

**THE FACE OF CHARLES I**  
PLASTER CAST, AFTER BERNINI

***— Annual Mass & Meeting —***  
***12 noon, Saturday 29 January 2005,***  
***Church of the Resurrection, New York City***  
***Details on Back Cover***

**Table of Contents**

American Representative’s Column 1

- § 2005 Dues Payment Notice
- § 29 January 2005 Annual Mass & Meeting at the Church of the Resurrection, New York City, 12 noon
- § Upcoming Annual Masses & Meetings:
  - 28 January 2006 at the Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston, South Carolina
  - 27 January 2007 at S. Clement’s Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- § Celebrations of Saint Charles’s Day, 2005: ¶ S. Clement’s, Philadelphia, Sunday 30 January
- ¶ Church of the Advent, Boston, Monday 31 January ¶ Saint Barnabas, Omaha, Saturday 29 January (Great Plains Chapter) ¶ S. Stephen’s, Providence RI, Sunday 30 January
- § London and other U.K. Celebrations § New York Chapter to Commemorate Canonization of Saint Charles § Articles in this issue § Goods Items § S.K.C.M. Website § The Emperor Maximilian
- § The Historic Liturgies Project § Dorothy Snow, R.I.P.

Homily Preached at Saint Barnabas Church, Omaha,  
by the Rev’d Fred R. Raybourn, SSC, 31 January 2004 6

Thomas Warmstry’s *Hand-kirchife*: An Early Pamphlet on the Martyrdom –  
transcribed with an Introduction by Richard J. Mammana, Jr. 8

*The Reformation: A History* by Diarmaid MacCulloch –  
reviewed by Lee Hopkins 14

*The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* by Frances A. Yates –  
reviewed by Lee Hopkins 18

*King Charles’s Memory* – by Frederick S. Arnold 21

*Martyr to What* – a Connecticut View of Charles I (1897) 24

Price List / Order Form for S.K.C.M. Goods insert

## *From the American Representative*

### **2005 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 2005. With postage rates expected to go up again, 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.

***2005 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Resurrection, New York City*** will be at 12 noon on Saturday 29 January 2005. We are grateful to the Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, *SSC*, 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, including the Guild of All Souls in November, 2004, when a new shrine of the Sacred Heart, to be the focus of the Guild's chantry work in the United States, was blessed.

The preacher for the occasion will be the Rev'd David Peters, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Reading, Berks. The choir of the Church of the Resurrection will sing Franz von Biber's *Missa Brevis in E Minor*. Following the Mass will be a luncheon. Reservations are mandatory. Send your check (\$20 per person) marked "SKCM Luncheon" to Resurrection Parish Office, *Attn.* SKCM Luncheon, 119 E. 74<sup>th</sup> St., New York NY 10021, **no later than 15 January**.

***2006 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston, SC*** will be held on Saturday 28 January 2006. We are grateful to the Rev'd Dow Sanderson, *SSC*, Rector, for his kind invitation. This will be the first time the Society has met at Holy Communion, where there is a rapidly-growing chapter of the Society. We are pleased to announce that our preacher will be the Rt. Rev'd Jack L. Iker, Bishop of Fort Worth and member of the Society.

***2007 Annual Mass & Meeting – S. Clement's Church, Philadelphia*** will be held on Saturday 27 January 2007. We are grateful to the Rev'd Canon W. Gordon Reid, Rector, for his kind invitation. Society member Bishop James W. Montgomery preached at Canon Reid's institution earlier this year. This will be the fourth time the Society has met at S. Clement's, which has a large, active S.K.C.M. chapter; Will Sears Bricker II is secretary. In 1999 we celebrated the 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Decollation of Saint Charles at S. Clement's, and also met there in 1986 and in 1994, the hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society.

## Celebrations of Saint Charles's Day, 2005

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.

***S. Clement's, Philadelphia, Chapter*** will hold its annual commemoration of the Royal Martyr on Sunday 30 January 2005 at the 11 o'clock High Mass. The Rev'd David Peters will be guest preacher; he will have preached at the Annual Mass & Meeting in New York the previous day. Thanks to Canon Gordon Reid, Rector, and Will Bricker, Chapter Secretary, for fostering this commemoration.

At the ***Church of the Advent, Boston***, there will be a special mass at 6 p.m. on Monday 31 January 2005 to commemorate the Martyr King. The Mass will be celebrated by the curate, the Rev'd Benjamin King. After the Mass there will be a gathering with refreshments and a talk by Betty Morris, historian of the Church of the Advent, on Poetry about the Life to Come.

***The Great Plains Chapter*** will hold its regular annual celebration on Saturday 29 January 2005 at 10 a.m. at Saint Barnabas Church, 40<sup>th</sup> & Davenport Streets, Omaha, Nebraska. As in other years, a Solemn High Mass will be celebrated with Sung Morning Prayer as the Liturgy of the Word. The Rev'd Robert Scheibelhofer 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)559-4633 (or check [www.saintbarnabas.net](http://www.saintbarnabas.net)).

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

***S. Stephen's Church, Providence, RI***, is sponsoring a New England commemoration of King Charles the Martyr on Sunday 30 January 2005. The Rector, Father John D. Alexander, informs us that S. Stephen's will offer Solemn Evensong of King Charles, Procession, and Benediction at 5:30 p.m. For directions or other information call (401)421-6702 (or check [www.sstephens.org](http://www.sstephens.org)).

Details of the ***London Celebration*** and other U.K. celebrations appear in the Christmas, 2004, issue of *Church and King*, which we hope to include with this mailing.

The London S.K.C.M. celebration will be on Monday, 31 January 2005, at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, at 12 noon, preceded by devotions and the wreath-laying at the bust outside the entrance, at 11:30.

**Bishop Ackerman** will celebrate a Mass for S.K.C.M. in London in April, around the time of the Society of the Holy Cross (SSC) gathering. Coincident with the special mass will be an exhibition of items of King Charles interest.

**The New York Chapter** will commemorate the *Canonisation of Saint Charles* at a date and time to be announced in April 2005. The Mass will be celebrated at Saint Paul's, 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 a transcription of the early pamphlet on the Royal Martyrdom, Thomas Warmstry's *Hand-kirchife* with Introduction by Richard, J. Mammana, Jr. There are two book reviews by Lee Hopkins, a 1934 article on King Charles the Martyr—a favorable view, and a homily preached by the Rev'd Fred R. Raybourn, SSC, at the 2004 Great Plains Chapter celebration at Saint Barnabas, Omaha.

**Goods items** include the recently published historical booklets, *The White King I – VII*, 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.

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. Alexander Roman's *Akathist* provides a very attractive collection of devotions, based on *Eikon Basilike*. 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](http://www.skcm-usa.org). Unfortunately, webmaster Skip Keats has been unable to return to his work on the website and it has been suspended. We are missing opportunities to extend our witness. A volunteer to take on this task is needed! There has been discussion among the Catholic Devotional Societies about possibly sharing a service to maintain (and, in the case of S.K.C.M.), improve their websites. The Catholic Devotional Societies involved were those who traditionally have shared a booth at General Convention, the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Guild of All Souls, the Society of Mary, the Living Rosary of Our Lady & Saint Dominic, and the Society of King Charles the Martyr. They were brought together by our Episcopal Patron, Bishop Ackerman, who is also Superior-General of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and a supporter of all the societies. Also included in the discussion are the Society of the Holy Cross (SSC) and the Catholic Clerical Union.

The website of our parent Society is [www.skcm.org](http://www.skcm.org).

Some words about the **Emperor Maximilian**, appearing in The Monarchist League's American Member Newsletter in an article entitled "Mexican Monarchy" by Joseph A. Crisp, will be of interest to Society members.

"Whatever opinion one has of the Second Mexican Empire, absolutely everyone must admire the personal courage of Emperor Maximilian, who refused to abandon his people even when given repeated opportunities for escape. By 1865 it was clear that the monarchy was doomed, opposed by rearmed Juaristas within and a massive American army without, the French in retreat and many of his own supporters deserting at the hint of danger in the air. The French offered him safe conduct back to Europe and even when given the opportunity of escape by the Juaristas after being captured at Queretaro he refused to forsake the cause to which he had lent his name and honour.

"He was also motivated by the certain death that awaited his most trusted and loyal officers such as Leonardo Marquez, Miguel Miramon, and Tomás Mejia. He hoped to either negotiate to secure their safety or otherwise share their fate, conscious of the fact that they had fought on under hopeless circumstances primarily out of their personal loyalty to him. As it happened, Maximilian died professing his love for Mexico, and his generals were killed shouting, "Long live the Emperor" with their dying breaths. It was a tragic but defiant end to an episode that was itself both tragic and defiant.

"The tragedy came not just with the regicide of Emperor Maximilian, the maddening heartbreak of Empress Carlota, the deaths of noble men like Mejia and Miramon or the rough treatment and exile meted out to all of the Mexican monarchists. The greater tragedy was in the victory of Benito Juarez, the increased secularization of Mexico and the brutal dictatorship of his general Porfirio Diaz in the years to come. The heroic defiance was evident in the subtle spurning of the American claim to hold dominion over all of North America, in the attempt to assert that stable and benevolent government was possible south of the border and that the government of monarchy could make a new beginning even in the backyard of the Great Republic. Today,

Maximilian has joined the ranks of other noble but futile causes, from the Jacobites of Britain to the Carlists of Spain, yet as long as the enthusiasts for Mexico's monarchy remain, and as long as the House of Hapsburg-Iturbide continues across the water, the memory of that innovative enterprise will never cease but live on in the minds of those loyal at heart."

In connection with *The Historic Liturgies Project, Emmanuel Church, Boston*, "The Holy Communion according to the Book of Common Prayer 1662" was published as a handsome service booklet. The service was conducted on 12 February 2004, and brought to our attention by Society member the Rev'd W. Douglas Bond. In this particular service, the collects proper to both 30 January and 29 May, the State Services for which were added in the 1662 Book, were prayed, "as part of the strong monarchical sentiment of the re-established 1662 Book. After all, the Martyr-King Charles I is the only saint to be 'canonized' by the Church of England." The booklet's informative notes were written by the Rev'd James Michael Weiss.

**R.I.P.** Dorothy Putnam Paine Snow, a long-time member of the Society and supporter of the Catholic Devotional Societies, died on 29 August 2004. It was Mrs. Snow who first acquainted the American Representative with the existence of the Society, after they met some thirty years ago at the Church of the Advent, Boston. It was remarkable that Mrs. Snow, descended from original Yankee Puritan stock, after her husband, photographer André Snow's death, became in the mid-1970s an ardent Anglo-Catholic. She was a frequent pilgrim to Walsingham, an artist, and had traveled extensively in Europe, particularly France and England, with her photographer husband. She taught art at the Windsor School and well into her retirement at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and was known as a gracious hostess who brought diverse groups of artists and Anglicans together at her home in Brookline or her Summer place/studio in Chatham. A ΦBK graduate of Brown University, at the time of her death in San Antonio, Texas she was in her 98<sup>th</sup> year.

*Jesu, Mercy! Mary, Pray!*

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

## *Homily Preached at Saint Barnabas Church, Omaha,*

**by the Rev'd Fred R. Raybourn, SSC**

Saint Martin of Tours Church, Omaha

31 January 2004

The task of preparing a sermon or homily for this day commemorating the beheading of Charles I, was not an easy one. Where does one begin? Does the sermon become an eulogy for the beheaded king? That would not be possible as we of the priestly order are not permitted to eulogize the departed at funerals. But, since this isn't a funeral oration, one could say that it would be permitted. I have chosen not to do that.

So, before embarking on this task, I asked myself: "What is the meaning of the word martyr?" Sure, we understand that a martyr is one who dies for the faith or a belief that one professes. We, generally, proclaim anyone who has died for the faith of Jesus, or the Catholic faith, or for the Biblical faith—if that may be the case—to be a martyr. We refer to these people as "red martyrs" in significance to those who have undergone persecution and severe hardship leading ultimately to the shedding of blood in death. On the other hand, those who are persecuted and suffer patiently for the faith or belief of Jesus without the shedding of their blood are sometimes considered to be "white martyrs". But what does the dictionary state? The dictionary definition is: "One who is put to death for adhering to a belief, faith, or profession." Another is: "One who sacrifices his life or something of great value for the sake of principle."

So the question arises: "Where do we classify Blessed Charles?" Briefly, and without being contentious, one could say that Charles was put to death for both, for adhering to a belief, and for the sake of principle. Why? Because Charles supported many of the principles that another martyr, Archbishop William Laud, instituted in his purpose to purge the whole Church of England of Calvinism. The disciplines of worship and discipline that Laud instituted offended the Puritans and created many enemies for the Archbishop. One could say that Charles was involved in all of this by his staunch support of Laud, and especially in his making certain that the Church of Scotland had a valid episcopate of the apostolic succession. Subsequently, Charles having tried to get the Scots to invade England, was captured, turned over to the English, and put in prison. He was brought before the court where he was condemned as a tyrant and traitor, and beheaded in 1649. Charles's crime was that he wanted to maintain the apostolic succession that Laud had instituted in Scotland, and that was in effect in England, while the Puritan Parliament wanted to do away with all of it.

It is fitting that we should gather to celebrate the blessed memory of the martyred Charles I along with that of Blessed William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. One did much to re-establish the norms of worship which had been deliberately discarded from the turbulent times of the destruction of the monasteries and the Elizabethan settlement while the other, the king, supported him wholeheartedly. Both set a XVII Century precedent, back to which the Oxford fathers would be able to look from their XIX Century perspective as a *noble precedent*.

So, is there more to us being here than just to extol the *noble precedent* set by Laud and Charles I? Can we benefit any real thing from this, or is this merely a time to hear the recitation of a nice traditional Anglican Service accompanied by nice music, all one human's commemoration? If we look closely at the lives of Charles and Laud, we will remember that they both gave their lives for what they believed. This should especially hit us very hard in our times of great turmoil in the church. We know of many who have



stood up for the defense of the Authority of Holy Scripture in our lives, faith. Still, we also know of those who continue to fudge the problem as if nothing has happened. What would have happened if both Laud and Charles had just decided to forget the whole thing and shrugged it off? We wouldn't be here this morning. One thing that we must realize is that the examples of both of these blessed men should move us to stand up and defend the orthodox teaching of the Faith.

Many years ago, I came across a business card that had some writing on the back; it stated: “If you were arrested today, would there be enough evidence against you to hold you for being a follower of the Christ?” Think about that.

I would venture to say that there aren't any in the congregation this morning who have experienced living under the control of the military. I, for one, have and it is not something to be desired. At any rate, let us say that we did live under such a system, and that some soldiers walked into this holy place right now and demanded to know who were those who considered themselves to be Christians, and who followed the man known as Jesus Christ. Would there be any substantial evidence for them to consider any one of us guilty and then be carted away to be confined somewhere for our belief? Sometimes I wonder if we are not more inclined to do things, or participate in religious functions, lightly or just because that's what we have always done.

Do we dare, in our day, to stand up and proclaim the faith as we have received it from the earliest times, and to declare, without any stuttering, that Jesus Christ is Lord of all? Regardless of what we may do outwardly in our Christian worship, the one primary object of our worship is God, in the most Holy and Blessed Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The basis of this worship is the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. If our faith is not firmly entrenched in Him, in His Person, and we are not convicted to follow Him as the only Lord and Savior, then all our teaching is faulty. The church in our day is faulty, precisely because our teaching is not authentic. Instead of looking at the teachings of the Church from the Person of Christ, through the Authority of Holy Scripture, Holy Tradition, and Reason, those who would bring the church to its knees, in the substance of feeling good, in front of the gods of secular corrupt society, believe that the church must now take its marching orders from the same.

In a sermon given on an occasion such as this, it was said that: “The last word uttered by King Charles to Bishop Juxon on the scaffold was the enigmatic ‘Remember!’ As Christians who value tradition, this is our responsibility—to remember God's commandments; to remember constantly in our devotional life the Incarnation, Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord; to remember the witness of the Apostles, Evangelists, the martyrs of the early church, the Fathers of the Early Church who established the doctrinal basis of our faith, and the martyrs and saints down the ages to our present day; to remember the example of our Lady [Saint Mary] and imitate the Royal Martyr's devotion to her; to remember the sacrifices made by Anglican worthies of the Oxford Movement in the XIX Century; to remember the two millennia of Christendom during which the Apostolic Succession has been safeguarded by those who have been true to the ‘faith once delivered to the saints’ only now to be disregarded by modernists and revisionists, enemies of tradition, in our own day, including so many bishops themselves.” [Sermon by Mark Wuonola, 25 January 1991, Church of the Guardian Angels, Lantana FL]

May we ‘remember’ and continue to uphold the Catholic Faith, bound by the Authority of Holy Scripture, in following Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. . .our only Lord and savior, Jesus Christ.

*[Thanks to Father Raybourn, Father Scheibhofer of Saint Barnabas, and Nick Behrens, Great Plains Chapter Secretary, for regularly organizing the commemoration of the Royal Martyrdom in Omaha.]*

***Thomas Warmstry's Hand-kirchife:  
An Early Pamphlet on the Martyrdom***

Transcribed with an Introduction by Richard J. Mammana, Jr.

This eight-page pamphlet is to be found in an original copy at the library of the Union Theological Seminary in New York. It is a very short tract and one of the first—with its date of January 31, 1648<sup>1</sup>—to draw out the parallels between Christ and King Charles the Martyr in their sufferings. It is attributed by Donald Wing in his *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America* (1945) to Thomas Warmstry, Walmestry or Warmestry (1610-1665). The unsigned, unaddressed tract was reprinted once in 1659.

Thomas Warmstry was born in Worcester, and took his B.A. from Brasenose College, Oxford in 1628, receiving his M.A. from Christ Church in 1631, and a D.D. in 1642. He was rector of Whitchurch, Warwickshire from 1635 until 1643, when he was instituted as rector of Minchinhampton, Gloucestershire. Warmstry was unable on account of the Civil War to travel to Gloucestershire to take up his new living, and it was subsequently given to an intruder.<sup>2</sup> He was deprived of his church preferment after fleeing to Oxford following the surrender of Worcester in 1646. During the Interregnum, the *DNB* notes that “he removed to London, where he acted as almoner and confessor to royalist sufferers.” At the Restoration, he was preferred quickly, and his sequestration was reversed by the House of Lords. On his death, Warmstry was concurrently the holder of a prebend in Gloucester Cathedral, Dean of Worcester, and vicar of Bromsgrove in Worcestershire.

The tract is particularly important not only for its date, but for its coming from an author whose party-sympathies were not exceptionally Laudian. Warmstry's works have a High Church bent, but his impassioned 1641 speech in Convocation “against images, altars [and] crosses” marks him as disinclined to these ceremonial expressions of Catholic doctrine. A portion of this speech makes the decidedly modern point that a “materiall crosse” in Christian churches is among the reasons “that kept many Jewes from embracing Christian Religion” not to mention “the Turk [and] the Heathen also.”<sup>3</sup> [!] Warmstry's early delineation of the basis for the cult of King Charles is, then, significant for coming not from an extreme Church partisan, but from an articulate and somewhat unorthodox member of the body of loyalist clergy.

The *Hand-kirchife* is also important for the emphasis it places on Charles as “Martyred by his owne [...] Subjects, for the truth of Christ, and the Liberties of this People.” It is Charles's Christian faith, and his personal conformity to Jesus Christ, which serve as the bedrock for Warmstry's immediate presentation of the king as a martyr. The rhetorical device of a handkerchief woven with words, offered by

---

<sup>1</sup> The English civil year began on the Annunciation until 1752. For this reason, many contemporary accounts of Charles' execution are dated 1648, while by modern reckoning they occurred during the year 1649.

<sup>2</sup> A.G. Matthews, *Walker Revised: Being a Revision of John Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948, p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> *A Convocation Speech by Mr. Thomas Warmstry One of the Clerks for the Diocesse of Worcester: Against Images, Altars, Crosses, the New Canons and the Oath, &c.* London: no publisher, 1641, p. 4.

the author to assuage the grief of the people of England, is perhaps self-consciously flimsy, but nonetheless a poignant testament to a nation's deep grief and a Christian man's final sacrifice.

Warmstry was the author of a number of works of topical interest, including *The Vindication of the Solemnity of the Nativity of Christ* (1648), in which he defended the celebration of Christmas, and the singing of carols; *A Box of Spikenard: or A Little Manual of Sacramental Instruction and Devotion* (1660); and the posthumous *Communicant's Guide in a Short Preparation towards a Worthy Reception of the Lord's Supper with Prayers fitted to the Several Occasions for the Use of Young Persons* (1685, 1687).

*[Richard J. Mammana, Jr. is a member of the Church of the Resurrection, Manhattan, and a frequent contributor to Touchstone, Sobornost, The Living Church and other periodicals. Most recently, he participated in the third annual Holy Trinity Orthodox Theological Seminary Colloquium in Jordanville, New York, delivering a paper on English travelers' accounts of visits to Holy Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra near Moscow. It will be published in mid-2005 in volume 3 of the series Readings in Russian Religious Culture.]*

A  
HAND-KIRCHIFE  
FOR LOYALL  
**MOURNERS**

OR  
**A Cordial for Drooping**

*Spirits*, Groaning for the bloody  
murther, and heavy losse of our

GRACIOVS

# *KING*

Martyred by his owne trayterous and rebellious  
Subjects, for the truth of CHRIST, and the Liber-  
ties of this People. Being a LETTER to a  
FRIEND.

Lam. I. 12. *It is nothing unto you, all yee that passe by? Behold and see, if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his feirce anger?*

Lam. 4. 20. *The Breath of our Nostrills, the Annoynted of the LORD is fallen into their Pitts: of whom we said under his shaddow we shall live.*

London: Printed Anno Dom. 1649.

THE great obligations that I beare unto you, for your many favours, and more especially for the refuge and comfort that I have received from you in the time of my persecution, will not suffer the sense that I have of the publique calamities that are now upon us, in the losse of our gracious King, now sacrificed to destruction by the Tyranny of insolent and

ungodly men, so wholly to take up all the room of my heart, but that the care of your safety and comfort, must be a partner with it, so far as to set me upon this endeavour to administer some Cordiall unto you, to preserve you from fainting under the burthen of those tender thoughts that are in you toward his sacred Majesty. It is the condition that God hath allotted unto all Earthly things, that they are all bitter sweets, and have in them a mixture of joy and sorrow. There is no delight so perfect in this world, but hath some affliction attending upon it. There is pure and sincere happynesse in nothing but in God; that we may not be so taken with any earthly felicity as to give up our hearts unto it. Therefore every Rose that growth in this garden hath its Thorne, every beauty its blemish, every Splendour its waight. That the one may be a remembrancer unto us, not to doate too much upon the other: That the full bent of our affections may still be reserved for God. If there were any thing found here of so entrie and uniforme a composure of felicity, that there were no other quarrel to entertaine against it, yet this is an inseparable abatement that sticks upon them all, that they are all fraile and fading and must have an end; and nothing can make us truly happy, but that wherein happynesse is lasting and perpetuall and on the other side. There is nothing that befalleth us in this world, so purely grievous and calamitous, but there is some matter of comfort and consolation to be found in it, which grace can discover and make use of, though some times it is beyond the wisdome of nature.

There is no Poyson but hath something Medicinable in it, which the art of Pietie may draw forth of it. I confesse indeed that the present calamity we are under, the losse of his Sacred Majesty, is an evill of so sad a presence unto an honest and Christian heart, that if we look upon it, with a full view in all the consequences that are like to follow it will not be easily [for ought I know] to think upon any earthly calamity of more universal and perfect sorrow; and yet even in this. There are some corners of refuge for a Christian soule to hide it selfe in, that it may not be swallowed up with discontent; That so good a KING should die, it hath in it matter of eminent sorrow. But then that he died so good a KING That hath some recompence of comfort and solace. In the former, our losse calleth for our sighs, but in the latter his gaine alloweth us some breathings of joy. That he should die under the name of a Tyrant, a Murtherer, and a Traytor, is an object full of lamentation. But that he died indeed a Martyr; A Martyr both of the State and the Church, for the liberties of his Subjects, like a good KING; And in the defence of the true Religion, like a good and glorious Christian: This hath joy in it above that sorrow, whiles we see the ignominies of his death but shaddowes and falsehoods, But the Glories thereof as Substances and Truths, which will enroll him in the golden Catalogues both of faithful sufferers for his God, and faithfull Patriots and Fathers of his Country. That he should be

trampled on with so much insolence, as I think the like hath never been heard of in the World, (and I am sorry I should have the first president in a Christian Church, and nation) it is a matter of much sadness and griefe, but that he should suffer so much insolence with such admirable courage and Christian patience, the like whereof I think hath scarce bin read of in all the world, this presenteth him unto as a Conquerour over his enemies and persecutors, and them as the slaves and captives of his Christian triumph, and affordeth us matter of joy and contentment. It is an heavy thing to think on, that he should suffer by his own Judasses: But a joyfull and glorious thing it is to think on, that he suffered so like his own Jesus, so like him in the manner and circumstances of his being betrayed by his owne servants, arraigned before Jewes and *Pilate*, as the best, reviled, reproached, and they say spit upon by an unworthy varlet, scorned and contemned, & condemned unto death: so like him in the temper of his sufferings, with so much meeknesse and fortitude, undauntednes of spirit, and submission to the will of God: So like him in the cause of his sufferings (as farre as we may withal reverence to the infinite and incomparable sufferings of Christ: compare inferiour things with those that are so farre above them) Christ suffered for the good of his people, so doth he for the freedome of his: indeed this difference there is which barres out infinitely any equality between the one and other: Christ he suffered for the whole world, he but for his three Kingdoms. Christ to free his people from an eternall captivity, and the tyrrany of *Sathan*: he to free his Kingdoms from a temporal captivity and the Tyrrany of wicked men: so that though in these things he be farre below his master Christ Jesus, yet so like him, that I think it will be very harrd to finde a nearer parallel in any earthly story: and like him too in the person of the sufferer, Christ was a King and so was he, Christ the supreame and Charles his substitute; Chris a spirituall King, he a temporall, whose Kingdome was of this world, and therefore according to our Saviours Rule, *his servants should have fought, that he should not have been delivered to those Jewes*.

It is indeed a sad thing to consider, what a distressed Familie and Kingdome hee hath left behind him; But it is a joyfull thing to think on, what a joyfull and glorious Kingdome he hath obtained, where every suffering of his hath as it were its peculiar crown: & his cruell death is succeeded with an eternall and immortal life: a Crown that feares no insolent deposeders, and a life that dreads no inhumane Traytors and murtherers.

To conclude as we find in him so much matter of joy to ballance our sorrows, and such as doth adde much honour to all those that have truly served so good, so gracious, and so pious a Lord and Master, so we have in him likewise great patternes of Patience and Christian resolution, that as he fainted not in his; so we may learn first of Christ, and then of him too, not to faint in our Tryals, that as he went so patiently and meekly to the

suffering of the losse of his Crownes and life, so we may prepare our selves Patiently and meekly to suffer the losse of him, not murmuring against God, or charging him foolishly, but seeing and acknowledging Gods hand even in this, that we may with the holy Psalmist hold our peaces and say nothing (nothing I mean in the way of murmuring and impatience) because it is his doing, but if we say any thing we may say with Eli; *It is the Lord let him doe what seemeth him good*, or with holy Job; *The Lord hath given, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord*, that however wicked men have taken upon them, without Commission to be the Judges of his Substitute, yet we may not take upon us to judge God, or call him to an account for his actions, but rather reverence both his Justice and mercy therein; his Justice upon us for our sinnes, and his mercy unto his Annointed, in taking him away, from so wicked, cruell, bloody and insulting a Nation, humbling our selves under his mighty hand, and waiting upon him in the wayes of his judgements, and patiently expecting in this also the fulfilling of that gracious promise of his unto his people. *That all things shall work together for good to those that love God*. In which joyfull promise, I heartily wish you and your worthy Husband, and your family a plentiful share, and in all that good which I hope the Lord will return yet upon the faithful, and loyall people of this land for *the sufferings of his Annointed, whereby he is so much glorified*. I shall end all with this Prayer unto God: that he will dispose us to submit as we ought unto this and all other afflictions hee shall lay upon us, and give us grace to yeeld him the fruit of them. That he will be gracious to our young Kind, the afflicted Queen, and the Royall Family, and to the oppressed and distressed people of the Land. That he will forgive our Enemies, and soften their hearts, and multiplie his blessings upon us and all our friends. So I rest,

Your much obliged servant,

January 31.  
1648.

# *The Reformation: A History*

by Diarmaid MacCulloch

reviewed by Lee Hopkins

*The Reformation: A History* by Diarmaid MacCulloch, Viking Press, 2004, 792 pp., ISBN 0-670-03296-4, \$34.95.

An alarming number of periodicals no longer publish book reviews, but of those that do, and are influential, there has been a virtual consensus of rave reviews of this history of the Reformation by Oxford's Diarmaid MacCulloch. The verdict on both sides of the Atlantic has been that this is probably the best such general history that anyone will ever write.

This praise is well-merited, in terms of scope, scholarship, felicity of readable style, and lack of bias. The approach is historical as well as sociological, and any intelligent reader who either knows little or nothing, or a great deal about the Reformation will finish this book wiser and better informed.

MacCulloch manages to take in not just Western Europe but the entire world over two centuries, venturing where few have been able to in detailed scholarship over the whole of Christianity. Missionary activities in the Orient and New World are given a fresh look beyond the clichés pigeonholing such zealous toil as the work of either saints or intrusive philistines.

The generally neglected spread of the Reformation beyond Central Europe is fully covered. An important fact is that in the early XVII Century the royal and aristocratic federation of Poland and Lithuania was the strongest power in Europe, and its multifaceted patchwork surprisingly conducive to the free worship of Roman and Orthodox Catholics, Protestants, and various putative heretical sects, as well as Judaism. This remarkably civil arrangement was destroyed by the equally remarkable Jesuit campaign in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as internal and external events that eroded the *status quo* in Poland and Lithuania.

The Counter Reformation in pragmatic terms was a dramatic success. At its unpromisingly discordant beginning at Trent, half of Europe was Protestant. But by 1690, the Jesuits, Hapsburg political gains, and Protestant squabbling had reduced the reformed areas to only one fifth of the land mass.

MacCulloch's technique is truly catholic in the basic sense of the word.

We learn that the seemingly unique self-determining congregationalism of Puritan new England existed as well in Transylvania. This was due to similarities of the two societies, isolated in forested remoteness and surrounded either by Ottoman Turks or hostile Indians, the frontier life fostering deep if idiosyncratic piety, fortitude, and a fighting spirit necessary to survival.

Few historians have given such a lucid explanation of the tensions between the core Reformation of Luther, and what is called the Second Reformation of Calvin. The mutual hatreds raging between reformers exceeded their enmity to Rome, seriously sabotaging their efforts as well as their image, in contrast to Rome's monolithic conformity.

The section on the Counter Reformation is rich in ironies. The French hierarchy generally kept aloof from attendance at Trent, just as they were to do on the occurrence of Pius IX's Vatican Council of 1870. Trent unfortunately did not represent the full spectrum of Roman Catholicism, and expected reform



atrophied in an atmosphere of Italianate self-promotion. One of the heritages of this was the long line of solely Italian Bishops of Rome to lead what was supposed to be a universal Church.

While the Inquisition quickened its pace and scope in never ending harassment and worse of forcibly converted Jews and Moslems, it kept the pressure on Southern France, which had been the site of the Cathar and other heterodoxies. This was counterproductive as it deepened localized enmity to Rome, and surfaced during the French Revolution to return the favor and indulge in persecution of Roman orthodoxy and clergy.

The lesson here is that bigotry has a long memory. Vatican interference in the political affairs of sovereign states probably never backfired so badly as the 1570 Pius V Papal Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* that freed her subjects of allegiance to Elizabeth I, and obliquely gave a nudge to assassination. The effect in England was to galvanize and unite the population. Roman Catholics in England overwhelmingly were patriots, and generally disapproved of and did not support Roman Catholic Englishmen arriving as agents, often as Jesuits, from abroad to plot against the greatest woman in English history and heritage. In fact, after the spate of books denouncing Pope Pius XII's passivity in the face of fascism and the holocaust, MacCulloch argues quite persuasively that one thing holding the Vatican back during World War II was the bitter memory of their political bungling against Elizabeth. For her, Roman plots can be viewed as an example of Nietzsche's later dictum that what does not kill you, makes you stronger.

The Counter Reformation created a very high strung religious sensibility. This was best expressed by two later sainted figures, Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross. The fervor of their worship was virtually sexual in intensity, as anyone has noted in seeing Bernini's ecstatic statue of Teresa, and the erotic tone of John's writings is obvious to anyone sensitive to nuances of language. In fact suspicions of John of the Cross cost him a period of imprisonment, his description of which gives us the phrase 'the dark night of the soul'. While it did not take long for Teresa to achieve official sainthood after her death, it was a chronologically long road for John of the Cross. But they remain the best examples of what the Council of Trent was trying to communicate to true believers. And the irony here is that while the Inquisition during their lives never let up cruel and paranoid pressure on *conversos*, or converted Jews, both Teresa and John descended from such families.

The mountain of data and related themes in this long book could easily be overwhelming, but it is so well organized, with its basic themes strategically restated in various permutations, like the structure of Bach's counterpoint, that one never loses track. MacCulloch also employs a wonderful device by which when a major point or doctrine is referred to in the text, its core explanation in terms of an explicit page reference is in parentheses. This saves the distraction of footnotes, or losing orientation by constantly consulting the index.

This whole book should be completely read and kept for reference by anyone who is serious about understanding our religious past and present. It would be impossible in any review to summarize MacCulloch's scope. So for purposes of our readership, and in recognition that he grew up in an Anglican rectory, it is best to turn to his approach to Anglicanism (and he had published definitive work on Cranmer and other major figures).

The salient point is made that the prereformation Catholic Church in England was acknowledged as the best ordered in Europe, a model of liturgical practice and ecclesiastical governance. This made the continuity of the cathedral systems, the unique majesty of English choral tradition, and the oft noted three legged stool of bishop, priest, and deacon, easy to assimilate into Elizabeth's ingenious Religious Settlement of 1559, on the heels of her accession. She learned the lessons of moderate politics the hard way, treated hard core Protestants with tact, yet with her own deep piety preserved the esthetic of the old

religious ways that had developed a distinct national idiom. Her advisors William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon were invaluable in this delicate matter, and Bacon's philosopher-statesman son Francis said admiringly that she did not seek to make windows into men's souls. What may have seemed to many cynical courtiers on the scene in 1559 as a clever, probably ephemeral balancing act, has survived "ever since", as MacCulloch remarks, "producing an interestingly subtle and reflective version of Christianity in the process".

Thus the Catholic Church in England, which started out as a separate Province, evolved along its own path. The eventual separation from Rome was heralded by a number of much earlier acts of national assertion. For example, Edward III's Statute of Provisions in 1351 kept the Pope from making English ecclesiastical appointments, and in 1353 the First Praemunire statute forbade taking pleas beyond English jurisdiction.

In the long reign of Edward IV in the next century, he confiscated monasteries governed from France.

This long process and climate of opinion it engendered did not require a great leap to the dismissal of the Pope as the Bishop of Rome in Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy. In the vigorous language of the period, the Roman prelate's job performance was not praised, but reduced further as "Bishop of that one See and Diocese and yet never able well to govern the same". Complete support was given by the staunch Roman Catholic Bishop Gardiner (later to be the mainstay of Queen Mary's government), who said the Act was merely an expression of power that had always adhered to the English throne, due to the unique history of the English Church. These three paragraphs are taken by me from *Tudor Portraits* by Michael Foss (Harper, 1979), in which the author goes on to say that the Act was a triumph of nationalism, of polity, and most of all as simply a statement of fact.

With the death of the old Queen and the arrival of the Stuart monarchy, with James I, Charles I, Archbishop Laud, and Bishop Lancelot Andrewes and company, the English Church reached its golden age and subsequent self-definition. And the exact moment of this definition could be taken as the Dutch Synod of Dordt in 1618 which condemned Arminianism.

The centrifugal diversity as the heart of Holland's religious tolerance was caused by a democratic society of literate, industrious, individualistic people who held varying strong opinions. This heterodoxy reflected a parity of opinionated equals, a balance of power. (Dutch expertise is reflected in the fact that only their country and England were sufficiently advanced to avoid mass starvation if a harvest failed.)

But underlying Dutch tolerance in mainstream national Christianity was a virtually universal belief in predestination. And after Calvin's death, the more extreme of his followers stated that Christ had died only for the elect.

Amongst this medley of judgmental certainties appeared the popular Amsterdam preacher Arminius, a major establishment Calvinist figure who was influential in both evangelical and academic circles. So he created a sensation by declaring that it is not God who decides who is damned or saved. In a strikingly modern existential mode, Arminius said that the damned become so by a willful turning away from God, an argument that is really at the heart of Dante, as well as Anglo-Catholicism. In short, free will accords us free choice.

Such a position is detrimental to the iron discipline of either Tridentine Rome or Geneva, and by implication questions the mediation of clergy. But Arminius was not trying to challenge organized religion, but simply rephrasing the message of Saint Paul's Letter to the Romans regarding the irresistibility of Grace (at a time, of course, when there was no highly organized ecclesiastical structure).

To summarize, the Dutch Calvinist establishment held a Synod at Dordt, and condemned Arminius.

Paradoxically, this served to weaken and provincialize Calvinism. It caused the Anglican bishops attending as observers to set about freeing their Church from the extreme Protestantism that lingered from the court of Edward VI. An evolutionary process then led to Anglicanism as the middle way between fundamentalist judgmentalism and papal monarchism. The 1618 Synod of Dordt might be called the birth certificate of the Moral Majority; and afterwards the church of Charles I was called Arminian by its Protestant detractors.

One of the anecdotes related by MacCulloch concerns the inquisitorial Pope Paul V berating the Venetian Ambassador for his city state's freedom of the press (which rivaled Amsterdam's). "Do you not know," said the pontiff, "that so much reading of Scripture ruins the Catholic religion?"

But as Milton stressed in *Areopagitica*, his pamphlet on free speech, it seems a reasonable argument that we are not corrupted by reading, but by ignorance.

And no better reading is current than MacCulloch's tome in the cause of humane ecumenical discourse, historical understanding, and the primacy of freedom of conscience over persuasion by fire and torture.

*[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 Rosicrucian Enlightenment*

by **Frances A. Yates**

reviewed by Lee Hopkins

*The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* by Frances A. Yates, Barnes & Noble, 1996 reprint of 1972 original, 269 pp. ISBN 0-7607-0017-2.

The Thirty years War lasted from 1618 to 1648, but in terms of consequences poisonously affects us still; and it can be argued that it was the worst event in the history of Western Civilization. It upstages the fall of Byzantium in 1453, because that awful collapse was a matter of if not now, then later. But the signature event of the XVII Century was the metastasis of all the malice created by the Reformation a century earlier.

As with tracing the origins of the world wars of the century just past, coherence requires certain oversimplification. So the Thirty years War's immediate cause may be said to have been the death in 1612 of the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II. Remarkable as an intelligent member of the Hapsburg dynasty, he had kept aloof from his nephew Philip II's violent, ineffective, and counterproductive support of the Counter Reformation's efforts to destroy Protestantism.

In such a period of passionate bigotry, Rudolf tolerated all religions within his large and fluid realm, even Judaism, and formed a buffer between fanatical Calvinism and the Inquisition. Moving his capital from Vienna to Prague, he was Plato's ideal of the philosopher king. Steeped in Renaissance humanistic learning, he surrounded himself with the best minds of his time, those seeking inquiry rather than polemic. Rudolf was visited by Bruno, Kepler, the great Englishman Dr. John Dee, and all manner of savants, including the preeminent Cabbalist Rabbi Leow of Prague.

All of this died with him in Prague, where among his many titles was King of Bohemia, which was an elective office, a very important one in the Holy Roman Empire, given Bohemia's central geography, its thriving Hussite reformed congregation, and physical separation of the seething hatreds to the north of Lutherans and Calvinists, who loathed each other as much as Roman lands to the south, which in turn returned the enmity.

James I in London was well aware of this powder keg, and hoped to defuse it. His plan was to keep his kingdom uninvolved (which he and his son Charles I accomplished to their great credit). But the second phase of his irenic speculations was a disaster: to create a balance of power by marrying his son Charles to a Spanish princess (which failed and backfired in national humiliation); and to marry his daughter Elizabeth to a European Protestant prince (which happened and triggered the Thirty Years War).

The curtain raised on this tragedy with the marriage of Elizabeth to Frederick V, Elector Palatinate of the Rhine, a key area of Calvinist activity centered around the university town of Heidelberg. The nuptials were held in the Banqueting House, still standing in Whitehall today as a museum commemorating Charles I's being judicially murdered in front of it in 1649.

The couple returned to Heidelberg, and created a Renaissance court of autumnal splendor, comparable to that which the future Charles I would craft. In the troubled times of both leaders, Frederick and later Charles created personal oases welcoming learned citizens of the international republic of the mind. The art of meaningful living flourished, a fusion of learning, art, manners, conversation, music,

inquiry, and deep piety. But these courts were ivory towers, deceptive in a feral world, as Prospero would recall in Shakespeare's *Tempest* of his utopian island, stuff such as dreams are made of. Both rulers would take these appearances for reality, that words were things, that men were rational.

The vacuum caused by Rudolf's death mandated finding a new King of Bohemia, an elective rather than hereditary office, and one which brought with it importance as one of the seven Electors who chose the Holy Roman Emperor. As Elector Palatine, Frederick already had one vote; as King of Bohemia he would have two. Theoretically then, in combination with Lutheran north German Electors, a Protestant could be chosen, and break the line of Hapsburgs who had been Emperor due to family networking.

Meanwhile in Prague, Hapsburg diplomats were negotiating with the Protestant Czech authorities, who voted with their hands and tossed the diplomats screaming out a high upper window. Amazingly, they did not splatter on the cobbles, but had their fall and dignity broken (in an age when appearances and style were everything) by landing in a dung heap, a fitting symbol of what was to happen to Central Europe.

Frederick received a festive welcome in Prague and ascended the throne, and thus was created the Rosicrucian Enlightenment, the subject of this justly famous book by Frances Yates.

The original Rosicrucian movement has no connection with the occult group that today is headquartered in San Jose, at the heart of California's Silicon Valley, in a rose garden compound housing a quite impressive museum of Egyptian artifacts, and strives to carry on since recently its putative leader allegedly put the organization's funds to his own occult uses.

The actual Rosicrucians derived from a book published in 1614 called *The Chemical Wedding* by one John Valentin Andreae in Wittenberg. It became a catalyst for international interest in alchemy. Renaissance alchemy, it must be explained, was not its lowest common denominator of greedy ignorance turning lead somehow into gold, but instead the highest of human aspirations, the attainment of understanding and transformation. Accordingly, Carl Jung used the terminology of alchemy to articulate his work on depth psychology, the collective unconscious, of archetypes that are in Jung's thinking the primordial and unchanging symbols that activate all human minds.

Rosicrucians are so called because of the designation of the *Rosenkreutz*, the Order of the Rose and Cross, as a means of identifying, in alchemical terms, those adepts united down the ages for an awareness of ultimate meaning. The high seriousness of alchemy in our past is attested by its being the motive for Bacon, the Royal Society, and Descartes. It traces itself back to the Wisdom of Solomon, the secrets of the Priory of Sion (and their military order of Templars)—and the Priory of Sion still exists. Protean connections link alchemy to Baignet's seminal book, *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, as well as the best seller, *The DaVinci Code*.

The Order of the Rose and Cross is too complex to describe in less than encyclopedic detail, which Frances Yates in this and her other books is able to communicate in a marvel of erudition and concision. The concepts involved are alive in the inner lives of many thoughtful scholars, clergy, and laymen today, appearing tangentially in the writings of such people as the late and brilliant Jesuit, Teilhard de Chardin. Involved as well is the revival of interest now in cabbalistic studies, aided by a fine and challenging new translation by Daniel Matt of the basic document, the Zohar, a XIII Century text of Jewish mysticism, derived from neoplatonic, Gnostic, and other esoteric sources. Matt is on the faculty of the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. This is the first complete version in our language, a twelve volume project of Stanford University Press, of which two have appeared.

The interest of all this to readers of these pages is its English connection. Princess Elizabeth, like her father and brother, was a person of great and subtle learning. Her appearance in Heidelberg, then Prague, was a continuity of the great influence of the anglophile neighboring state of Lutheran

Württemberg, whose Duke was a member of the Order of the Garter. He was greatly influenced by the great and mysterious Elizabethan savant and alchemist Dr. John Dee (about whom Peter Ackroyd has written a wonderful novel). Dee has been called the greatest mind of Elizabethan England, certainly a tall order. And it is another example of the greatness of Elizabeth I that she took this extraordinary man under her personal protection from charges of heresy and witchcraft. Dee spent the first part of his career in London, having great influence on Sir Walter Raleigh, Christopher Marlowe, and others who comprised a secret group called the School of Night.

The latter part of Dee's life was spent visiting the Duke of Württemberg, then King Frederick and Queen Elizabeth in Prague. He dominated the two local German universities of Tübingen and Heidelberg.

Another luminary of this circle was the polymath Comenius (Johan Komensky), who founded the Pansophist school of inquiry, a remarkable modern progressive system deriving from the alchemical macrocosm-microcosm concept. Comenius was a member of the Moravian Brotherhood, the reformed church of John Hus, who in the XV Century was given a safe conduct to attend the Council of Constance to plead his case, then seized and burned.

But Prague's great collation of esoteric scholars, influenced by Dee, was dispersed by the invasion of Bohemia and the Thirty Years War. But many fled to a hospitable welcome in England, and were instrumental in founding the Royal Society later.

The brief Rosicrucian Enlightenment in Prague was destroyed by a Hapsburg coalition. The libraries, university, and lovely palaces of Heidelberg and Württemberg were destroyed; Prague was sacked. The royal family found shelter in The Hague. Frederick did not live long, but Elizabeth did. She would have become Queen of England if Charles I had not produced children. Her daughter was later married to the Elector of Hanover, who became George I due to his wife's Stuart bloodline.

Yates argues persuasively that alchemy was the alternative belief system of premodern Europe, and is still alive and well. Those not understanding its serious side equate it with the nonsense involved, much as serious psychological study today is tainted by the many fools and charlatans in lab coats. To thus dismiss the whole study is as dimwitted as equating Christianity with television's religious hucksters.

A good history of alchemy in English literature is Stanton J. Linden's *Darke Heiroglyphicks*, published by University of Kentucky Press, which traces the subject from Chaucer through the Restoration. Chaucer's Canon Yeoman worked for an alchemist. Skelton and Jonson derided the subject. Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Cowley, and Milton used alchemical imagery to describe metanoia, or transformative Christianity. Shakespeare's *Tempest* is about a magus as mouthpiece for the bard's reconciliation with life. And Yates, from the University of London's Warburg Institute, points to alchemical attributes of the often ambiguous actions of Hamlet and King Lear.

## *King Charles's Memory*

by Frederick S. Arnold

*American Church Quarterly* volume 35, 1934  
pp 33-37

ON the afternoon of the 30th of January, 1649, Charles I of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Virginia, King and heir of an hundred kings, was led, through the halls of his palace of Whitehall, to a scaffold erected on the road outside the Banqueting House and, by a masked executioner, beheaded in the sight of all the world. The vast crowd assembled for this awful sight burst into sighs, groans, lamentations, and floods of tears. It is said that women fell into convulsions; that, in a few instances, on hearing the news, men fell dead from the shock; that even the Puritans' pulpits were bedewed with tears. English kings, notably Edward II and Richard II, had been deposed of old and privately done to death. Kings, for instance, Edmund and Edward the Martyr, had been assassinated, in the dark ages almost forgotten. Never before had such a deed as this been done, however, nor was to be done again until Louis XVI was guillotined (1793), in the French Revolution, at Paris.

The deed was the deed of a fanatical minority, possessed for the time of the power of the sword. Macaulay, in his "Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History," says: "It could not be procured without dissolving the government by military force, without establishing precedents of the most dangerous description, without creating difficulties which the next ten years were spent in removing, without pulling down institutions which it soon became necessary to reconstruct, and setting up others which almost every man was soon impatient to destroy. It was necessary to strike the House of Lords out of the constitution, to exclude members of the House of Commons by force, to make a new crime, a new tribunal, a new mode of procedure. The whole legislative and judicial systems were trampled down for the purpose of taking a single head."

Nor was this great and revolutionary crime exactly successful. Oliver Cromwell, indeed, usurped the government for the rest of his natural life as Lord Protector. He could neither be king himself nor found a dynasty. He could not carry out his own ideas, some of which, such as the reform of parliament, were excellent. He could never govern constitutionally and legally, because his own parliaments disrated his title and their own. He was compelled, by the horror and aversion of England, to maintain his seat by the army and by military and despotic power. The religious problems of the nation remained in confusion to the end of his life. At length he died on his "lucky day," September 3rd, in the year 1658. A mighty storm of thunder, lightning, wind and rain tore over the British Isles at Oliver Cromwell's passing, so that it seemed to men that his powerful soul was riding the hurricane to some dark coast.

A moment of anarchy succeeded the Protector's death, until, within two years, men hastened to restore the ancient constitution. The crown, the Houses, the laws, above all, the Church of England, returned. Everything was as it had been. The constitutional development of England was taken up where the last legal session of the Long Parliament had left it. The crime had borne no fruit. The Protectorship had been a barren interlude.

Yet that the Apostolic and Catholic Church of England came back with the crown and the Lords and the laws was probably, under God, due to King Charles the First. It was Charles who promoted Archbishop Laud successively from St. David's to Bath and Wells, to London, and to Canterbury. William Laud became King Charles's confessor at the beginning of his reign. Charles supported Archbishop Laud at

all times, in his heroic efforts to revive the policy of Bancroft (d. 1610) and Andrewes (d. 1626), to root out Calvinism, and to make the religion of England Anglo-Catholic. In his letter to Bishop Juxon from Newcastle in 1646, as given in W. H. Hutton's history (Macmillan), the king wrote: "I need not tell you the many persuasions and threatenings that hath been used to me for making me change Episcopal into Presbyterian government, which absolutely to do is so directly against my conscience that by the grace of God no misery shall ever make me." He added: "God is my witness, my chiefest end in regaining my power is to do the Church service." It was generally thought and still appears probably true that King Charles, by giving up Episcopacy after the defeat at Naseby (1645), could have won enough Presbyterian support to have saved his life. Charles and the English people knew that he died because he would not surrender the Church.

Bishop Juxon attended the king at his martyrdom, heard his last confession, and gave him his last Communion. The Bishop stood beside him at the scaffold. "There is, sir, but one stage more, which, though turbulent and troublesome, is yet a very short one," Bishop Juxon called to the king. "Consider, it will soon carry you a great way; it will carry you from earth to heaven; and there you shall find, to your great joy, the prize to which you hasten, a crown of glory."

"I go," replied the king, "from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown; where no disturbance can have place." His head was severed from his body at one blow. (Hume's *England*, Ch. 59.)

There can be no shadow of doubt that the consistent Anglo-Catholicism of King Charles I throughout his whole life, his refusal to give up Episcopacy, even when he was in the power of his enemies, and the very Catholic and consecrated bearing and manner of the king in his witness-bearing death created that high tradition of loyalty to the Church, which bore fruit at the Restoration. It was the memory of the royal martyr which made all thought of "comprehension" or of any surrender of Anglican principles inconceivable after 1660. The Prayer Book of 1662 was an improvement on the Book of 1559 or 1604. The Clarendon-code, as the laws on Church-matters were called, enforced a reasonably satisfactory Anglicanism throughout England, and three Anglo-Catholics, Juxon, Sheldon, and Bancroft, were elevated in succession to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Knowing the irreligious character of Charles II and the weak Churchmanship of the upper classes previous to 1640, it seems certain that it was the life, the faith, and the martyrdom of King Charles I that created the great tradition of High Anglicanism and identified law and loyalty with the Church and the sacraments. Under God, we owe our Church to the royal martyr.

This being so, it must appear most ungrateful in all Churchmen of the English rite, if we do not pay him reverence due and seek his intercessions for us in the courts of heaven. But for Charles I, you and I would today have practically no choice between Protestantism and Rome. But for Charles I, the English Church today would be scarcely so much as the non-Episcopal Lutheran Church in Germany and there could be no Anglican communion. But for Charles I, under God, the Church would not have been restored intact at the Restoration.

It is because this is so obviously true, that the efforts have been made by Puritans and misbelievers to blacken the memory of the royal martyr. The most simple device, yet one of influence among simple people, has been to confuse the two kings named Charles in unlearned minds, for indeed the vices and immoralities of the son, Charles II, were flagrant enough. Mere cursory reference to Macaulay, Green, or any respectable author, not to mention such a favorable historian as Hume, will instruct the reader that Charles I was chaste, temperate, kind, a devoted husband and father. He was a scrupulous observer of the offices of the English Rite. He went to his private chapel at six in the morning. He promoted Archbishop Laud and other great Churchmen of the school of Bancroft and Andrewes. Laud was his confessor. Thus, that Charles I was pure, temperate, devout, and orthodox is undisputed historical fact.



Charles I, was, incidentally, an exquisite judge of art and painting and wrote better than any modern English king. The *Eikon Basilike*, published as the king's work, has been attributed to Doctor John Gauden, one of Charles I's chaplains. Gauden made this claim very privately, after the Restoration, to gain favor with the court. He was in fact made a bishop. He may have had much to do with editing and giving the book final shape. It is, however, plainly the mind of the king, whose writings it appears to resemble more than the writings of Gauden. The king may have entrusted Gauden with the duty of giving the work final shape. On the whole, *Eikon Basilike* is a kind of argument not only for kingship, but for Anglo-Catholicism. Thus the attack on the personal character of Charles I is historically impossible, though the enemies of truth have done something among the ignorant, by confusing the royal martyr with his dissolute son of the same name. Even the king's friends have, however, admitted that he was not a politician or a statesman adequate to the times in which he lived. His manner was reserved and distant, rather than conciliatory. He seems to have had the fault of a quick temper. He inherited from his father, James I, the absurd notion of kingcraft, as something tortuous and involved in plot and subterfuge.

Yet in considering the politics of Charles I it must be remembered that the theory of the constitution was still unfixed. In the Middle Ages, there was no such thing, generally speaking, as ownership of land. Land was a fief of the crown. It was burdened with elaborate feudal dues and obligations. It was in the attempt to enforce these ancient rights of the crown, especially ship-money, that Charles I raised against him all the rich men of the kingdom.

Our modern system of plutocracy, or the rule of wealth, and of the uncontrolled monopoly of land and of natural resources was represented by Oliver Cromwell and the Puritans. The future lay with them. Though, thanks to Charles I, they were not able to destroy the Church of England, they were able to enclose the commons and to rob the lands of the poor; to abolish the feudal dues, on which Charles I had insisted, without substituting a land-tax in their place; and to transform the merry England of the Catholic and feudal ages into the plutocratic England of modern times; the England of concentrated wealth, land-monopoly, and proletarian misery. We see economic history today with different eyes than those of Macaulay and Green. Perhaps we shall not side with the politics of the Stuarts. At least, we may cease to think the changes wrought by Cromwell and the land-grabbing rich men of the seventeenth century as beneficent in the economic sphere.

It may be that when Charles I was opposing the English landlords, he was simply making a last, unsuccessful effort to preserve the mediaeval system. Under those ancient tenures, the right to the use of the earth was shared, as it has not been since Cromwell's time, by all the people of England. The great estates bore all the burdens of government and society. Land monopoly was impossible in the Catholic ages. It was the king's effort to preserve the incidence of the ancient tenures that first stirred the gentry against him, but England has hardly been a happier country because of the victory of the landlords.

Charles I failed to restore feudalism. The spirit of the age was against him. His unsuccessful efforts have united, to defame him, all the advocates of landlordism, from Cromwell's time to our own. If ever the issue is raised again it must be in a different form. The politics of the Stuarts is a thing of merely historic interest. Yet it is far from certain that the land-system which became triumphant after Cromwell's day was any better than the feudal system for which the king contended.

Be that as it may, there is no room to doubt, but that, by his Catholic life and his martyr's death, Charles I saved Anglicanism from apostasy and misbelief. His great memory, his high tradition brought back the Church, the bishops, the Prayer Book, and the faith. By his death, under God, our spiritual victory was won. So that we do well to keep the 30th January, *in memoriam sancti Caroli, regis et martyris*, and to bid his intercessions for the Church for which he died.

[The article by Frederick S. Arnold is but one of a number of items relating to the Royal Martyr to be found at the Project Canterbury website. Access <http://justus.anglican.org>, select "Project Canterbury" and then indicate "K. Charles the Martyr" under "By Topic". Our thanks to Richard J. Mammanna, Jr., and the many volunteers who transcribe materials making them available at this location. Donations in support of Project Canterbury may be sent to Mr. Mammanna at 509 West 121<sup>st</sup> Street, Apt. 811, New York NY 10027.]

### ***Martyr to What.***

Here's an American Who Disapproves of King Charles the First.

[*Litchfield (CT) Enquirer*, Thursday 11 March 1897, p. 1, col. 6]

To the Editor of the Courant: —

A picture of King Charles the First, "Charles the Martyr," was unveiled with elaborate ceremonies, in an Episcopal church in Philadelphia a few days ago. As a rule the functions of the ritualists [*sic*] are looked on by the public entirely from a spectacular standpoint, but the relations of Charles Stuart to all that we hold sacred and vital in free government and human elevation were so hostile that we are tempted to ask, what next? Will it be a statue to Archbishop Laud, or to Stafford?

It might be said that those who sympathized in this absurd ceremony—if the attempt to canonize a thoroughly bad man is not something more than absurd—represent but a small fraction of the Episcopal communion, but some clergymen whom the public has been accustomed to regard as men entitled to confidence and respect participated either directly or by letter. The cautious and conservative "Churchman," a paper credited with great sagacity in knowing the drift of general opinion and following its leadings, gave a column [*sic*] account of the performance, with no word of reprobation. All this gives rise to the suspicion that the ritualistic party is gradually acquiring control of the entire body. Worse than this the ceremony itself lends some color to the opinion that "the body of ritualists are profoundly hostile to the underlying principles of American liberty both civil and religious." For King Charles stands for nothing but absolutism, unlimited authority in the sovereign based on divine right to rule, a principle in itself wrong and in its practical working productive of nothing but misery to the human race.

As an individual, Charles is as little worthy of honor as he is as a representative of an erroneous and discredited principle. There were some heroic men among the early Stuarts, but after the marriage of James V. with a daughter of the false and cruel house of Guise the blood was fatally tainted. Mary Queen of Scots, James I of England, Charles I and his sons, Charles II and James II were each and all utterly untrustworthy. The truth was not in them. All were possessed with a selfish and narrow idea of their dignities as sovereigns, and probably all except Charles II would have welcomed martyrdom in vindication of their ideas of prerogative. There are martyrs to error as well as martyrs to truth, but the difference between error and truth remains unchanged and those who honor the martyrs to error dishonour the truth.

Here in New England, where the ancestors of so many of our citizens came to avoid the oppression of Charles I and his creatures, the falsification of history involved in the laudation of the faithless king seems almost insulting to the good sense of the American people. And New England churchmen say more fervently than ever, "Oh, for a day Philips Brooks!"

--A CONNECTICUT CHURCHMAN.

[Thanks to Society member Eva Murphy of the Church of the Advent, Boston, who spotted this in her researches.]

## SKCM News — December, 2004

### *British Headquarters*

### *American Region*

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

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  
Boca Raton FL 33433-2487  
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	<b>Decollation of King Charles the Martyr</b> - 2005, 356 <sup>th</sup> 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 HIGH MASS OF SAINT CHARLES**

**12 noon, Saturday 29 January 2005**  
**Church of the Resurrection, New York City**  
**The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, *SSC, Rector***

**The Rev'd David Peters,**  
**Vicar of Holy Trinity, Reading, Berks., *Preaching***

**Franz von Biber – *Missa Brevis in E Minor***  
**Choir of the Church of the Resurrection**

**Followed by LUNCHEON & ANNUAL MEETING**

Luncheon reservations are mandatory:  
Send check (\$20 per person) marked "SKCM Luncheon" to:  
Resurrection Parish Office, *Attn.* SKCM Luncheon, 119 E. 74<sup>th</sup> St., New York NY 10021  
**by 15 January.**