

HUBERT LE SUEUR

DETAIL OF *CHARLES I ON HORSEBACK*, BRONZE, 1630-3
(Trafalgar Square, London)

— *Annual Mass & Meeting* —
11 a.m., Saturday 31 January 2004,
Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, FL
Details on Back Cover

Table of Contents

American Representative's Column	1
§ 2004 Dues Payment Notice	
§ 31 January 2004 Annual Mass & Meeting at the Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, Florida, 11 a.m.	
§ Upcoming Annual Masses & Meetings:	
29 January 2005 at the Church of the Resurrection, New York City	
28 January 2006 at the Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston, South Carolina	
§ Celebrations of Saint Charles's Day, 2004 § London and other U.K. Celebrations § New York Chapter to Celebrate Canonisation of Saint Charles § Articles in this issue § 2003 General Convention issue § Devotional Societies' Booth § <i>Akathist</i> to Saint Charles § Goods Items § S.K.C.M. Websites § <i>The First Hour</i> § Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament § R.I.P.	
<i>Martyr for the Good of the Land: The Evidence of Pagan Inspiration for the Execution of King Charles I – Part 3</i> – by James N. Ward	5
<i>The Cult of King Charles the Martyr</i> by Andrew Lacey – reviewed by Lee Hopkins	14
<i>The Cult of King Charles the Martyr</i> by Andrew Lacey – reviewed by Sarah Gilmer	19
Price List / Order Form for S.K.C.M. Goods	insert

2004 Dues Payment Notice

An insert with return envelope is provided with this issue of *SKCM News*. Your dues status is noted. Please, as you recall the memory and invoke the intercession of the Royal Martyr in your prayers during January, take care that your dues are paid up through 2004. With postage rates up we cannot for long continue mailings to members who are not current in their dues payments.

Your payment should be sent in by 30 January.

Annual dues are \$10 and include two issues of *SKCM News* and of *Church and King* each year. Why not consider giving interested friends gift memberships in the Society? Let me acknowledge our Society's gratitude to those members who have given donations, very substantial in some cases, to aid in the work and witness of the Society. Your generosity has been of great help and is much appreciated.

May I also take this opportunity to thank our Membership Secretary, William M. Gardner, Jr., for all his outstanding work on Society record-keeping, of membership activities, dues, and accounts, as well as goods orders.

2004 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, Florida, will be on Saturday 31 January 2004 at 11 a.m. We thank Father David C. Kennedy, *SSC*, for his invitation to return to Guardian Angels, where we met in 1991 and 1998. There is an active chapter of the Society at Guardian Angels. The Rector of Guardian Angels is now the Rev'd Craig E. O'Brien, *SSC*; Father Kennedy is serving as Assisting Priest. Music of the Mass will be Mozart's *Missa Brevis* and *Ave Verum Corpus*. The instruments and voices will be from Palm Beach Atlantic University. A catered luncheon will feature roast beef and Yorkshire pudding, with trifle for dessert. Luncheon reservations (\$25 a person) should be sent to the Guardian Angels parish office at the address noted on the back cover. For directions, please consult the parish website: <http://www.holyguardiangels.org>

Patrons and donors are sought as usual. Please see the form inserted in this issue of *SKCM News* and send your donations to the American Representative.

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.

The parish was recently given a ca. 1870 petit point picture of the day before the Royal Martyrdom. It includes King Charles, Bishop Juxon, Princess Elizabeth, and Prince Henry. It will be blessed at the Mass.

2005 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Resurrection, New York City will be on Saturday 29 January 2005. We are grateful to the Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, Rector, for his kind invitation. This will be the first time the Society has met at Resurrection, which has hosted the other Catholic Devotional Societies on a number of occasions.

2006 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston, South Carolina will be on Saturday 28 January 2006, at the invitation of the Rev'd Dow Sanderson, Rector. Charleston is the location of increasing activities in honor of the Martyr King. These included a Solemn High Mass on All Saints' Day, 2003, at the Chapel of Saint Charles, King & Martyr. The celebrant was the

Rev'd Daniel L. Clarke, SSC, curate at Holy Communion. A barbecue picnic on the grounds followed. Donations to the Friends of the Chapel of Saint Charles may be sent to P. O. Box 169, Mayesville SC 29104. The dedication of the Chapel will be carried out by Bishop Ackerman on 30 January 2004 *en route* to the Annual Mass & Meeting in Florida. Thanks to Mr. Richard Hines for his key role in this tangible witness to the Martyr King. Organizing the rapidly growing Carolina chapter is Mr. Donald Evans.

Celebrations of Saint Charles's Day, 2004

In future December issues of *SKCM News*, we hope to include lists, more complete than that following, 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 the 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. There will be a reminder of this in the June issue in the hope of having a more complete list than that below to publish next year.

The Great Plains Chapter will hold its regular annual celebration on Saturday 31 January 2004 at 10 a.m. at Saint Barnabas Church, 40th & Davenport Streets, Omaha, Nebraska. As in other years, a Solemn High Mass will be celebrated with Sung Matins as the Liturgy of the Word. Music will be Adrian Batten's "Short Service" sung by the choir of Saint Barnabas Church. The Rev'd Robert Scheibhofer is Rector of Saint Barnabas. A brunch provided by members and friends of the Nebraska Branch of The Monarchist League will follow in the church undercroft. For information, call Nick Behrens at (402)455-4492 or the church at (402)558-4633 (or check www.saintbarnabas.net).

For information on The Monarchist League, write BM 'Monarchist', London WC1N 3XX U.K.

Saint James' Anglican Catholic Church, Cleveland, Ohio, will commemorate the Royal Martyr with Solemn Evensong and Benediction at 6:30 p.m. on 29 January 2004, and Sung Mass at 6:30 p.m. on 30 January, writes the Rector, the Rev'd Cyril K. Crume.

Details of the ***London Celebration*** and other U.K. celebrations appear in the Christmas, 2003, issue of *Church and King*, which we hope to include with this mailing.

The London S.K.C.M. celebration will be on Friday, 30 January 2004, at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, at 12 noon, preceded by the wreath-laying at the bust outside the entrance, at 11:40.

The New York Chapter will commemorate the ***Canonisation of Saint Charles*** at a time to be announced on Saturday 24 April 2004. The Mass will be 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 will gather for luncheon. For information please contact Dr. Bernard P. Brennan,

S.K.C.M. Chapter Secretary, 129 Columbia Heights, Apt. 33, Brooklyn NY 11201; (718)852-8235. A volunteer is needed to take over the New York Chapter work from Dr. Brennan.

Articles in this issue include the third and final installment of James N. Ward's fascinating essay on pagan inspiration of the Royal Martyrdom. There are also book reviews of Andrew Lacey's new *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* by our faithful, regular contributors Lee Hopkins and Sarah Gilmer.

The **2003 General Convention** of E.C.U.S.A. was a disappointment for our Society. A resolution from the Diocese of New York concerning the 30 January commemoration of the Martyr King, mentioned earlier in these pages, came onto the floor of the House of Bishops at the convention on Thursday 31 July in the report of the Prayer Book, Music and Liturgy committee. In addition to King Charles, several other additions to the calendar of Lesser Feasts and Fasts were considered, including C. S. Lewis, Archbishop William Temple, Janani Luwun, Archbishop of Uganda, slain by Idi Amin, who were later approved for trial commemoration.

In answering a question put by Bishop Ackerman, our Episcopal Patron, on why the committee was not recommending King Charles, the chairman of the committee, Bishop Henry Louttit of Georgia, is reported to have said "because he is male, English and old." Bishop Louttit is said to have emphasized the need for diversity in the calendar. Further questions dwelt on whether Charles's Martyrdom were for the Faith or for "his political rigidity".

According to a news report by David Skidmore and Richelle Thompson (Friday 1 August 2003), "Bishop Barry Howe, also on the Prayer Book, Liturgy and Music Committee, said the committee heard conflicting historical analysis of Charles' efforts in defense of the historic episcopate, some of it surrounding his support of Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud whom Howe described as 'one of the most confining and devastating archbishops.'"

"Today's action marks the second time the house has rejected a commemoration of Charles I, although the SCLM [Standing Committee on Liturgy and Music] has considered at least a dozen proposals since the last vote in 1985."

Before the Convention there were the usual sort of letters to *The Living Church*. One, favorable, was from Society member the Rev'd Donald Langlois. One of the negative ones advised, "Let's not romantically enshrine a weak and divisive king with a commitment to absolutism."

The **Catholic Devotional Societies' booth** was again organized by the Rev'd Dr. Richard C. Martin. We joined the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Guild of All Souls, the Society of Mary, and the Living Rosary of Our Lady & Saint Dominic in this witness. Literature from the respective societies was available. Society members were prominent among the volunteers staffing the booth—Donald Evans and his son Rivers from Charleston and Wally and Dorothy Spaulding from Virginia. Our thanks to them for enabling this witness.

The **Akathist to Saint Charles** has been published and is now available for purchase on the goods order form enclosed. Dr. Roman's *Akathist* has been beautifully typeset by Richard Mammana and has as the cover the icon of Charles the Martyr, reproduced in color. An Akathist is a genre of liturgical prayer which is sung while standing. There are akathists in honour of the Holy Trinity, Christ, Our Lady and Her Miraculous Icons, and the Saints. The standard akathist is divided into twelve 'ekos' or hymns where each contains twelve sentences of praise beginning with the word 'rejoice'. Preceding each ekos is a collect

called the 'kontakion'. A thirteenth kontakion, read thrice, is followed by repetition of the first kontakion and ekos. A special prayer concludes the akathist. It is said that the Western litany is derived from the structure of the ekos.

Dr. Roman composed this Akathist in 1998 and presented it to the Society of King Charles the Martyr in honour of the 350th Anniversary of His Martyrdom in 1999. Dr. Roman writes, "This Akathist is a summary of the life of Saint Charles and is a devotional hymn of praise of our Patron. It is intended for private or group reading. I have used many quotes from Scripture in the text and have done so purposely to celebrate at once the Catholic, Orthodox, and Evangelical tradition that Saint Charles both represented and zealously defended with his very life." Alexander Roman, Ph.D., a member of S.K.C.M., is an Orthodox Catholic and a member of the Monarchist League of Canada. He is an Eastern theology enthusiast with a particular interest in Saints and Hagiography. He is the Executive Assistant to the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature.

While the Akathist provides, in Dr. Roman's words, "a Byzantine Rite cast to devotion to our Royal Martyr", it will appeal to those of all traditions who share a devotion to the Royal Martyr.

The Akathist was set up for printing by Society member Richard J. Mammana, Jr., a parishioner of the Church of the Resurrection, New York City.

The Icon of the Royal Martyr was commissioned by, and is reproduced with the permission of, the Rev'd Father F. Stephen Walinski, of Saint Vincent of Lerins Antiochian Orthodox Church, Omaha, Nebraska.

Goods items include the recently published historical booklets, *The White King I – VII*, issued by our parent organization initially to coincide with the 350th 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.

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. 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 continue to be popular. They are made of entirely handsewn English silk by The Ben Silver Corporation. A new shipment has just been received—place your order now. 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?

The new **Website** of the American Branch will be www.skcm-usa.org. Webmaster Skip Keats indicates that it will be partly constructed by the time you receive this issue of *SKCM News*. The website of our parent Society is www.skcm.org.

In *The Intercession Paper* of ***The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament*** (October, 2003) our Society is included on 30 January ('Charles Stuart') in the calendar of intercessions. Our Episcopal Patron, Bishop Keith Ackerman, is the Superior-General of the Confraternity. For information, write to the Secretary-General, the Rev'd William Willoughby III, 101 East 56th Street, Savannah GA 31405.

R.I.P. On 14 February 2003, Hubert Walter Wandesford Fenwick, chairman of the Royal Martyr Church Union, died. Born in Glasgow in 1916, Mr. Fenwick had chaired the RMCU since the late 1950s. His obituary appears in the Summer, 2003, issue of *Church and King* enclosed with this mailing.

Jesu, Mercy! Mary, Pray!

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

***Martyr for The Good of the Land:
The Evidence of Pagan Inspiration for the Execution of King Charles I***

by James N. Ward

Continued from December, 2002, and June, 2003, *SKCM News*. Part III of III Parts.

Crop Failure, Grain Prices, and Infant Mortality in Britain, 1600 to 1649

Educated people tend to view Stuart history in terms of the arguments of religious conviction, law, power distribution, life at court, and the other concerns of those who are not laborers. However, this presents a rather blunted view of life in England during Charles's reign. Agriculture was the chief industry of the land, and the majority of the population was directly employed in or linked to its success. For example, during Charles's reign cottager peasants (without ploughs) made up 30 percent of the population and earned income from wages as hired agricultural laborers or sometimes as industrial workers. Tenants

were those peasants within the manorial system of rented land, had their own plows, and made up an additional 30 percent of the population; Yeoman freeholders with small farms an additional fifteen percent; Gentry, or freeholding large farmers made up an additional ten percent of the population; the Peerage made up less than one percent; clergy an additional two percent. Everyone else was unattached to land and living in cities, working in trades, in factories, or as domestic servants, or serving in the military or at sea. Therefore, 26 percent of the population made their income from the sale of agricultural products (Peerage, gentry, yeoman), 75 percent of the population directly worked the land (cottagers, tenants, yeoman), and 44 percent had to buy grain (cottagers, clergy, factory workers, tradesmen, military, etc.).

Land ownership distribution also changed dramatically from the beginning of the reigns of the Tudors to the end of the Stuarts. In 1436 land ownership was held 35 percent by the Church or the Crown, 20 percent by the peerage or aristocracy, 25 percent by the gentry, and 20 percent by yeoman freeholders. In contrast, by 1690 land ownership had changed to 10 percent owned by the Church or the Crown, 18 percent by the peerage or aristocracy, 45 percent by the gentry, and 27 percent by yeoman freeholders.¹

In an economy so dependent on agriculture, two years of crop failure is enough to bring on a famine and there were eleven major famines in Europe in the 1600s. 1631 was a year of both plague and famine² and by 1640 the increasing stress on farm life in Continental Europe brought concern to the relatively unscathed farmers in England. In addition, another transformation of English farming also was taking place that placed additional instability on old ways. But most importantly, Wedgwood [and other historians] noted that “A series of three disastrous harvests [1646,7,8] had caused wide-spread distress, and the price of wheat, barley, and oats was the highest of the century.”³ Worse still, “The summer of 1648 had been continuously and disastrously wet from the beginning of May until mid-September, adding anxiety about floods, crops and livestock to the disturbance and destruction of renewed fighting.”⁴

Land Enclosure

The Saxon invasion brought with it an agricultural system more productive than previous Roman methods of farming: the ‘settlement.’ During the period 450-1066 England developed many of the villages and settlement patterns still evident today. The nucleated village had immense effects on agriculture. By the eighth or ninth century a growing population in concentrated communities needed a more productive form of farming to support the people. The resultant farming system is known as ‘open field’ or ‘strip’ farming. The open field system has a distinctive pattern of ridges and furrows. This corrugated pattern was created by the method of ploughing and the ridges developed over a long period of time. Each ridge comprised the smallest unit of the open field system. A number of adjacent ridges formed a strip and this strip was owned or tenanted by a peasant farmer. Parallel strips were grouped to form ‘furlongs’⁵. The strips generally were 220 yards long: the distance an ox team could pull a plough without pausing for breath. Strips were farmed

¹ Munro, John H.: *The Economic History of Late-Medieval and Early Modern Europe, 1250 – 1750*.

² Cox, J.C., *The Parish Registers of England*.

³ Wedgwood, p. 39.

⁴ Rogers, Theodore, *History of Agriculture and Prices*, Oxford, 1887, V., pp. 826-7.

⁵ The ‘furlong’ has many definitions. Here we refer to that definition of a square furlong, or 220 yards by 220 yards, or 10 acres. The medieval field system was one of one-acre strips - 1 furlong by 4 rods (or 22 yards, or 72 furrows). An acre was approximately the area that could be plowed by one man with an ox team in one day.

in rotation and the whole affair was carefully controlled from the village. Common lands were provided for the grazing of sheep and from which villagers could forage (for mushrooms, berries, fuel, etc.). The open field system still was very much a subsistence farming method.

The enclosure of farming land⁶ we know today took place over a long period of time, but reached its peak in 1600 to 1650. The first enclosures were organized in the 1100s and continued slowly until the 1800s when the movement was completed by the General Enclosure Act of 1801 and the Enclosure Act of 1845. Essentially the enclosure movement marks the change from subsistence to commercial farming. Whereas many farmers did well out of enclosure, the loss of common rights and access to common land seems to have put many smallholders and laborers at a temporary disadvantage: rights to common land were lost.⁷

Wool Exports: The 'Golden' Bough

Wool exports brought gold to England and was the most successful export. While farming was changing and putting pressure on marginal laborers, exports of wool products also suffered a precipitous decline shortly before the English Civil War, and continued well through it, and thereafter. English wool products had enjoyed continuous favor as a best-selling export for over 200 years, with each decade exporting more than the last until the peak decade from 1601 to 1609 when exports of English wool short broadcloths reached 108,464.⁸ From 1610 to 1619, exports dropped slightly to 105,906. But then the bottom falls out of this revenue producing industry: from 1620 to 1629 only 89,637; followed by 88,066 in 1630-40; and 86,924 from 1640-50.⁹ At the time of Charles's martyrdom, revenue for this formerly revenue producing but now moribund industry had been grim for thirty years.

Infant Mortality

In addition to other stresses the population was having difficulty replacing itself. "[M]ale...infant mortality...rose during the period from 1600 to 1649," and was directly linked with agricultural failure "in particular, during the mortality crisis of 1623, a year when high wheat prices coincided with low wool prices."¹⁰ Note here that this is two years after John Pym's maiden speech in 1621 in Parliament concerning the "contagious disease of popery"¹¹ often considered the birth of the Republic and Parliament taking the upper hand in rule of the Kingdoms. While "outright starvation was probably uncommon...high [wheat] prices led to a gradual physical weakening of those among the population who had to draw first upon financial or food reserves, then on bodily reserves."¹²

⁶ With the characteristic hedgerows and fences of the English countryside that we find so charming today.

⁷ The latter parliamentary enclosures were a little kinder on the peasants: each received a holding equivalent of the strip.

⁸ 1 short broadcloth = 24 yards by 1.75 yards. From one sack of wool, 4.333 broadcloths could be manufactured.

⁹ Munro, Appendix Table 16.

¹⁰ Scott, Susan and Duncan, C.J.: "Malnutrition, Pregnancy, and Infant Mortality: A Biometric Model." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 30.1 (1999) 37-60

¹¹ Fletcher, Anthony, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War*, p. xx.

¹² Scott & Duncan, p. 38.

Agricultural Wages

A single pound was a fortnight's wage for a skilled worker, or a month's wage for most unskilled agricultural workers of the time. £74.81 in the year 2001 has the same "purchasing power" as £1 in the year 1649,¹³ so a typical annual wage for agricultural workers was between £900 and £1,800 per year, or roughly \$1,500 to \$3,000. Wages were low, with the relative real daily wage reaching its lowest purchasing ability (the power to buy food, fuel, and shelter) in 1625 but wallowing in a moribund state well into 1670,¹⁴ when following the Restoration purchasing power for workers improved dramatically.

Wheat Prices & Infant Mortality

In economics there typically is an iron law of supply and demand that is reflected in the price of a good or service. The staple food of a typical Englishman during Charles's lifetime was bread, and wheat prices reflect accurately what a typical person had to pay for his daily bread, and also what land owning persons were getting in revenue for their crops. Researchers have found great sensitivity to prices reflected in cycles of malnutrition that were widespread in rural communities in England before 1750¹⁵ and that marginal conditions of high mortality and low fertility resulted. These oscillations in infant mortality synchronized significantly with the oscillations in grain prices.¹⁶

Parliament's House of Commons included many yeoman freeholders and gentry farmers who wanted high wheat prices. Charles was the King of all the people of England and Scotland and Wales and Ireland, and most non-landowning people (i.e. most of Charles's subjects) wanted low priced wheat. It is no surprise that during events surrounding the English Civil War wheat prices rose and fell dramatically, but the surprises are that they *fell* during times Parliament was complaining to the King about the unhappiness of the people and proclaiming their better models to satisfy their ills. Let us be very clear on this point: wheat prices rose when Parliament, or more specifically the House of Commons, was fomenting dissent, when they had the upper hand, and most dramatically when they were in charge. Wheat prices *declined* when Charles or his ministers were in charge, had the upper hand, and most importantly for the purposes of this study, prices fell dramatically following Charles's martyr's death.

For example, during the "rule of Buckingham" from 1624 to 1628, of which Parliament complained that the people of the land were suffering, wheat prices actually dropped more than five percent,¹⁷ a welcome event for a wage earner consumer, but not so welcome an event if you were yeoman farmer or gentry landowner. During the direct reign of Charles, "the Personal Government" from 1629 to 1640, of which members of the disbanded Parliament also complained, wheat prices again dropped about five percent. Contrast this with the sharp price increase of over 13 percent from 1628 to 1629, when

¹³ The Pound Value in time calculator of the British government's Economic History Service at: <http://www.eh.net/ehresources/howmuch/poundq.php>

¹⁴ Clark, Gregory: "The Long March of History: Farm Laborers' Wages in England 1208 – 1850, University of California at Davis, Ph.D. Thesis in Economics.

¹⁵ Scott & Duncan, p. 38.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁷ There were annual variations in wheat prices, however the overall trend was declining prices.

Parliament was in session and champing at the bit for greater power and fomenting dissent throughout the land.¹⁸

Although overall wheat prices declined during Charles's personal reign, from 1639 to 1640 prices began to increase during greater unrest from the yeoman and the initial formation of disgruntled political parties on heretical religious lines. From 1639 to 1642 they rose over ten percent and Parliament of course blamed the King, although as landowners themselves they were enjoying increasing revenues. The surprise of course is that during the Civil War from 1642 to 1646, wheat prices actually fell twenty percent, owing to good harvests and fair weather (and pesky gentry and addled peers out of the way to let non-conscripted farmers work unheeded). However, upon the King's capture and imprisonment from 1646 to 1649 when Parliament and the Army had a free hand, prices rose to very dramatic levels, increasing 66 percent.¹⁹

The Revolutionary Governments of 1646 to 1660 enjoyed an initial decline in wheat prices of 12 percent following Charles's martyrdom, however prices quickly rose 13 percent again in 1650-51, then prices began a long steady collapse, dropping more than fifty percent in 1654 from the high prices of 1649, until gradually recovering in 1658. Keep in mind that although low wheat prices were welcomed by working consumers they were hated by the free landholders; i.e. members of Parliament and their peer constituents. It is no surprise that the constituency of the Republic looked at their wallets and began to think that a Monarchy was no different from Parliament on the concerns of their economic interests. Restoration was around the corner.

Was it a 'Ritual?'

"...from the removal of the King from Newport until his death on the scaffold, not one of the King's subjects risked his life to save him."²⁰

Most readers of *SKCM News* have read the details of the dramatic events surrounding our blessed Charles's martyrdom, and undoubtedly many of the descriptions of pagan sacrificial elements detailed here have recalled associations and parallels. Based on my reviews of the historical literature cited above, I hold that King Charles was killed as a pagan sacrifice in a ritual manner that those orchestrating that event either participated in willingly as pagans, pretending to be 'Christians,' or unconsciously, acting under invincible ignorance of what they were doing. All of it was diabolically inspired, redeemed only by Divine Providence and God's abundant grace upon our beloved Martyr King.

Summary & Conclusion

C.S. Lewis observed that the power of pagan belief in Britain was frightfully complex, deep, and nearly inaccessible by today's mind when he commented, "The world-old religion with its baffling mixture of agriculture, tragedy, obscenity, revelry, and clowning, eludes us in all but its externals."²¹ When "Judge"

¹⁸ All of my wheat price data is taken from the famous and widely available Beveridge Wheat Price Index, 1600 to 1869, and originally is from Beveridge, W. H.: "Weather and Harvest Cycles," *Economic Journal*, vol. 31, 1921, pp. 429-452.

¹⁹ Beveridge.

²⁰ Wedgwood, p. 38.

²¹ Lewis, Clive Staples, "The Anthropological Approach" in *English and Medieval Studies*, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London, 1962, p.219, 222-23.

Bradshaw admonished the King from the bench to acknowledge that he was before a court of law, Charles wryly noted “I see I am before a power.”

Of course, classifying the people and events that lead to Saint Charles’s martyrdom as pagans²² unconsciously reenacting ancient sacrificial rituals to satisfy their distressed crop gods will be seen as overdrawn by most, and—because of this author’s convictions—merely an overworked theory motivated by an extreme partisan position. So be it. The facts speak for themselves, and are presented here in tabular form:

Summary Table of Similarities Between Charles’s Martyrdom with Pagan Sacrifice

Source	King Charles’s Example	Pagan/Mythic Similarity	Source
Partridge, p. 130, also numerous contemporary sources.	Auburn hair	Preferred sacrificial victim has red hair .	Graves, p. 295; also Frazer, p. 514, 524.
Numerous sources; also, Partridge, p. 24.	Cromwell was both an avid hunter and a farmer .	Sacrifice is ritual re-enactment of hunting and an invocation to successful farming .	Burkett, p. 50; Frazer, TGB; Weston, FRTR.
http://www.stellafane.com/moon_phase/moon_phase.htm	Phase of the moon was crescent (new moon was on Jan 28, 1649)	Sacrifice at crescent moon	Frazer
Numerous sources; also, Partridge, p. 54.	Scapegoat for Parliament’s war and troubles.	Preferred sacrifice is a scapegoat .	Frazer, Burkett.
Partridge, p. 53, quoting the <i>Ordinance for the Trial of Charles Stewart, King of England</i> .	“...and it pleased God to deliver him into our hands...”	Providential, or found sacrifice is best.	Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous reasonable and honest sources.	Innocent .	Preferred sacrifice is both innocent ...	Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
According to the ‘High Court of Justice’ appointed by the House of Commons, 1549	‘Criminal’	...And a criminal .	Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous sources.	King of England, Scotland, Ireland, & France.	Preferred sacrifice is the King .	Frazer, TGB; also Weston, FRTR.
Numerous sources.	‘Divine right of Kings.’	King is divine substitute.	Weston, FRTR.
Scott, Susan and Duncan, C.J; and Clark, Gregory; and Beveridge, W. H.	Agricultural distress throughout the kingdom.	Sacrifice is for agricultural renewal: the greater the distress , the greater the sacrifice.	Frazer, TGB; also Weston, FRTR.
Ordinance for the Trial of Charles Stewart, King of England (Partridge, p. 53).	“...whearby the country hath been miserably wasted ...trade decayed...people murdered and infinite other mischiefs committed...”	Well-being of the land is linked with the well-being of the King .	Weston, FRTR.
Numerous sources.	Execution occurred at the Banqueting House, a ‘sacred’ place where ritual meals were consumed : meals made from the agricultural produce, the	Sacral regicide was done on the fields to ‘fertilize’ them with the blood of the slain king to make them fruitful; a ritual meal was consumed.	Frazer, TGB; Weston, FRTR; Burkett, <i>Homo Necans</i> ; and Murry, <i>The Divine King in England</i> .

²² Although they were deluded that they were “Christians.”

	fruit of the land.		
Ordinance for the Trial of Charles Stewart, King of England (Partridge, p. 53).	"...whereby the country hath been miserably wasted ...trade decayed...people murdered and infinite other mischiefs committed..."	' Wasteland ' means you must sacrifice the King.	Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous sources.	Charles did not resist his execution at the hands of 'a power' and nodded his head to place it upon the block.	Willing sacrifice that ' nods head in assent .'	Burkett.
Numerous sources.	Beheaded.	Beheading has great mythical and pagan religious significance.	Frazer, TGB; Weston, FRTR, and <i>The Quest of the Grail</i> .
Numerous sources.	Even his enemies noted that Charles went to the test of his beheading with purity of conscience.	The pagan beheading game scenario is a test for purity .	SGGK and 'The Champion's Portion'; and Frazer, TGB.
Numerous sources.	Order of the Garter worn at execution, given away to Bp. Juxton.	Garter has pagan religious significance. Gawain did not give up the garter (failure = evil) and received a 'nick' in punishment.	The Gawain Poet, SGGK; also Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous sources.	Garter is worn as a sign of bravery , given away as a sign of separation: ' Remember .'	Garter is worn as a reminder of cowardice , redeemed as a sign to the court of fraternity and to ' remember ' Gawain's adventure.	The Gawain Poet, SGGK; also Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous sources.	Charles wore the Order of the Garter George on his cloak to his execution.	"...no one may enter [the sacred grove of sacrifice] unless bound by a cord to acknowledge the power of the deity."	Tacitus, <i>Germania</i> .
Numerous sources.	Disguised and masked executioners .	Masks are part of pagan sacrificial rituals; executioners are masked, or are shape-shifters .	Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous sources.	Executed in public.	Sacrifices are public.	Frazer.
Numerous sources.	Role Reversal: King Charles was the source of the law, yet executed under the 'law.'	Role reversal of the sacrifice is a prominent theme in pagan religious tradition. Saturnalia.	Weston, Burkett, Frazer.
Numerous sources.	Cromwell refused the throne and title of 'king' although he had all the same powers. He died of malaria while in power.	The executioner of the King becomes King himself , and is himself executed.	Frazer, TGB.
Numerous sources.	Parliament (specifically, Pym in the The House of Commons) thought they were fighting a "papist" (Roman Catholic) conspiracy.	The Celts (followers of the Druids) fought against the Roman invasion.	Tacitus.
Numerous sources.	Exchange of winnings: Parliament took Power from the King; King gave Parliament "the crown." "I go from a crown corruptible to a crown incorruptible."	The exchange of winnings has ancient pagan mythic roots.	The Gawain Poet, SGGK; also

As difficult as it is to sift through as all this material, the fact remains that at Charles's execution the central pagan elements of sacrifice were present: England was under extreme agricultural stress and feared additional crop failures; Charles was the King (sacred God-King), he wore the garter (green = evil, but also a symbol of redemption like the cross, garter = cross), he was beheaded at the Banqueting House (blood fertilizes crops), he was a scapegoat (the evil is moved to the person), and he suffered a reversal of roles (the King is the law = the "law" executes the King, a Saturnalia pattern).

During the "Commonwealth" its chief protector frequently was called by the common folk "King Cromwell."²³ Years after the martyrdom, Parliament offered Oliver Cromwell the throne and the title 'King,' but he declined. Perhaps he knew then what we commonly know now because of Frazer's work in TGB: the man who kills the King becomes the King, and in turn is killed himself. Lacey Baldwin Smith cast an astute judgment concerning the aims of the Commonwealth that included a reference to the mystical element of Kingship: "When Commons was purged out of existence by a military force of its own creation, the country learned a profound, if bitter, lesson: Parliament could no more exist without the crown than the crown without Parliament. The ancient constitution had never been King and Parliament but King in Parliament; when one element of that mystical union was destroyed, the other ultimately perished."

Oliver Cromwell died of malaria at 3 o'clock on 3 September 1658, in Whitehall, London; his body secretly was interred in Westminster Abbey on 10 November, thirteen days before his state funeral. After the restoration of Charles II to the throne, Cromwell's body was exhumed on January 30, 1661, and hung up at Tyburn (the place where criminals were executed). His body was then buried beneath the gallows, but his head was stuck on a pole and raised above Westminster Hall until the end of Charles II's reign.

Frazer first gave scholarly observational order to the concept of sacril regicide and according to his biographer always held the view "defeat of witchcraft and other such irrational obsessions was not and can never be final, and that if ever the vigilance of the rational governing classes were to slip, the old insanity would start back to life and come boiling up."²⁴ The example of Charles's martyrdom gives ample credence to this view. Frazer also held the comparative method of religious observation—which we have employed here with comparison of ancient pagan sacrificial practices and Charles's martyrdom at the hand of resurgent pagans—was "the [proper] instrument for the detection of savagery." Frazer died a thoroughly committed atheist, and elitist,²⁵ though not a royalist.

Without the martyrdom of Charles I, and without the publication nearly 200 years latter of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, Frazer most likely would never have begun his research into the killing of kings, Weston would never have observed and written *From Ritual to Romance*, and T.S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* probably never would have been written. But the literature is the afterbirth: SGGK seeks to redeem the diabolic with Christian virtue in allegory; Frazer seeks to disarm the consequences of pagan thinking by classifying them as myth and ritual in a "science" of anthropology; and Weston seeks to further distance us from the consequences of the actions of brutes by containing it in descriptive terms as literary criticism. Eliot warned us in the prophetic voice of the poet that the decadence of the west will return us to the consequences of paganism. It remains to be seen just how that prophecy will be fulfilled, and what 'king' will be slain. Let us hope that the heavenly intercessions of our Martyr patron may give pleasure to Him and let this cup pass.

²³ Wedgwood, p. 14.

²⁴ Ackerman, p. 252.

²⁵ "The government of mankind is always and everywhere essentially aristocratic. No juggling with political machinery can evade this law of nature." Identified in Frazer's letters by Ackerman, p. 211.

Bibliography

- Abel, Wilhelm: *Agricultural Fluctuations in Europe from the Thirteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, trans. Olive Ordish (London, 1980), Part II: chapters 4-6, pp. 90-193.
- Ackerman, Robert. J. G. Frazer His Life and Work. Cambridge University Press, 1987. ISBN 0521398258. ASIN: 0521340934.
- _____. The Myth and Ritual School: J. G. Frazer and the Cambridge Ritualists. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1991. Pp. xiv, 253. ISBN 0-8240-6249-3.
- Benson, Larry D.: *Art and Tradition in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Rutgers University Press, 1965).
- Beveridge, W. H.: "Weather and Harvest Cycles," *Economic Journal*, vol. 31, 1921, pp.429-452.
- Bowden, Peter: "Agricultural Prices: Statistical Appendix," in Joan Thirsk, ed., *Agrarian History of England and Wales*, IV: 1500-1640 (1967), Table XIII, 862.
- Burkert, Walter: *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. University of California Press, 1983, pbk. 334 pp, 9 B&W plates, indices.
- Donaldson, E. Talbot, *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, M.H. Abrams, General Editor, Vol. 1, pp. 183-84. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1962.
- Edwards, H.J., translator: Julius Caesar, *Gallic War*, Loeb, 1917.
- Fox, Denton: *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968.
- Fletcher, Anthony: *The Outbreak of the English Civil War*. Edward Arnold, London, 1985.
- Frazer, Sir James George, *The New Golden Bough* [abridged], edited by Dr. Theodor H. Gaster, S.G. Phillips, Inc., 1959 (original edition 1890), page 94 of the paperback *Mentor* edition of the New American Library.
- Graves, Robert: *Claudius the God*, Harrison, Smith and Robert Haas Inc., London, 1935.
- Hughes, Ann: 'The English revolution of 1649', in David Parker, *Revolutions and the Revolutionary Tradition in the West* (Routledge, 2000).
- _____. *The Causes of the English Civil War*, second edition, Palgrave 1998.
- Lewis, Clive Staples, "The Anthropological Approach" in *English and Medieval Studies*, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London, 1962, pp. 219-23.
- Munro, John H.: *Economics 201Y: The Economic History of Late-Medieval and Early Modern Europe, 1250 – 1750*. Topic 8: *Agrarian Change and Modernization in Tudor-Stuart and Hanoverian England, 1400-1750: The 'New Husbandry' and Enclosures*. University of Toronto.
- Murry, Margaret: *The Divine King in England* (1954).
- Partridge, Robert B., 'O Horrible Murder': *The Trial, Execution, and Burial of King Charles I*, The Rubicon Press, 57 Cornwall Gardens, London SW7 4BE. xii + 180 pp., 58 illustrations, 1998. ISBN 0-948695-57-9.
- Raffel, Burton, translator: *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, The New American Library, Inc., New York, 1970.
- Rogers, J.E. Thorold: *History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, IV: (1401-1582), 383-7; V (1583-1702), 398-402.
- Samuels, Dorothy, Professor of History, XXX University, Lecture Notes, available at: http://kcweb.nhmccd.cc.tx.us/employee/jsamuels/sir_gawain_and_the_green_knight.htm
- Scott, Susan and Duncan, C.J.: "Malnutrition, Pregnancy, and Infant Mortality: A Biometric Model." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* Vol. 30, No. 1 (1999), p. 37-60.
- Spiers, John: *English Poetry: The Non-Chaucerian Tradition* (1957).
- Stugrin, Michael: *Monarch Notes to Sir Gawain and The Green Knight (with Pearl, Purity, and Patience)*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1974.

Tacitus's, *Annals* XIV.28-30, Penguin edition, 1997.

Trevelyan, G.M.: *England Under the Stuarts*, Methuen, London, 1904 [reprinted 1985].

Wedgwood, C.V. [Cicily Veronica]: *A Coffin for King Charles: The Trial and Execution of Charles I*. Mcmillian Co. 1964. Dewey Decimal no. 942.062 W416c 0.1.

Weston, Jessie L. *From Ritual to Romance*.

_____. *The Quest of the Grail*.

[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.]

The Cult of King Charles the Martyr

by Andrew Lacey

reviewed by Lee Hopkins

The Cult of King Charles the Martyr by Andrew Lacey, Boydell Press, 2003, 310 pp, ISBN 0-85115-922-2.

The Amelekite came to him expecting a reward for killing King Saul. He had removed David's mortal enemy, but David's reaction was to execute this benefactor. For David "said unto him, thy blood be on your head; for thy mouth has testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord's anointed" [II Samuel 1:16].

The murder of a king in historical times was a breaking of a taboo akin to incest. It was a blasphemy. The evolution of kingship and anointment represented a kind of covenant. The earlier, prehistoric ritual slaying of an old king by a young rival was equally solemn and numinous. It was not merely the bestial removal of the alpha male, as this cyclic sacrifice would one day take the life of the new king. The bloody transference of kingship in the sacred grove at Nemi in Frazer's *The Golden Bough* attests to this as a cultural archetype, as do the works of Jung and Joseph Campbell, and many literary examples were cited in James N. Ward's recent article in these pages [*concluded in this issue*].

In a curious way, the judicial murder of Charles I by Cromwell encompasses both the older prehistoric sacrifice and the impious act denounced in the Old Testament. The chiliastic Puritan notion of condoning evil things now to usher in a glorious future merged with the notion of divine retribution in the eventual killing of regicides and the desecration of Cromwell's grave.

The noble king who dies for his people, but who symbolically is their once and future spiritual icon, fits Charles I as readily as Arthur, or similar attributions to the medieval German emperor Barbarossa. Reflected here is a basic human need, oddly fulfilled by the Soviets, who had banned religion. The carcass of Lenin was stuffed like an animal in some provincial natural history museum, and displayed to adoring pilgrims for decades. The spiritual bankruptcy of our times is demonstrated by sightings of the bloated likeness of the dead Elvis Presley, while his garish Graceland home has become a shrine, and his sequined finery beheld as holy relics.

An interesting prelude to the tragedy of Charles I was the deposition of Richard II, another connoisseur monarch, by the future Henry IV. It would not do to murder Richard outright, and his death remains a mystery, though he was probably starved to death. Having got around this problem, Henry assumed the sanctity of an anointed king. Before long his new Lancastrian dynasty was challenged by his former ally, Henry Percy, known as Hotspur. The resultant battle of Shrewsbury in 1403 is deemed the bloodiest battle between Englishmen until the Civil Wars of the 1640s.

With masterful hypocrisy, Henry IV, unmindful of his recent disposal of Richard II, utilized the fact that to take arms against one's sworn monarch is treason, a capital crime. So, to solidify his own shaky position, Henry IV's victory at Shrewsbury became a bloodbath, because instead of the usual preservation of defeated notables for profitable ransom, they were killed. Hotspur's battle ravaged corpse was displayed, then boiled with spices, quartered, and exhibited in key cities.

Richard II was only later reburied at Westminster Abbey, but during Henry IV's life the remains were hidden so as not to be a source of pilgrimage (and sedition). Archbishop Scrope of York, Hotspur's mentor, was beheaded by Henry IV, and immediately became in Northern England a kind of latter day Saint Thomas Becket. Various miracles were believed performed by means of Scrope's retroactive piety, and his likeness remains in a handsome original stained glass window at York Minster.

Meanwhile, the posthumous sanctity of Richard II brought a terrible fate upon a royal clerk who had taken advantage of the confusion attendant upon the late king's last days, stealing the royal seal and absconding to Scotland for various fraudulent acts. This was considered not only a felony, but a sacrilege. He was caught and brought back to London to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. But all along the journey, he was ceremonially hanged and cut down while still alive in each major town his captors passed. At last, after these ghastly preludes, he got the full leisurely horror in London of dismemberment and mutilation.

These preliminary comments set the scene for the outrageous trial of Charles I. If it is treason to take arms against your king, how can the king be tried for treason for defending himself against rebellious subjects? But few expected the execution actually to happen. When it did, the act horrified many of the erstwhile enemies of Charles, who had acted on perceived parliamentary principle, as much as it appalled all of Europe.

A key point is that the reverence for Charles as a martyr was instantaneous. The way this came about is the subject of a new book as erudite as it is readable. Andrew Lacey, a member of the English branch of our Society, and a librarian at both Cambridge and University of Leicester, has written the landmark study, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*.

The great value of this book is that Lacey's wide reading and shrewd interpretation of the amazing variety and volume of the XVII Century pamphlet wars gives us an inside look into the climate of opinion regarding Charles I, pro and con. This reading takes us inside the world of Charles and his contemporaries, an accomplishment that few attain in the difficult, elusive (and often delusive) field of intellectual history. Lacey joins the select company of the likes of Basil Willey and Johan Huizinga who went beyond the usual rearrangement of data to fit preconceived conclusions. As the worldview of Charles and his contemporaries was so different from our own, its retrieval is dependent upon a close study of original documentation, as well as a knowledge of its context, an ability as much analytical as intuitive.

Modern folly assumes that we, right now, stand at the pinnacle of human accomplishment and knowledge, onward and upward in a teleological arrangement by which today is superior to yesterday, and it will be even better tomorrow. Such hubris impedes us from comprehending the present, planning for the future, and least of all appreciating times gone by. In his research, Lacey avoids all this.

He also makes us aware that most historians have spent an inordinate amount of time on the Cromwellians, and neglected the Royalist cause. The usual academic perspective is that although the Roundheads were violent, lawless philistines, they somehow through regicide, treason, and military dictatorship pointed the way, in unruly but quaint fashion, to enlightenment, democracy, and social justice.

The Whig school of history, propounded with great popular appeal by Macaulay in Victorian times, is still predominant today. Its viewpoint is taken for granted, allowing XX Century Marxist historians such as Christopher Hill to skew some good work on the XVII Century Leveller Movement into a Soviet-style time warp.

The cause of Charles I is thus seen as irrelevant, his supporters reactionary, their whole milieu an anachronism. But the worldview of Charles in fact represented the mainstream of his historical period.

His beheading was an aberration and atrocity almost beyond belief when it occurred. No men of good will condoned it. Presbyterians and other mainline Dissenters were horrified. Sir Thomas Fairfax, the former Parliamentarian military commander, a very honourable man, retired from public life and sought comfort in writing bad poetry.

The English Civil War, like the American Revolution, was an affair conducted by very militant minorities. The great mass of people simply went on with their lives. They were repelled by regicide. Most wished only to get on with the pleasures of traditional English life, paramount among which were ale and sport, deemed sinful by Puritans. Charles, a remote figure, was never really a popular king, but Cromwell was a much less popular usurper.

When the head of Charles was axed from his body, it was seen as an unnatural act. The great chain of being, — “as above, so below”—was severed along with the neck of Charles. A social contract that had unified society since the Middle Ages had been broken.

The spontaneous cult of King Charles the Martyr was quite simply a very human response, the need to restore the rightness of things, what Chinese call the Tao, and Hindus term Dharma. Charles inspired a grassroots movement that continues to this day.

Strangely, the royal family did not participate. Queen Henriette Maria did not return to live in England after the Restoration. Having no sympathy with Anglicanism, she turned with greater fervor to her Roman Catholicism. A year after his father’s murder, Charles II took the Covenant to achieve a Scottish alliance (but his apostasy only resulted in the young man sitting through Calvinist sermons rather than seeing a hoped-for army).

But the hard core of Anglican loyalism took form. Fueled by the writing of Jeremy Taylor, and the existing literature of the Caroline Divines, a High Churchmanship emerged that held aloof from compromise and opportunism, and was a very brave stand to take in the 1650s. The Church of England stood firm and self defined as a separate province of the Catholic Church, a middle way between the obscurantism of Rome and the extremism of Geneva. Cases in point in the post-Restoration world were the courageous actions of the Seven Bishops and the Non-Juring Bishops, whose principled pronouncements put them in real peril, unlike the clergy today who are prolific with manifestoes that no one takes seriously, or even reads.

Lacey’s comments on the *Eikon Basilike* of Charles I are particularly informative. This series of meditations in 28 chapters revolve around the causes of the war, and his exoneration. Despite frequent claims to the contrary, this work was written by Charles himself, starting from the first hostilities, and edited after his death. His notes were captured after the battle of Naseby in 1645, then returned to him. Charles was an exceptionally learned and literate man, even by the high standards of his court.

This writing of his created a popular notion of a sacrificial Christ figure who died for the sins of his nation. But more profoundly, in the measured tone in which he never dramatizes himself, an identification can be made with the very mysterious Biblical figure of the priest king Melchizedek, who is only briefly mentioned in Genesis 9, Psalm 110, and Hebrews 13.

Whatever plans the very private Charles may have had for this book, it was a runaway success in its own time and long after (though now difficult to find in print since an edition decades ago from the Folger Shakespeare Library). Even under the heel of Cromwell, there were 39 editions in 1649 alone, just after the beheading, plus twenty foreign language editions. Lacey does not mention it, but this book outsold even the second greatest best seller of the time, *The Leviathan* of Thomas Hobbes, a book that is still a landmark in political theory, a stark contrast to the sentiments of the royal meditations.

Alarmed, Cromwell unleashed his Latin Secretary, John Milton, in all his dramatically magniloquent malice, to counteract this Royalist publication. Charles II had hired the famous Huguenot scholar Salmasius to defend his murdered father. The endless pamphleteering of the period took on a new and improved literary tone. The royal vindication of Salmasius was everywhere, to Cromwell's consternation. He learned, as Charles I and Laud found out in the 1630s, that press censorship at that period was beyond government resources.

A later commentary, an anti-Stuart diatribe called *High Church Politicks* written in 1710, proclaimed that "We have known the extravagant praise of the royal martyr run men not only upon irreligious rants, but civil seditions, and lead them at once to talk blasphemy against heaven and treason against the state."

After the Restoration, 30 January was celebrated annually on the Anglican calendar as a fast day, with commemorative sermons of great length. Unfortunately, these sermons came to have less and less to do with Charles I, and more with some current political issue, what was later called here in America after our Civil War "the bloody shirt technique", where the honoured dead somehow became front men and publicists for whatever cause is expedient to the fortunes of whomever is speaking. The real Charles faded away to be replaced by orotund expositions of Tory High Church politics. The mixture was as hypocritical and destructive to both religion and public policy then as it is now. While denouncing the double dealing of Puritans, Anglicans emulated them, although in a more literate manner.

They were caught in the act after their vociferous support of the Roman Catholic James II became counterproductive, and the monarch began to work against their vested interests. The assiduous turning of clerical coats during the second half of the century is memorialized in the satiric poem *The Vicar of Bray*, which was even set to a rollicking hymn tune.

These were difficult, fast-moving times. Bishop Gilbert Burnet's *A History of My Own Times* tries so hard to justify the expulsion of James II that he created the foolish story about that King's heir not being his own offspring, but a baby smuggled in a warming pan under the covers of the Queen's obstetric bed.

By the time of Queen Anne, the last of the Stuarts to reign, the stage was set for the self-satisfied stagnation of the Church of England throughout the new century. The Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, an accelerated pace of social and political change profoundly transformed traditional English life. Disenfranchised country people became a pagan mob infesting cities, and were ameliorated by the reformist priest John Wesley. He never intended Methodism to become a separate denomination, and was appalled when his followers in the American colonies created their own Bishops. A few traditional Anglican voices remained, but they were a minority, exemplified by Dr. Johnson's 1789 Fast Day sermon. Further events of the years following, primarily the guillotining of France's Louis XVI, momentarily

renewed interest in Charles I, but the circumstances of the two monarchs, while superficially similar, upon scrutiny have little in common except in being acts of regicide almost a century and a half apart.

In time, official indifference to Charles I continued. Waning turnouts for the Parliament's Fast Day services at Saint Margaret's Church, across the street next to Westminster Abbey, waned until they were discontinued by the Prince Regent in 1812.

Lacey makes a critical point in marking 1832 the watershed year of High Churchmanship. The cult of Charles I had started out in orthodox fashion as soon as he died, diminishing into political infighting once the men of the martyr's generation began to die off after the Restoration. Until 1832 the observance was based on the unity of Church and State, based on the Erastian settlement of Elizabeth I. She designated herself Supreme Governor of the Church, a realistic step backward from her father's megalomania (for it was Henry VIII who changed the traditional royal title of Your Grace to the bloated Your Highness).

1832 was the year of the great Reform Act, a giant step forward for human rights and social justice. But buried within this unprecedented legislation was a provision that governance of the Church would pass from Crown to Parliament. And Parliament, once limited to Anglicans, was now open to people of all persuasions or none. So now the Church could be controlled by those who were not members of it, or even Christians.

Realization of all the implications of this transition created the Oxford Movement, growing out of the ancient church of Saint Mary, which remains one of the university city's great treasures.

The Oxford Movement, of unsurpassed scholarship, literary quality, and elegance, created awareness that the Church of England was not a Protestant Church, but a reformed Catholic Church, in communion with the Greek Orthodox Church which had split with Rome some six centuries before Canterbury did, a linkage actively pursued and defined by Archbishop Laud before he was killed by the Puritans, just as his colleague the Patriarch of Constantinople was murdered by the Ottoman Turks.

It became obvious that the English Church had always been a separate Catholic province since before Saint Augustine of Canterbury arrived in 596.

But the overall impact of the secular events of 1832 sundered both politically and psychologically the former unity of Church and Crown. The significance of Charles I would never be the same in public consciousness. It was as if the axe had fallen on Charles I a second time. It fell the third time with the destruction of the Oxford Movement through the defection to Rome of one of its leaders, John Henry Newman.

What Parliament began was completed in 1858 through a Parliamentary motion that the State Prayers (regarding the Gunpowder Plot, Charles II, and so on) be removed from the Prayer Book calendar. These observances were deemed too political, and in a joint act of self-mutilation reminding one of today's political correctness cant, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Queen Victoria agreed.

The general response was of complete indifference, the cause of Charles I seen as elitist, undemocratic, anachronistic, and irrelevant. But loyalists still existed, and in 1894 the Society of King Charles the Martyr was formed, followed by the Royal Martyr Church Union in 1906. It seems inexplicable that a minority movement should split itself this way, except to say in resignation that once again human nature exerts itself.

The Archbishop of Canterbury commissioned a study in 1957 published as *The Commemoration of Saints*. It stressed the importance of such observances. Rather than the bureaucratic Roman methodology of canonization, it suggested the older practice of canonization by acclamation: "King Charles is a clear example of popular canonization; in which Church, state and popular feeling concurred, and that with a vehemence surprising to the modern generation. The Propers did indeed reflect the deep emotion of their

day too vividly for modern use: but their framing and the Calendar entry as a genuine a canonization—that too of a martyr—as the historic Church can show, Convocation, Parliament and popular acclaim acting in passionate unity.”

In 1980 the observance of 30 January was reinstated in the English Alternative Service Book (but not in the U.S.).

While writing this review, I received a postcard from London, sent by Sumner Walters, a priest from Grace Cathedral here in San Francisco. He is an American who got his doctorate at Oxford and was ordained at Canterbury. He observed the bust of Charles I in the lovely Tudor church of Saint Margaret, by Parliament and Westminster Abbey. “He defiantly faces the statue of Oliver Cromwell standing outside”, he wrote. “You have seen this, I’m sure.”

Yes, I have. But how many of the multitudes passing through Whitehall, locals and tourists alike, have any notion who Charles I and Cromwell were? The cult of Charles I is a work in progress, like the imperfect evolution of Christianity itself. The key to fulfilment is to reflect on the last word uttered by Charles I as he stood before the block and axe: “Remember!”

[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.]

The Cult of King Charles the Martyr

by Andrew Lacey

reviewed by Sarah Gilmer

This book is unique in its exploration of the figure of the Royal Martyr. It covers not only the compelling image of the Martyr himself, but how King Charles has been viewed and venerated through history, and for what reasons.

Andrew Lacey states that

“What Charles represented throughout the regicide was an individual who had internalized the conventions of early modern rhetorical and martyrological genres to such an extent that there was no division between conscience and policy. That is why he could be so self-assured in facing his judges and his death; it may also explain why he lost his habitual stammer during the trial.”

This is very perceptive, and rings true. Also good is Lacey’s assessment of the King’s moral victory:

“Turning to the regicide, all commentators agreed that Charles’ performance at the trial was masterly and that he won the propaganda battle. This victory was compounded by the mistaken publication of the text of the trial by Parliament which only served to disseminate still further the fact that Charles had run rings around his judges and succeeded in embarrassing them thoroughly over questions of legitimacy and arbitrary power. That the Royalists recognized this is shown by

the fact that they did not feel the need to publish their own version of the trial; the Parliamentary version served their needs admirably.

“For Charles, the trial allowed him to abide confident in the dictates of his sovereign conscience. Sitting in Westminster Hall and facing his judges, Charles was calm in the conviction that he alone represented the sole legitimate authority in the kingdom and that this authority derived from a divine donation enshrined in ancient law and custom. His judges, by comparison, represented nothing but themselves backed by the power of the sword. This conviction gave Charles the assurance of his own moral superiority, the knowledge that whatever his judges might claim for themselves, to Charles they were merely ‘a power’, illegitimate and contemptable.”

And so it is that the King himself laid the foundation of the cult. Its earliest expressions naturally would be shock and grief over the King’s death, sympathy for his calm courage, and fear for the political instability of the times, with power falling into the hands of ever more radical and extreme elements. The immense success of *Eikon Basilike*, and the futile attempts of the King’s enemies to discredit it, as well as their sophistical attempts at denying the status of martyr to anyone who did not die for the cause of their own very narrow belief systems, makes plain how flimsy and hypocritical their moral claims really were.

However, there is always a danger involved with powerful symbols and emotions—they are easily exploited, and sometimes fade into distant abstractions or mere rituals in which the original meaning is lost, or perhaps into a thing which dare not be questioned.

Speaking of organizations such as ours, the author states that “they are concerned to remember and restore, whereas the historian’s aim should be to investigate and to explain.”

To remember and restore is a worthy endeavor, and one of the great charms of our Society. However, I believe we should be historians as well. Knowledge of the facts can only strengthen our Cause, and enrich our efforts.

My wish is truly to understand Charles I, to know what he was like, how he lived, and to know what really happened in those distant days. A man of flesh and blood, who of course made any number of mistakes in the course of a life fraught with difficulty and danger, a man beset by enemies prepared to exploit those mistakes to the full, is of far greater interest than a remote and distant hero or the mere symbol of a cause, however lofty. Ultimately, it is not necessary to be a part of any religion or party to admire the courage and idealism of Charles I.

[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.]

SKCM News — December, 2003

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*
6152 Verde Trail North Apt. D-211
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

1 January 1651	King Charles II crowned at Scone
10 January 1645	Martyrdom of Archbishop Laud
15 January 1649	King Charles I brought to Saint James's
23 January 1649	Scottish Commissioners protested against mock trial of King Charles
27 January 1649	Sentence pronounced on King Charles I
30 January 1649	Decollation of King Charles the Martyr - 2004, 355 th Anniversary
2 February 1626	King Charles I crowned
6 February 1685	King Charles II died
9 February 1649	Burial of King Charles I at Windsor
27 March 1625	Accession of King Charles I
27 March 1894	Society of King Charles the Martyr formed
1 April 1813	Finding of the body of Saint Charles, K.M., at Windsor
26 April 1661	Canonisation of Saint Charles: Convocation unanimously approved the office for 30 January
14 May 1662	Royal Warrant directing the use of the office for 30 January in all churches
29 May 1630	King Charles II born
29 May 1660	King Charles II restored

**SOCIETY OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR
ANNUAL MASS AND MEETING**

SOLEMN PONTIFICAL MASS OF SAINT CHARLES

11 a.m., Saturday 31 January 2004
Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana, FL
The Rev'd Craig E. O'Brien, SSC, Rector

The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, Episcopal Patron,
Presiding and Preaching

Mozart – *Missa Brevis*
Strings and Voices of
Palm Beach Atlantic University

Followed by LUNCHEON & ANNUAL MEETING

Luncheon reservations are mandatory:
Send check (\$25 per person) marked "SKCM Luncheon" to:
Guardian Angels Parish Office, *Attn.* SKCM Luncheon, 1325 Cardinal Lane, Lantana FL 33462-4205
by 15 January.