass setting was Darke in F; S. S. Wesley's anthem, "Thou Wilt Keep Him in Perfect Peace" was also sung. Several of the traditional Society hymns were vigorously sung ("At Candlemas", Repton; "Lord, let the strain arise", Diademata; "O holy King", Winchester old; and "With thankful hearts", Woodbird). About 125 members and supporters attended the Mass.

This was the first time we met at the Church of the Transfiguration (the "Little Church around the Corner"), although the Royal Martyr has traditionally been honoured there. Its sometime Rector, Father Norman Catir, preached at the Annual Mass in 1999, when we met at Saint Clement's, Philadelphia, to commemorate the 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Royal Martyrdom.

The Society was privileged to have as preacher at the Mass the Rev'd Canon Prof. J. Robert Wright, Saint-Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History, the General Theological Seminary. Canon Wright, President of The Anglican Society and a member of S.K.C.M., preached on the importance of honoring King Charles the Martyr and the Royal Martyr's role in shaping our Anglican identity.

Afterwards, about 60 adjourned to the Park Bistro for the Luncheon and Annual Meeting of the Society. Dr. Mark Wuonola, the American Representative, thanked Father Miller, Canon Wright, Dr. Dumschadt, Dr. Bernard Brennan (the New York Chapter secretary) and the patrons and donors who supported the music and luncheon.

*Patrons of the Annual Mass:*

Charles Barenthaler  
 Dr. Bernard Brennan  
 Sarah Gilmer  
 Irving P. Graeb, Jr.  
 Alan Hoffman  
 the Rev'd Dr. Joseph Walter Lund  
 Jay W. McCann  
 Paul W. McKee  
 Terence Murphy  
 the Rev'd Robert H. Pursel, Th.D.  
 John J. Slain  
 Philip Terzian  
 the Rev'd Dr. Charles E. Whipple  
 Dr. Mark A. Wuonola

Charles J. Briody, III  
 David B. J. Chase, Ph.D.  
 John & Frances Clark  
 William H. Franklin  
 Christopher Holleman  
 Samuel A. Manka  
 Col. James G. McFadden  
 the Rt. Rev'd James W. Montgomery  
 New York Chapter, S.K.C.M.  
 Stephen Page Smith  
 Warren Reznicek  
 Douglas G. H. Channon  
 The Rev'd Richardson A. Libby  
 the Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin  
 Galen Blaine Ritchie  
 the Rev'd Nelson Skinner  
 Wayne Wilson  
 Robert S. Clere  
 Howard S. Greene

*Donors to the Annual Mass:*

**2003 Annual Mass & Meeting – Saint Paul’s Church, K Street, Washington, D.C.** will be on Saturday 1 February 2003 at 11 a.m. We are grateful to the Rev’d Andrew Sloane, Rector, for his kind invitation. We are happy to return to Saint Paul’s, where we have met in 1985 and 1995 during the rectorships of Father James Daughtry and Father Richard C. Martin. The Society has a sizable chapter at Saint Paul’s; chapter secretary at Saint Paul’s is Paul McKee. Our preacher will be the Rev’d Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, Rector of the Church of the Resurrection, New York City.

**2004 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, Florida,** will be on Saturday 31 January 2004. We thank Father David C. Kennedy, SSC, for his invitation to return to Guardian Angels, where we met in 1991 and 1998. Members may be interested to know that this Spring, Father Kennedy was recognized by Nashotah House by being awarded the degree of D.D. (*h.c.*). Many S.K.C.M. members were present, including Bishops Wantland, Iker, and Ackerman. Also receiving a D.D. was the Rev’d Andrew C. Mead, Rector of Saint Thomas, Fifth Avenue, New York, who preached at the Annual Mass in 1989 and in 1991.

There is an active chapter of the Society at Guardian Angels. Our preacher will be the Rt. Rev’d Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, Bishop of Quincy and Episcopal Patron of the American Branch of the Society of King Charles the Martyr.

### **From Your American Representative**

In future *December* issues of *SKCM News*, we hope to include lists of parishes all around the country celebrating Saint Charles’s Day, including the time of each such celebration.

We will, of course, continue to report in each *June* issue of *SKCM News* details of all celebrations on which we receive information. It would be edifying to all members if more such reports were submitted. Society Members are asked *please* to take the initiative in reporting such celebrations of which they are aware. Press time for the June issue is always 15 April.

However, it seems even more important that we strive to enable all supporters of our Cause to attend commemorative services on or about Royal Martyr Day. Notices of *upcoming* celebrations will serve this purpose and are earnestly solicited. The press time for the December issue is always 15 October. Please note this reminder so we have a complete list of commemorations to publish next year.

### **Celebrations of Saint Charles’s Day, 2002**

**The Great Plains Chapter** observance took place on Saturday 26 January at Saint Barnabas Church, Omaha, Nebraska. Over 50 people attended the service. A Solemn High Mass was celebrated with the Office of Sung Morning Prayer serving as the Liturgy of the Word. The Rev’d Robert Scheibhofer, rector of Saint Barnabas and a Society member, celebrated.

A brunch provided by members and friends of the Monarchist League was served in the church undercroft following the Mass.

For information on the Great Plains Chapter, call Nick Behrens at (402)455-4492 (or check [www.saintbarnabas.net](http://www.saintbarnabas.net)). Thanks to Mr. Behrens for his work editing the American Member Newsletter of

The Monarchist League. The coverage of S.K.C.M. events is much appreciated. For information on The Monarchist League, write BM 'Monarchist', London WC1N 3XX U.K.

At the *Church of the Advent, Boston*, in addition to the regularly-scheduled 7:30 a.m. Mass on 30 January being of Saint Charles, there was a special Mass at 6 p.m. followed by a reception in the Parish Library. The curate of the Church of the Advent, Father Benjamin King, preached at the Mass. At the reception, attended by about two dozen, Prof. William K. Tinkham read a paper on Saint Charles (reprinted herein) and Dr. Wuonola made a few remarks about the objects of the Society and some of its connections with the Church of the Advent.

At *S. Clement's, Philadelphia*, a special Mass was celebrated at 6:30 p.m. to commemorate Saint Charles Stuart, K.M. About 20 were in attendance. The stirring Society hymns were sung to excellent tunes: "With thankful hearts thy glory" (Woodbird), "Lord, let the strain arise" (Diademata), "At Candlemas in white arrayed" (Repton), and "Royal Charles, who chose to die" (Petra). Thanks to Father Robert W. Offerle, CSSS, Interim Rector, Will Bricker, Chapter Secretary, and the many members in S. Clement's chapter for sponsoring a special commemoration each year.

At the *Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, Florida*, the Rev'd David C. Kennedy, SSC, Rector, there were two Masses on 30 January, at 10 a.m. and 6 p.m., the latter followed by supper at the Red Lion Pub, where King Charles and the present occupant of the throne were toasted. This is the traditional form of the annual meeting of the Guardian Angels chapter.

Society member and chapter secretary Charles Peace reports that at *Grace & Saint Peter's Church, Baltimore*, the Wednesday evening Low Mass on 30 January was celebrated in the Lady Chapel by the Rev'd Melvin Truiett.

Society member the Rev'd Canon James P. DeWolfe, Jr., SSC, reports that he celebrated and preached at *All Saints, Fort Worth, Texas*, on 30 January. Thirty-three people were in attendance. Also, on 29 January, Father Christopher Jambor celebrated the Mass of Saint Charles with 16 present.

The Rev'd Douglas E. Hungerford reports that at *Holy Trinity, Peru, Indiana*, the feast of the Royal Martyr was kept on 30 January at Mass, using the Missal propers. Father Hungerford, a Society member, is rector of Holy Trinity.

Father Richard Gates reports from Philadelphia that at the *Chapel of Saints Francis & Clare* Mass was celebrated on 30 January in commemoration of Saint Charles.

At the *Anglican Church of Saint Francis of Assisi* (ACA) in Jonesboro, GA, The Rev'd Michael J. Stranz, Vicar, a Mass of Saint Charles was celebrated on 30 January. It was reported by Society member LTC Jan S. Monningh. It is noted in the bulletin that "Saint Charles's Day was included in the Kalendars of the Continuing Church after The Affirmation of St. Louis by the Congress of Concerned Churchmen, 1977."

At *Saint Luke's Church* (ACA) in Manakin-Sabot, VA (a suburb of Richmond), the commemoration was kept with Solemn Evensong and Benediction celebrated by the Rev'd Michael Kerouac. The offertory hymn was "In prayer and praise" (Puer nobis). Society member Powell Johann is organist at Saint Luke's, where there is also a new shrine (icon and votive candles) of Saint Charles.

At *Saint Philip's Church, Charleston, SC*, the Rev'd J. Haden McCormick, Rector, there was a Solemn Eucharist of Saint Charles at 5 p.m. on 30 January. The Rev'd A. Kenneth Weldon was the celebrant.

Details of the *London Celebration* and other U.K. celebrations appear in the Summer, 2002, issue of *Church and King* which we hope to include with this mailing.

R.M.C.U. celebrations were in Edinburgh (11:30 a.m. on Thursday 31 January 2002), Saint Mary's Cathedral; and in London (11:30 on Wednesday 30 January), The Banqueting House, Whitehall. The latter service was held jointly with the Society of King Charles the Martyr. Devotions at the bust outside the entrance were held beforehand. The luncheon was held at the Greenville Suite, Strand Palace Hotel.

For information on the Royal Martyr Church Union, please write: Ronald Miller of Pittenweem, Hon. Secretary & Treasurer, The Priory, Pittenweem, Fife, KY10 2LJ

*The New York Chapter* commemorated the *Canonisation of Saint Charles* at 11 a.m. on Saturday 27 April 2002. The Mass was celebrated at the Church of Saint Paul in the City of Brooklyn, Clinton Street at Carroll Street, by the Rev'd Peter Cullen, rector. Following the Mass, members and friends gathered for lunch. For more information on the New York chapter, please contact Dr. Bernard P. Brennan, S.K.C.M. Chapter Secretary, 129 Columbia Heights, Apt. 33, Brooklyn NY 11201; phone (718)852-8235. Thanks to Dr. Brennan for organizing this annual event.

*New goods items* include the recently published historical booklets, *The White King I – VI* and *VII (Part I)*, issued by our parent organization initially to coincide with the 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Royal Martyrdom. Each volume of 30-some pages contains many interesting excerpts from *Church and King* and from the Society's minute-books, with some editorial comment. Additional volumes, which will now address special topics, will be made available as they are published. We commend our parent Society, and the anonymous editor of the series, for producing these.

Volume I covers the early years with emphasis on the Tercentenary Year (1949), the year which also saw the death of Mrs. Greville-Nugent. There were some glorious moments but also many disappointments, particularly regarding sponsorship of commemorative activities really beyond the Society's capability. Volume II covers 1950-1954, the latter year being the Society's 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. There is also a section on the Branches and Chapters of the Society, including several pages on the American Branch. Volume III covers 1955-1960, which was the Tercentenary of the Restoration. There is also a Society Kalendar, which includes dates in Saint Charles's life, dates and biographies of Royalist worthies, and other important dates in the history of the Stuart dynasty.

Volume IV covers 1960 to 1969, the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Society. Although there was no special celebration of that anniversary, it was a very notable year, being the year in which a Mass

was instituted in the Banqueting House. It was at 9 a.m. and attended by about 46, of whom 16 communicated. The Act of Devotion was at 11:20 a.m. followed by the High Mass at Saint Mary-le-Strand at 12:15. There is also an article about the Statue of King Charles the Martyr at Charing Cross. It has a fascinating history, from its commission and casting in 1633 and its being buried during the Commonwealth to its various restorations and safeguarding during the wars of the XX Century. Volume V covers 1970 through 1994, the Centenary of the Society. It mentions the death of Mrs. Carnahan in 1972 and her succession by Mrs. Langlois, as well as the present American Representative's starting in 1988. By 1985 the American Branch at 175 nearly equaled the British membership, at 200. Notable in Volume V is a section of short articles on the Royal authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*. Volume VI contains several dozen poems touching on King Charles the Martyr, from the Century of his martyrdom down to the XX Century.

Recently added is Volume VII, Part 1. It covers Saint Charles, the man, his interactions with Parliament, and his death, using excerpts from *Church and King* over the years. In the section "Saint Charles and Parliament" we are well-reminded that the Root and Branch Bill, to disperse the remaining property of the Church as Henry VIII had the monasteries' property, was a prime motivator of the Great Rebellion. This was clearly recognized by XVII-Century historians but has been largely forgotten today.

Dr. Latham's *Saint Charles Litany* (which also appears in the Society's *Liturgical Manual*) is available in a new edition, consistent in appearance with other Society publications. Dr. Roman's *Akathist* has been beautifully typeset by Richard Mammana and will be published as soon as we are able. We are sorry this project has been delayed, but it will be worth the wait: The cover will feature the icon of Charles the Martyr, originally commissioned by Father F. Stephen Walinski when he was at Saint Martin of Tours, Omaha, reproduced in color. It appeared in black and white on the cover of the June, 1991, *SKCM News*.

Society rosettes, neckties, and bow ties may be ordered using the goods order form (insert). The rosette, of the type used by patriotic organizations and societies, is 10 mm in diameter. According to their manufacturer, Dexter Rosettes, a Pennsylvania firm well-known for this type of decoration, the rosettes are suitable to be worn, particularly on a lapel, by men or women. The cup is red with narrow gold stripes. The rose within the cup is white, and is tied with red. The dominant red of the cup and the red tie represent Saint Charles's martyrdom. The central white rosette symbolizes the White Rose, as he is often called, while the gold represents his kingly state.

"White Rose" motif neckties and bow ties are made of entirely handsewn English silk by The Ben Silver Corporation. The design features tiny, repeating silvery-white roses accented with golden leaves ("a rose Argent slipped Or"), strewn on a field of scarlet red, emblematic both of the livery color of the House of Stuart and also of the Royal Martyrdom. The ties' colors thus harmonize with the lapel rosettes. These ties are unique to our Society.

Please note that the membership insignia (pins, ties, lapel rosettes, etc.) are personal items **for members only**. Who would wish to wear the insignia of an organization in which one did not have membership or were not in good standing?

*Articles in this issue* include book reviews by our regular contributors Lee Hopkins, Sarah Gilmer, Suzanne Bowles and James N. Ward. It is remarkable how our passions and interests are expressed by our choice of reading material. We are indeed fortunate to have members who offer their perspectives on books of interest to Society members.

We also have the second installment of Dr. Ingliss's 1780 sermon, of interest because of its timing with respect to the American Revolution, transcribed by our regular contributor Richard Mammana. The archaic spellings have been retained.

Of course, we are also publishing Prof. Wright's sermon from the January, 2002, Annual Mass at the Church of the Transfiguration, New York City. In addition, we are pleased to provide Prof. Tinkham's paper delivered on 30 January 2002 at the Church of the Advent, Boston. Prof. Tinkham is a long-time member of the Society and has been a friend of the American Representative for nearly thirty years.

**The Anglican Society** publishes *The Anglican*, subtitled "A Journal of Anglican Identity". Prof. J. Robert Wright is the President of the Society, which shares our objective of restoring 30 January to the Kalendar. His sermon from this year's Annual Mass in New York, on the Royal Martyr's part in our Anglican identity, is published in this issue of *SKCM News*. Members interested in more information may write to Prof. Wright at The General Theological Seminary, 175 Ninth Avenue, New York NY 10011.

**Eikon Basilike** is now available online thanks to the good work of Society member Richard Mammana. It can be found at <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/pc/charles/eikon/> We very much appreciate Mr. Mammana's work. Society members will find other material of interest on the Project Canterbury website.

From **Blessed Charles Chapman Grafton, Bishop**, in a letter to a goddaughter, dated 20 August 1903 (*Works*, Vol. 7, p. 177): "Charles I. had been brought up with notions of kingly authority, which have now under England modern Constitutional Government passed awake. His sons, Charles II. and James, I don't respect. But their father was a good man and a martyr." [Bishop Grafton was one of the founders of the American Branch of the Cowley Fathers, rector of the Church of the Advent, Boston, and finally, Bishop of Fond du Lac.]

**R.I.P.** We were recently informed of the death of James R. Townsend of North Richland Hills, Texas.  
*May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed, through the mercy of God, rest in peace.  
Jesu mercy, Mary pray.*

—Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D.  
*American Representative, S.K.C.M.*



## *The Case for Charles*

Sermon Preached at the XIX Annual Mass

Society of King Charles the Martyr  
Church of the Transfiguration, New York  
26 January 2002

The Rev'd Canon J. Robert Wright, Saint-Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of  
Ecclesiastical History, General Theological Seminary

*"Be ready always to give account to anyone who asks of you a reason for the hope that is within you, but do it with gentleness and reverence."* I Peter 3:15.

The Commemoration in which we are engaged this morning is part of an international movement for the recovery of Anglican identity. King Charles the Martyr (d. 1649) was commemorated in the Prayer Book of the Church of England from 1662 to 1859, then he was dropped. He never quite made it to the first American Prayer Book of 1789-90 because of our country's need for distance from monarchy at that time. Whether or not the Queen's Printers had statutory authority to remove his name from the English Kalendar in 1859 when the State Services were terminated [I think they did not], he did finally re-enter an official English liturgical calendar in 1980 with the publication of the Alternative Service Book of the Church of England in that year. Of course he has also entered the calendars of some other Anglican churches throughout the world, such as Canada. But most remarkable of all is the fact in this XXI-Century post-deconstructionism world of searches for identity, that Charles as "King and Martyr" has been clearly and explicitly retained in the new calendar of the very modern *Common Worship* volume of the Church of England, just published in the year 2000. Whatever the word "martyr" may mean, and there are various acceptable definitions, the modern-day Church of England clearly recognizes him as a "martyr." The Commemoration of King Charles the Martyr is on the rise, even in official circles, in liturgical calendars, in special services, in shrines and memorials, and in other ways. There is a growing realization that he is part of who we are as Anglicans, and even in the Episcopal Church, in addition to the long-standing witness of the Society of King Charles the Martyr and other groups, The Anglican Society, which I serve as President, has by official action of its Executive Committee resolved to work for the addition of his name to the calendar of the Episcopal Church.

Charles could have avoided martyrdom if he had agreed to give up his witness to the catholic faith and order that is an essential ingredient of classical Anglicanism, in particular if he had agreed to settle for a church without bishops. Never have I felt his prayers and intercessions, his patience and determination, more personally than in the last several years when I have represented the Episcopal Church in our dealings with the Lutherans over the *Concordat of Agreement* and then the *Called to Common Mission*. I daresay that not every one of you here will wish to embrace every detail of the way that historic ecumenical venture finally came out on paper—I know that I still have one or two questions, and especially with the way that the Lutheran church seems to have unilaterally altered a few details of what was already agreed. But that is not

my point here this morning. My point is that the team representing the Episcopal Church stood for episcopacy then as did Charles in his day, made its witness for the same Gospel to which the doctrines of apostolic succession and historic episcopate are generally understood to attest. Our witness to that substance, if not to every detail, was (after much suffering on both sides) eventually accepted by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. And in all of those meetings with the Lutherans, amidst all those piles of papers, I became increasingly conscious of the witness and prayers of Charles Stuart, King and Martyr: that what I was struggling to defend, in this very different, very American, post-monarchical world in which we live today, was in theological and doctrinal substance the same thing that he had given his life for. By the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886-88, the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion are committed to the historic episcopate, and by action of our General Convention we even hold that it is “essential to the reunion of the church.” But the term itself, “historic episcopate,” we must admit, is not one that Charles would have known, any more than many of us would be prepared to defend every aspect of monarchy that he believed was integral to episcopacy as he knew it. There has to be a substance of episcopacy that can be distinguished from the accidents and incidentals that have accrued to it over time and history, and only upon its “absolutely essential features,” its “first principles,” as William Reed Huntington the Quadrilateral’s author said, must we take our stand. Indeed there is no secret that one of the major Lutheran misunderstandings of us had been their perception that when we speak of episcopacy we presume the entire British church-state establishment as it is known in England. But neither can we assume that the form in which we hold it in the Episcopal Church today is the only form of episcopacy that is consonant with the Gospel, when, after all, the majority of the world’s Christians in churches having the historic episcopate insist that it must be restricted to celibates who are male. On the other hand, “The bishop must be the husband of one wife,” we read clearly in I Timothy 3:14, but does that mean that no celibate can be a bishop, or that no-one divorced and re-married can be a bishop, or—in apparent contradiction of I Peter 2:25—that Jesus Christ was not a bishop because he was not the husband of one wife? Must the episcopacy, the truly historic episcopate, include the papal primacy, as even some Anglicans have argued? There is a Roman Catholic form of the historic episcopate, an Eastern Orthodox form, and now a Lutheran form of it in this country, which, again, is somewhat different from our own. Anglicanism today, Anglicanism in the time of King Charles I and Archbishop Laud, did not and does not have sole proprietary right to define the meaning of episcopacy.

From the time of the New Testament onwards, there has been room for much diversity of incidentals in different understandings of how episcopacy relates to the Gospel, but one thing is certain: Charles I, King of England and Scotland, gave his life for it on the 30<sup>th</sup> of January in 1649. For those of us who struggle to define it and defend it still today, for every true Anglican, he is in this sense our patron. In devotional language, we can be confident that we have his prayers on our behalf at the throne of Grace. He was ready, as Scripture says, to give account to anyone who asks a reason for the hope that was within him, with gentleness and reverence, and so must we. As Episcopalians, as Anglicans, we do not seek to unchurch or unchristianize those churches not yet standing in the historic episcopacy, but it is our conviction, displayed on pages 876-878 of our Prayer Book and endorsed by action of our General Convention, that the historic episcopacy, in its substance although not in incidentals, is essential to the reunion of the church. It too is part of the hope that is within us. It is a treasure that we seek to share, not one that we possess

exclusively. The historic episcopacy is not the Gospel, but it is very closely tied to the witness and proclamation of the Gospel, as the late Archbishop Michael Ramsey was known to say.<sup>i</sup>

Before I conclude, let us think back in history to the situation in England that Charles faced in the years immediately preceding his execution in 1649, as he was being spirited from place to place in varying degrees of confinement under guard. A civil war was under way, there was the Solemn League and Covenant, and the Westminster Assembly appointed by the Long Parliament had drawn up a very thin book published in 1645 and entitled *A Directory for the Publique Worship of God*, mostly containing exhortatory suggestions rather than set formularies, and certainly nothing like an Ordinal for the transmission of the threefold ministry. Printed at the very beginning of that little volume (of which I own a copy), was the ordinance of the Long Parliament passed on 3 January 1645, the very day that Archbishop Laud was condemned to die for treason. That ordinance, sad to say, was entitled “For the taking away of the Book of Common Prayer,” and by it the book that had defined classical Anglicanism since 1549 was abolished and any use of it thereafter was made a penal offense. “The said Book of Common Prayer,” it decreed, “shall not remain, or be from henceforth used, in any church, chappell, or place of public worship within the kingdom of England or dominion of Wales.” This *Directory* declares that there are to be no festivals or holy days apart from the Lord’s Day, and thus it contains no seasonal prayers or calendar of the church year at all. Even Christmas, for example, is no longer kept. Church buildings may continue to be used for public worship, but they possess no sanctity in themselves. Bowing or any other external adoration is forbidden. Even the text of the Lord’s Prayer is not printed, and if used it is to be recited by the minister alone. Apart from the metrical psalms there is nothing for the people to say, not even the litany. At the burial of the dead there are to be no prayers or ceremonies of any sort, only silence. My friends, it was against those directions, which continued to be mandatory from 1645 until the Restoration on 29 May of 1660, that Charles resisted until his execution on 30 January 1649. It was one thing to hold, as Richard Hooker had emphasized for Anglicans, that anything could be said or done in worship so long as it was “not contrary to the Word of God” as interpreted by antiquity and reason, and quite another thing to demand, as did the *Directory* and most Puritans, that nothing could be said or done that was not explicitly required in Scripture. Against that directory and in that context, Charles Stuart gave his life as a martyr for classical Anglican identity, Anglican orders, Anglican spirituality, Anglican polity, Anglican mission – for the Anglican understanding of the Gospel’s manifold implications. He died pointing to the Lord, to the Gospel, to the apostolic and catholic tradition that Anglicans have received and still try, in our own very different world, to proclaim. Charles stood ready, as the Scripture says, always to give account to anyone who asks a reason for the hope that is within. He did it with gentleness and reverence, and that cost him his life.

I have already observed that the Commemoration in which we are engaged this morning, in this 353<sup>rd</sup> anniversary of his martyrdom, is part of an international movement for the recovery of Anglican identity. The Caroline understanding of Church and Gospel that Charles Stuart was unwilling to give up, in obedience even unto death, has well been described by the historian Kenneth Hylson-Smith as “an example in faith and conduct of that Churchmanship which emphasizes catholicity: continuity with and descent from Christ and his Apostles; the central importance in the life of the Church of episcopacy; a deep concern that the worship of the Church should be of prime importance in the life of the Church, and should be conducted with reverence and awe; a focus on the altar, in churches furnished and adorned in such a way as to enhance the beauty of holiness and stimulate worship; the centrality of the sacraments, and a doctrine of the

Eucharist which stresses the presence of Christ, but which admits of neither the transubstantiation of Roman theology nor of the consubstantiation of Luther; and an affirmation of the English Church as part of the historic Church, joined still, in spite of outward division, by the one Catholic faith.”<sup>ii</sup> Who would deny that these are many of the major emphases we stress in the Episcopal Church today as derived from our understanding of the Gospel? In affirming Charles’s sacrificial self-commitment to classical catholic Christianity, the same that we have inherited in the Quadrilateral, we underscore the cost of discipleship, even unto death. In affirming the substance of what Charles stood for, we add clarity to the profile of Anglican identity even today. And such clarity is of central importance not only to our worship but also to our evangelism and mission. For good reason the Church of England has restored Charles Stuart, martyr, to its official calendar of saints, and so should we. So integral a part is he, to our own self-understanding of who we are and of what we offer, that we too may say, and should say: Holy Charles Stuart, King and Martyr, pray for us!

i. Arthur Michael Ramsey. *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*. (London: Longmans, 1936, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1955), ch. vi, esp. pp. 77, 82.

ii. Kenneth Hylson-Smith. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England from the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century*. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), pp. 35-36.

## **King Charles I (1625-1649): England**

A Paper Delivered at the Church of the Advent, Boston,  
30 January 2002

by Prof. William K. Tinkham

Today we commemorate the death of King Charles the Martyr. Charles I, King of England from 1625 to 1649, died a martyr’s death for his faith and to preserve the Church of England, as well as to retain the monarchy. He was beheaded by order of Oliver Cromwell on 30<sup>th</sup> January 1649—exactly 353 years ago today!

Why do we remember Charles I? There were other kings who were murdered in England:

1. Ethelbert the Martyr—King of the East Angles. During the period of the heptarchy (that is the seven kingdoms in Anglo-Saxon England in the VII, VIII, and early IX Centuries) the powerful King of Mercia, Offa II, defeated the weak King of East Anglia, Ethelbert, who was made a prisoner. Subsequently, he was beheaded by orders of Offa in 794. The history of East Anglia in this period is rather obscure and not much is known about him.

2. Edmund the Martyr (840-869)—King of East Anglia. He was defeated and captured by a Danish army. The Danes bound him to a tree, used him as a target of their archery practice, and then beheaded him in 869. He was buried at what is now Bury St. Edmunds. Within forty years he had come to be honoured as a saint in East Anglia. In the X Century a great abbey was built to which his body was translated. It became a local shrine and a great place of pilgrimage in the Middle Ages. In 1914 Bury St. Edmunds became the seat of the modern Diocese of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich.
3. Edmund the Magnificent (939-946). He was a grandson of Alfred the Great and King of England in the Wessex line. He was murdered while defending his steward against a criminal who had returned from banishment from the kingdom.
4. Edward the Martyr (975-978). He was also King of England in the Wessex line. Edward was the son of Edgar the Peaceful (959-975). He was murdered by order of his stepmother.

These four kings were in the early Middle Ages whereas Charles I was a King of England in the Modern period. (Anything after 1500 is modern to an historian. However, the date 1485 is the line of demarcation in English history since Henry VII, the first Tudor, came to the throne in that year.) Thus it is significant that the last of these four kings lived more than a thousand years ago whereas Charles I reigned just over three hundred and fifty years ago. He was much closer to our own time and perhaps easier to understand.

Who was King Charles I and why was he put to death? He was the second son of James I (1603-25) the first Stuart King of England. His mother was Anne of Denmark and he was the grandson of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Henry, Lord Darnley. His older brother Henry was the heir-apparent to the throne but he died in 1612. Thus with the death of James I in 1625 Charles ascended the throne in succession to his father. He adhered to James's theories of divine right kingship and followed his policies. However, he was a High Church Anglican; in the XX Century he would be an Anglo-Catholic. He was even more strongly opposed than his father had been to Puritanism—an English form of Calvinism. Religious belief meant more to Charles I than it did to James I. He was now twenty-five years old. The same year he came to the throne Charles was married to Henrietta Maria the daughter of King Henry IV of France. She was sixteen years of age and the sister of Louis XIII. Their marriage was a love match, unusual in royal circles where marriages were usually arranged according to dynastic interests for the most part.

Between 1626 and 1629 Charles I called four Parliaments. Charles needed money to run the government and Parliament held the purse-strings. However, the House of Commons contained many Puritans who wanted to "air their grievances" before granting the king any funds. Between 1629 and 1640 Charles I ruled personally without calling Parliament since the House of Commons refused to grant him money. Thus during this period Charles was forced to resort to various medieval methods of taxation which were available to the king. These were common practices in the Middle Ages but now Charles was resorting to them to avoid asking Parliament for funds. Increasingly the Puritan members of the House of Commons came to resent the taxation.

During the reign of James I the Dean of Gloucester, William Laud, was consecrated Bishop of St. Davids in Wales in 1621. In the first year of the reign of Charles I Laud was translated to the Diocese of Bath and Wells in 1626 and subsequently to London in 1628. He became Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1629. Finally, in 1633 Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury—the highest ecclesiastical office in England. He was a strong exponent of High Church Anglicanism. Thus his theological views were in agreement with those of Charles I. Furthermore, he enforced conformity to strict Anglican doctrine and practice which the Puritans came to resent. Laud expelled from their churches all clergy suspected of Puritan tendencies and used the authority of the government to suppress all meetings for religious purposes outside the Anglican Church. Under this pressure the gulf between the Puritans and High Church Anglicans widened and became more consciously antagonistic. It was in this period of the 1630s that the Puritan migration to New England increased in numbers. This was especially true in Massachusetts where the records show a substantial influx of colonists who elected to settle in this citadel of Calvinism.

In many instances Puritan clergy had removed the altars in the churches and replaced them with wooden communion-tables set up in the nave. The collection plates were kept on these tables and the laity counted the money on the tables. Also, the laymen formed the habit of leaving their hats on the communion table. Thus Archbishop Laud prevailed upon Convocation to issue a decree which prohibited these practices. The communion table was to be placed against the east wall of the sanctuary in its ancient place and a rail was to be erected around the table. The Puritans were incensed at this requirement.

In April, 1640, Charles was advised by his chief minister, Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, to call Parliament. Charles demanded money from Parliament and the House of Commons, now packed with Puritans, demanded that he hear their “grievances”. After three weeks this so-called Short Parliament was dissolved. Next, in November, 1640, Parliament was again summoned. This was the Long Parliament which would last for 20 years—from 1640 to 1660. The members of this Parliament were determined to place limits on the royal powers which had made the king independent for so long. The House of Commons decided now upon drastic action. (1) Lord Strafford was convicted of treason and sentenced to death. (2) Archbishop Laud was imprisoned.

Next, Parliament passed law after law which stripped the king of the royal powers which Charles’s predecessors had enjoyed from the early Middle Ages. Charles was forced to accept these measures since all classes were united in these demands against the king. The Presbyterians and the Low-Church elements in the Anglican Church wished to stop with these political changes. However, the Puritans were not willing to do so. They wished to do away with the bishops in the Church of England and to claim control over the army and the executive power of the government. This would have made Parliament as absolute as the king had ever been; it was completely contrary to constitutional precedent. It was at this point that divisions began to appear in Parliament. On one side were Low-Church Anglicans, moderate Presbyterians, and Royalists; on the other were Puritan zealots and Parliamentarians.

In 1642 Charles tried to arrest five members of the House of Commons who were leaders of the Puritan opposition. This was a serious mistake! Parliament then issued a call to arms and the Civil War began. However, this was sheer rebellion against the king! Charles I fled to Oxford which welcomed him

with open arms. That university city was always loyal to the Stuart monarchs; the other university favoured the Parliamentarians. Edward Hyde, Lord Clarendon, was now the principal advisor to Charles I.

Only a minority of the population took an active part in the Civil War but they were the influential minority. The great mass of the agricultural workers remained neutral, except when pressed into service, as infantry on one side or the other. Nobility, yeoman farmers, and the industrial and commercial classes of the towns volunteered. English and Scottish Calvinists combined in the Parliamentary Army to oppose Charles. These were the Roundheads—composed of three groups actually: Puritans, Separatists, and Scottish Presbyterians. None of these groups liked each other. If Charles had been clever, such as Elizabeth I, he could have divided the Roundheads. I submit that religion tends to reflect social conditions. The Low-Church Anglicans and moderate Puritans or Presbyterians reflected a higher social class than others who wished to abolish the Anglican Church. Social and economic disparities existed between the various factions. Charles could have separated the dissident elements arrayed against him by playing off one faction against the other.

Actually, if the Stuarts had preceded the Tudors, instead of following them, they would not have had so much difficulty governing England. The Stuarts acted like typical medieval kings and followed medieval constitutional precedents in government. However, the Tudors, especially Henry VIII (1509-47) and Elizabeth I (1558-1603) had followed a different policy. Under the Tudors the House of Commons increasingly came to be composed of a newly-enriched class of city merchants and land-owning squires who had been able to acquire title to lands which formerly belonged to the Church. After the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII in 1536-39 this monarch had sold these lands to these newly-enriched people. Thus an alliance was formed between the king and the Commons. His daughter, Elizabeth I, was extremely astute in dealing with the Commons. She allowed the Commons to think they had power in the government of England. She allowed them to have the symbols of power while she was careful to retain the substance of power in her own hands. She would keep any opposition to her off-balance by playing off one faction against the other. The Stuarts seemed unable to do this; they were not politically astute.

The supporters of Charles I were the Royalists or Cavaliers. The line between the Royalists and Parliamentarians (or Cavaliers and Roundheads) represented no clear class divisions. In general, London and the seaports were the strongholds of Parliament; although there were Royalists in every city and a majority in some. Normally the Royalists were stronger in the north and west of England (these were the more conservative areas) while the Parliamentarians were stronger in the eastern and midland counties where business and commerce flourished. The eastern seaports, in particular, were engaged in commerce with the Netherlands. Calvinism was dominant there. Thus along with commercial goods the Calvinist views were imported from this continental country. The southern counties held mixed views. For example, in the county of Sussex there were many Royalists yet there were pockets of Puritans in many of the towns. Even this geographical alignment was only partially valid. Actually, it was not a war of sections any more than it was a war of classes. Initially, it was a war of opposing political and religious principles or sentiments in which economic views were also involved. As the war went on, however, it became apparent that irreconcilable religious differences were at the centre of the struggle.

The Civil War lasted for four years—1642-1646. In the first year the Royalists had the advantage. Although the Parliamentarians had an army nearly four times the size of the Royalists the King's cavalry was commanded by the able and courageous Prince Rupert, the nephew of Charles I. Thus the first Battle of Edgehill in 1642, in which the Royalist cavalry proceeded to rout the Parliamentarian forces, was a victory for Charles. The first two years of the war tended to favour the king. However, it was difficult for the king to secure men and weapons. Charles was never able to secure sufficient money to equip an army. Furthermore, the navy and most seaports were under the control of the Parliamentarians. This prevented Henrietta Maria from securing arms from France and the Low Countries. In the long run the deciding factor in the war was the New Model Army composed of the dedicated extreme Protestants organized by a country squire, Oliver Cromwell, and led by General Thomas Fairfax. It was well-armed and well-drilled and under strict discipline. The cavalry unit known as Ironsides was under the personal command of Cromwell. With the appearance of the extremely efficient Ironsides cavalry the Royalists lost the advantage which they had enjoyed at the Battle of Edgehill.

In 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was formed between Scotland and Parliament. This was an agreement by Parliament to establish Presbyterianism in England in place of the Anglican Church and its bishops. In the latter half of the XVI Century a militant form of Calvinism had been brought into Scotland by John Knox which was now the dominant religious position there. In 1603/04 at the Hampton Court Conference, at the outset of the reign of James I, the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 had been revised. In 1644, in agreement with the Scottish Calvinists, this book was then declared to be illegal and was replaced by the Directory of Public Worship which was of Presbyterian origin: In return for this and a subsidy the Scots agreed to send an army to support the forces of Parliament. In this same year 1644 at the Battle of Marston Moor the joint forces of Cromwell's Ironsides and the Scottish army defeated the Royalist army which gave the Parliamentarians control of the northeast of England. This was the turning-point of the war.

There were two important events in 1645: (1) Archbishop Laud was put to death by the Puritans on 10 January 1645. (2) In the Summer of 1645 the New Model Army, led by General Fairfax and Cromwell, decisively defeated the Royalist army at the Battle of Naseby. In 1646 Charles I surrendered to the Scots. They handed him over to the Roundheads who imprisoned him at Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight, off the southern coast of England.

In December, 1648, Colonel Pride, who was a Separatist leader, surrounded Parliament with troops and prevented Presbyterian members from entrance. This action which was called "Pride's Purge" expelled three-fourths of the remainder of a remnant of Parliament that had been representative in 1640. In 1642 nearly two-fifths of the 504 members had left to fight for the King. In 1648 "Pride's Purge" expelled three-fourths of the remainder. Now there were only ninety members left, and no more than fifty or sixty generally attended sessions of Parliament. Because they composed the sitting part of Parliament they were called the "Rump Parliament". They represented only the Parliamentary army. England was now governed by a thinly-disguised military despotism. Three months later the "Rump Parliament" proceeded to abolish the House of Lords.

In January, 1649, the House of Commons established a commission to try Charles I composed of 135 Commissioners. Three resolutions were published: (1) A declaration that the people have all just



power. (2) The Commons represent the people and thus have supreme power. (3) What the Commons declare to be law is law, though the consent of the King and Lords be not had.

The King was tried by what we would call a “kangaroo” court, and it was a foregone conclusion that he would be found guilty of the charges. Charles I was charged with having ruled in an unlimited and tyrannical manner. He was referred to as “Charles Stuart” and treated in a contemptuous manner. The charges were trumped up and the King was not allowed to refute them in his own defense. However, his accusers represented only a small segment of people now—the Parliamentary army and their fanatical leaders and the Separatists. Charles as king, now represented the great majority of the people in England.

Charles said: “The King cannot be tried by any superior jurisdiction on earth. But it is not my cause alone; it is the freedom and liberty of the people of England.” However, since the “kangaroo” court was under orders of Cromwell to find the King guilty of treason, John Bradshaw, President of the Court of 70 Commissioners, pronounced the sentence—Charles Stuart was to be beheaded as a tyrant. Fifty-nine Commissioners signed the death warrant, some under duress.

Thus on 30 January 1649, Charles I, King of England, was brought to a scaffold outside the banqueting-house at the Palace of Whitehall. On the scaffold he made an effective speech against his “arbitrary” judges and the “power of the sword”, and reminded his hearers that “A subject and sovereign are clear distinct things. . . . I have a good cause and I have a gracious God; I will say no more.” To his chaplain, William Juxon, the Bishop of London, he observed: “I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be, no disturbance in the world.” His last remark to Bishop Juxon was—“Remember!” Shortly thereafter he knelt down and was beheaded. Subsequently, he was buried in Saint George’s Chapel at Windsor.

During the trial and at the hour of death Charles had behaved with a quiet courage and dignity which had won many to his side. English people were shocked at the sight of the blood of their king; and the execution of this monarch horrified the country. People detested the execution of a king and it has never been forgotten. The noble manner in which Charles left the world caused his failures to be forgotten, and almost overnight he came to be regarded as a martyr. Shortly after his death a book entitled *Eikon Basilike* appeared extolling the virtues of Charles I. At the time Bishop Juxon was thought to be the author. However, in 1829, H. J. Todd claimed in a book that John Gauden, Bishop of Exeter (1660-1662), was the author. This is now the accepted view. [But there is also a widely-held view that the work is largely the King’s own. —*Ed.*] Over fifty editions were sold within the year. John Milton, the Puritan poet, wrote a book to counteract it but only two editions were sold and it was a failure.

The murder of Charles I not only outraged the deepest feelings of the country but it made a restoration of monarchy and Church inevitable in due course. The regicides failed to realize that in cutting off Charles’s head they were cutting their own throats. With the death of Charles the fate of Puritanism was sealed and the future of the Church ensured. Although Cromwell and the extreme Puritans had won in the short run the Puritan republic would last for only ten years—1649 to 1659. With the death of Cromwell in 1658 he was succeeded by his son Richard. However, the Puritan government of the Protectorate would last for only a year longer. In 1660 the English people, having had their fill of Puritanism, called for the return of the monarchy. Thus Charles, the eldest son of Charles I, returned to England from exile in France and

ascended the throne as Charles II. Also, in 1660 the Anglican Church was restored and the bishops who were left returned to their dioceses. There were only eight bishops still alive in 1660 and fourteen dioceses were vacant. By 1668 only three were still alive—the number required to consecrate a new bishop. If the Anglican Church had not been restored in 1660 and new bishops consecrated the episcopal succession in England would have become extinct by 1670 when all three bishops were dead. Thus the episcopate in England barely survived the Puritan government. At the Savoy Conference (1661-62) the Book of Common Prayer was revised in 1662. (This is the standard Prayer Book of the Church of England at the present time.) Charles I was proclaimed the equivalent of a saint by the Church of England in 1662 and, until 1859, he was commemorated in the Prayer Book kalendar on 30<sup>th</sup> January. Because of the martyrdom of Charles I the monarchy continues to exist today, although limited by the terms of the Bill of Rights of 1689—whereby the monarch reigns but does not rule.

At the outset here I have referred to four murdered Anglo-Saxon kings. They are not remembered in the same way as we remember Charles I. This is due partly to the fact that they lived in the early Middle Ages—800 to 1,000 years ago—a long way from our time. Also, they were mostly local martyrs. Furthermore, their enemies gave them no option as far as their deaths were concerned. It was quite opposite in the case of Charles I. Charles did not want to die; he had much to live for. He was very much in love with his wife, Henrietta Maria, and she with him. He was devoted to her and to his six children—three sons and three daughters. It was a happy family which lived high moral lives in an era when the royal families in Europe lived dissolute lives. The importance of Charles I is the fact that he had a choice. The Puritans had offered to save his life if he would renounce the throne, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Church of England. Charles refused! Instead he lay down his life for the principles in which he believed. By his death he saved the Episcopate—and thus the Church of England. Charles I was the only English king who gave up his life for the Church.

This is why we have a Society of King Charles the Martyr.

*[Prof. Tinkham was born in Dartmouth, Massachusetts. On his paternal side he is a direct descendant of several Mayflower passengers (Separatists) who came to Plymouth in 1620, as well as a Puritan who was an early settler in Boston in 1633. On his maternal side he is a ninth-generation Episcopalian.*

*During World War II he served with the U. S. Army overseas in G-2 Military Intelligence, Ninth Infantry Division. He participated in the invasions of North Africa, Sicily, and Normandy, followed by further combat service in France, Belgium, and Germany, and was in the Battle of the Bulge. He received seven Battle Stars for these campaigns and was a member of a unit which received the Presidential Unit Citation for the capture of the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine River in Germany. He was awarded the European-African-Middle Eastern Service Medal and the Belgian Fourragere.*

*He was educated at New College, Oxford University, where he read theology and English history (1945-47). He received the A.B. degree in history from Boston University in 1954 and the A.M. in English history from Harvard University in 1957, followed by doctoral work in this field at Harvard. Subsequently, he was a post-graduate student at Tufts University. He was Professor of History at Boston State College and later at the University of Massachusetts – Boston from which he retired in 1983. His special field of study is the XVI Century Tudor period of English history, especially the Reformation in England.*

*Prof. Tinkham was formerly the Junior Warden and Archivist and a member of the Corporation and Vestry at the Church of the Advent, Boston, where he has been a communicant for nearly sixty years. Throughout his life he*

*has been identified with the traditional Anglo-Catholic position in the Episcopal Church, serving as Vice-President of the New England Branch of the American Church Union and a member of the National Council of the Evangelical and Catholic Mission. He was a founding member of the Episcopal Synod of America at Fort Worth, Texas, in 1989. He is also a member of the Prayer Book Society and of the Society of King Charles the Martyr.]*

***The Duty of Honouring the King,***

explained and recommended:

IN A

SERMON,

Preached in ST. GEORGE'S and ST. PAUL'S

CHAPELS, NEW-YORK,

On Sunday, January 30, 1780;

Being the Anniversary of the Martyrdom of

King CHARLES I.

By CHARLES INGLIS, D.D.

RECTOR OF TRINITY CHURCH, NEW-YORK.

NEW-YORK:

Printed by HUGH GAINE, at the BIBLE and CROWN,

in HANOVER-SQUARE,

M,DCC,LXXX.

TO

The INHABITANTS of the CITY of NEW-YORK,

IN

The COMMUNION of the CHURCH of ENGLAND;

The following SERMON

IS

Respectfully inscribed,

BY

Their affectionate Pastor,

Friend and Servant,

The Author.

I PETER, II. 17.

*Fear God. Honour the King.*

(Continued from *SKCM News*, December, 2001)

3. AND this suggests another Motive or Reason for discharging this Duty; namely, That the greatest Evils which can befall Society, necessarily attend the Neglect or Breach of it. So that if even the Authority of God were set aside in this Case; the Principles of Humanity, Reason and sound Policy would decide in favour of the precept—“honour the King.”

MORE human Blood hath been shed—greater Miseries and Calamities have been entailed on Mankind—and more audacious Impieties and Enormities of every King have been committed by Means of Sedition and Rebellion, than perhaps through any other Cause whatever.

IF Men once deviate from the obvious Path of their Duty, there is no telling where they will stop. Perhaps they apprehend no great Danger at first, and foresee not all the Consequences of their Procedure. Having subdued the first Struggles of Conscience, it afterwards becomes more pliant; and they are gradually carried on from one Step to another, till they find themselves in a Situation, that is extremely difficult and perilous. Thus have the most aggravated Evils arise from seemingly small Beginnings, which occasioned little Alarm: And this is often the Case of Rebellion—it proceeds mostly from a neglect of the Precept before us, “Honour the King.” Many consider this Neglect as a very trifling offence; but how pernicious has it frequently proven in its Effects to Mankind!

WHEN disrespectful Sentiments of the Sovereign are entertained, contrary to this Command, it leads to disrespectful and seditious Language; and the Transition is easy and natural from the Language to the Practice of Sedition. He that freely indulges himself in that Language, wants only an Opportunity to realize, and reduce it to Practice.

NOW reflect for a Moment on the horrid Train of Evils which follow Rebellion. The first Stages of its Progress are carried on by Deceit, Violence and Perjury. It is dreadful even in its mildest Effects. It is stained with Blood, and diffuses general Distress and Misery. The Ruin of Millions attend it. All the dark, malevolent Passions of the Soul are roused and exerted; its mild and amiable affections are suppressed; and with them, virtuous Principles are laid prostrate. Hence it is that Civil Wars are always more cruel and barbarous than foreign Wars, and more destructive to Morals; In the former, personal Revenge and Animosity mingle, and kindle up the Soul to tenfold Rage. Reckon over the Benefits which Government confers on Mankind: and the Evil which is contrary to each of these Benefits, is brought on Mankind by Rebellion. Add to all this, that when successful, it generally ends in Tyranny, and the most grievous Oppression.

EACH of these Particulars was literally verified in the Rebellion, whose Guilt was consummated by the shedding of Royal Blood—by the Martyrdom of King CHARLES I, which we commemorate this Day.

I shall not take up your Time with a minute Detail of the Rise, Progress and Effects of that Rebellion. Suffice it to observe, that it began with the Breach of St. Peter’s Precept—“honour the King.” Groundless Suspicions of him were cherished, and the most palpable Falshoods were propagated by designing Men. Hereby the Minds of many were poisoned. Ambition under the usual Mask of Patriotism, and Enthusiasm in the Garb of Religion, blew the Trumpet of Sedition. Open Violence succeeded, and a bloody, ruinous Rebellion was the Consequence. The Nation was weakened, its Property destroyed and dissipated, and the Constitution was wholly subverted. The Sovereign was deliberately murdered—a

Sovereign who was not more distinguished by his Sufferings, than by his Fortitude and Probity—by unaffected Piety to God, and Benevolence to Mankind. Of this he gave the highest Testimony that Man is capable of giving—he resisted unto Blood, and laid down his Life, rather than betray the Church of God, or the People, committed to his Care by divine Providence.

WHAT was the Issue of all those Crimes, this Waste of Blood and Treasure?—The most oppressive, absolute Tyranny, on the Part of the Usurper; and a State of the most abject Slavery, with Respect to the People at large! A State infinitely worse than that which the most inflamed Zealot, the most violent Republican or Enthusiast even pretended to dread before the Rebellion commenced.

NEED I tell you that the unnatural Rebellion which, at this Day, desolates and disgraces America, bears the strongest Resemblance to the former Rebellion? The one is an exact Counterpart of the other—begun on nearly the same Principles, and carried on by the very same Methods.

THE Transactions which led to the present Rebellion are recent, and fresh in your Memory. They originated from those who dishonoured the King, traduced his Government, trampled on his Authority, and imputed to him Designs which had not the least Foundation in Truth. Imaginary Dangers were pretended; the Passions of the Populace were inflamed to a Degree of Phrenzy; and every Engine was employed to carry on the Work of Sedition. These Methods, managed with great Artifice and Zeal, and each Circumstance heightened with the bitterest Aggravations, proved but too successful. The Minds of many were poisoned, and seduced from their Duty; and several well meaning Persons were prevailed on to join in the destructive Measures that were afterwards adopted. Independency, that Foible of weak Minds tinged with local Pride, in which however the ambitious Leaders sought their own Aggrandisement, though big with certain Ruin to this Country, was declared; and then Rebellion, undisguised and undissembled, flourished over us.

WAS there a happier Country on Earth before that Period, than this? Did it not enjoy all the Advantages of Government without its Burdens? Is there on Earth, this Day, a more wretched Country? Where is that Peace, that Ease, that Affluence, Security and Freedom which formerly resided in, and distinguished America? They are fled. Oppression, Violence and Usurpation prevail in their Stead. Distress and Affliction are universally diffused. The tenderest Ties are rent asunder. Those who should live and love like Brethren, are filled with deadly Animosity against each other: Not only Fellow Subject waring against Fellow Subject; but Brother and Brother, Parent and Child stand up to shed each other's Blood! Thousands have perished by the Sword, and by the Calamities of War—thousands are driven from their once peaceful Abodes, stript of their Property, and exposed to Misery and Want, on Account of their Loyalty. The Land is polluted with innocent Blood—with the Blood of those who, from a Principle of Conscience, adhered to their rightful Sovereign; and rather than renounce Him, or bear Arms against Him, have submitted to Death. Unsatisfied with these accumulated Evils, the Leaders of Rebellion would plunge this devoted Country still deeper in Ruin. They have leagued with the Popish, inveterate Enemies of our Nation, of our Religion and Liberties—delivered this Country into the Hands of a despotic Power—a Power which has extinguished Liberty, and extirpated the Protestant Religion from all its Dominions; and would, doubtless, gladly avail itself of the Opportunity, now offered, to exterminate Both in this Country also—But I turn from the Subject with Horror—my Heart will not permit me to enlarge.

AND are these the Fruits of dishonouring the King? Are these the *Benefits* that are gained by it? And shall we listen to the popular Declamations that would excite to the Breach of God's Law for the Purpose? O rather let *me* ever adhere to the Maxims of Inspiration— "Fear God. Honour the King."

THUS were Matters weighed in the equal Scales of unbyassed Reason and sound Policy--were the Consequences of honouring the King, put into the one Scale, and the Effects of neglecting it, put into the other; it is easy to see which would preponderate, which would have the Advantage. Prudence, Reason and Policy certainly forbid us to run into a greater Evil, that we may avoid a less. A wise Man will deliberately examine Things, not only in themselves, but in their Consequences; and of two Evils, if he is unavoidably obliged to chuse, he will chuse the least. Were we to decide on the Principles of mere worldly Prudence, this would be a much better Test of Obedience to the Precept in my Text, than *the Feelings of the People*, which hath been absurdly advanced as a Test in this Case by some: Not reflecting that *the Feelings of the People*, of a great many at least, on such Occasions, will be exactly such as are excited by Ambition, Discontent, false Principles, or the artful Management of designing Men. But when to all these Considerations, the Authority of Heaven is added, to "honour the King," it is difficult to account how any one who fears God, or loves his Fellow Creatures, can disregard this Precept.

INSTRUCTED thus, and commanded by the Word of God--warned by the Example of others, and taught by our own Experience, let us firmly resolve, my respected Hearers, to practise this Precept, "Honour the King." In doing so, we shall both act agreeably to the Will of Heaven, and promote the Welfare of Society; for such is the Goodness of the Almighty, that in this, as in every other Instance, he hath not only made our Duty compatible with our Interest and Happiness; but he hath inseparably connected them together.

LET us honour the King by faithfully adhering to, and supporting his Government. This is undeniably a Part of our Duty; and by discharging it, we shall adhere to and support the Cause of Truth, of real Liberty, and the Protestant Religion, whilst we manifest that Loyalty which is due to our rightful Sovereign.

UNDER his auspicious Reign, this Country enjoyed Blessings whose Value, like that of Health, was not fully known but by their Loss. At least, they were not sufficiently prized; or else they had not been so wantonly flung away. To be a British Subject, with all its concomitant Advantages, implies more Happiness, more and greater privileges, than to be the Subject of any other State or Prince on Earth. We should be, and I trust we are, sensible of this; should we not therefore now act with a Firmness and Zeal proportioned to the Magnitude of those Objects? Should it not also be our wish, that our deluded Brethren may return to that Duty which they once warmly professed? And share with us again in those Blessings we once sweetly enjoyed in common?

LET us honour the King by cherishing respectful Sentiments concerning him; speaking of him with Affection, with Esteem and Reverence; and by promoting a like Spirit and Conduct in others.

HAPPY for us, that in doing this, we need not deviate from Truth, nor sacrifice Christian Sincerity to political Duty. In this remote Quarter of his Dominions, where his name hath been designedly slandered to serve the Purposes of Rebellion and Revolt, it is become the more necessary to contradict those Slanders, and to declare--That there is not this Day in Christendom a better, a more amiable Sovereign than our present gracious King--few Countries at any Period have been blessed with such a Sovereign--a King whose Ambition it is to preserve the Rights of his Subjects inviolate, and communicate Happiness to them

all without Exception—a King, whose Life is a shining Example of Religion and Virtue, and is a strong Incentive to the Practice of both by others—a King, who is a munificent Patron of Science, and of all those Liberal Arts which embellish and dignify human Life—a King, who unites the private Virtues of the Christian and the Citizen with the more splendid Virtues and Accomplishments of the Monarch; and who, by this bright Assemblage of Virtues, adds Lustre to the Throne he fills!

TO vilify *such* a Sovereign, and revel against him, how aggravated the Guilt!

I SHALL be the more concise in exhorting you to honour your King, as I am conscious—and it is with the highest Pleasure and Exultation I can testify—that in the worst of Times, and on the most trying Occasions, you, my Fellow Citizens, *did* honour and faithfully adhere to him.

YOU have been, and I doubt not, ever will be, loyal to your earthly Sovereign. Let me beseech you not to tarnish this Virtue by Disloyalty or Disobedience to the Sovereign of Earth and Heaven—to the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.

WHILST you honour the King, fear God also. These Duties should be inseparable. The one naturally rises out of the other. He that has formed just Conceptions of the Deity, will be impressed with filial Reverence and Fear towards him. The Conscience of such a Person will be tender, and shrink at the Thought of violating any of the divine Precepts—especially those which respect the Order established by the Almighty among his rational Creatures; for a Disregard of these cannot fail of dishonouring the Creator, by an Increase of Wickedness; nor of injuring Mankind by destroying the Barriers which Heaven hath fixed to guard their Happiness.

THERE is the greatest Reason that we should fear God; not as an arbitrary Tyrant; but as a just, powerful and wise Governor, whose Laws are founded in Righteousness and Truth; who will support the Dignity of his Laws, by punishing Transgressors; and who is privy, not only to our Actions, but to our most private Thoughts.

HIS innate Purity leads him necessarily to detest Sin. As moral Governor the Universe, placed at the Head of the great intellectual System, it would be utterly inconsistent with that Character, and with all his Attributes, not to check and punish Sin; which might otherwise subvert his Kingdom, and frustrate his Designs.

HENCE the frequent Denunciations in his Word, against sinful Nations; the actual Judgments inflicted on those Nations; nay, their total Overthrow, when they finally abused his Mercy, and the Measure of their Iniquity was full.

THIS Procedure was not confined to that People, whom he chose, and were under a particular Dispensation. There is the clearest Proof of the contrary. The general Rules and Laws of God's Proceedings with the Children of Men, are the same and invariable--invariable as his Nature, and the Relation which Men bear to him; for all are equally his Creatures—all are equally capable of Virtue or Vice.

THE Jews indeed had a peculiar Law and Dispensation; and by that Law and Dispensation they were judged. The Gentiles were under the Law and Light of Nature, and had traditional Instruction; by that Law, that Light and Instruction they were also judged. The General Rules of the Divine Procedure, as I said before, were the same to both; the Mode of Application only varied according to their different Circumstances.

THUS we find in Fact that many of the most celebrated Heathen Nations, States and Cities which figured in ancient History, are the Subjects of Prophecy. They were liable to the same providential

Dispensations with the Jews. Judgments were denounced against their Vices; and those Judgments were inflicted. Consult the Prophecies recorded in the Book of God concerning those Nations; then turn to the History of those Nations, and you will find the Prophecies concerning them exactly verified.

HENCE War, Famine, Pestilence and other Calamities, are expressly called the Judgments of God, to execute his Displeasure against guilty Nations. Obedient to the divine Command, these accordingly rush forth, and visit the Abodes of Sin. They come to chasten and reclaim, if Men will forsake their Sins, and return to their Duty: Or else, to overturn and destroy, if they are impenitent, and refuse to reform.

WHENEVER therefore we see those Judgments abroad, and a People visited with them, which is our Case at present; we may be assured that the Hand of God is *there*, and that he is calling those People to an Account for their Transgressions. To “fear God” is the especial Duty of such a People—the Sentiments and Conduct which they should adopt, are pointed out by Hosea— “Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for he hath torn, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and will bind us up.”

TOO many are diverted from their proper Duty on such Occasions, and fail in making a right Use of those Calamities, by attending only to the secondary and visible Causes of them. They forget the first Spring and Mover, and the Ends for which Calamities are sent. Unfruitful and unwholesome Seasons commonly produce Dearth and Mortality; Ambition, Avarice, Resentment, and the Intrigues of designing Men are the immediate and general Causes of War. In these proximate Causes, People rest, without looking further. They do not consider that Providence always works by such Means, and employs them to effect its Purposes; and that the Calamities thus produced, come not the less from God, because they are brought about through those secondary Means and Causes.

A FEW Instances will elucidate this Point with Respect to the Calamities of War, which concern us most at present.

THE Assyrian, that is Sennacherib, is expressly called “the Rod of God’s Anger,” and was sent against the Jews to chastise them for their Vices, which he accordingly did. Cyrus surprized and took Babylon; Alexander of Macedon overthrew the Persian Monarchy, as was predicted of each; and the Romans reduced Jerusalem, and inflicted those heavy Judgments on the Jews which had been denounced against them by our Saviour.

THE Prophecies concerning those memorable Events undeniably prove that they happened by the Appointment of God: Yet they were brought about by men who knew not the divine Will, and were actuated solely by temporal Motives. What was said of the Assyrian, may be affirmed of each— “Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his Heart think so; but it is in his Heart to destroy, and cut off Nations not a few.”

THESE were the Scourges of God; they were the Instruments that executed his Purposes; though all Claim to Merit on their Part was precluded, because they were unconscious of those Purposes; it was not in their Heart to accomplish them, nor did they mean so. They were influenced by Ambition, Pride, Cruelty, and a Thirst of Conquest; and accordingly, were liable, in their Turn, to the Stroke of divine Justice for their Transgressions. But hereby the infinite Wisdom and Power of God are conspicuous, in educing Good out of Evil; making the irregular Passions of Men subservient to his Designs, and to the Glory of his Moral Government. Thus not only Idolatrous Heathens, but even Insects and Vermin, nay the very Elements, have been delegated by the God of Heaven, to punish and reclaim his offending People—to carry his threatened Judgments among guilty Nations.



I mention these Things purely to shew, that we should look beyond the immediate Authors of our present Calamities. We should raise our Thoughts to God, own his Hand, and acknowledge the Justice of his Dispensations. We should fear him, as the constant Witness, the righteous Judge of all our Actions—a God of Mercy to those who fear and serve him—a consuming Fire to obstinate Transgressors.

FEAR, when not directed to its proper Object, is indeed a mean Passion. The Almighty is its true Object; and to fear him, is as much our Honour and Wisdom, as it is our Duty. The Fear of God will guard us against the Violation of his Law; it will lead us to Repentance, if we have offended him, and to the conscientious Discharge of each Duty we owe to him and our Fellow Creatures; it will inspire us with Confidence and firm Trust in Him, and be a Shield against all other Fears and Terrors.

THE Almighty has the supream controlled Disposal of all Things. The Actions and Hearts of Men—the Powers of Nature and Events of this World, are entirely in his Hand. He can direct or change, he can repress or accelerate them as seemeth best to his unerring Wisdom.

THE Person who firmly believes this; and in Consequence of that Belief, habitually fears God in his Heart, sincerely serving him, and placing his Confidence in him, will feel Consolation, Hope and Fortitude springing up within him, at the Approach, or under the Pressure of any Calamity. He will not yield to unmanly Fears; but confidently look up to God for Support and Deliverance.

THESE Reflections are very suitable to our present Situation—and we may profit by them. The Times admonish us to examine our Ways, humble ourselves before God, and turn to him with unfeigned Repentance. Proceeding by the same Rules which he hath always observed towards offending Nations, his Judgments are gone forth to visit us for our Abuse of his Mercies, our Barrenness under his Gospel, and the other numberless Transgressions by which we have provoked him.

CONSULT your Conscience, and then tell me—Should we not hearken to the Voice of God, speaking to us in his Judgments, and calling us to Reformation? Can we look for his Favour or Pardon, if we persist in offending him? Or expect his Blessing, if the Cry of our Sins continues to enter his Ears? Would it be right in us to repeat or multiply our Transgressions, when all that is dear to us, or valuable on Earth, is at Stake in the present Contest; and when the Issue of this Contest is suspended on his Will?

IF any Persons among us, by their vicious Lives, dishonour God and provoke him; they are worse Enemies to us than either Rebels, or their Popish Allies. They make the God of Nature our Adversary, who can summon the Powers of Nature, and arm every Element, to work our Destruction, and defeat our Designs. The Efforts and Power of Man may be resisted; but who can resist him that is Almighty?

I TRUST that these Considerations will sink deep in our Minds, and produce suitable Effects. O let us not remain hardened under the chastening Hand of God, nor defeat his gracious Designs to reclaim and save us. Sincerely lamenting our past Sins, which have been committed against the clearest Light, the dearest Love, and the most transcendant Mercy, let us prostrate ourselves before God, implore his Pardon, through the atoning Merits of his blessed Son; and firmly resolve, by his Grace, to amend hereafter, to dear him, and walk devoutly in his Ways.

WE should not rest contented with a cold and barren Assent to these Things; for this could neither be pleasing to God, nor profitable to us. We should actually reduce those Truths, those Resolutions to Practice; and frequently ask ourselves, Whether the Purposes of God have been answered by his Visitation? Whether our evil Habits are weakened or broken—our Sins mortified and forsaken—our Virtues increased

and strengthened? Whether are more punctual, more conscientious in the Discharge of our Duty to God and Man? Whether we have advanced in Piety and Probity, under our Afflictions, and are become more humble, holy and resigned? Whether we “deny ourselves, take up the Cross daily, and follow our divine Master” with more Ardour? Whether our Hearts be more weaned from the World, from its pleasurable Enjoyments, and criminal Pursuits? Whether we are more sensible of their Insufficiency for our Happiness? And, in fine, whether our Affections are more spiritualized, more disengaged from the fascinating Blandishments of this Life, and centred in God?

QUESTIONS of this Sort, seriously and repeatedly urged, would be very beneficial; and I appeal to your Conscience, whether the Gospel does not require these Particulars of us—whether each of them is not an especial Duty in our present Situation? Evidently, it is by a religious Regard to these, and other like Christian Duties, and by this only, that we can expect the Almighty will be reconciled to us; that he will remove our Calamities, call back the Sword from destroying, bid Discord cease, and command Peace, with its attending Blessings, to revisit us. To such Amendment, his Promises of Mercy and Deliverance are explicit, numerous and peremptory; and he will be faithful to those Promises. When so many powerful Motives conspire in recommending this Line of Conduct, may I not flatter myself that you will pursue it?

INFLUENCED by those Motives, let us, in the Name of God, and in his Strength, resolutely set about this Conduct: Cheared with the pleasing hope which results from it, when pursued, let us look forward to that happy Period—not very distant *now*, I trust—when we shall return into the soft Bosom of Peace; when the Remembrance of past Sufferings shall serve to enhance its Value, and inspire us with the more Zeal to praise, and thank, and fear God, and to honour the King; when our misguided Brethren, cured of their Delusion, shall be brought back to their Duty, and partake once more of the Benefits which, hitherto, they have too lightly regarded. Let each of us *then*, “put on Bowels of Mercy, Kindness, Meekness, long Suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any Man have a Quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you”; and let us resolve to imitate the Example of Christ’s Subjects in that blessed State, foretold by Isaiah, when all Envy shall be extinguished, and brotherly Love shall abound— “Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.”

THAT each of us may cultivate this divine Temper—that each of us, as a Follower of the meek Jesus, may adorn that Profession, and manifest a deep Sense of our Obligation to imitate, and love, and serve him---that each of us may improve by the Chastisements of Heaven, and rise, purified from the Dross of Sin, more bright and shining out of the Furnace of Affliction—that each of us may attain that Amendment, with all its consequent Blessings, which are designed and aimed at by the Dispensations of our merciful God—May He of his infinite Goodness grant, for the Sake and Merits of his dear Son, Jesus Christ; to whom, with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, three Persons, but *one eternal God*, be ascribed immortal Praise, Glory, and Dominion, henceforth, for evermore.

AMEN.

***The King and the Gentleman:  
Charles Stuart and Oliver Cromwell: 1599-1649***

by Derek Wilson

reviewed by Lee Hopkins

*The King and the Gentleman: Charles Stuart and Oliver Cromwell: 1599-1649* by Derek Wilson (St Martins Press, 1999) 473 pp, ISBN 0-312-24405-3, \$27.95.

Derek Wilson's *The King and the Gentleman* is a well researched character study of Charles I and Oliver Cromwell. As the emphasis is upon their contrasting personalities, the quest for psychological explanation is at the expense of historical perspective, so that while Wilson is a solid and experienced biographer, this limited approach would leave a reader new to the subject bewildered as to how the events described came about.

While light on historical process, Wilson does well with delineating the origins of the Cromwell family, in that its sudden rise from obscurity may explain Oliver's cantankerous, blustering personality. Such bellicosity and iconoclasm are often the mask behind which many insecure and anxious people face a world seen as threatening. This may be detected in the defensive, self-righteous behavior of many of the new men who clawed their way to relative success from the despised obscurity of lower class life, at a time when the old aristocracy was decimated by the Wars of the Roses, and the subsequent policy of Henry VIII was to destroy what remained of rival claimants of royal blood.

When the future Henry VII defeated Richard III at Bosworth Field in 1485, and created the Tudor dynasty, one of the many adventurers who followed him from Welsh nonentity was one Morgan Williams. He emerged from the Celtic twilight to become a brewer in Greenwich, in itself a great step upwards for him, but nothing like the great consequences of marrying a woman named Katherine Cromwell. She was the sister of the up and coming Thomas Cromwell, rising meteorically in the service of Cardinal Wolsey, the most important man at Henry VIII's court, and after the King the most powerful man in England. After Wolsey's fall, Thomas Cromwell stepped into the secular offices held by the late cleric, his head becoming larger and larger until removed by his moody monarch.

Morgan Williams flourished in the patronage of Cromwell, ingratiating himself by changing his name to become a Cromwell. His brother in law, busy despoiling Church property, rewarded Morgan with what became the family estate in Huntington in Cambridgeshire, a Benedictine property from which Morgan forcibly evicted the monks. To go from brewing ale to the ranks of the country gentry was a heady social acceleration that many in this period would accomplish, and so economics rather than theology do more to explain the popularity of the dissolution of the monasteries.

This process may explain much of the appeal of Calvinism to these parvenus, in a form of self-justification they might see themselves as the natural Elect of God to overlook the fact of humble origins in a time when bloodlines were of paramount importance. To be called a self made man had pejorative connotations rather than the congratulatory meaning the term implies today.

The newly gentrified Cromwells in Huntington enthusiastically joined in local witchhunts, probably personally questioning poor wretches by torture on the path to burning at the stake. Such ascendant people as these newly minted Cromwells considered anything beyond their own bleak religious practice a blasphemy, with Roman Catholicism as the highest form of witchcraft, and what they called the Arminian element in the Church of England not far behind. (Arminianism is the misnomer for what would now be called Anglo-Catholicism, a term not yet coined, though the future Archbishop Laud deplored being called an Arminian, as this man of impeccable form and style disapproved of the Dutch originators as too violently polemic, while approving their doctrines of free will and free grace versus predestination.)

The Puritan clergy were particularly influential in the Cromwell's East Anglia, and the nearby University of Cambridge was their intellectual fortress, just as Laud's alma mater, Oxford University, was the center of his theological and liturgical movement.

Men from backgrounds similar to the Cambridgeshire Cromwells were prominent in voicing their support of Genevan theology in Parliament, in opposition to Stuart kingship and Laudian Church. All in the loudly proclaimed name of self-government and personal freedom, a great irony as their ultimate triumph would result in the suppression of Parliament by Cromwell's future military dictatorship. And their sought after parliamentary ascendancy would only result when their remnant in the future combined with the Calvinist Scots who started hostilities in the Civil War, to paradoxically bring about the recall of Charles II to the throne in 1660 to restore the liberties they had lost due to their own miscalculations.

But to return to the early part of the Century, as the Cromwell family schemed its way upwards, the Stuarts had been the royal family of Scotland since 1437. Somehow surviving the violence and Byzantine intrigue of Scottish politics, James VI of Scotland became James I of England, wearing the crowns of both countries upon the death of Elizabeth I in 1603.

By this time, Oliver Cromwell was a small boy, apparently spoiled as an only son of the most prominent local family. By all accounts, the child was difficult, with such violent mood swings that he has been assessed as a hypomatic personality, part of the manic depressive syndrome, complicated by well documented hypochondriac anxieties all his life. In XVII Century terms, he would be called splenetic, in accord with the ancient belief in the four humors defining character. By whatever form of nomenclature, Oliver Cromwell suffered all his days from murderous rages, as the men, women, and children butchered in Ireland were to find out.

Meanwhile the future Charles I had been born in 1600, living in the shadow of his older brother Henry. As heir to the throne, Prince Henry was a golden and agreeable youth. He lacked the precocity of his younger brother, causing their intellectual but didactic father to urge Henry to emulate Charles. The smaller boy, though sickly, and very late to walk or talk, subsequently showed such remarkable promise that it was planned he be trained as the future Archbishop of Canterbury. This would have been a wise usage of a Duke of York, in the face of rising Puritan ecclesiastical and political militance, for as James I shrewdly observed, "No Bishop, no King." And such a career would certainly have been more compatible to Charles.

James had married a Danish Lutheran, further complicating the Scottish scene, for despite the historically close ties between the courts of Scotland and Denmark, the climate of overwhelmingly Presbyterian Scottish opinion found Lutherans as loathsome as the Church of England or Rome.

Despite the hectoring of their father, Henry and Charles were very close. When Henry died suddenly at the age of twelve, Charles was so shattered by the loss and by being thrust into a rather alien

role that he came to believe all his life that his brother had been poisoned. With his strong sense of duty, Charles prepared himself for kingship, developing into a pious, learned man, who would become a good and faithful husband and father, upon accession purging the court of the excess that dimmed the reputation of James I.

As Charles worked at being prince of Wales, Cromwell was being prepared for Cambridge by a lecturer there named Thomas Beard, a much admired mentor who was one of the more effectively strident unlicensed preachers who attacked the episcopate. This gained the attention of Bishop Neile of Lincoln, who sent his protégé William Laud to be Archdeacon of Huntingdon from 1615 to 1621 to discipline Beard. Later on in 1633 when Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury, he closed his file on Beard by removing him from his university post, as part of the program to bring Puritan preachers under diocesan control. One may speculate that Cromwell later came to see this dismantling of his mentor's career as Laud's first unknowing step towards the headsman's block.

From an early age, Cromwell was convinced that he was one of those chosen to do battle with the Antichrist in the form of anyone who disagreed with him. Lacking Miltonian magniloquence with which to express his narrow views, he instead channeled them into action, developing the laser intensity of those who are not impeded by introspection.

The simplistic Cromwell and the convoluted Charles were polar opposites frozen in mutual incomprehension. Cromwell would find the prince's subtle sense of nuance a form of weakness, while in future years Charles would be lulled into a complacent view of Cromwell as just another ranting fanatic, which was true except that no one realized until too late that he was also a kind of military genius facing an opposition of gentleman amateurs, with exceptions like Montrose and Prince Rupert spread too thin.

For such a man as Cromwell, the scope of Cambridge probably offered little except for selective tidbits to bolster his already formed opinions. But in any case his university days came to an end in 1617 with the death of his father, and the necessity to manage the family estate. To accomplish this, he spent some time studying law at Lincoln's Inn in London, a common practice for young men responsible for family resources in an age as engorged with litigation as our own. But it is interesting that his father may have had second thoughts about Oliver, as the estate was not left to Oliver, but rather unusually to his mother. Oliver's violent nature may have given his father pause, as the older man was actually a religious moderate, while his uncle had attained a degree of importance at the Stuart court. Perhaps the elders in the Cromwell family, with the caution and insecurity of the upwardly mobile, saw the wisdom of going with the temporal flow in fluid times. As a result, Oliver was well along in life before his mother died and he had any personal resources at all.

It was an age of extremism of the sort that made thoughtful people cautious. Both Charles and his father had been raised as Calvinists, but came to reject the creed by realizing its inherent threat to the throne. A great influence in this move toward the orthodoxy of the Caroline Divines was the serial Bishop of Lincoln, Durham and York, that same Richard Neile who chastised Cromwell's tutor, and brought Laud to court in 1609. Their influence soared, and the subsequent creation of the King James Bible was no coincidence.

The journey of Charles inward to the Catholicism of the ancient British Church of Augustine of Canterbury, Theodore, Cuthbert, Bede and the other various Celtic and Anglo-Saxon saints and sages was formed by events as well as reflection and deep study. One can assume that the compassion and dignity

inherent in Anglican tradition, aside from its own merits, offered relief, a middle path, in contrast to the harsh Protestantism and inquisitorial Hapsburg Roman Catholicism that was tearing Europe apart through the Thirty Years War (1618-38), which not incidentally had cast his beloved sister Elizabeth and her husband, the Elector Palatine from their Bohemian throne, and ruined their lives, while nearly destroying Germany and its population to no rational purpose. Then the marriage of Charles to the Roman Catholic French princess Henrietta Maria, a real love match unusual in royal couples in that they were, by court standards, shockingly monogamous, gave him personal experience of the efficacy of sacramental religion in the life of this truly pious but otherwise difficult woman. The consolations of Canterbury, and knowledge of the fraudulence of attacks on the validity of its ordinations through the counsel of the excellent churchmen who comprised his inner circle, formed his core of belief while taking him through anguish over the deaths of his brother, the eccentric father he truly loved, and the murder of his avuncular mentor the Duke of Buckingham. All this, in his desperate final days caused him to die for his Church, when he could otherwise have saved his life and throne in some form by apostasy.

Becoming King in 1625, he made Laud Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 upon the death of George Abbot, and truly came into his own. His achievement as the last of the great Renaissance princes was symbolized by his Banqueting House in Whitehall, which survives in pristine fashion, revealing the pinnacle of art in life, and life itself as an artform.

Cromwell had entered Parliament in 1628, the same year Buckingham was killed by a madman, and the following year tumultuous events fermenting in Parliament since the 1580s, then exacerbated by the economic, political, and ideological phenomena of James I's reign, caused the constitutional crisis of the Petition of Right, and the dissolution of Parliament by Charles in 1629, beginning his period of personal rule. Thus began a vortex of furious factional infighting within the Parliamentary, mainly Puritan party.

Puritan is a blanket term that really does not mean much, as it covered fine patriots and decent men like Fairfax, those seeking various forms of personal religious experience from genuinely well meaning perspectives, persons seeking social justice. Add to this a barely controllable, large and varied lunatic fringe, as well as the ever available lumpenproletariat indispensable to any revolutionary movement as moronic mob foot soldiers. No one at first paid much attention to Cromwell, who was as personally unattractive and intellectually insignificant as Stalin or Hitler. But such men can prevail in the turmoil of what is not really a unified, coherent cause, but a coalitional free for all where guile, malice, and lack of normal restraints of conscience count for more than consensus, fair play, and a healthy awareness of the dark side that we all possess.

In short, to see the English Civil War as King versus Parliament, or Anglican against Puritan, or in terms of any such simple dichotomy is to completely misunderstand it.

And this is the difficulty with *The King and the Gentleman*, that it would mislead anyone not familiar with the subject (and few readers really are), as Derek Wilson creates the impression that what we are dealing with is a situation arising from a conflict of personalities, rather than a true historical watershed as multifaceted as the fall of the Roman Empire. It is a reversion to the vast oversimplifications of Thomas Carlyle, that all history is about is various larger than life figures abrading against one another. This is not to deride Wilson, but simply to point out that his particular conception and format are too limited. Anyone who wishes to have a basic knowledge of this labyrinthine period should start with C. V. Wedgwood's *A*

*Coffin for King Charles*, and then read Pauline Gregg's biography of Charles I, plus Antonia Fraser's *Cromwell*.

As for the title Wilson selected, while no one can doubt the kingly qualities of Charles I, the honorable and unfortunately seemingly anachronistic title of gentleman would seem to apply to Cromwell only in the legalistic sense of his time as a landed proprietor.

[Lee Hopkins, S.K.C.M., is a San Francisco writer who has authored a novel, *After They Learn to Dance*, and is completing a trilogy. He is a regular contributor to these pages. A graduate of UCLA, he heads Taskforce 2000, a worldwide communications, conferencing, and marketing service. An Episcopalian whose avocation is British travel, his biography appears in the 1996 Who's Who in the West.]

## ***Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England***

by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, Eds.

reviewed by Suzanne Bowles, Ph.D.

*Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, Eds. Stanford University Press (paperback), 1993. x + 382 pp. ISBN 0-8047-2262-5. \$16.95.

This is a collection of eleven essays by distinguished scholars in the field of early modern England. (Though the title uses the phrase "early Stuart England" much of the material presented deals with the Elizabethan period as well.) What the editors hope to achieve with this seemingly eclectic group of essays is to open up a fuller understanding of the period by examining the *interaction* of politics and culture. The culture in this case includes not only art, architecture and literature, but also the offerings of the gutter press (*e.g.* libelous verses, grisly murder tales), uses of history (particularly Roman), and that popular form of courtly entertainment, the masque (a lavish musical extravaganza performed before the royal court).

One of the most important things we learn from this book is that politics in general and views of the royal court in particular were much more complex and subtle than the traditional dichotomies of court v. country, Anglican v. Puritan, or king v. Parliament have led us to believe. Divisions were not nearly so neat or clear-cut. As several analyses of the masques, for instance, demonstrate, the poetry used in masques could be both flattering and critical at the same time. Charles I fares well in this book, largely because he is portrayed as a complex individual rather than the stick-figure tyrant of Whig history.

I would like to commend to our readers' attention four essays in particular. "The King's Writ: Royal Authority in Early Modern England" by Kevin Sharpe analyzes the writings of Elizabeth I, James I and Charles I to discover how they each viewed their own authority and how those views changed with each reign. This piece, especially the section on James, is important because it gives us insight into how Charles was inculcated with certain ideas of kingship by his father and how he later expressed them when he came to the throne. "Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England" by J. S. A. Adamson is a fascinating study of how the concept of chivalry was changed by Charles in order to represent the monarchy in a new

way. This change is illustrated (literally) by a comparison of two royal portraits, Robert Peake's *Prince Henry on horseback*, c. 1610-12, a study of Charles's elder brother decked out in full jousting rig, and Sir Anthony Van Dyck's *Charles I on horseback*, c. 1638, in which the symbols of chivalry are more Roman and imperial. In "The Politics of Portraiture" John Peacock examines royal portraits to plumb their political messages. Once again a Peake portrait, *Henry, Prince of Wales*, 1604-10, is contrasted with several Van Dycks, *Le roi à la chasse*, c. 1635, and *Charles I and M. De St Antoine*, c. 1633, to show Charles's desire to create an image of himself different from that of his brother. (Clearly the role of Henry and Charles's relationship to him warrants further investigation.) Alastair Bellany's "'Rayling Rymes and Vaunting Verse': Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603-1628" examines the way in which popular means of expression, e.g. anonymous verses and pamphlets, were used to stir up feeling against the court in ways that Charles I - to his increasing frustration - could not control.

I highly recommend this book to our members. The essays on Charles provide us new and innovative ways of looking at the Royal Martyr. Even the articles that do not deal directly with Charles will still give the reader valuable insights into the political and cultural background of his reign.

[Suzanne G. Bowles, a member of S.K.C.M., holds a Ph.D. from Syracuse University. She is Assistant Professor of History at William Paterson University, Wayne, New Jersey, and a member of Grace Episcopal Church, Madison, New Jersey.]

## ***'An Instance of the Fingerpost'***

by Iain Pears

reviewed by James N. Ward

*'An Instance of the Fingerpost'* by Iain Pears. Vintage (Paper), 1998. 698 pages. ISBN 0-09-975181-X, approximately £7.99.

There are three chief reasons not to review this book in the pages of *SKCM News*. Chiefly, Iain Pears's *'An Instance of the Fingerpost'* is an international bestseller, now released for over three years, and so this review is rather old news. Also, it is a genre novel—an historical thriller at that—and novels usually seldom and selectively are reviewed in these pages. Finally, this book only tangentially is about our blessed Charles, King and Martyr. So why this review? There are three exceptional reasons that encourage your attention, the weakest being that the novel is a ripping good mystery and an excellent entertainment. Our blessed Charles cautioned us to make our entertainments wholesome and selective, so I commend to your piety whether to include an occasional novel, and this one in particular, to your reading list. Of more significance to our society members is Pears's excellent work in reconstructing something of the flavor of life for persons in all walks of life during the Restoration of the 1660s: the dress, habits, manners, money, food, drink, sights, and *smells* that make the period come alive and bring us to an improved appreciation of how people lived. But the most compelling reason to review the book and recommend it to S.K.C.M. members is that it weaves its tale among accurate historical events of the Restoration and is peopled with



real persons that were actors in both Parliament's Great Rebellion against King Charles and subsequent events under the "Commonwealth." Pears does an excellent job of detailing the political intrigue of Restoration England, the fears and motives of factions, and the haunted memories all persons had of the consequences of the Great Rebellion and its disastrous outcome leading up to and following King Charles's Martyrdom. This novel satisfies the requirements of the critic, and appeals to the appreciation of the ordinary reader.

With those positive things said the book is not without flaws (detailed below). In addition a word of caution is in order about the contents: Pears perhaps is too accurate for those readers whose sensibility or piety would be disturbed by confronting the rather frank carnality of the age. Personal chastity and sexual continence lived side by side with wanton lewdness, serial congress, and casual disregard for the health, well-being, and reputation, of those of a lower class than oneself. The attitudes of the characters often reflect this coarse and base world-view. Pears also accurately—and hilariously—describes the "refined" table manners of Oxford dons and professors of the time. My neighbor's dogs are better behaved at meals and would have left the room in disgust. But most cautiously, we must warn potential readers that there are several scenes of medical practice of the age that are not for the squeamish and sadly cannot be omitted if one wishes to play the detective in following the mystery. If XX Century medical details are distasteful to you, then I assure you XVII Century medical details in this novel would be a major affront and you should avoid this book.

*'An Instance of the Fingerpost'* is a murder mystery set mostly in Oxford and partially in London circa 1663. The novel's backdrop is that Charles II has just regained the English throne, and experiment- and observation-driven science and empirical philosophy only are beginning to gain strength in the centers of learning; while various stripes of religion, superstition, and near magic occupy the minds and attentions of many persons high and low. Pears ably weaves the historical figures Henry Bennet (Earl of Arlington), Robert Boyle (of Boyle's law), George Digby (Earl of Bristol), Thomas Ken, John Locke, John Thurloe, Anthony Wood, Richard Lower, John Wallis, and Christopher Wren together with a cast of fictional characters into a splendid yarn of an unknown conspiracy set against a backdrop of known events that creates a compelling whodunit. S.K.C.M. members may be more interested in the numerous interesting side plots involving Royalists in 'The Sealed Knot' battling wits against disempowered but manipulative Republicans; and the additional tensions and conflicts between the various stripes of free church protestants, Church of England Catholics, establishment 'low church' protestants, and Roman Catholics. There is an additional side plot involving medical research and the efforts of XVII Century physicians to understand the circulatory system that provides wonderful insight into both the genius and ignorance of the age and is especially welcome to those who appreciate the history of science.

The novel is composed of four accounts of the same events and time period written in turn. The authors are: Marco de Cola, a 'foreigner,' and a visiting Italian merchant; William Prestcott, a young impoverished student and dishonored 'gentleman;' Professor John Wallis the famous mathematician and cryptographer; and lastly the reclusive historian, Anthony Wood. Each in turn tells his own tale during the death of Oxford Fellow Dr. Robert Grove: royalist, theologian, and misanthrope. Each writer knows some or all of what the others have written, yet each has been deceived in his own way about the true state of affairs and none knows all the facts necessary to solve the mystery. Each successive narrative claims inaccuracies in prior accounts, and suggests alternate explanations of the same controversial events; yet

each narrator has an agenda and is to be suspected. Only the ‘omniscient’ reader can fill in the blanks and establish ‘the facts.’ But it is by just such a process that Pears effectively creates disorientation and lulls one into the comfortable brilliance of the armchair detective, and then deliciously twists the tale yet again. It is delightful to be manipulated in such a fashion, and Pears does a wonderful job of changing styles yet remaining true to his characters, while keeping the plot moving along and the history lessons passively absorbed.

Pears is best known for his modern detective novel series about art historians and art dealers that has a recurring cast of characters. In that series he brings his extensive knowledge of art history into otherwise conventional detective tales. Readers who are familiar with them should be both warned and encouraged: *‘An Instance of the Fingerpost’* is offering an entertainment of a decisively superior order. Those who think Pears’s other work is facile should give *‘An Instance of the Fingerpost’* a chance; those who enjoy his minor yarns must be forewarned that this is a decidedly more complex book filled with subtlety and erudition.

The book’s flaws circuitously can be described, as I do not want to reveal plot or mystery spoilers. An overall flaw is there is too little history, not too much, and Pears easily could have made this a longer, more detailed, and more enjoyable book by creating an even richer world of the 1660s. Restoration England still was thoroughly haunted by Parliament’s original Great Rebellion, the murder of England’s lawful King, the ineffectual ‘republic’ styling itself a “Commonwealth,” and the ultimate emergence of the naked tyranny of Cromwell’s “Protectorate.” Another layer of these details would have added to the book, not distracted. One gets the impression the author wanted to add them, but brevity, an editor, and commercial considerations stayed his hand.

A peculiar flaw is that while Pears has some knowledge of the differences of religious factionalism within and without the Church of England of the time, he does little with it, and keeps most of the important details off stage. This leaves knowledgeable readers (such as members of S.K.C.M.) frustrated and ignorant readers underserved. This is a major disappointment, as a fuller explication of the religious factionalism of the day would shed some additional light on the motives of many of the major characters and provide education for those encountering the early Catholic party of the C. of E. for the first time. In addition, it must be noted that the only religious ideas that get a full explanation are some rather woolly-headed new age<sup>1</sup> twaddle that will either bore or anger you. Pears is at his weakest here in even including it.

A more specific flaw is the tiresome imperative of zeitgeist and the pervasively politically correct necessity in modern commercial fiction publishing that at least one major character must be a homosexual, and that this single dimension of his character is operative and is the sole explanatory variable of what motivates his actions. This misguided imperative ends up burdening us with a one dimensional character operating in a novel with multidimensional ones. But more mysterious is why on earth the character’s erotic disposition is necessary to emphasize in the first place is beyond me, and in Pears’s construction of that character here it certainly is bewildering how being so inclined is important to the character’s construct or the plot. It definitely smacks of being tacked on by the p.c. editorial police trying to cobble together a slice of market share. Certainly a skillful author could have drawn another (more compelling) dimension from the character toolbox to motivate said actor. Refreshingly, Pears departs from the normal p.c. order of the day in this instance and the homosexual character is not healthy, balanced, and happy, but rather tubercular,

---

1 “New age” rhymes with “sewage” and is about as intellectually compelling.

paranoid, and miserable. But then of course his state is attributable to his ‘repression’ of “the love that dare not speak its name.” Need I also reveal that this unhappiness is because of repressive Mother Church?<sup>2</sup> Or had you already guessed? One sighs at the wearisome banality of the one-dimensional repetitiveness of it all, and moves on.

There is an amusing, though subtle, allowance Pears makes in his conclusion that is disappointing on first reading, and to the uninitiated in the dramatic constructs of both the masque and Restoration theatre, frustrating. I must admit I fell into his trap, and groaned and said “that’s cheating” when first I encountered it, accusing Pears of weakness. But the author is fair and gave me a foreshadowing to his resolution of this sub-mystery, especially since one character in the book draws particular attention to classical notions of the construct of drama, compared with the failure of the play he was observing. I was fooled because I was reading the book with my rationalist, armchair detective hat on and looked for no other dimensions. However, long after I put the book down and upon reflection I got Pears’s little joke and smiled. Suffice to say that *deus ex machina* makes an appearance in the tale, although not as the resolution of the main plot’s conflict. To say anymore would be to reveal too much. Needless to say, to those more intelligent than myself (everyone in S.K.C.M.), you will not be fooled but amused, and to those few who are like myself also are fooled, afterward you too will be amused.

It is easy to lose track of who is doing what when and keep characters’ identities straight in this multi-layered story. In aid over this necessary complexity, Pears provides two helpful appendices that I highlight, for they are easy to miss. Firstly, Pears provides a timeline setting forth key dates and events in 17th century English history, which helps bookmark “who where when” as we seek to unravel the mystery. In addition, Pears provides an appendix list of characters that gives a brief synopsis of their accomplishments and their fictional or non-fictional status. This is especially helpful as there are many actors in this drama, and some characters play minor roles in one account but thereafter become prominent in subsequent views.

‘*An Instance of the Fingerpost*’ is a delightful book that critic Graham Greene easily would have characterized as purely ‘an entertainment’ and not a novel, as it does not present any serious or challenging ideas. Unless you count Pears’s repetition that different observers see the same events of history with different recollections and emphases: an idea that was old when Thucydides wrote the *Peloponnesian War*. ‘*An Instance of the Fingerpost*’ perhaps is somewhat better than Greene’s ‘entertainment’ standard in that Pears has done an excellent job of drawing us nearer to the times he describes, the characters of Restoration history and their motivations, and science such as it was. In addition, we can exercise our minds against his superior construct of a mystery, and amuse ourselves with delightful and subtle references to the theory of art and drama of the time. Perhaps that is enough to merit the level of our patron saint’s wholesome entertainment. This reviewer resolved the question in the affirmative.

*[James N. Ward, a member of S.K.C.M. and Assistant Treasurer of The Guild of All Souls, American Branch, holds a M.Sc.F. from The George Washington University. He is a Paris-based financial professional, and also serves as Adjunct Professor of Computational Finance at The American University of Paris. He is a member of Saint Paul’s Foggy Bottom (K Street), Washington, D.C., and Saint George’s Anglican Church, Paris.]*

---

2 Of course! Forever the “true” villain!

## *Reigning Cats and Dogs*

by Katharine MacDonogh

reviewed by Sarah Gilmer

*Reigning Cats and Dogs* by Katharine MacDonogh (St Martins Press, New York, 1999) ISBN 0-312-22837-6, \$26.95.

This attractive and interesting little volume is beautifully illustrated with color plates and small details of canine and feline companions of royalty scattered throughout.

The author has the unfortunate habit of referring to the dogs and cats in question as “it”, even when calling them by name, and describing their unique and endearing personalities, which falls on my sensibilities like an anvil, and spoils the narrative for me.

Still, there is much here of interest.

For example, Frederick II of Denmark (1559-88) created an order of chivalry inspired by the loyalty of his dog Wilpret. A beautiful alabaster portrait of the King on horseback is pictured, inscribed with the motto, “Wilpret was faithful.”

The Stuarts were of course well known as dog lovers. King Charles’s spaniel Rogue is mentioned in passing, and there is a great deal on Prince Rupert’s dog Boye, and the spite and superstition of the Roundheads concerning him.

There is also an interesting discussion of the Cavalier King Charles Spaniel and the connection of this breed to the Stuarts and their adherents.

From the little dog who accompanied Mary, Queen of Scots to her execution, to Frederick the Great’s beloved dogs, with whom he wished to be buried, there is a wealth of information contained within the pages of this small book.

*[Sarah Gilmer, S.K.C.M., of Toccoa, Georgia, is a regular contributor to these pages. She has also written for The Royal Martyr Annual. She is interested in the Royal Martyr and the times in which he lived, and in things equestrian, as well as things feline and canine.]*

## Bismarck on King Charles

from *Bismarck* by Emil Ludwig

*[Bismarck had anticipated the King's mood, and decided to join the king in the train, without disclosing his plans beforehand. He sought to influence the king before he re-entered the capital.]*

“In those days of fable, the king of Prussia (William I, reigned 1861-88) still travelled in an ordinary train. He was sitting alone in a dimly lighted compartment. There the minister found him, obviously depressed. When Bismarck asked permission to explain the situation, the king cut him short, saying:

““I see well enough how all this will end. In the Opernplatz, under my windows, they will cut your head off—and, a little later, mine!”

“Bismarck, who sees the shade of Augusta behind the king, is content to answer: ‘Et après, Sire?’

““Après, indeed! Then we shall be dead!”

““Yes, then we shall be dead! We must die sooner or later, and could there be a more respectable way of dying? I should die fighting for the cause of my king and master. Your Majesty would die sealing with your own blood your royal rights granted by God's grace. Whether upon the scaffold or upon the battlefield makes no difference to the glorious staking of body and life on behalf of rights granted by God's grace! Your Majesty must not think of Louis XVI. He lived and died a weakling, and does not make a fine figure in history. Think, rather, of Charles I.! Will he not always remain a distinguished personality, the man who, after fighting for his rights and losing the battle, went unmoved and with kingly mien to his death? Your Majesty has no option but to fight. You cannot capitulate. Even at risk to your person, you must resist the attempt to force your hand!”

““The longer I went on talking in this fashion, the more was the king invigorated, and the more did he come to feel himself playing the part of an officer fighting for kingdom and country. . . . The ideal type of Prussian officer, the man who goes to certain death unselfishly and fearlessly, saying simply “at your orders”; but who, when he has to act on his own responsibility, fears the criticism of his superiors or of the world more than he fears death. . . . Before we had reached Berlin, he was in a fighting as well as a cheerful mood, as he showed plainly enough to the ministers and officials who came to meet him.””

## **SKCM News — June, 2002**

### ***British Headquarters***

The Rev'd Edward R. C. Thompson and  
The Rev'd Barrie Williams, *Joint Presidents*

Mrs. Irene Sillitoe, *Vice President*

Robin Davies, *Chairman & Hon. Treasurer*  
22, Tynning Road  
Winsley  
Bradford-on-Avon BA15 2JJ

The Rev'd Barrie Williams, *The Chaplain*  
5, Crinkle Court  
9, Chubb Hill Road  
Whitby, North Yorkshire YO21 1JU

Peter Maplestone, *London Secretary*  
Saint Mary-le-Strand

### ***American Region***

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., *American Representative*  
291 Bacon Street  
Piety Corner  
Waltham MA 02451  
wuonola@earthlink.net

William M. Gardner, Jr., *Membership Secretary*  
Church of the Guardian Angels  
1325 Cardinal Lane  
Lantana FL 33462-4205  
bgardner53@alum.mit.edu

The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, *SSC, Episcopal Patron*  
Diocese of Quincy  
3601 N. North Street  
Peoria IL 61604

### **Kalendar of Anniversaries**

13 June 1625	King Charles married
14 June 1645	Battle of Naseby
18 June 1633	King Charles I crowned at Holyrood
30 June 1670	Death of Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans, daughter of Charles I
9 July 1949	Death of Hon. Mrs. Greville-Nugent, Foundress of S.K.C.M.
10 August 1669	Death of Queen Henrietta Maria
3 September 1658	Death of regicide, Cromwell
8 September 1650	Death of Princess Elizabeth at Carisbrooke
15 October 1633	King James II and VII born
19 November 1600	King Charles born

**At the Annual Mass & Meeting, 26 January 2002,  
Church of the Transfiguration, New York City**

Pictured are (left to right):

the Rev'd Canon J. Robert Wright, D. Phil., Saint-Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History, The General Theological Seminary, preacher for the occasion;

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., American Representative, S.K.C.M.; and

the Rev'd Charles E. Miller, D. Phil., Rector of the Church of the Transfiguration

(see article on p. 1)

---

i. Arthur Michael Ramsey. *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*. (London: Longmans, 1936, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1955), ch. vi, esp. pp. 77, 82.

ii. Kenneth Hylson-Smith. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England from the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century*. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), pp. 35-36.