

***SKCM News***

***June, 2005***

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

## Table of Contents

American Representative's Column	1
§ 29 January 2005 Annual Mass & Meeting at the Church of the Resurrection, New York City	
§ Upcoming Annual Masses & Meetings:	
28 January 2006 at the Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston, SC	
27 January 2007 at S. Clement's Church, Philadelphia, PA	
§ Celebrations of Saint Charles's Day, 2005 § Mayesville Chapel Dedication and Charleston Chapter Activities § London and other U.K. Celebrations	
§ New York Chapter News § Articles in this Issue § Dues Increase to \$12	
Sermon Preached at the XXII Annual Mass, 29 January 2005 – Church of the Resurrection, New York City – the Rev'd David Peters	5
A Sermon Preached on the Feast of King Charles the Martyr, 30 January 2005 – Saint Stephen's Church, Providence, RI – the Rev'd John Alexander	8
A Sermon Preached at the Church of Saint Charles the Martyr, Fort Morgan, Colorado on its Patronal Feast, 1 February 1998 – the Rev'd John B. Pahls, Jr.	12
<i>The Royal Martyr. Or, A Poem on the Martyrdom of King Charles I (1715)</i>	15
The Diary of John Evelyn, <i>edited by Guy de Bedoyere</i> – reviewed by Lee Hopkins	17
<i>A History of Britain, Volume Two, The Wars of the British Isles 1603-1776,</i> by Simon Schama – reviewed by Lee Hopkins	20
<i>Lord Minimus: The Extraordinary Life of Britain's Smallest Man,</i> by Nick Page – reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne	24
<i>Price List / Order Form for S.K.C.M. Goods</i>	<i>insert</i>

**2005 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Resurrection, New York City** was held on Saturday 29 January 2005 at noon. The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, Rector, was the celebrant of the Solemn High Mass. Father Trent Fraser traveled from Michigan to attend and served as Sub-deacon. Preaching at the Mass was the Rev'd David Peters, Vicar of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Reading, Berkshire, England. Father Peters's sermon is reprinted elsewhere in this issue of *SKCM News*. Music was provided by the choir of the Church of the Resurrection directed by Mr. David Enslow. The Mass setting was Heinrich Ignaz Franz von Biber's *Missa Brevis* in E minor. It was of note that last year was the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of von Biber's death. He was ennobled by Leopold I and wrote for the Cathedral at Salzburg. Several of the traditional Society hymns were vigorously sung ("Royal Charles, Who Chose to Die", Dix; "At Candlemas in white arrayed", Repton; "Lord, let the strain arise", Diademata; "With thankful hearts thy glory", Woodbird). About 125 members and supporters attended the Mass, which had been advertised in *The New York Times*. The Canon used was that of the 1637 Scottish Prayer Book promulgated by King Charles and Archbishop Laud in Scotland. The music and liturgy were reverent and did honor to the Martyr King. Flowers at the high altar and at the shrine of the Sacred Heart (a new shrine which serves as the Guild of All Souls Chantry location in this country) were in memory of departed members and officers of the Society. During 2004, long time Society members Dorothy Snow and Everett Courtland Martin died. *May they rest in peace.*

This, the twenty-second annual Mass & Meeting, was the first held at the Church of the Resurrection. Father Ralph Walker traveled all the way from Denver to be at the annual Mass.

Afterwards, about 75 adjourned to the Parish Hall for the Luncheon and Annual Meeting of the Society. Dr. Mark Wuonola, the American Representative, thanked Canon Swain, Father Peters, the servers and ushers, and the patrons and donors who supported the music. Dr. Wuonola also took the opportunity to thank Membership Secretary Bill Gardner for his work. Thanks were extended to the caterers and the crew who served the luncheon. In addition, Dr. Wuonola thanked the staff of the parish office who prepared the programme and responded to a number of inquiries.

Dr. Bernard Brennan's work with the New York Chapter over a number of years was recognized. The request was again made for assistance to continue to build on the solid foundation created by Dr. Brennan's good work. It was also mentioned that another stalwart of the Society in New York, the Rev'd Dr. Charles E. Whipple, was unable to attend today; members were asked to keep Father Whipple and Dr. Brennan in their prayers.

Patrons of the Annual Mass:

Charles F. Barenthaler  
 Prof. Thomas E. Bird  
 The Ven. Shawn W. Denney,  
 Archdeacon of Springfield  
 Alan R. Hoffman  
 The Rev'd Dr. Joseph W. Lund  
 Paul W. McKee

The Rt. Rev'd James W. Montgomery  
 The Rev'd Robert H. Pursel, Th.D.  
 The Rev'd Ralph T. Walker, D.D.  
 Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D.

Donors:

Will Sears Bricker  
 David B. J. Chase, Ph.D.

William H. Franklin  
Hugh G. Hart  
Charles Owen Johnson  
Tracy & Sarah Payne  
Warren Reznicek  
Paul Robertson  
A. Weldon Walker III

The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, SSC

Don M. Davis  
Dr. James C. Kelly  
Daniel J. F. Lula  
Samuel A. Manka  
The Rev'd Dr. & Mrs. Wm. H. Swatos, Jr.  
Douglas Guy Hudleston Channon  
Howard S. Greene Sr.

**2006 Annual Mass & Meeting – Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston, SC** will be held on Saturday 28 January 2006. Details will be advertised in the late Fall and will appear in the December, 2005, *SKCM News*. 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 an active, rapidly growing chapter of the Society. Our distinguished preacher will be Society member the Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, SSC, Bishop of Fort Worth.

**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. This will be the fourth time the Society has met at S. Clement's, which has a large, active S.K.C.M. chapter under the leadership of Will Bricker. We met at S. Clement's in 1986, in 1994 (the hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Society), and in 1999 (the 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Decollation of Saint Charles).

### **From Your American Representative**

In *December* issues of *SKCM News*, we strive to include lists of parishes all around the country celebrating Saint Charles's Day, including the time of each such celebration. Notices of *upcoming* celebrations are earnestly solicited. The press time for the December issue is always 15 October. Please note this reminder so we have a complete list of commemorations to publish in the *December* issue this year..

We will, of course, continue to report in each *June* issue of *SKCM News* details of all celebrations on which we receive information. It would be edifying to all members if more such reports were submitted. In future, 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.

## Celebrations of Saint Charles's Day, 2005

*The Great Plains Chapter* observance took place on Saturday 29 January 2005 at Saint Barnabas Church, Omaha, Nebraska. About 35 people attended the service. A Solemn High Mass was celebrated with the Office of Sung Morning Prayer serving as the Liturgy of the Word. The Rev'd Robert Scheiblhofer, Rector of Saint Barnabas and a Society member, celebrated. Father Nicholas Taylor of Saint Aidan's Anglican Cathedral in Des Moines was the preacher. His sermon was so moving that he was asked to repeat it at Saint Barnabas's Sunday Mass the following day. The canticles and service music were led by the choir of Saint Barnabas Church. Hymns included "The Praise of Charles, Our Martyr King" (Spire), "At Candlemas in White Arrayed" (Repton), "Lord, Let the Strain Arise" (Diademata); "Gathered Within this Holy Place" (Caithness), and "With Thankful Hearts Thy Glory" (Llanfyllin).

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

For information on the Great Plains Chapter, call Nick Behrens at (402)455-4492 (or check [www.saintbarnabas.net](http://www.saintbarnabas.net)); he also edits the American Member Newsletter of The Monarchist League. For information on The Monarchist League, write BM 'Monarchist', London WC1N 3XX U.K.

At the *Church of the Advent, Boston*, there was a Mass at 6 p.m. on Monday 31 January 2005 followed by a reception in the Parish Hall. About two dozen were in attendance. The curate of the Church of the Advent, Father Benjamin King, preached at the Mass. At the reception, attended by over a dozen, Mrs. B. Hughes Morris, historian of the Church of the Advent, gave one of her much-admired lectures illustrated with slides. This lecture was entitled "Boston Beans and 'P's'" and addressed some familiar and some unfamiliar locales and connections in Boston, enlivened by a number of eccentricities. Mrs. Morris was introduced by the Rev'd Allan B. Warren III, Rector of the Church of the Advent.

At *S. Clement's, Philadelphia*, the Sunday High Mass on 30 January was to commemorate Saint Charles Stuart, K.M. Preacher for the occasion was the Rev'd David Peters, who had preached at the Society's Annual Mass in New York just the day before. Thanks to Canon W. Gordon Reid, Rector, Will Bricker, Chapter Secretary, and the many members in S. Clement's chapter for sponsoring a special commemoration each year. Flowers were given and placed at the shrine in honour of Saint Charles and in memory of deceased members of the Society.

Society member Father Martin Yost reports a *Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Mass & Meeting* held at *Saint John's, Dallas*, on Saturday 5 February 2005. A very handsome broadside was produced to advertise the event. The preacher was the Rev'd William Warnky, Priest-in-Charge of the Church of the Good Samaritan, Dallas. The celebrant was Father Yost. Some interesting tunes were chosen for some of the usual Society hymns, including "With Thankful Hearts Thy Glory" (Valet will ich dir geben) and "Royal Charles Who Chose to Die" (Toplady). Following the Mass was a luncheon with an address by Dr. Luis Martin, Kahn Professor *Emeritus* of History at Southern Methodist University. Thanks to Father Yost and Saint John's Church for making this witness possible.

***S. Stephen's Church, Providence, RI***, sponsored a New England commemoration of King Charles the Martyr on Sunday 30 January 2005. The Rector, Father John D. Alexander, preached at Solemn Evensong of King Charles, followed by Procession and Benediction at 5:30 p.m. There were about 80 at the service, which was followed by an elegant reception in the parish hall. Father's Alexander's sermon for the occasion appears elsewhere herein.

Society member Canon Sanford Raymond Sears reports from ***Saint Bartholomew's Anglican Catholic Church*** that the Sunday Mass on 30 January 2005 was of Saint Charles.

***Chapel Dedicated in Mayesville and Charleston Chapter Activities.*** The Charles Towne, Carolina chapter of the Society has continued with its many activities. The highlight of these was the 9 March 2005 dedication of the Chapel of Saint Charles, King & Martyr, Mayesville. There were over 80 in attendance at the Pontifical High Mass; the chapel seats 112. Guests arrived from Georgia and North Carolina as well as South Carolina. Bishop Ackerman was present to bless the chapel, a project of Mr. Richard Hines of the Carolina Chapter. A proclamation from the American Representative was read by Mr. Hines, commending him and the chapter "for [their] excellent work for the Cause of the Royal Martyr in the Carolinas and beyond. Furthermore, I commend the Hineses for the generosity making possible the Chapel of Saint Charles, King & Martyr, being consecrated today by the Patron of the American Region, Bishop Keith Ackerman. The chapel provides a tangible, beautiful, and powerful witness to the intercession of the Martyr King at the Throne of Grace."

The chapter's other activities have included a monthly meeting, often an early Mass at the Church of the Holy Communion followed by breakfast. There was an Annual Mass & Reception at the Church of the Holy Communion. In addition, a noon Eucharist was celebrated according to the 1928 Prayer Book rite at the Cathedral of Saints Luke & Paul.

Details of the ***London Celebration*** and other U.K. celebrations will appear in the Summer, 2005, issue of *Church and King* which we had hoped to include with this mailing. It continues to be difficult to coordinate the publication times of *Church and King* and *SKCM News*. Thus, you are receiving the Christmas, 2004, issue of *Church and King* with this issue of *SKCM News*.

***The New York Chapter*** has commemorated the Canonisation of Saint Charles in April each year at Saint Paul's, Brooklyn, and a group of several dozen have generally gathered for lunch and fellowship. For nearly ten years, this has been organized by Dr. Bernard Brennan, who is no longer able to continue the work. As a result there was no celebration in April, 2005.

There is good news, however. The Rev'd Berry Parsons has agreed to take on Dr. Brennan's work. He is at Saint John's, Brooklyn, and will be assisted by Mr. Walter Morton. New York area members are advised to contact Father Parsons at St. John's Church, 9818 Fort Hamilton Parkway, Brooklyn NY 11209.

*Articles in this issue* include book reviews by our regular contributors Lee Hopkins and Sarah Gilmer Payne. A 1715 poem about the Royal Martyrdom transcribed by Richard Mammana also appears.

Of course, we are also publishing Father Peters's sermon from the 2005 Annual Mass at the Church of the Resurrection, New York City, and Father Alexander's sermon from the 30 January 2005 Service of Evensong & Benediction at S. Stephen's, Providence. The latter serves as a good introduction to the Cause of the Royal Martyr—and was very appropriate as there were many visitors in attendance. In addition, we are pleased to publish a 1998 sermon preached at Saint Charles, King & Martyr, Fort Collins, Colorado, by Society Member Father John B. Pahls.

***Dues Increase.*** Note that annual dues will increase to \$12 effective with assessment of 2006 dues.

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

**Sermon Preached by  
the Rev'd David Peters**

at the XXII Annual Mass of the American Branch of  
The Society of King Charles the Martyr

Church of the Resurrection, New York City

29 January 2005

May I begin by thanking Dr Wuonola, Canon Swain and the Society for your invitation to me to preach this afternoon. I count it a great joy and a great honour and I am very pleased to be able to accept and be here today. I bring you of course all the good wishes of the Society of King Charles the Martyr as together we celebrate the life and martyrdom of our Royal Patron.

I will begin with a quotation; not from the Bible (although some of his followers get close to regarding his writings and speeches as quasi-sacred) but from the Diaries of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Viscount Stansgate, aka Tony Benn. In case you don't know of Tony Benn, he is an elderly English politician of unashamedly socialist credentials who has achieved a sort of cult status in England after years of being regarded as a 'loony leftie'. The quotation comes from an entry written on December 26<sup>th</sup> 1976 as follows:

'Caroline [Benn's wife] gave each of us a copy of the Communist Manifesto in our stockings, published in English in Russia, and she gave Joshua a book called Marx for Beginners and gave Hilary, Isaac Deutscher's three-volume biography of Trotsky. I read the Communist Manifesto yesterday, never

having read it before, and I found that, without having read any Communist text, I had come to Marx's view.'

And so we listen to that with a kind of wry grin on our faces, almost a patronising smirk. 'Silly old Wedgwood-Benn', we think, 'what sort of world does he live in; what a lost cause'. It's not surprising. In the world in which we live we have seen the total discreditment of Communism and its rejection by those people who were forced to live under that particular system. When Benn wrote those words however, it was rather different. The West, Britain and the US in particular, were in the midst of the Cold War with Britain in particular rocking on the precipice of economic ruin. Now we can allow ourselves that smile and it's probably for this reason that Benn is now so well loved in Britain; the realisation that he no longer poses a danger.

Yet we should not be too sanguine about this. A lot of what Benn fought for all his political life has come to pass in some degree or other. Benn led the campaign to enable hereditary peers such as himself to renounce their titles and not be forced to sit in the House of Lords. In addition he led the way in having hereditary peers removed from that House altogether. A vehement opponent of fox-hunting. A vehement opponent of colonialism and capital punishment. A passionate advocate of the National Health Service and legalised abortion. Thus it would be foolish to assume that everything he stood for has been merely a lost cause, a waste of time and effort.

I use Tony Benn as an example because we, as members and supporters of the Society of King Charles the Martyr, are in great danger of regarding the cause that we hold, namely the celebration and commemoration of Charles Stuart as a martyr for the Church of God and for its branch, the Anglican Church, as a lost cause.

I regret to say I have seen this year after year at the Annual Commemoration at the Banqueting House in Whitehall. For as long as I have attended, most of the sermons preached at that event have been defeatist in tone and content concerning both our Royal Patron and his cause, and the present-day situation of the Anglican Church. One memorable sermon even had as its text as quotation from a 'Biggles' book. The quote was 'Ginger, things are rotten bad!'

Why should this be? In some ways the answer is obvious. For many who support the cause of King Charles, their secular politics and their ecclesiology is rigidly conservative. Thus in an age of shifting politics and social life and, in particular, the shifting theologies and politics of the Anglican Church, the figure of King Charles is very comforting with his clear and unambiguous solidity of faith and politics. It is not for nothing that so much of the iconography of the Caroline age concerning Charles depicts the Ship of State or the Ship of the Church being rocked to and fro by opposing factions and hurricanes but standing firm against them. It is noticeable at the Annual Commemoration how many of the congregation are both former Anglicans as well as cradle Roman Catholics. Charles can unite both traditionalist Anglican and traditionalist Roman alike. Alas! he can also be used as a figure around which people have licence to moan and complain about the Church and the World. It is as though they glory in the so-called lost cause of Charles and identify him as the personification of the so-called lost cause that is Anglicanism.

Not only that but monarchy is no longer fashionable. We live in an age where monarchies are seen as anachronisms. We also live in an age when the regal figure of Christ ruling the world from the Cross and the Altar, the majestic Christ of John's Gospel, that that Christ is no longer seen as the 'projection' of Christ the Church wants to promote. The Church, it seems, no longer wants Christ the King. Rather the Church



wants Christ the Social Worker. Thus the person of King Charles, in the eyes of many, is seen as an impossible and embarrassing figure to support and to give thanks for in the Church. Rather he should be banished to the furthest corner of the Church and be kept out of sight, rather in the way that the statue of King Charles in the Shrine Church at Walsingham has been banished to its furthest and most remote corner, up a flight of stairs and next to the Orthodox chapel! In a time when the Church is ruled by Roundheads, it is no surprise that we Cavaliers should be ridiculed and disheartened.

Yet in our hearts we know that it is our job and our duty to show that the cause of the Royal Martyr is not, after all, a lost cause; that he, and the Church for which he gave up his throne and his life, is alive and active and vital for the well being of the Christian faith in the world.

I think we must approach this task by admitting to ourselves that whilst Charles was a martyr to the faith (and martyrs, not surprisingly after 9/11, are hardly popular or understood by the world at large), he was a martyr in order that the faith might survive. Martyrs such as Charles do not go to the scaffold in order that the faith might die. They die, following the example of Christ, in order that the faith might live and remain active.

It is one of the marvellous paradoxes that make up the Faith that so much Christian symbolism is related to death and yet out of that death comes life. So it must be with the example and martyrdom of Charles. When on the January day he gave up his life he did not do so in order for us, three and hundred and fifty years later to moan and complain and glory in things being rotten bad. Rather he died that we might have life as Catholic Christians in the Anglican Church. We must stop our continual bickerings and our constant battles over so many issues.

In particular we must stop glorying in decline. All too often Catholics in the Church over the last thirty years have glorified in woe. They pretend not to of course. They pretend that they are really standing up for a constant unchanging truth and that everybody else is trimming all around them. The reality is different. Too many Anglican Catholics actually enjoy being part of a declining sect as it allows the fun of pretending to be martyrs whilst not actually having to go through any pain at all. I know that is not true in every case. I thank God for the legal protections which we English clergy are afforded in comparison to some of the acts carried out against priests in ECUSA. However, it is the case that too many Anglican Catholics enjoy the decline which we have gone through and do nothing, beyond a mean-spirited and mulish resistance, to try to arrest that decline.

To be sure it doesn't mean we must become rationalists or Vicar of Bray characters constantly changing our views and opinions depending on the prevailing winds. That would certainly not be following in the example of Christ or of Charles with their unchanging and unyielding commitment to the truth. It does mean we have to be prepared to engage with those for whom we might most profoundly disagree and show them, by our integrity and perseverance, that the Catholic faith we follow and the liturgy by which it is expressed and played out is a living faith and a faith for which men and women have followed and continue to follow through the centuries.

We must also try to give thanks for the profound benefits that the reign of Charles brought to the English Church and which Anglicans the world over can try both to offer to others and to enjoy ourselves. The Church before Charles and the Puritan Church of the Commonwealth was a dour affair of metrical psalms and respectability. I hesitate to criticise respectability whilst here on the Upper East Side but I think you know what I mean. King Charles, in conjunction with, I am proud to say, my parish's most famous son,

Archbishop Laud, brought back to the church the great glory and fun that the Catholic faith can provide through the sacraments. We need to rediscover that sense of *joie de vivre* in our faith, an infectious enjoyment and love for what we do and whom we celebrate. We celebrate today, not with some poky little service of dullness and oppression, but with wonderful music, spectacular theatre, colour and light. Afterwards we celebrate with food and drink and, I hope, laughter. A visiting priest said to me after my church's Feast of Tithes last year 'You really do have all the toys here in your box don't you?' to which I replied 'Yes Father, and we enjoy playing with them at every opportunity.'

That doesn't mean we are flippant with the externals of our faith or that we compromise the Gospel and the Mass by simply playing at Church. But it does mean that we follow Christ not with thin lips and bent backs but with devotion, prayer and infectious joy.

King Charles embraced all that just as he embraced the full complexities of the Catholic faith. He did it without compromise and without a sense of meaninglessness. He also embraced it up until death in the hope that through his death others might recall his last word and 'Remember'.

It is now up to us to remember that the faith we follow, faith in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord, is not a dead faith or a lost cause but a living faith and a faith we must proclaim to those who have not yet heard it and those to whom we offer so much. We do this with the help and assistance of Charles our royal patron who, along with our blessed lady Mary and the whole Communion of Saints, prays for us to the Father. We do this by devoting ourselves ever closer to the Sacrament of the Altar where we give thanks and literally receive within us the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the outward forms of bread and wine.

We do this by placing ourselves at the service of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost and proclaiming his love and redemption of the world. In this way we do not simply 'Remember!' We remember and we live.

## **Sermon Preached at Evensong and Benediction**

S. Stephen's Church, Providence, Rhode Island  
30 January 2005

the Rev'd John D. Alexander

Our commemoration this evening constitutes part of a growing international movement to restore Charles Stuart to his rightful place in Anglican liturgical and devotional life. Although the services commemorating the martyrdom of King Charles on 30 January were dropped from the English *Book of Common Prayer* in 1859, the Church of England has once again added Charles to its liturgical calendar in its *Alternative Service Book* of 1980 and again in the volume entitled *Common Worship* in 2000. And his feast day has similarly entered the calendars of other Anglican Churches throughout the world.

J. Robert Wright, Professor of Church History at the General Theological Seminary in New York, writes: “The commemoration of King Charles the Martyr is on the rise ... in liturgical calendars, in special services, in shrines and memorials, and in other ways ... There is a growing realization that he is part of who we are as Anglicans ...” (Wright, 2002). Likewise, many individuals and groups – including the Society of King Charles the Martyr – continue to work for the addition of his name to the official calendar of the Episcopal Church.

For some, though, the commemoration of Charles is problematic. When I first studied English history in junior high school, my textbooks did not present Charles as a sympathetic figure. Following the Whig historians of the early XIX Century, such as Lord Macaulay, the authors of many such textbooks have depicted Charles as a despot and tyrant, and his opponents in the English Civil War as the advance guard of liberty and democracy, whose principles – though ahead of their time – eventually triumphed in the Glorious Revolution of 1689 and the American Revolution of 1776.

There is perhaps just a grain of truth in that interpretation. In commemorating Charles, we are neither claiming that he was a particularly good king, nor are we endorsing his political principles. And, lest there be any doubt, this celebration is *not* a cover for crypto-monarchism!

Charles adhered to the divine right of kings, a theory that already was rapidly becoming anachronistic in XVII Century England. Those who had to deal with Charles found him by turns intransigent, inconsistent, hesitant, indecisive, and equivocal. During his reign, religious dissidents were subject to cruel and barbaric penalties, such as having their ears cut off, which only fanned the flames of Puritan resistance and opposition. It’s possible – not certain but possible – that a more politically adept monarch, with greater gifts for negotiation, compromise, and toleration, could have avoided civil war and kept both his throne and his head.

Why, then, do we commemorate Charles as a saint? The answer is found in his deep Christian faith and commitment to the Church, both in life and in death. Unlike his father James I and his son Charles II, Charles was in his private life a man of exemplary moral character, a faithful husband, and a devoted father.

Before the Civil War, Charles strove to defend and build up the Church of England. Together with his Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, he insisted that worship be conducted according to the *Book of Common Prayer*, decently and in order, in a spirit of reverence and awe. During his reign, a renewal of Anglican theology and spirituality took place under the auspices of the Caroline Divines: a generation of extraordinarily gifted churchmen comprising such figures as Jeremy Taylor, George Herbert, and Nicholas Ferrar. Churches were rearranged to give central place to the altar, thus emphasizing the Sacraments and the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The revived use of candles, vestments, and church music served to cultivate the beauty of holiness. All this was hateful to the Puritans; but here at S. Stephen’s we are undoubtedly the beneficiaries of the legacy of High Anglican tradition that Charles bequeathed to the Church.

Even more, though, we account Charles a martyr for his faithful witness unto death. After the defeat of the Royalist forces at the Battle of Naseby in 1645, Charles became a prisoner first of the Scots, and then of Parliament. During his captivity, he engaged in a series of protracted negotiations with the representatives of a Parliament that was eager to reach an accommodation that would allow him to return as king with strictly limited powers in a constitutional monarchy.

The problem was that this Parliament was dominated by Presbyterians, who kept insisting that Charles renounce episcopacy, convert to Presbyterianism, and accept the abolition of bishops in the Church of England (Gregg, 1981: 409; Carlton, 1995: 306-307). Had he agreed to these demands, Charles conceivably could have regained his throne as early as 1646 or 1647. But his conscience would not let him compromise on this issue. On the basis of his reading of Scripture and Church history, Charles firmly believed that bishops in apostolic succession are essential to the existence of a true Church; so he persisted in refusing to consent to the abolition of episcopacy. For this reason, those who contend for the apostolic ministry in our own day find in Charles a powerful model, example, patron, and intercessor.

With episcopacy as the sticking point, Charles's negotiations with Parliament dragged on fruitlessly. Then, in 1648, after putting down the Royalist uprising known as the Second English Civil War, the Puritan army under Oliver Cromwell decided that enough was enough, and took control of Parliament in the *coup d'état* known as Pride's Purge. The army then demanded Charles' trial and execution, thus sealing his fate.

At his trial Charles refused to recognize the authority of the court or enter a plea, and was summarily sentenced to death. And so, on 30 January 1649, as the Rump Parliament passed a law abolishing the monarchy, Charles went to the scaffold at Whitehall. After forgiving his executioners, his last words to his chaplain, Bishop Juxon, were: "I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible Crown, where no disturbance can be, no disturbance in the world." He then added, "Remember!"

Lying on the block, Charles spent a final moment in prayer, and then stretched out his arms to give the headsman the pre-arranged signal to strike. A great groan went up from the crowd as the axe fell and the executioner held aloft the severed head in silence.

The killing sent a wave of revulsion and unease throughout the land, even among many of the king's former opponents. Handkerchiefs dipped in the king's blood were soon attested as having wrought miraculous healings. A short book with the Greek title *Eikon Basilike*, purporting to contain the king's prayers and meditations during his captivity, became a bestseller and went through numerous printings in several languages despite the furious efforts of Cromwell's government to suppress it.

The twelve years of Puritan rule that followed the king's death were a dark and gloomy time. Use of the *Book of Common Prayer* was forbidden. The Church's calendar of feasts and fasts, of saints and holy days, was suppressed even to the point of outlawing the celebration of Christmas and Easter. Episcopacy was abolished and all the bishops forced into exile or early retirement. Of the estimated ten thousand clergy of the Church of England, approximately three thousand were turned out of their livings for refusing to assent to the Puritan reforms. When we're tempted to think that things are going badly in the Church today, we need only remember England in the 1650s to put our present problems into perspective.

The amazing thing is that despite everything, the practice of Anglicanism flourished, both underground and in exile. In homes, private chapels, and even some parish churches, clandestine use of the *Book of Common Prayer* continued. Clergy committed the Prayer Book services to memory, so that they could recite them publicly with the outward appearance of praying extemporaneously in the approved Puritan manner. At great personal risk, many new clergy secretly sought and received Episcopal ordination from the retired bishops. Up and down England, people discreetly kept the banned festivals of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and All Saints (Maltby, 2003).

So, together with the growing determination throughout England to bring back the monarchy at the first opportunity, there grew up an equal determination to bring back the Anglican Church with its Prayer Book, Calendar, and bishops. And at the heart of all this illegal underground Anglican activity was the veneration of the memory of the Martyr King. In death, Charles had become even more powerful than in life. But that is the Christian pattern after all: strength made manifest in weakness.

The early Church father Tertullian wrote that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church; and this was certainly true of Charles. According to the eminent church historian J.R.H. Moorman, the beheading of the king not only outraged the deepest feelings of the country, but also “made a restoration of monarchy and Church inevitable in due course ... So Charles died; but with his death the fate of Puritanism was sealed and the Church’s future ensured” (Moorman, 1980: 241).

So, as J. Robert Wright points out, the commemoration of King Charles the Martyr is nothing less than a *celebration of Anglican identity* (Wright, 2002). By going to the scaffold rather than compromise his principles, Charles ensured the survival of the tradition of worship and spirituality to which we in this parish are the present-day heirs. Rightly, then, do we give thanks to God for the faithful witness of Charles Stuart, King and Martyr.

### SOURCES CONSULTED

- British Monarchy Website. Profile of Charles I at <http://www.royal.gov.uk/output/Page76.asp>.
- Carlton, Charles. 1995. *Charles I: The Personal Monarch*, Second Edition. London: Routledge.
- Gregg, Pauline. 1981. *King Charles I*. London: J.M. Dent.
- Kenyon, J.P. 1978. *Stuart England*. Pelican History of England, No. 6. New York: Penguin.
- Maltby, Judith. 2003. “Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of ‘Anglicanism’, 1642-1660,” in Stephen Platten, ed., *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*. Norwich: Canterbury Press. 122-143.
- Moorman, John R.H. 1980. *A History of the Church in England, Third Edition*. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse Barlow.
- Society of King Charles the Martyr website, [www.skcm.org](http://www.skcm.org).
- Wright, Rev. Canon J. Robert. 2002. “The Case for Charles.” Sermon preached at the annual Solemn High Mass of the Society of King Charles the Martyr, 27 January 2002, in the Church of the Transfiguration, New York City. Text online at the Project Canterbury website, [justus.anglican.org/resources/pc/essays/wright/charles/html](http://justus.anglican.org/resources/pc/essays/wright/charles/html).

## Sermon Preached on Sunday 1 February 1998

in the Church of Saint Charles the Martyr,  
Fort Collins, Colorado

by the Rev'd John B. Pahls, Jr.

*"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his servants."* Ps. cxvi.13.

This morning we celebrate the feast of the Patron Saint of this parish, which actually fell this last Friday. I'm told that this in fact is the first parish in the United States to have been dedicated to Saint Charles, and so it is of special moment for us to celebrate his feast, not only because he is "*our* Saint" but because, I think there are some object and supremely important lessons which we as Christians and as Anglicans can learn from him.

To say that King Charles I is "a controversial figure" is to put it mildly, for there has been hardly anyone in history who has evoked such severe and even violent ambivalences of feeling. To us in America, with our tradition of republican government and religious pluralism, fed as we have been with the New England puritan version of our early history, Charles has most often been portrayed as little less than a self-serving tyrant, even a monster, who richly deserved what he got; this view obviously resonated with Americans during the colonial period and the first years of independence when monarchy, all things British, and—dare I say?—all things Anglican were roundly hated. Too, there has always existed in the Calvinist mind an unbending attitude of perfectionism in which any fault, and anyone to whom it attaches, are evil, without hope of salvation, and to be condemned by the righteous in their justified wrath and if possible extirpated from the midst of godly society. To the Calvinist, sanctity is a matter of some kind of immediate, realized perfection, and to triumph and prosper a sign of righteousness; hence no imperfect person can be considered a saint. That attitude has largely colored American religious and cultural thought even down to our own day, and given that predisposition, it has been hard indeed for American Christians, even American Episcopalians, to move beyond the canards of puritan propaganda and grant an impartial hearing to this most misunderstood of English monarchs.

But though Charles may be an interesting historical and character study, for us Anglicans he is more importantly an indispensable touchstone in the history and ongoing life of the Church. I may wax bold, in fact, to say that without him we would not be here in this place this day or any other day—for there would be no Anglicanism, no Episcopal Church, no Apostolic Ministry, no Prayer Book, no Liturgy, no Sacraments—none, in fact, of those things which we hold so dear and so much take for granted, but in defense of which he gave up his life.

Who was Charles I? Why should he be honored by us as a saint? More importantly, what is there about him that can teach us something about ourselves and our life and mission as Christian people?

Charles was born in 1600 at the Scottish royal residence at Dunfermline and was taken to London in 1603 when his father, James VI, acceded to the English throne as James I. From all accounts he was a weak and sickly child and slow in developing, not walking until three years old or speaking until nearly six,

and spoke with a pronounced stammer all his life. He never topped much more than five feet in height and his health was always fragile. He was shy, introverted, and rather inclined to be self-absorbed. In fact he was never intended to be King at all, and but for the death of his elder brother Henry, Prince of Wales, he might have remained in comfortable and honorable obscurity. He was known to be earnest and pious and a lover of the Church of England and the Anglican faith to which his father had readily converted on coming to the throne—the Church of the Elizabethan settlement with scholarly divines, restrained but elegant worship, and a firmly-based polity Catholic, Apostolic, and reformed. (It takes little imagination, in fact, to picture the pious young prince perhaps taking holy orders and eventually accepting a bishopric, as younger sons of royalty in generations before him had frequently done.)

He succeeded his father as King in 1625 and was crowned at Westminster on Candlemas Day of that year. From the first he saw kingship as a solemn burden and charge laid on him and his earnestness resulted in a firm resolve to govern as his father had done. He had been brought up with the view that kingship was ordained by God and that kings ruled by divine right and authority. There were, however, profound differences as well as similarities between him and his father. Like all his Stuart ancestors and descendants, Charles was plagued by a kind of “eternal tennis match” between vacillation on the one side and a mulish stubbornness when crossed on the other. But he had none of the native shrewdness or guile of James, and appears not to have been a very astute judge of character. Though seemingly he did not succumb to flattery, he was in the habit of taking questionable advice from men of small wisdom or of lesser integrity than his own; this, combined with his utter conviction that God had entrusted him with rule, that according to his best lights he would exercise that rule, and that he was entitled to have and to do all things needful to forward it, was to bring him much sorrow and contribute to his defeat and death. The religious, political, and cultural flux in which England found itself inevitable was played out in the struggle for power between a staunchly Anglican King and a radical and predominantly puritan Parliament; and eventually the country was plunged into civil war. After a series of initial victories, the tide turned against Charles and the royalist army and after protracted in-the-field losses and strategic retreats he was forced to give way; yet even after his capture and imprisonment his stubbornness would not allow him to concede the struggle, and it was at that juncture that some say he used deceit to attempt the regaining of power by means of escape and appeal to the Scots, who ultimately turned him back to Cromwell. He was charged with treason and warfare against the nation, brought to trial by Cromwell’s military junta, and condemned to death by beheading.

It was in the last weeks of his life, with the specter of death facing him, that the genuine nobility of the man showed most clearly. He never did accept that the court had jurisdiction to try him, but when the condemnation came, he bowed to the inevitable and accepted it as penance for his sins, especially for allowing the executions of Archbishop William Laud and the Earl of Strafford who had been his close confidants and advisors. Insulting comments and profane language, which invariably offended him, were apparently directed at him by his jailers, who seem to have made great sport of it, but there is no record that he replied to them other than with the greatest forbearance. The night before his death, he prayed the whole night, reciting the Psalms; in the morning he read the Office, listening as Bishop Juxon read the passion according to Saint Matthew, and received Communion, afterward talking to his youngest children for the last time. He then put on two shirts because it was a bitterly cold day and he “would not have the people think [me] afraid.” After this he walked from his prison to the banqueting house at Whitehall Palace which

had been built in memory of his father. On the scaffold outside he gave a short address to those around him, assuring them that he was going “from a corruptible crown to an incorruptible.” It was noted that his lifelong stammer had ceased. Then he removed the George, the chain and medallion of the Order of the Garter, together with a ring, and gave them to Bishop Juxon with the single word, “Remember.” And he prayed, and he died. As the axe fell, an eyewitness reported that there went up from the crowd “such a groan as I have never heard before, nor pray I may ever hear again.” Bystanders rushed forward with handkerchiefs to sop up the blood that fell from the scaffold, but the soldiers drove them away.

After his death his body was taken to Windsor and buried in the same crypt as Henry VIII, but without the burial office, the use of the Prayer Book having that day been outlawed.

These are the facts of Charles I’s life and death. But what are we as late XX Century Christians and Episcopalians to make out of this seemingly so unhappy a life?

*First*, the price of dedication. The society into which Charles was born and which he ruled was a country in the midst of profound political and religious change. Not only was there a move afoot to change the system of civil government, there was and had been for a long time a move to change the nature of the Church. Not only the Crown, but the Church were precious to the King, and he would allow for no altering of either. Charles considered himself both the son and the guardian of the Church and faith in which he had been reared. To all accounts Cromwell indeed allowed at one point that the King might live, and even remain King, if only he would agree to the abolition of the Episcopate and the settlement of the Church into a Presbyterian or congregational polity. This he would not, and count not do, for he considered the faith and order of the Church to be part of the sacred trust committed to him at his Coronation. To bear faith is a risky and costly business, but one for which he was willing to pay the price.

*Second*, the reality of sin and the assurance of God’s mercy and love. That Charles had personal faults, many of them serious indeed, cannot honestly be denied. He was a vacillator at times, utterly pig-headed at other times, often lacking in wisdom. But he was a genuinely kind, courtly, and generous man. He was passionately devoted to his wife and children, and was one of the few Kings of England never to have had a mistress. He was, above all, a lover of Christ and of the Church, and to the last declared openly his dependence upon and confidence in Christ as his Savior. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, described him as “if ever any, the most worthy of the title of an honest man; so great a lover of justice was he that no temptation could dispose him to a wrongful action except it was so disguised to him that he believed it just; he was the worthiest gentleman, the best master, the best husband, the best father, and the best Christian, that the age in which he lived produced.” Part of his personal preparation for death was praying for those who had pronounced the sentence and those who were to carry it out. At the end he committed himself in all things to God, and accepted death both as a penance and as a passage to eternal life. After his death it was said that “nothing in his life became him like the leaving it.” Perhaps that, after all, is the very best thing that could be said of any human being; but it was especially true of this one.

*Third*, the Christian’s emulation of the lives of the Saints as a response to the call to personal holiness. Today, as in Charles’s time, society and Church are in enormous flux; the life of the Church is torn by struggles over Christian doctrine and Christian living. There is a spirit in the Church which manifests itself in bullying, shouting down, and even attempting to force those who disagree from the Church’s communion. There is a move towards the alteration of the Catholic and Apostolic structure of the Church’s polity, Ministry, and Sacraments, but, far worse, towards a kind of theological indifference; the



danger is not so much that we may become anti-ecclesial but vaguely universalist, the unique salvific role and divine authority of Christ shrugged off as if with the oft-parodied attitude, “It doesn’t matter what you believe as long as you’re sincere.” The example of Saint Charles, on the other hand, shows that supreme importance of the Church’s faith, worth laying down one’s life for. Like him, we are called to witness to the grace of God in Jesus Christ, and the saving power of His love. We are called to proclaim that Savior by Whose Name only the grace of God is mediated to the world. And, we are called to be steadfast, immovable in that profession, as Saint Paul says, “knowing that in Christ your labor is not in vain.” We are to be the faithful remnant, the leaven of grace that leavens the whole lump. That takes firm resolution, and reliance on the grace of God, and constant reading and meditation on the Word, and faithful and regular recourse to the Sacraments, and the prayers of all the Church, militant, expectant, and triumphant.

We honor Saint Charles this day, because above everything else the world values, he loved and honored God with that risky kind of love. We honor Saint Charles because he shows us what it means to struggle and to attain the incorruptible crown, for which he so gladly laid aside the corruptible one. But, perhaps more than any other consideration, we honor Saint Charles because we are members of the Church together with all Christians now living and who have gone before us. We trust that Saint Charles is praying for the Church, and for us especially, as we continue in our pilgrimage. He was perceived, by his enemies and those who see power as the ultimate end, to be a “loser”; but in reality he proved to be the most true of winners, his trophy his entrance into the victory of eternal life with the Lord he loved. May no less be said of any of us. God bless us all. Saint Charles the Martyr, pray for us! *Amen.*

## **The Royal Martyr.**

### **Or, A Poem on the Martyrdom of King Charles I.**

London: Printed for the Author, and sold by S. Noble,  
in the Long Walk near Christ’s Hospital. 1715.

Ye sacred Muses! now inspire my Quill,  
That it with Truth and Justice may fulfil  
The mighty Task that it hath undertook,  
A Scheme to frame, wherein the World may look,  
And there behold that great and woful Sin,  
Which our Fore-fathers have involv’d us in;  
But above all, those dire and hated Crimes  
That acted were at separate Place and Times.  
Blest CHARLES! his Cause does loud for Vengeance call  
Upon those People, nay, upon us all,  
Unless we do his righteous Counsel take,

And by our Penitence our Sins forsake:  
(Although he did when on the Scaffold pray  
That God would not this Sin unto us lay)  
We must not think Mercy will be our Lot,  
Or this great Sin will ever be forgot.

Let us review th'Original of their Sin,  
And at his Sufferings let us now begin,  
Which was produc'd by a C—— Parliament,  
Hatch'd up in Hell, and purposely was sent  
To rob, to spoil, and murder th'Innocent.

#### HIS TRYAL

I Him present before a sinful Crew,  
As *Thomlinson, Cook, Hugh Peters* and *Carew*,  
Who with some others, they themselves did call  
Great Judges of High-Court in Justice-Hall.  
Poor Wretches, they thought 'twas a glorious thing  
To sit as Judges, and to judge their King,  
Nay, and condemn him too, which was far worse,  
And brought us under a most heavy Curse.  
But hark to hear, what I tremble to write,  
These daring Wretches their own King indite  
In a long Form, in harsh and cruel Words,  
Just such as savage Nature's self affords;  
They stick not to abuse his gentle Nature  
With Names of Murd'rer, Tyrant and a Traytor.  
Impious of Wretches! nothing did they fear  
But boldly stile him their vile Prisoner.

Being arriv'd at that sad fatal Place,  
He turn'd about, and with a chearful Grace,  
Unto the throng'd Spectators little said,  
But for his Enemies in general pray'd,  
That this great Sin might not on them be laid.  
His Royal Neck he humbled to the Block,  
And willingly submitted to the Stroke,  
Knowing 'tas for his Glory and Renown,  
To change an earthly for an heav'nly Crown.

After they had him oft before them brought,  
(Before those Tyrants of *Injustice-Court*)  
They then proceed their Sentence for to give,  
That this their Sovereign was not fit to live.  
Upriseth *Bradshaw*, and impiously he said,  
That he should be deprived of his Head.  
This bloody Sentence quickly was obey'd,  
And in there Days he was to Execution led.

Had all those Wretches who their King betray'd  
A publick Terror to the World been made,  
'Twou'd been a Warning to Posterity  
From ever injuring Sacred Royalty.

*FINIS.*

***The Diary of John Evelyn***  
**edited by Guy de Bedoyere**  
reviewed by Lee Hopkins

*The Diary of John Evelyn*, edited by Guy de Bedoyere. The Boydell Press, 2004, 380 pp. qpb, ISBN 1843831090. \$24.95.

Sometimes opposites attract, and the dichotomy exhibited by the XVII Century's two most famous diarists, Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) and John Evelyn (1620-1707), could not be more striking.

Pepys came from a Calvinist, Cromwellian family, his father a solid middle class tailor. He lover life, learning, wine, women, and song, became an important and innovative government official, still revered in the Royal Navy's pantheon as the man who reformed and modernized the fleet. He died a Jacobite, loyal to the man who had commanded the navy, the exiled King James II.

Life, well and fully lived, enabled Pepys to grow and change, overcoming his mundane origins. Like many self made men, Pepys was full of paradoxes, and perhaps the most striking was his deep personal friendship with James II. Considered by history a failed monarch, as inflexible as his father Charles I, James the man was good and brave, with an engaging sense of humor and gift of friendship. Aside from his political woes, he was one of the best of fighting admirals who turned the tide to victory in the Dutch wars. The enduring image of him remains from a key battle, in which he strode along the exposed deck, directing the action while encouraging his men. He was drenched in the blood of those around him, until finally

struck by a severed head which had enough velocity to knock him down. Getting back up, James resumed direction of the action, while seeing to the medical care of his badly mauled sailors.

John Evelyn's background and life were entirely different from his close and very old friend Pepys. The Evelyn family had become wealthy after solving England's perennial problem of being short of gunpowder, as the island was short of saltpeter, and had to rely on expensive and unreliable Italian imports. A typically English energetic and practical solution to this peril to the life of the nation in dangerous Elizabethan times was to extract vital ingredients for gunpowder from human waste gathered as it flowed out by the Thames estuary. This humble operation was a major factor in the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. A grateful Queen Elizabeth granted the Evelyns an extremely lucrative gunpowder monopoly. By the time John Evelyn was born in 1620, his family was secure in the higher echelons of wealth and influence. Such circumstances could have produced another playboy fop, but John was an exceedingly bright boy who used his birthright in the service of learning and personal development.

Providentially Evelyn and Pepys were to meet in school, and form a lifelong, intimate friendship, a kind of cross pollination, which benefited each of them as well as their country in a difficult period, while posthumously enriching English literature.

For both men wrote diaries. Evelyn's covered his whole life, including his family background, while the encoded diary of Pepys barely spanned the decade after the Restoration of 1660. Both diaries were not discovered until the XIX Century, but that coincidence is all they have in common. They are as different as the two men. To the general reader, the writing of Pepys is far more interesting, giving us brilliant vignettes of major events, personalities, of the wonderful color and vigor of London life, whether at court, on the street, in ale houses, any place Pepys took his exuberant self. Evelyn, a quiet, reflective man, writes with a subdued charm that fills in the background, setting the scene for the center stage performance of Pepys. Taken together, both diaries may be likened to the wonderful music of the period, to the mastery of Purcell, where a steady and measured basso continuo anchors brilliant contrapuntal permutations.

Yet despite temperamental differences, these two comrades, who were certainly an odd couple, shared much in common. They mutually gloried in their long friendship, enjoyed senior status among the luminaries of the Royal Society, loved reading, discussion, playing chamber music, savoring food and wine, excellent company, good sense, and solid character. In short, they exemplified the now endangered species of gentleman and scholar and informed patriot.

For all the passion of Pepys, Evelyn is a detached observer, dryly humorous at times. But he was no ivory tower mandarin. Though his position as the second son of a wealthy family spared him involvement in their mercantile concerns, Evelyn was public spirited. He involved himself in high level service to his country in a very unsettled time. For example, he held a key public health post in London at the time of the great plague of 1666. Instead of fleeing the city like most of his peers, he stayed on despite the high risk of contagion and a horrible death.

By today's lack of standards, he would be called an elitist. He did not suffer fools gladly, and was well aware of his great capacities. His cool and remote personal style caused him to be called conceited, a judgment no doubt owing more to envy than perception. His lapidary sureness of touch was not the expression of a cold nature, as he was kindly, compassionate, and philanthropic, always seeking to help where it would do the most good, rather than be visible and praised for some easy benefaction. He was a very staunch Anglican of a type more common in the time of Charles I than Charles II. The quiet, dignified intensity of Evelyn's religious practice could be misunderstood as a kind of posturing in the extroverted world in which he lived, a situation akin to the old joke that if Jews are the chosen people, then Anglicans are the frozen people.

Evelyn's reverence for this majestic liturgy informs his diary. In one famous passage, he attends a Christmas Eucharist forbidden by Cromwell, and relates how in the middle of the service, the door burst open to admit a kind of armed Puritan vice squad of loud yahoos determine to put an end to what they decried as a strange and unnatural act.

Such a foolish official move was typical of the rudderless ship of state under Cromwell, and doomed his regime to end when his brutal iron grip was loosened by death. The parallels to changes wrought by the demise of Stalin are obvious. Fully able to crush any armed challenge to Cromwellian rule, his government could not cope with anything less blatant, and clearly had little grasp of what went on in the country short of violent overt opposition. Consider the odd case of Evelyn, who was well known as an unrepentant Royalist, who spent much time during the military dictatorship abroad, during which time he paid many visits to the exiled court of Charles II in Holland. Though many Puritan spies were focused on this court, Evelyn was never challenged when he returned home, and in fact carried a passport signed by John Bradshaw, who had also signed the death sentence of Charles I.

The 1649 portrait of Evelyn which is familiar to all who visit London's splendid National Portrait Gallery, adorns the cover of this book. The picture at first seems another formulaic meditation on mortality very typical of this period. Evelyn is in a winding sheet, his left hand resting on a skull, so that you wonder how the painter forgot to include an hour glass and skeleton with scythe. But then you study Evelyn's face and grasp that this is no graphic cliché. His ascetic, long nosed visage has intelligent, rather sad eyes that look directly into your own. And you cannot help thinking of the famous English cathedral epitaph which reminds the passerby that "Once I was as you are, and in time you will be as I am".

The difference is that John Evelyn left us an account of his long life that few could duplicate. Memories may be, as John Donne said, the rags of time. But these of Evelyn are the precious personal fabric woven by one remarkable man who lived in extraordinary times.

The discovery of the diaries of Evelyn and Pepys in the XIX Century is a curious coincidence, the former coming to light in 1818, the latter in 1823. While today, Evelyn's diary is little known, it was at first far more popular than that of his now famous contemporary. But both diaries are similar in suffering from

textual corruption from long years of inept editing. In either case, these deficiencies have been changed in recent years.

This current edition of Evelyn is attractively designed, and contains a fine introductory essay. The Boydell Press is a great resource for books of interest to the members of the Society of King Charles the Martyr, and their catalog is well worth a close look. This published may be reached at 668 Mount Hope Avenue, Rochester NY 14620-2731, or by phoning 585-275-0419, as their titles are not widely distributed.

***A History of Britain, Volume Two,  
The Wars of the British Isles 1603-1776***

**by Simon Schama**

reviewed by Lee Hopkins

*A History of Britain, Volume Two, The Wars of the British Isles 1603-1776*, by Simon Schama. Talk Miramax Books, 2004, 544 pp, qpb, \$40. ISBN 0-7868-6752-3.

Simon Schama is one of the leading art and cultural historians of our time, whose work on XVII Century Holland is without peer. He is most familiar to many for his stint as art critic for the *New Yorker* magazine. Teaching for many years at both Oxford and Cambridge, he is now on the Columbia faculty.

Though obviously a man to take seriously, one at first wonders why he would write yet another general history of England in these sprawling volumes. Having not read the first volume, my skepticism faded when I opened his second volume, *The Wars of the British Isles 1603-1776*.

For a reader familiar with the subject, he grabs and holds attention for over five hundred pages. His technique is to illuminate his subject by means of highlighted paradoxes.

For example, he begins with the statement that the two decades of the English Civil War and Cromwellian military dictatorship up to the Restoration of 1660 created casualties proportionate to those of World War I.

This at first seems rash, as World War I decimated Britain, ravaging it in terms of demography, society, culture, economy, religion, and every other category of human quantification. The reader first thinks no, the widely scattered, not very numerous pitched battles of these middle years of the XVII Century were nothing like Flanders or Verdun.

But then it sinks in. For a close reading of the period, beyond the formal slaughters of massed formations at Marston Moor, Edgehill and the like, shows continuous violence and bloodshed back and forth, up and down the British Isles from the raising of the standard of King Charles to marshal his Royalist Army, to the exhausted country welcoming the martyred monarch's son home at last.

So yes, Schama's point is well taken, for in the smaller scale of three centuries and a half ago one can say that the population was almost entirely impacted by loss of life and destruction of certainties.

Britain was never the same again after the judicial murder of Charles I in 1649, just as surely as Foreign Secretary Edward Grey spoke prophetically in 1914 to say that amidst the guns of August, the lights were going out all over Europe.

Schama's clarity extends to his astute selection of very fine illustrations, some quite obscure, that give us a quickened sense of his various subjects. These plates are wonderfully reproduced, nothing like the hackneyed plates in most histories, simply gathered by category from some archive, as unfocused as a generalized internet search.

If there is an underlying theme to Schama's approach, aside from the assault of critical thinking upon lazy assumptions, it can be said to be the steady if not even always conscious process of national consolidation and uniformity, a gelling of nationalism, that is the distinctive historical dynamic of the XVII Century. From the ill fated decision of King Charles in 1629 to rule without Parliament, to Parliament's tragic consequences of trying to rule without him, the same homogenizing process is evident in Louis XIV's drive to France's natural borders of Rhine, Alps, and Pyrenees, while disenfranchising Protestants of rights guaranteed by the Edict of Nantes, in an attempt to standardize religion. In Scandinavia, Sweden's Gustavus Adolphus gained hegemony of the Baltic, while later in the Century Peter the Great dragged his ramshackle medieval Russia kicking and screaming into the European world order.

The wretchedness and potential for violence among the great majority of populations, the raw material of crude social surgeries were the faceless workers, farmers, and artisans, all these anonymous folk who comprise most of our ancestors. They find an advocate in Schama. But in historical context, this broad base of society that provided food and labor was ignored by a small but growing, upwardly mobile middle class, and simply despised by self-indulgent upper classes. Yet the mute majority was beginning to become dimly aware of what would become the novel concept of human rights. They would find a voice in the egalitarian program of John Lilburne and his Levellers who emerged from the Cromwellian ranks, their ideas as startlingly subversive to Cromwell as they would have been to the Stuarts. What the Levellers were trying to articulate was well expressed in the near future by Thomas Hobbes in his book *Leviathan*, probably the most influential book of its time. What Hobbes spelled out was the concept of the social contract, under which a person, the individual social unit, must behave in a certain way to enable a particular society to function. Hobbes argued that society in turn owes the individual stability, safety, and a bearable life. And these things during the period of the Civil War could be provided by neither the Stuart dynasty nor Cromwell. Things simply were no longer right, and awareness, resentment, and unease about social dysfunction had been growing, to be articulated by Hobbes.

The excesses of James I are well known as an extreme form of even Stuart myopia, but one of Schama's characteristic asides gives a concrete example of court profligacy. The Stuart court, relieved of the hardscrabble life in Scotland, found the London world its oyster. So Schama introduces us to the Ante-Supper, an absurd and obscene observance invented by one of the Scottish nobles. This was a lavish display of food set out on a groaning board to be viewed by arriving guests to create awe and salivation. It was an exact replica of what they would be served later. So the original Ante-Supper, cold and congealing, enough to feed a village for a week, was thrown away when the fresh version was served in another room.

Simultaneous with such festivities, Sir John Davies, attorney general of Ireland, a laughingstock as the fattest of court officials, died from obesity and the stress of trying to make the Irish into English people. But before he died, he expressed contempt for the perpetual hunger of the Irish, calling them "no better than

cannibals”, and importing 100,000 Scottish colonists to take over what arable land the Irish possessed. His wife, Eleanor Davies, spent her life in the writing of incoherent religious prophecies as inane as her husband’s public policy.

In recalling that it was not discord with Parliament that set off the Civil War, but the fatal imposition by Charles I of the Book of Common Prayer upon Scotland in 1637, Schama gives a very astute analysis of the psychological state of that northern kingdom.

Scots firmly believed in a fictitious notion that their country had a direct Covenant with God like that of Israel. The story held that this arrangement existed before one King Fergus who reigned in 310, before the conversion of Rome by Constantine. It was widely believed that the Covenant belonged to the whole people, regardless of whatever form of government prevailed. The fractious clans became the equivalent of Israel’s twelve tribes.

And as Charles had been born in Scotland, and was well aware of this strange folklore that bolstered their Calvinism with a kind of voodoo nationalist metaphysic, it was unfortunate whatever political prudence he possessed was mastered by his Anglican idealism. Schama makes the interesting point as well that the stubbornness of Charles was intensified by his role model (very common in his time) of the ancient Stoics. The dark side of their otherwise noble concepts was a belief that consistency is necessary, unalloyed by changing circumstances, facts, or even common sense.

Politics being the art of the possible, this inflexibility doomed the Royalist cause. From the start of the conflict with Parliament, basically caused by Charles’s necessity to raise money simply to run the government, his case was never clearly stated. Various high handed and ineffective blusters never got around to the simple statement that Charles really needed this money, because rising inflation had made traditional royal resources shrink so that it was impossible for “the King to live of his own”. Some of his more astute advisors suggested that a Parliamentary leader, specifically John Pym, be made a member of the Privy Council, and many historians still wonder why this was not done. Pym would have been safely outnumbered, but Parliament would have been placated by having its most important leader in the inner sanctum. At this early stage, Parliament was still run by those who were practical men of affairs, some very well educated, who could be made to see the bottom line of the royal economic dilemma. This was still possible, before the Puritan religious extremists gained the upper hand. Logic and reason have never governed human affairs, but there surely was a way (never really tried) to explain to someone like Pym that Charles’s request, for example, for Ship Money, one of the biggest issues, was reasonable.

Ship money meant funds to keep the navy afloat, the nation’s primary means of defense from ancient times to the present. At issue was the tradition that only those counties bordering the sea paid the Ship Money. But now more money was needed, so all counties, the government argued, should pay Ship Money. As there is no place in the British Isles far from the sea, and that river systems everywhere connected to the surrounding waters (in the absence of decent roads), it should have been obvious that everyone, everywhere benefited by safe and sure waterborne travel. But his reasonable notion never really got past the political babble.

At the time, the King’s appeal for Ship Money was seen as an extreme example of tyranny. That it was nothing of the sort must have dawned on many in coming years, as they experienced the acceleration of Cromwell’s real tyranny. Soon he was to murder their King, oversee the decimation of Parliament, and the seeming destruction of the Church of England. Then came the erosion of the common law, and suppression



of the simplest of pleasures treasured by any freeborn citizen in the theatre, the alehouse, playing sports on the village green, dancing, and traditional festivities, including the celebration of Christmas.

In the whole tragedy of the Civil War, it is mentioned above that the first fatal error Charles made was to try to impose the Book of Common Prayer on Scotland, an act of futility comparable to the untrue story about King Canute ordering the tide not to come in. And the second and final fatal error made by the King was personally to invade Parliament with his armed guards and try to arrest those members who led opposition to him. What he forgot to consider was that Parliament in its ancient roots was older than the monarchy.

King Charles was human and fallible like the rest of us, and so was Cromwell, though the Puritan usurper made far more wrong moves than the well meaning King. For the King was acting according to the conventional wisdom of his time. Cromwell was a radical, a military genius, but not a reflective man. He did not realize that change comes best from within. Two centuries later, the German philosopher Hegel's dialectic would reason that revolutions generally follow a counterproductive course, in which the antithesis (or challenge) to the thesis (or status quo) are replaced by what is called the synthesis, the evolutionary reality of the revolution's course, which becomes entirely different from either previous status quo, or original revolutionary intentions. So in England a society was destroyed, to be painfully renewed at the Restoration to something much less than the world of Charles I, and at the cost of decades of death, ruin, cultural vandalism, and human suffering.

I am sure that many Anglicans like myself have a picture on display of Charles I, mine a fine mezzotint of a Van Dyck portrait, sent me by my old friend and mentor, Carl Sadler of Seattle. And seeing each day the likeness of the martyred King, I wonder how many people have hung a picture of Cromwell, and if they did, what their motives might be.

Had he been capable of introspection, of the critical self knowledge which is the opposite of smug Calvinism, Cromwell would have come to the devastating conclusion that he at the end of his life had been proven a false prophet, blasphemer, and heretic.

Charles I could not say "O death where is thy sting?" because he felt the horrible reality of a headman's axe. But he could, if it were possible posthumously, quote confidently the rest of the couplet: "O grave where is thy victory?" For Cromwell, the putative winner, really did not win. It was Charles Stuart who ultimately prevailed.

A. N. Wilson wrote that "Christianity is an organic imaginative growth, not a religion delivered on tablets of stone. It is an extremely exciting discovery about the human heart." Anglicanism is arguably the most appealingly catholic—in every sense of the word—and humane manifestation of the Christian experience. And King Charles not only contributed much of that syncretic growth, but died for it, for us, for the creative evolution of human consciousness. His last calm word on the scaffold was "Remember", and we do.

And so Schama carries his wonderfully revelatory narrative onward to 1776, always challenging comfortable assumptions about history. For history is as much of a mystery as the human lives it resurrects, as puzzling as the life each of us experiences from day to day. The more you know, the less you know, as Socrates found, foreshadowing Oscar Wilde's observation that in this world it is not the invisible that is mysterious, but the visible.

[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.]

***Lord Minimus: The Extraordinary Life of Britain's Smallest Man***  
**by Nick Page**

reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne

*Lord Minimus: The Extraordinary Life of Britain's Smallest Man*, by Nick Page. St Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10010. ISBN 0-312-2916-2. \$16.95.

This is a book which can be judged by its cover. It is an appealingly small volume featuring Jeffrey Hudson as depicted by Van Dyck in a detail of one of the artist's many beautiful portraits of Queen Henrietta Maria. A measuring stick extends from top to bottom of the left cover.

*Lord Minimus* is a biography of Jeffrey Hudson, the Queen's Dwarf, who first delighted her by popping out of a large pie at a royal banquet, like the four and twenty blackbirds in the nursery rhyme.

The book presents both a sympathetic picture of Jeffrey himself and an excellent general picture of the times in which he lived.

His devotion to the Queen, and her affection for him—he was in effect her adopted child, never treated as a buffoon or a freak—is clearly brought out in the text, as is Jeffrey's struggle for dignity and recognition as something more than a cute little oddity: he once killed a man in a duel (on horseback with pistols, which takes considerable skill, regardless of one's strength or stature) and was all his life proud to have been commissioned a Captain of Horse.

This is a moving account of a colorful, varied life.

[Sarah Gilmer Payne, 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 — June, 2005**

### ***British Headquarters***

### ***American Region***

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

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

Mrs. Irene Sillitoe, *Vice President*

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

William M. Gardner, Jr., *Membership Secretary*  
6152 Verde Trail North  
Apt. D-211  
Boca Raton FL 33433-2487  
bgardner53@alum.mit.edu

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

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

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

### **Kalendar of Anniversaries**

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

**At the Annual Mass & Meeting, 29 January 2005,  
Church of the Resurrection, New York City**

Dr. Wuonola (American Representative, S.K.C.M.) thanks  
Canon Swain (Rector, Church of the Resurrection) to the approval of those in attendance.  
(see article on p. 1)

**xx**