

(image not available in web edition)

KING CHARLES I
PAINTING C. 1611. ARTIST UNKNOWN

— *Annual Mass & Meeting* —
11 a.m., Saturday 26 January 2008,
Mount Calvary Church, Baltimore, Maryland

SKCM News

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Editor

(web edition)

December, 2007

ISSN 1540-045X

THIS DECEMBER, 2006, ISSUE IS BEING PUBLISHED IN JAN. 2008

Table of Contents

American Representative's Column	1
§ Dues Payment Notice	
§ <i>SKCM News Publication Schedule</i>	
§ <i>Church & King</i>	
§ Appointment of <i>Council</i> for American Region, S.K.C.M.	
§ Upcoming Annual Mass & Meeting and U.K. Celebrations:	
§ 26 January 2008 at Mt. Calvary Church, Baltimore, Maryland	
§ U.K. Celebrations, S.K.C.M. and R.M.C.U.	
§ Other Notices will appear in the delayed June, 2006, issue which will appear in Spring, 2008	
Sermon Preached at the XXIV Annual Meeting of the American Region at Saint Clement's Church, Philadelphia, by the Rev'd Dr. Arnold Klukas, 27 January 2007	3
Sermon Preached at the IV Annual Meeting of the American Region at Saint Mary's Church, Asheville, NC, by the Rt. Rev'd Dr. Clarence C. Pope, Jr., 30 January 1987	8
<i>Saint Charles King and Martyr</i> – Tract dated 1941 – by Donald Hole	11
<i>Illustration:</i> Shrine of Saint Charles, King & Martyr as it Originally was Arranged at the Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham, Norfolk, England (from Hole's 1941 tract)	18
Dues Notice	(not included in web edition)
Price Sheet of SKCM Goods	(not included in web edition)

Dues Notice

Included with this issue (December 2007) of SKCM News is your dues payment form. Note that the hiatus in publication of SKCM News means that we are not assessing dues for one year's time. Since there was no SKCM News mailed at the beginning of 2007, no dues were collected last year, and this is the regular time for assessing the new year's dues. Accordingly, two years' dues are now payable for previously paid-up members to be current through 2008. Please try to send in your dues by 30 January as you REMEMBER the Royal Martyrdom during the month of January.

SKCM News Publication Schedule

June 2005 - published June, 2005

December 2005 - NOT published

June 2006 - NOT published

December 2006 - published December, 2007 (you should have received this issue already)

June 2007 - will be published March, 2008

December 2007 - published January, 2008 (the present issue)

June 2008 - will be published June, 2008

Hence we will be back on schedule and will have missed two issues, December, 2005, and June, 2006. Again, the American Representative apologizes for his indisposition leading to the hiatus in most of his Society work during this period.

A number of back issues of *Church & King* will be mailed during the first part of 2008. Note that the Christmas, 2007, issue has not yet been published but will be sent as soon as it is available. Details of the January U.K. celebration, however, appear herein.

Appointment of SKCM Council

I am appointing a council of advice to move forward with the Society's upcoming reorganization into a non-profit entity with articles of incorporation & by laws. As a transition, and prompted to some extent by my recent lengthy indisposition, it makes sense to get more people involved. The new SKCM News Editor, Father Swatos, the new webmaster, Mr. Covert, will join our Membership Secretary, Bill Gardner and Episcopal Patron, Bishop Ackerman, as officers of the American Branch and be members of the Council. We will also have A. Donald Evans on the Council, representing the Chapters. Biographical sketches of Father Swatos and Mr. Covert appeared in the recently-published December, 2006, *SKCM News*; information on Mr. Evans, a new appointee, follows. One member remains to be appointed.

At present, I view the Council of six, which I will chair, as a "council of advice" and so am appointing it myself. I have had advice from Mr. Gardner and Bishop Ackerman and from a number of trusted stalwarts of our Society's American Branch. Mr. Evans's appointment will ensure that the chapters' perspective is represented at the table and will, I believe, lead to a protocol for better chapter organization than the haphazard approach of the past. The Charleston Chapter of which he has been a principal has been an exemplar. I think improved chapter organization will lead, in turn, to increased membership. I expect the Council to meet quarterly, and additionally if needed, by telephone conference.

A. Donald Evans has been an active member of the Society for several years. He and his wife, Lydia, live in Charleston, SC and have three children: Henslee, Coakey, and Rivers. He is a former vestryman at his

parish, Saint Philip's Church, Charleston, SC. Don is active in the Vergers' Guild of the Episcopal Church and serves as the Deputy Director-General of The Order of Saint Vincent. His current diocesan service includes board memberships at The Canterbury House, an Episcopal retirement community, and The (Episcopal) Society for the Advancement of Christianity in South Carolina. To occupy his secular time, Don is an investment real estate broker and advisor.

As we prepare and then adopt Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws, the Council will become formalized. It may be modified as members' input on the reorganization of the American Branch is collected all along the way.

2008 Annual Mass & Meeting – Mount Calvary Church, Baltimore, Maryland will be held at 11 a.m. on Saturday 26 January 2008. At the kind invitation of the rector, the Rev'd Jason A. Catania, we will have our annual mass and then meet briefly after luncheon.

The distinguished preacher for this occasion will be the Very Rev'd Gary W. Kriss, D.D., sometime Dean of Nashotah House and presently Priest of Salem in New York. Dr. Wuonola is delighted to welcome his friend, Dean Kriss, to the Annual Mass and its roster of distinguished preachers. The music of the Mass will be Franz Josef Haydn's Mass No. 7 in B flat, *Missa brevis Sancti Joannis de Deo* (Little Organ Mass), Hob XXII/7.

Luncheon reservations--\$15 a person--should be made by 18 January with the Mt. Calvary Parish Office, 816 N. Eutaw Street, Baltimore MD 21201-4624. For directions, phone the parish office at (410) 728 6140.

The ***Society of King Charles the Martyr's London Celebration*** will as usual be on the day, 30 January 2008, at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, at noon, with Solemn Prayers at the Bust outside the Banqueting House at 11:40 a.m. The preacher for the occasion will be the Rev'd Jonathan Baker, Principal of Pusey House, Oxford.

The ***Royal Martyr Church Union's London Celebration will*** as usual be at Saint Mary-le-Strand, Westminster, at 11 a.m. on Saturday 2 February 2008. The Solemn Eucharist will be celebrated by the Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe, the Rt. Rev'd Dr. Geoffrey Rowell. The preacher will be Dr. Peter McCullough, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. The Eucharist will be sung to sections of Mozart's *Missa Brevis in D*. White vestments will be used as the occasion falls on the anniversary of King Charles's coronation in Westminster Abbey in 1626, on Candlemas Day. (Luncheons at Sarastro restaurant to be booked in advance at £15 with R.M.C.U. Secretary and Treasurer David Roberts, 7 Nunnery Stables, St Albans, Herts AL1 2AS.)

The Edinburgh Celebration will be on Thursday 31 January 2008 at 11:30 a.m. at Saint Mary's Cathedral, Palmerston Place, Edinburgh. The Choral Eucharist will be celebrated by the Bishop of Edinburgh, The Rt. Rev'd Brian Smith, President of the Union. The preacher will be the Rev'd Charles Robertson, a Chaplain to H. M. The Queen in Scotland. (Lunch afterwards at the chapter house, contribution of £5 in cash on the day.)

The new ***Website*** of the American Branch is www.skcm-usa.org.

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

BLESSED CHARLES, KING AND MARTYR [30 JANUARY 1649]

preached on 27 January 2007, S. Clement's Church, Philadelphia,

at the XXIV Annual Mass of the American Region

by the Rev'd Dr. Arnold Klukas

INTRODUCTION: CHARLES'S CORONATION

On Candlemas Day, 1626, the young Charles I was anointed and crowned as King of England. Much of the coronation ceremony was unchanged from the days of the Anglo-Saxon kings, and a prayer first written down by Archbishop Egbert of York [d. 766] was said over the new King as he was anointed, it reads:

"O God, who providest for Thy people by Thy power and rulest over them in love; grant unto this Thy servant Charles our King, the spirit of wisdom and government, that being devoted unto Thee with all his heart, he may so wisely govern this Kingdom, that in his time Thy Church and people may continue in safety and prosperity, and that, persevering in good works unto the end, he may through Thy mercy come to Thine everlasting Kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

After King Charles received the Holy Communion the rubrics called for three naked swords to be carried before him (two pointed and one blunted) to represent the three oaths that he swore that day:

"First, that the Church of God and all Christian folk should keep true peace at all times."

"The second is that he should forbid all robbery and all unrighteous things to all orders."

"The third is that he should enjoin in all dooms justice and mercy, that the gracious and merciful God, of His everlasting mercy, may show pardon to us all."

The first two swords represented the Church and the Law, and the blunted sword represented the mercy with which, as the sovereign himself is to hope for mercy, all his justice is to be tempered.

The new King took his oaths seriously. Unlike King James, his father, who considered compromise and favoritism in both his private and public life as his rightful due, Charles was devout in his piety, exemplary in his morals, and uncompromising in his principles. These three signs of righteousness were the cause of his eventual doom. We will first examine Charles as sovereign and then as martyr.

CHARLES AS A SOVEREIGN

Embedded in the coronation ceremony is the archetypal image of monarchy [*monos*= rule by one], which up until the English Civil War was understood as something essential to the maintenance of any nation. Just as God the Father was the Creator and Ruler of the cosmos [*cosmokrator*], so the monarch was to his nation. The Common Laws of England were established upon this archetype, and the medieval jurist Henry of Bracton [XIII Century] had articulated it in his *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*. Bracton explained the God-given status of the King in these words:

"The king has no equal within his realm...because he would then be subject to those subjected to him. The king must not be under man but under God and under the Law, because Law makes the King. There is no *rex* where will rules rather than *lex*. Since he is the vicar of God there ought to be no one in his kingdom who surpasses him in the doing of justice, but he ought to be the last, or almost so, to receive it, when he is plaintiff. If it is asked of him, since no writ runs against him there will only be opportunity for a petition, that he correct and amend his actions; if he does not, it is punishment enough for him that he await God's vengeance. No one may presume to question his acts, much less contravene them."

This statement was well-known to King James, who frequently promulgated the doctrine of “the divine right of kings” and taught his son to abide it. Bracton’s *dicta* were also known to the members of Parliament who would later condemn Charles as a tyrant and traitor.

Three political principles are evident in both Bracton’s *dicta* and the coronation liturgy. *First*, the sovereign has the God-given status of being first in his kingdom. He is subject to no one other than to God and Common Law. Parliament could not meet unless the monarch called for it to do so, sheriffs and justices owed their responsibilities to the monarch, all military action and public defense was under the control of the monarch.

Common Law, as inherited from the past, was to be implemented by the King.

Second, his personal authority does not come from the people, or even the nobles; it comes directly from God and it is before God that the king must himself be judged. His was the God-given mandate to uphold justice and punish anyone who disturbed the common peace or restricted the rights of individuals.

Third, because the *Ecclesia Anglicana* was the church of the nation, as supreme governor the king was both the head of the Church as well as the head of the State. He was not only responsible for the temporal necessities of the clergy and people, but also was to safe-guard the doctrine and discipline of the Church. The three swords, as you may remember, represented the Law, the Church, and justice.

Because King Charles fully understood and intentionally maintained these principles, he came up against a wall of opposition from those who undertook to deconstruct all three. As the English Civil War regressed into anarchy [rule by no one], and the King was imprisoned by the New Model Army and its leaders, Charles saw the old order abolished:

Common Law was dismissed when the House of Commons, “purged” of all but radicals, proclaimed itself to be a unicameral body that was alone the source of Law. The Church, by God’s mercy still retaining its apostolicity and liturgy, was dissolved and the Book of Common Prayer prohibited. Justice became whatever might proclaimed to be right.

CHARLES AS A MARTYR

On the 20th of November, 1648, Cromwell’s Army demanded that the House of Commons put King Charles on trial for tyranny and treason. Certainly some of the leaders of the Army and the House were men of ill-will; but we mustn’t forget that a number of those who participated in the King’s trial did so from their own high principles. They believed that God was on their side, that the Scriptures did not support either a hierarchical Church or a monarchical State. They were imbued with the Calvinist notion of a covenanted community, and an Independent’s belief in the authority of the People as the foundation of the rights of all law and governance. But for all their Puritan erudition, they seemed to be unaware of today’s Epistle [I Peter 2:13ff]: “Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether it be the king, as supreme; or unto governors...Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king...”

It took the house of Commons and Cromwell’s supporters more than a month to come up with an excuse to over-ride both history and legal tradition so as to justify the trial of their king. Parliament had become a farce, with no legal right to either meet or to make laws. The newly-invented High Court was an oxymoron, because by English law all justice proceeded from the sovereign. No member of the House of Lords or any respected jurist would have anything to do with the proceedings. When the accusations against him in the Great Hall of Westminster, King Charles replied:

"I would know by what power I am called hither, I would know by what authority, I mean *lawful*, for there are many unlawful authorities in the world....Remember, I am your King, your *lawful* King, and what sins you bring upon your heads, and the judgment of God upon this land, think well upon it....I have a trust committed to me by God, by old and lawful descent, I will not betray it, to answer a new unlawful authority; therefore resolve me that, and you shall hear more of me."

His accusers were aghast, not only because the King had pointed out the illegality of the proceedings, but something had changed in both his speech and demeanor. Hitherto he had been a poor public speaker, he stuttered badly and was easily interrupted; but now he spoke with strength, measured assurance and without stuttering at all. Several days later, in response to a lengthy diatribe against him, the King responded:

"...the last time I was here [I spoke] against the legality of the Court, and that a King cannot be tried by any superior jurisdiction on earth. But it is not my case alone, it is the freedom and liberty of the people of England; and do you pretend what you will, I stand more for their liberties. For if power without law may make laws, may alter fundamental laws of the Kingdom, I do not know what subject he is in England that can be sure of his life, or anything he calls his own."

Of the three swords at his coronation we have heard Charles' defense of Law and Justice; but what of the Church? In September 1643 Parliament had accepted a **Solemn League and Covenant** with the Scots that abolished the episcopacy and prohibited the use of the Book of Common Prayer. This was followed by the formulation of the Westminster Directory [1645]. Archbishop William Laud had been executed for treason by an act of Parliament on 10th of January, 1645. The Church of England, as King Charles understood it, was already a thing of the past. Yet Charles refused to accept the new ecclesiastical order, even if his acquiescence might save his life. In his Declaration at Newport [November 1648], in the last year of his life, he still upheld his Church:

"I conceive that Episcopal government is most consonant to the Word of God, and of an apostolical institution, as it appears by the Scriptures, to have been practiced by the Apostles themselves, and by them committed and derived to particular persons as their substitutes or successors therein and hath ever since to these times been exercised by Bishops in all the Churches of Christ, and therefore I cannot in conscience consent to abolish the said government [of the Church of England]."

What makes a martyr? In today's Epistle we read [I Peter 5:1] that St. Peter calls himself "a martyr [witness] to the sufferings of Christ." From the earliest days of the Church four characteristics became the criteria for defining a true martyr:

1. Heroic sanctity and the practice of the theological virtues
2. Purity of doctrine, upheld even when facing suffering and death.
3. Public veneration by the faithful.
4. Evidence of miracles directly related to the martyr's intercession.

Unquestionably, King Charles gave clear evidence of all four criteria. His personal life was one of moral rectitude, and all his public actions were to preserve both Church and State as he understood them. Let us conclude our meditations on the life and witness of blessed Charles, King and Martyr, with a brief look at the last day of his earthly life.

CONCLUSION: CHARLES' EXECUTION

On the 30th of January, 1648 the King awoke early on a bitterly cold and sunless morning. According to his manservant, he said "this is my second marriage day; I would be as trim today as I may be, for before tonight I hope to be espoused to my blessed Jesus." His chaplain, William Juxon (who had been the Bishop of London) celebrated Holy Communion with the King; as Providence would have it, the Gospel appointed in the Book of Common Prayer for the day was Matthew 27, the passion narrative. Again today's Epistle

strikes a clear parallel between King Charles' martyrdom and that of his Lord: "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow His steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth."

Because of Parliamentary fumbles, the King was forced to wait more than five hours before his executioners were ready for him. He walked through the Royal Banqueting Hall, for which he had commissioned a great ceiling from Rubens that depicted the triumph of wisdom and justice over rebellion and falsehood, and out onto a scaffold set up in Whitehall. He calmly addressed those on the scaffold and said:

"I shall be very little heard of anybody here; I shall therefore speak a word unto you here [on the scaffold]...I think it my duty, to God first, and to my country, for to clear myself both as an honest man, a good king and a good Christian."

He continued by forgiving his captors and praying that they might still find a way to bring peace to the kingdom. Then he attested:

"If I would have given way to an arbitrary way, for to have all laws changed according to the power of the sword, I needed not to have come here; and therefore I tell you (and I pray God it be not laid to your charge) that I am the Martyr of the people."

He might have ended there but Bishop Juxon asked him to say something about his religion. He then continued:

"...that I die a Christian according to the profession of the Church of England, as I found it left me by my father...I have a good Cause and I have a gracious God; I will say no more."

As the king approached the chopping block he said: "I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be, no disturbance in the world." He took off his cloak and his insignia of the Order of the Garter and gave it to the Bishop with one word: "Remember!" He laid his head on the block and with one blow his head was severed from his body.

Some of the guards and a number of determined spectators immediately stepped forward and dipped handkerchiefs in the King's blood or tore off pieces of the blood-soaked pall. Within days of the execution stories were being circulated, both in print and by word of mouth, that relics of the King's person cured fits, blindness and scrofula. On the day of the King's burial [February 9] a book appeared in London with a Greek title: *Eikon Basilike*. Its title was intended to confuse the censors, but its subtitle explained its intent: The Pourtraicture of his Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings. It bore no publisher's mark or author's name. It was a series of meditations and prayers related to the events of the King's life, and the remaining Royalists gladly accepted it as the King's own words. By the end of the year it had been reprinted thirty-seven times and added much to the growing cult of Charles as a saint who was martyred for his loyalty to Church and Crown. Another tribute entitled A Handkerchief for Loyale Mourners appeared only two days after the execution; it compared the King's martyrdom to the Crucifixion. Thus within a month of King Charles' death he was already, by acclamation, deemed a saint. After the Restoration of his son, Charles II, to the throne and the re-establishment of the Church of England, and the new Book of Common Prayer [1662], his sainthood was finalized by a day in the liturgical calendar and a special Form of Prayer to be Used Yearly on the xxx. Day of January. I conclude with the collect appointed for this office:

"O most mighty God, terrible in Thy judgments, and wonderful in Thy doings toward the children of men, who in Thy heavy displeasure didst suffer the life of our late gracious Sovereign, to be this day taken away by wicked hands; We Thy unworthy servants, humbly confess, that the sins of this Nation have been the cause which hath brought this heavy judgment upon us. But, O gracious God, when Thou makest inquisition for blood, lay not the guilt of this innocent blood (the shedding whereof nothing but the blood of Thy Son can expiate), lay it not to the charge of the people of this Land; nor let it ever be required of us, or

our posterity. Be merciful, be merciful unto Thy people, whom Thou hast redeemed; and be not angry with us forever: But pardon us for Thy mercies sake, through the merits of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

Primary sources:

Authorized [King James'] Bible (London, 1611)

Book of Common Prayer, 1662 [NB:" A Form of Prayer.." was omitted in editions after 1859]

A Hand-Kerchife for Loyall Mourners or A Cordiall for Drooping Spirits(London, 1649)

His Majestie King James VI & I and the Divine Right of Kings, <http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/kjdivin2.htm>

St. John's College L. 12 (James 367): Coronation Ordo of 1626,

[http://joh.cam.ac.uk/library/specialcollections/manuscripts/post medieval/pmml 12/](http://joh.cam.ac.uk/library/specialcollections/manuscripts/post%20medieval/pmml%2012/)

Secondary sources:

Catholic Encyclopedia: "Coronation," <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04380a.htm>

Catholic Encyclopedia: "Martyr," <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09736b.htm>

Ermengarde Greville-Nugent, "King Charles the martyr and Reunion," SKCM, 2001, 9ff

Andrew Lacey, "Charles I and the Eikon Basilike," SKCM, 2003, 8ff

Andrew Lacey, The Cult of King Charles the Martyr (London, 2003)

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Sovereignty," <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sovereignty>

Hugh Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud, 2nd ed. (London, 1968)

C. V. Wedgwood, A Coffin for King Charles: The Trial and Execution of Charles I (London, 1964)

[The Rev'd Arnold W. Klukas, Ph.D. is currently Professor of Liturgics and Ascetical Theology at Nashotah House as well as the Vicar of Saint Mary's Chapel. He is a frequent lecturer and retreat leader in the areas of liturgy and the visual arts, the Anglican spiritual tradition, and medieval architecture. He read theology at Yale Divinity School and Oxford University, and medieval architectural history at the Courtauld Institute of the University of London and the University of Pittsburgh. Fr. Klukas became interested in the Society of SCKM when he was a curate at All Saints, Margaret Street in London. Before coming to Nashotah House he was the Rector of Grace Church, Pittsburgh, which became a solidly Anglo-Catholic parish during his ten years as its rector.]

SERMON PREACHED

**on Saint Charles's Day, 1987, at St. Mary's Church, Asheville, North Carolina,
at the IV Annual Mass of the American Region**

by the Rt. Rev'd Clarence C. Pope, Jr., Bishop of Fort Worth, Texas

It is my great privilege and honor to be asked to participate in this festival of Blessed Charles the Martyr, a king who, had he abandoned the Catholic Faith, would have lived out his natural life. He, like others I have known of a saintly disposition, seemed somewhat inept when it came to politics and planning. I am reminded of a priest in my younger days who regularly forgot where he had parked his car and who kept his parish in general administrative chaos. But he knew where the altar was, he poured out his life for his people, and was loved by the entire population of the small town in which he lived. This is somewhat typical of those whose eyes are fixed upon the transcendent to such a degree that they assume that a word here or a word there will suffice to keep things running smoothly in this world. Many historians have called Blessed Charles 'naughty' because of his belief in the divine right of kings. More than likely, he assumed many would understand this, and his actions seemed to indicate as much. Unfortunately, such was not the case, and what for Charles was an attempt to be faithful to what he believed Scripture taught—we have just heard an appropriate passage from I St. Peter—others would interpret as mean and self-centered. I don't wish to overstate the case, but I suspect that for Charles the other worldly overshadowed the worldly to the degree that he was unable to govern by plot and intrigue—necessary elements of his age. In this sense, he was quite inept and came across as bumbling and unfair.

Upon the death of his father, James I, Charles inherited a mess both from the standpoint of government and the religious life of the nation. Calvinism was rampant and the Puritan spirit everywhere. And, yet, there remained a remnant of the fullness of the Church and with the inherent Catholicism of Charles, a strong corrective movement came into being with substantial support from William Laud and other of like belief and talent.

My purpose is not to retell the story of Blessed Charles with all the complex political involvements which he embraced in an effort to bring peace and concord to Church and nation but to hold him up as an example of sanctity in the face of heavy opposition. He was unwilling to distance himself from what he believed to be a divine calling and purpose as King and at the same time demanded that the Catholic Church and the Church of England be one and the same. In the end this would cost him his life even as his Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ went to the Cross rather than deny Himself.

What I am about to say in no way should be construed as impugning the integrity of my fellow Bishops, the majority of whom disagree with me; but since there are fundamental differences of opinion over certain issues in the Church, I think it is appropriate that I share my thinking with you, especially at such an observance as this.

And so, let's peek at the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1985 at Anaheim, California. That's quite a leap, isn't it—336 years to be exact, but not so distant when we look at the issues. Among other things, the House of Bishops passed a "mind of the House" resolution designed to accelerate the election and "consecration" of women to the Episcopate. The vote was about 3 to 1 in favor thereby reflecting a basic disagreement between brothers of good will. The ordination of women to the presbyterate and episcopate, I might add, has been hopelessly confused with equal rights and justice so that it is virtually impossible to discuss the problem in its proper theological context of being and sign. Being married to a lady physician, I am keenly interested in equal rights, but this has nothing to do with the ordination

question. Later, in the House of Bishops' deliberations, a proposal to add Blessed Charles, King and Martyr, to the Calendar failed badly and amidst some laughter here and there. I suppose after Minneapolis, we should not have been surprised by the passage of the first resolution cited, nor by the failure of the Calendar resolution.

In my opinion, both these actions are symptoms of a seeming loss of respect for supernatural religion, Holy Scripture, and the Tradition of the Church. One had but to look at the overwhelming concern for the social and secular agenda to know that the decline that has afflicted the Episcopal Church of the past 15 or more years will continue and probably accelerate.[Prophetic! --Ed.]

Blessed Charles saw the Church severely impeded by an emphasis which took her away from her roots and into the novel realms of Puritanism. It is said that John Owen, a Puritan preacher who would later be the Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, once told Parliament that "paintings, crossings, crucifixes, bowings, cringing, altars, tapers, wafers, organs, anthems, litany rails, images, copes, [and] vestments" were to be considered a Roman varnish on the English religion and should be eliminated. I particularly liked his attack upon CRINGING, an obvious reference to acknowledging God's showing forth through sacrament and sign. What better way, I ask, to witness to Almighty God than to cringe before the Holy. I dare say that if one cannot cringe before the Holy, then one had better examine one's religion. In other words, what is your cringe rating?

Charles had his work cut out for him and with a singleness of purpose that is almost unequaled in history, he set out to restore that which had been cast down. I find it very difficult to read his history without coming to the conclusion that the House of Bishops made a terrible mistake in not allowing his name to be added to the calendar of Church worthies. But then, as I have suggested earlier, this is consistent with the drift of things.

For blessed Charles, the supernatural bubbled up and through the Church in a normal and natural way, not at all unlike our own belief. In part, this is the essence of the ancient, historic Church of the Bible, mediating the life and grace of God as revealed in His Son, Jesus Christ. Christ and His Church are one, and it follows that the many outward and visible signs which have been accepted universally should in a sense have the holy ambience attached. And yet, God remains transcendent.

The Puritans believed in God's transcendence, but they didn't believe too much in His creation and, therefore, the Church was viewed as very truncated and lean—a bowl of thin broth when compared to the banquet table of Catholic tradition.

Today, those of us who champion the traditional way, or the "old Church" are not in danger of having our heads chopped off, although the enormous pressure to surrender has caused severe health problems among a few of us. And the struggle is a bit different, because I believe what is happening today is the gradual emergence of a form of Christianity that is not altogether based upon Holy Scripture and Church tradition but more and more on what some believe to be new revelations. I cannot tell you what these revelations are based upon, because there doesn't seem to be any objective foundation. One relatively new bishop wrote me soon after I had received some national publicity that I needed to understand that God was changing His Church through the majority action of the House of Bishops. The implication was that I am out of step with the new revelation and am going to be left behind in the dust. So be it!! When I was ordained Deacon, Priest, and finally Bishop, at no time did the ordinal suggest that I was being admitted to anything but an order of the universal Church of the Living God. The words "Episcopal Church" were not used and are not used in conferring Holy Orders, since we profess to be acting for the Catholic Church. For me, that means the Church faithful to the givens of Holy Scripture and universal tradition. I know, believe, and practice nothing else. I am a Catholic Bishop who happens to serve in the Episcopal Church. Surely Apostolic Succession must include more than tactile succession—surely, it must contain the Faith-once-delivered to the Saints, professed and proclaimed in Holy Scripture, the Creeds, and Catholic tradition.

In the Fall of 1985, Bishop Terwilliger and I went to England to begin to make common cause with some of our British counterparts, and one of the several meetings we attended was at the Bishop of London's residence where seven English Bishops were present and one from Scotland. I must say that this was before London went to Tulsa. [This refers to a controversial episcopal act by Bishop Graham Leonard. –Ed.] When we first arrived at London's residence, we were not at all certain that we had been invited, since we were being managed by the staff of the English Church Union, and we were told to wait for what seemed to be a very long while. After an awkward space of time, the butler came to the head of the stairs overlooking our holding area and announced: "The American Bishops are requested to ascend." Obviously, we were accepted. The conversation that followed was fascinating in that it was obvious they were concerned about exactly the same things as we. We had tea, and in the final minutes of our visit, London remarked that he believed a fundamental change was occurring within all of Christianity and across denominational lines. He said sides were being taken between those who believe in revelation and supernatural religion and those whose sights are leveled upon the world., There were grunts around the room as only Englishmen can, indicating approval of his assessment. He concluded by saying that he believed by the turn of the Century we would begin to see a realignment across ecclesial boundaries of these two groups since they are, in his opinion, incompatible.

Is this an accurate diagnosis and is the treatment appropriate? I don't at the moment really know, but I tend to think so. I am not sure Blessed Charles would have the answer either, and yet, maybe he did. His commitment to the Catholic Faith was absolutely unswerving and is an example to us all. His way was to stay the course.

As Charles was about to be beheaded, he turned to his chaplain, Bishop William Juxon, and said, "I go from a corruptible crown to an incorruptible, where no disturbance can be. . . ." God grant us that kind of faith and courage for the days ahead.

[This sermon of 20 years ago is fascinating to read today. It is reprinted from the June, 1987, SKCM News.]

SAINT CHARLES – King and Martyr

by Donald Hole

We are all familiar with the fascinating romance and poignant tragedy associated with the House of Stuart in connection with our country's history. It has formed the basis of countless novels and songs and plays. The political history of the XVII Century—the struggle between King and Parliament—has given occasion to much controversy into which it is needless to enter here. Broadly speaking, it was the clash between the growth of parliamentary government and the royal despotism formerly exercised by the Plantagenet and Tudor monarchies. But anyone who imagines that the parliamentary cause stood either for democracy or for religious toleration is suffering from a strange delusion. The Parliament of those days—and indeed for long afterwards—was in no way representative of the English nation or of the common people. It represented the aristocracy, the squirearchy, and the commercial classes who had grown rich and powerful out of the “great pillage” of the Church's property which had taken place in the previous Century, and who had founded great families upon the spoils of the monasteries. That good eventually came out of evil, and that the constitutional monarchy which was gradually evolved through the XVIII and XIX Centuries, together with a more adequate representation of the people, has been on the whole a great advantage, we may readily admit. But that does not alter the fact that the civil war of 1642 was a war of religion quite as much as it was a war of politics. Politically it resulted, not in parliamentary government, but in military despotism. From a religious point of view it resulted in the temporary triumph of that foreign Protestantism which had been gradually growing in strength through the previous reigns, and, very nearly, in the total destruction of the Church of England. Few English churchmen at the present day seem to realize that, but for the courage and consistency of one man, who died a martyr's death on 30th January, 1649, the Church of England would no longer exist. There would be no Archbishop of Canterbury on the throne of Saint Augustine, no Bishops, no Dean of Saint Paul's, no canons, archdeacons, rectors or vicars, and even Bishop Barnes would be unable to draw the emoluments of the see of Birmingham.

It has been sagely remarked that “Christian Monarchy was last achieved here by Charles I” (in a leading article of the *Tablet* for 28 September 1940). That, of course, does not mean that no subsequent sovereign has been sincerely attached to the Christian religion; it means that Charles was the last English monarch who realized, and attempted to put into practice, the idea of “Christian Kingship” as understood throughout the middle ages. We must try to understand what that was.

The “Christian King” was the “eldest son of the Church”, subject to her laws in all spiritual matters, but bound by his office to defend her rights, and to give to her judgments the sanctions of secular law. He could exercise no spiritual function or jurisdiction, yet he was something more than a mere layman. He was a “*persona mixta*”—and this was symbolized by the ceremonies of his coronation. He was clothed in Episcopal garments—stole and dalmatic and cope—and he was anointed with holy oil. It gave him, moreover, both the right and the duty to exercise a certain supervision over the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and was the only justification of his preponderating influence in the appointment of bishops.

“Sir Henry Watton, diplomatist, ecclesiastic, and poet, wrote a ‘panegerick’ of his master which happily expressed what churchmen thought and courtiers knew about their young king eight years before. ‘When you had assumed the crown before all other things there was resplendent in you a religious mind, the support of kingdoms, and joy of good men. The Chapel Royal was never more in order. The number of eminent divines daily increased. Sermons in no age more frequented, in none more learned. No execration rashly proceeded from your mouth. Your ears abhorred not only any wanton but even the least sordid word!! . . . From first to last the King remained a devoted son of the Church.” (W. H. Hutton, *A History of the English Church*, p. 4)

The evening before his coronation was spent in religious exercises, when Laud (acting Dean of Westminster) instructed him in his duties and how to prepare for them. Laud became his confessor, and retained that office until his death, when it passed to Bishop Juxon. (*Ibid.*, p. 4)

Charles exercised the utmost care in the choice of bishops and in other ecclesiastical appointments which came within his patronage, and he took care that those whom he appointed should realize their duties. Laud records how in 1626 he "chid" them all "that in this time of Parliament we were silent in the cause of the Church and did not make known to him what might be useful and beneficial to the Church, professing himself ready to promote the cause of the Church". (Hutton, *Hist. Eng. CH.*, p. 25)

Hutton remarks in this connection that Charles was "incurably Erastian", but this charge is certainly not justified. Erastus, a German heretic of the XVI Century, taught that the Church's function was merely to persuade and exhort, and that it had no power to enforce its teaching even by excommunication; the punishment of all ecclesiastical offences being the exclusive province of the civil magistrate. Charles, on the contrary, recognized most clearly the Church's magisterium and did all he could to support the bishops in the exercise of it. It was Parliament, not the King, that was "incurably Erastian" in its claim to decide questions of theology and Church discipline, and it was on this very ground that the King and Parliament came into collision long before the political controversy developed. Yet underlying this charge of Erastianism there is a certain truth. The fact is that Charles's position as a "Christian King" was hampered and to some extent vitiated, by something which he had inherited, and for which he was not responsible. He ascended the throne as the "Supreme Governor of the Church of England". This "Royal Supremacy", initiated by Henry VIII and reasserted by Elizabeth, was in fact a caricature of "Christian Kingship".

For the first thousand years of her history the Church of England had claimed to form a part of the Catholic Church, not only on the ground of holding the Catholic faith and possessing the Apostolic Ministry, but as being included in the administrative unity of the Church Universal, which found its centre and focus at Rome. The Church of England had never claimed to be an independent ecclesiastical entity, but only to consist of two provinces of the church, which looked to the Chief Bishop of Christendom as their spiritual Head. Appeals lay to Rome from the English ecclesiastical courts which administered the Canon Law common to the whole Church. The breach between England and Rome effected by King Henry VIII did not arise out of any theological difference, but from purely personal reasons. Henry wanted the Pope to grant him a divorce from his lawful wife, and the Pope refused. In order to attain his purpose the King first obtained complete control of the ecclesiastical machinery, and then, by Act of Parliament, forced his subjects to repudiate all papal authority and to accept him as Supreme Head of the Church of England. In the picturesque language of Nicholes Harpesfield, he "cut off the head of Saint Peter and put it upon his own shoulders, an ugly sight to beholde". For the Canon Law of the Universal Church was substituted the ecclesiastical law of Parliament and royal injunctions and letters patent.

Under Edward VI the Royal Supremacy was used to force upon the Church a new mode of worship and to foster the growth of foreign Protestantism, subsequently known as Puritanism. It was a grim nemesis, that Parliament, which had been the subservient tool in the hands of the Tudor monarchy, for establishing the Royal Supremacy over the Church, should in the following Century compass the death of the Church's "Supreme Governor" for defending the Church's faith and worship. Charles's attempt to realize the ideal of "Christian Kingship" was hindered, not helped, by the fact that he was by statute law the "Supreme Governor of the Church of England".

In connection with this we must consider his attitude with regard to Rome. By the time that he ascended the throne the "Roman Question" had become a political issue rather than a theological one, very largely through the misguided action of various Popes. Under Elizabeth, 'popery' had become associated with Spanish domination, and English nationalism rose up in protest against it. "Popish recusants" were unjustly accused of being disloyal to the English Crown, a charge which they disproved most effectively by dying in defence of the Crown and giving up all their temporal goods in the royal cause. It is true that there was a controversy between Anglican and Roman writers, exemplified in the famous dispute between Archbishop Laud and the Jesuit, Fisher; but if we study that controversy, it becomes clear that the points at issue were quite capable of reconciliation. They referred chiefly to current teaching and popular abuses common among Roman Catholics of that day, but not taught authoritatively by the Roman Church; of the exact meaning of the term "transubstantiation"; and of the papal claim to political domination. It must never be forgotten that the learned Franciscan, Christopher Davenport (known in Religion as "Sancta Clara"), chaplain to Queen Henrietta Maria, anticipated J. H. Newman and Bishop Forbes by 200 years, in showing that the XXXIX articles were quite capable of being reconciled with the teaching of the Council of Trent.

When King Charles and Archbishop Laud called themselves "Protestants", they did not mean that they protested against the Catholic Religion, but that they protested against certain abuses which they believed to be current among Roman Catholics of that day, and against certain papal claims which they believed to be inconsistent with the national political independence.

The Caroline Divines did not protest against the Pope's spiritual supremacy. Thus, Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh, enumerates the papal power which the Church of England does not acknowledge: (1) Power to dispense the law of the land; (2) Judiciary power in respect of property; (3) Legislative power in dictating civil laws; (4) Powers of patronage in disposing of English benefices; (5) The exorbitant fees claimed by papal courts in the matter of granting dispensations, licences, etc. There is not one word against the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. (Oxford Movement Centenary Tractates, No. VI, p. 20)

Several times during the XVII Century, a reconciliation between England and Rome, on the acceptance of the Pope's spiritual Supremacy, came within measurable distance. King James I in a speech before Parliament said: "I acknowledge the Church of Rome to be our Mother Church." In the oath taken at his coronation he pointedly refused to state "That the Pope hath no power to excommunicate me", substituting the words "That no excommunication of the Pope can warrant my subjects to practice against my Person or State". He even wrote to Pope Paul V offering to recognize his spiritual primacy and to reunite the English Church with Rome on condition only of his disclaiming political sovereignty over kings. The offer, however, was rejected. (*ibid.*)

King Charles I told Panzani, the envoy of Pope Urban VIII, "that he would willingly have parted with one of his hands, rather than such a schism (i.e., between England and Rome) should ever have happened. (*ibid.*, p. 6) Sir Francis Windebank, a secretary of state, said to Panzani: "If we had neither Jesuits nor Puritans in England I am confident that union might easily be effected" (*ibid.*, p. 7), and that "all moderate men in Church and State thirsted after reunion".

From all this we can gather King Charles's attitude towards religion. His first collision with Parliament was on this very point. Richard Montague, a Canon of Windsor, wrote a pamphlet in 1624 which we should consider a very moderate expression of Anglicanism. He denied that the Church of Rome was apostate, though admitting that she was corrupt. He asserts the truth of the Real Presence, while rejecting transubstantiation. He asserts the power of Absolution though denying that confession was in all cases necessary. He defends the use of Images without worshipping or adoring them. This pamphlet was denounced in the House of Commons and an appeal was made by Parliament to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Abbot). The Archbishop was himself a Puritan, and advised Montague to revise his opinions, instead of which Montague appealed to the King. James, on reading the pamphlet, exclaimed: "If this is popery, so am I a papist". Montague then presented a new pamphlet entitled *Appello Cæsarem*. The whole incident is eloquent of the confusion of the times. What right had Parliament to take cognizance of doctrinal questions? The answer is that the Tudor sovereigns had used Parliament for that very purpose. The Royal Supremacy itself stood upon an Act of Parliament. Now Parliament was taking the bit between its teeth and exercising its power independently of the King. If Parliament had made the King "Supreme Governor of the Church of England", why should not Parliament take that supreme government into its own hands? Montague, in his *Appello Cæsarem*, appealed from Parliament and from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the King—thereby acknowledging the Cæsaro-papalism introduced by Henry VIII. James, however, died before the book was published, and Montague had written another book in which he upheld the Invocation of Saints.

On 7 July 1625, Parliament decided to impeach him, and forthwith put him into prison.

Charles, who had now ascended the throne, intimated to the House of Commons that "what had been there said and resolved without consulting him in the case, was not pleasing to him", and he gave practical effect to his displeasure by making Montague (still in prison) one of his Royal Chaplains.

He did not, however, accept the "appeal to Cæsar". He, perfectly correctly, referred the case to a committee of bishops—Montaigne (London), Neile (Durham), Andrewes (Winchester), and Laud (St. Davids). They reported that Montague's book contained nothing but what was in their opinion the doctrine of the Church of England. The proceedings in Parliament were squashed, and in 1628 Charles promoted Montague to the see of Chichester. On the death of Abbot in 1633 he made Laud Archbishop of Canterbury.

Hutton remarks that the doctrine of the "Divine Right of Kings" and the duty of non-resistance, so clear to the Cavaliers of the XVII Century, was "the answer of English Controversialists to the claim of the Papacy". It was certainly something very different from the doctrine of "Christian Kingship". The Christian King was "the Lord's Anointed" because of his sacring by the Church, but he had no "right divine to govern wrong". In theory at any rate, the highest arbiter of justice and equity was the Universal Church speaking through the Chief Bishop of Christendom. Again and again, as in the case of Saint Anselm and Saint Thomas of Canterbury, the Papacy had been the only power that could protect the subject from royal tyranny and injustice. When England under Henry VIII became separated from the rest of Christendom, a new theory of kingship had to be sought, and it was found in the theory of "Divine Right"—the omnipotence of the king as king.

Charles, in spite of some unwise support given to the advocates of Divine Right, honestly attempted to govern as a Christian King. He realized most profoundly that he was the servant of the Church, not its master—that it was his duty not to make laws for the Church, but to see that the Church's laws were carried out. In this he found a loyal supporter and a ready instrument in Archbishop Laud.

"There was no department of Church life", says Wakeman, "which his energy did not enliven, no recess too dark for his eyes to penetrate. A visitation of his province, carried out by his Vicar General in 1633-1636, did much to remove the outward signs of Puritan nonconformity. The use of the surplice was enforced, kneeling at the reception of Communion enjoined, the Holy Table moved from the body of the church to the east end, placed altar-wise along the east wall, and railed in to preserve it from desecration. Churchwardens were obliged to repair the church fabrics, and Cathedral chapters to observe their own statutes. The court of High Commission under Laud's presidency kept a vigilant guard over the morals of the nation and the rights of the church. . . . The country squire who had seized part of the glebe or churchyard to round off his estate . . . the man of position who was guilty of incest, the courtier who treated his wife with cruelty, were all brought under the chastening hand of the High Commission. 'Laud intended', says Clarendon, 'that the discipline of the Church should be felt as well as spoken of, and that it should be applied to the greatest and most splendid transgressors as well as to the punishment of smaller offences and of meaner offenders'. Under his influence the bishop began to make much more searching enquiries in their visitation articles, and so revive the discipline of the laity, which had been suffered to fall into disuse. . . . Householders were obliged to send their children and servants to be catechised. . . . All parishioners had to make their communions three times a year, and attend the services of their own parish church, to bow at the name of Jesus, and uncover their heads during the service." (H. O. Wakeman, *Hist. Ch. of Eng.*, pp. 368-9)

It must be understood that the nonconformists here mentioned were not ministers of a separate religious body, but Puritans who had been thrust into English livings, and who refused to obey the rules or teach the faith of the Church of which they were the official representatives. The conception of religious toleration—the existence of various religious denominations all equal before the law—had not yet arisen. The puritans were as fanatically opposed to it as were the Anglicans. It was a question of which party should capture the Church of England. Charles, in supporting Laud's efforts to enforce church discipline, was carrying out the ancient idea of Christian Kingship. Bit throughout their endeavours runs one ironical fact. Laud, in restoring the altar to its proper place, had to rely, not on catholic custom but on a royal injunction of Queen Elizabeth, while the Prayer Book, upon whose use he so strongly insisted, had no canonical authority whatever. It had never ever been submitted to Convocation, but depended solely upon an Act of Parliament—the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity—which same authority had also given to the English sovereign the statutory position of "Supreme Governor of the Church of England"!

The Court of High Commission, through which Laud was constrained to act, in enforcing the discipline of the Church, was not an ecclesiastical court at all. It was a secular court set up by Elizabeth's Supremacy Act, for the purpose of exercising the ecclesiastical jurisdiction attached to the Crown by the statute of Henry VIII.

This court had power "to exercise by delegation from the crown the spiritual jurisdiction formerly exercised by the Church". (Wakeman, p. 319)

Nevertheless, it is true that Charles, in spite of all handicaps and all anomalies, did strive to realize the Catholic idea of Christian Kingship, and soon the issues were to be brought to a point when he would have to choose between a deliberate betrayal of the Church of England and dying a martyr's death.

That the civil war was a war of religion fully as much as it was a war of politics, is shown by the conduct of the parliamentary army and by Parliament itself.

"As the Parliamentary army set out from London in September, 1642, they sacked the churches on their way, burning the communion tables and destroying surplices and prayer-books. . . . At Oxford they fired shots at the statue of the Blessed Virgin with her infant Son in her arms over the new porch of St. Mary's church. Later they hacked to pieces the representation of Christ on tapestry at Canterbury, and made a stone statue of Him a target. The cathedral church of Worcester was foully defiled, and many another after it. Charing Cross was destroyed by order of the Common Council on 2 May 1643. Before that, on 24 April, the House of Commons had appointed a 'committee for demolishing of Monuments of Superstition and Idolatry'. . . . Bishop Hall tells in sad words the 'furious sacrilege' which he witnessed in the 'reforming the Cathedral Church at Norwich'. . . ." (Hutton, *Hist. Eng. Ch.*, pp. 125-6)

Under this order every "altar of table of stone" was to be destroyed, also all crucifixes, crosses, images, and pictures (especially of the Blessed Virgin Mary). Churches were turned into ale-houses, cathedrals used for stabling horses. Even the priceless old glass windows, depicting the lives of the Saints, were ruthlessly smashed.

In January, 1643, a bill was passed in both Houses for "abolishing episcopacy". Later in the year, as the price of military assistance from the Scots, the House of Commons accepted the Solemn League and Covenant, pledging it to the extirpation of "popery and prelacy" and the acceptance of a Presbyterian ministry and Calvinistic doctrine.

"From the year 1643, therefore, the clergy began to be ejected from their livings, partly as malignants, or aiders of the king party, partly for refusing the Covenant and adhering to the Prayer Book. The number ejected cannot have fallen far short of two thousand". (*Ibid.*, p. 128)

"Some of the benefices thus vacated were filled by the patrons with Presbyterian or independent ministers who had been ordained by the presbyteries, or, in many cases, had not received any sort of ordination at all. Some were simply seized by men who made themselves ministers of the vacant parishes without any lawful authority whatever". (H. O. Wakeman, *Hist. Eng. Ch.*, p. 376)

In 1644 the observance of church festivals was abolished. Christmas was ordered to be observed as a fast. The use of the Prayer Book, even in private houses, was made a penal offence. Laud, after a mock trial, was executed in 1645.

After the death of Laud an attempt was made to arrange peace. Commissioners from both sides met at Uxbridge on 29 January 1645. But the negotiations broke down

"because Charles was determined to preserve episcopacy, while the Scots who now controlled the policy of Parliament, were determined on its destruction. Charles was willing, on the advice of his chaplains, to grant toleration, but he said: 'Let my condition be never so low, I am resolved by the grace of God never to yield up this Church'." (See W. H. Hutton's article on Charles I in *A Dictionary of English Church History*, Edited by Ollard.)

After the battle of Nazeby it became evident that the royal cause was hopeless, and on 6 May 1646, Charles gave himself up to the Scots. He was king of Scotland as well as king of England, and a rift had already taken place between the Scottish Presbyterians and the English Parliament, which was by this time mainly Independent and disinclined to establish Presbyterian discipline to its full extent.

"Then came months of difficult negotiation. The king was willing to allow the establishment of Presbyterianism for a time, and the suppression of the Independents, in whom men like Baxter as well as the Scots already saw their most dangerous foes; but he insisted on the maintenance of some at least of the sees, as a security for freedom of Church worship and for the continuance of apostolical succession". (W. H. Hutton, *A History of the English Church*, p. 138)

The Scots would only promise their aid on condition that the king would consent to the abolition of the Church of England and the establishment of a Presbyterian Church in its place after the Scottish model. The king refused, and his doom was sealed. The Scots handed him over to the English Parliament.

During his imprisonment at Holmby House, another attempt was made to establish peace by what was known as the Treaty of Newport, but it came to nothing because the king still refused entirely to abandon episcopacy. "How can we expect God's blessing", he said, "if we relinquish his Church? . . . we should have neither lawful priests, nor sacraments duly administered, nor God publicly served, but according to the foolish fancy of every idle person". (W. H. Hutton's article in *Dict. Eng. Ch. Hist.*)

On 11 November he escaped to Carisbrook Castle, where he once more became a prisoner, and on 30 January 1649 he suffered death before a vast crowd assembled at Whitehall.

Thus there were three distinct occasions on which Charles might have saved his life and regained his throne by the sacrifice of his principles. There can be little doubt, as Bishop Creighton remarks, that "had Charles been willing to abandon the Church and give up episcopacy, he might have saved his throne and his life. But on this point he stood firm; for this he died, and by dying saved it for the future".

We are therefore justified in claiming King Charles as a Martyr for the Catholic religion.

That dreadful deed, when, as G. K. Chesterton expresses it, a Puritan "cut off the anointed head of the sacramental man of the middle ages", sent a profound thrill of horror through the whole country.

"From the very moment that the axe fell", says Fr. Sillitoe (in a sermon preached at Saint Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe on 30 January 1937), he was hailed by popular acclamation as a saint and a martyr. Men and women surged to the scaffold to dip their handkerchiefs in the martyr's blood and purchase blood-stained chips of wood to be preserved as sacred relics. Very shortly afterwards miracle-working properties were claimed for these relics. "In 1637, three years before the Restoration, the dowager Countess of Devonshire built a Church at Peak Forest, Derbyshire, and though possible never used nor consecrated until after the Restoration, it was nevertheless at the time of its building dedicated to Saint Charles, King and Martyr, which dedication remains to this date". (See article by Rev'd E. Milner-White in *The Church Times* for 27 August 1937.)

In ancient times (at least in some parts of the Church) this recognition of sainthood by popular acclamation constituted what afterwards came to be known as "canonization". Many of the Celtic Saints could probably claim nothing beyond this. In more organized parts of the Church the matter lay in the hands of the local bishop or in those of the metropolitan or patriarch. "About the XII Century local canonization began to give way in the West to the centralized action of Rome. . . . Diocesan beatification, however, did not die out until the present elaborate process was finally defined by the Bulls of Pope Urban VIII in 1625 and 1634". (See article by Rev'd E. Milner-White in the *Church Times* for 27 August 1937.) Under this process, the test required (after orthodoxy and heroic virtue) is miracles. Miracles are also demanded by some of the Eastern Churches, though not by all. "Rome", says Fr. Milner-White, "is fast lessening its insistence upon 'miracles'. It did not require them in the cases of More and Fisher, though it may be said that the fact of martyrdom overrode the necessity. But in any case, 'miracle' to Rome is coming to mean no more than an answer to prayer, following on the invocation of the holy man". *Incorruptibility of body* used to be another test, but was definitely given up by the Church of Russia in 1705, and by Rome at a much earlier date. (article by Fr. Milner-White)

It is, however, interesting to note that even this test is met in the case of Saint Charles. In 1813, in the presence of the Prince Regent, the Duke of Cumberland, Count Munster, the Dean of Westminster, and the Royal Physician, Sir Henry Holford, the vault in Saint George's Chapel (where the King had been interred) was opened, and the coffin was uncovered, when the body was found to have suffered no corruption. The narrative to this effect was drawn up by Sir Henry Holford and signed by the Prince Regent. It has been deposited in the British Museum. (J. G. Muddiman, *Trial of Charles I*, with preface by the late Earl of Birkenhead, p. 166)

We must now consider the formal canonization of the Royal Martyr. It must be admitted that the "Cavalier Parliament", which met on 8 May 1661, made a bad start, almost amounting to bathos. It ordered that the 30th of January should be observed as a *fast*, as an act of national penance for having slain the King. Here we see the doctrine of "Divine Right" in full play.

In contract with this, the Bishop of Winchester (Bryan Duppa) issued a form of prayer for that day." (W. H. Hutton, *A History of the English Church*, p. 196):

"O Lord, we offer unto Thee all praise and thanks for the glory of Thy grace that shined forth in Thine anointed servant, Charles; and we beseech Thee to give us all grace by a careful studious imitation

of this Thy blessed Saint and Martyr, that we may be made worthy to receive benefit by his prayers, which he, in common with the Church Catholic, offers up unto Thee for that part of it here militant, through Thy Son, our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ."

Here we have a clear example of the ancient form of diocesan canonization already alluded to. But something more was needed than diocesan action.

Mr. Chesterton says:

"Whether or no we believe that the Reformation really reformed, there can be little doubt that the Restoration did not really restore. Charles II was never in the old sense a King, he was Leader of the Opposition to his own ministers." (G. K. Chesterton, *A Short History of England*, p. 179)

He certainly did not restore the idea of Christian Kingship so firmly held by his father—he was content to rely upon the Royal Supremacy. When the question arose of restoring the use of the Prayer Book, he sought for a compromise with the Presbyterians by referring the matter to the Savoy Conference, composed of divines of both parties in equal number. When he found that agreement was hopeless, he referred the matter to Convocation—but not as to a body which had supreme spiritual authority in the Province. He ordered it to "review" the Book of Common Prayer, and to send to him in writing any additions and alterations they might think fit "for his further allowance and confirmation"—which, if he approved, he would then recommend to Parliament "that the said Book of Common Prayer shall be appointed to be used". (See preamble to the Act of Uniformity, 1662.)

Convocation carried out this mandate very conscientiously, and submitted more than 600 "additions and alterations", all in a Catholic direction, which, on receiving the royal approval, were embodied in the Act of Uniformity of 1662. In reviewing the Kalendar, Convocation inserted the name of "King Charles the Martyr" against the 30th January. It also drew up a "form of prayer" for use on that day, as for a "red-letter" Saint's Day. It included special psalms and lessons at matins and evensong, and a special collect, epistle, and gospel at Holy Communion. This may be said to constitute the Provincial canonization of Saint Charles, and to justify the dedication of Churches in his honour. There are six churches under this dedication:

Saint Charles, King and Martyr, Peak Forest (1657)

King Charles the Martyr, Falmouth (1662)

Charles Church, Plymouth (1665)

King Charles the Martyr, Tunbridge Wells (1684)

King Charles the Martyr, Newtown-by-Wem (1861)

King Charles the Martyr, South Mymms (1940)

On 1 September 1665, Ward, Bishop of Exeter, writing to Archbishop Sancroft, speaks of his consecration of a church in Falmouth "by the name of Charles Church, *in memoriam Caroli Regis et martyris*, out of the honour which every true son of the Church owes to his memory (the only person canonized for a martyr by it." (Hutton, *Hist. Eng. Church.*, p. 194) This may show some doubt in the mind of the good bishop as to when the Church of England was founded (he may even have thought that it was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth!) but at least he shows no doubt as to the formal canonization of Saint Charles.

The "form of prayer" drawn up by Convocation for use of 30th January, was not ready in time to be included in the "Book Annexed", which was authorized by the Act of Uniformity, but it was issued under a Royal Warrant which was repeated at the beginning of all subsequent reigns until that of Edward VII. The Kalendar, on the other hand, formed part of the "Book Annexed", and was duly enacted by Parliament.

Various attempts were made by the Whig party to get rid of the services commemorating King Charles the Martyr. These finally succeeded in 1859, when the Royal Warrant authorizing them was revoked, and it was directed that the services should no longer be printed with the Prayer Book. At the same time the name of King Charles was expunged from the Kalendar—but it was done quite illegally by the Queen's printers on instructions received from the Home Secretary.

It has been remarked that "The loss of the actual services for the 30th January" (drawn up by the Convocation of 1661) "is hardly to be deplored, for the emphasis throughout the Office was on reparation for the murder of the King, and there appears little of the joy which the Church delights to show on the birthday of a Martyr."

Various attempts have been made to get the name of King Charles restored to the Kalendar. The Lower House of Convocation in 1915, 1917, and 1918 petitioned for its restoration, but each time it was refused by the bishops of the Upper House.

This raises some very interesting and complicated questions. In the first place, it is difficult to see how Convocation could “restore” what it had never abrogated. The insertion of King Charles’s name in the Kalendar has already all the authority that the Church (or Parliament either) can give to it. All the Convocation could do would be to request the Home Secretary to instruct the King’s printers to abstain from their illegal action!—a petition which is not very likely to produce much result. But even if it were successful, what “form of service” should we use for the 30th January? Should we feel inclined to use that prescribed by the Convocation of 1661? I do not think so—at least not without some modifications. For some years past the feast of Saint Charles has been observed in a growing number of churches. In the early 1900s it was observed at Saint Margaret, Pattens, and later at Saint Cuthbert, Philbeach Gardens, and at Saint Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe. The Society of King Charles the Martyr was founded in 1894, and one of its objects is to encourage the observance of this feast, and it has issued an Order of the Mass for use on that day. The Epistle and Gospel (suggestive as they are of the doctrine of Divine Right) are the same as those authorized by the Convocation of 1661. But the collect composed by Bishop Duppa has been substituted for the Convocation collect, and the service has been enriched by the addition of Introit, Gradual, Tract, Sequence, Offertory, Secret, Communion, and Post Communion. The Bishops of 1661 would hardly recognize it!

This raises the whole question of the canonical authority of Convocation—bound hand and foot, as it is, by the “Submission of the Clergy” and the Royal Supremacy, and in enforced separation from the Centre of Catholic Christendom. The “form of service” for 30th January had the approval of Convocation—so had the revised Prayer Book of 1662. But neither one nor the other was promulgated by Convocation; the former was promulgated by Royal Warrant and the latter by Act of Parliament. The whole position of the Church of England is anomalous, and will remain anomalous until Catholic Reunion has been effected and the Royal Supremacy abolished.

Under these circumstances the tendency among English Catholics has been to revert to older models of liturgical worship, which have the sanction of 1,000 years of Catholic use and authority, from the introduction of the “office hymn” at Evensong to the celebration of the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday. Such sanction cannot, of course, be pleaded for the commemoration of Saint Charles the Martyr. All that can be said is, that Convocation, with its strictly limited powers, has given it such Provincial recognition as it was able to give. For the actual form of service, we may well use a very wide discretion, keeping as closely as possible to Catholic models for celebrating the festivals of the Saints.

The great point is that the Festival should be revived. It has already received all the sanction that Provincial authority is capable of giving to it, and Englishmen need to be reminded of the last exponent of “Christian Kingship” and of all he did and suffered on behalf of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*.

We may well be assured that Saint Charles, in glory, has not forgotten the Church in whose defence he died; may his prayers hasten the time when that Church shall once more regain her full Catholic heritage.

[A tract published in 1941 by The Society of Our Lady of Walsingham, Walsingham, Norfolk {U.K.}, and printed by The Southern Post, Ltd., 40 Fleet Street, London E.C. 4. Other works by the same author include Love and Death, The Blessed Dead, The Church and the Church of England {with a preface by Lord Halifax}, and England’s Nazareth: History of the Holy Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham. The Handbook, England’s Nazareth, is in its subsequent editions familiar to all pilgrims to that Norfolk Shrine. Further, it is noteworthy that Father Hope Patten, restorer of the Shrine ruined at the English Reformation, also entertained a lively devotion to the Royal Martyr and that a Guild of All Souls chapel now stands at the Shrine. Together with the all pervasive celebrations of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass these emphases parallel the four main devotional Societies in our Communion, the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Guild of All Souls, the Society of Mary, and our Society. The tract was found by our regular contributor, Richard Mammana, on sale for twenty-five cents at the Strand in New York!]

(image not available in web edition)

IMAGE OF SAINT CHARLES IN CHAPEL OF SAINT ANN AT THE SHRINE OF OUR LADY OF WALSINGHAM

PHOTO: CLAUD FISHER, WALSINGHAM

SKCM News — December, 2007

British Headquarters

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

Mrs. Irene Sillitoe, *Vice President*

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

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

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

American Region

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., *American Representative*
P. O. Box 79212
Waverly MA 02479 wuonola@earthlink.net

William M. Gardner, Jr., *Membership Secretary*
6152 Verde Trail North, Apt. D211
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

John R. Covert, *Webmaster* covert@covert.org

The Rev'd William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D. *Editor,*
SKCM News bill4329@hotmail.com

Kalendar of Anniversaries

1 January 1651	King Charles II crowned at Scone
10 January 1645	Martyrdom of Archbishop Laud
15 January 1649	King Charles I brought to Saint James's
23 January 1649	Scottish Commissioners protested against mock trial of King Charles
27 January 1649	Sentence pronounced on King Charles I
30 January 1649	Decollation of King Charles the Martyr - 2005, 356 th Anniversary
2 February 1626	King Charles I crowned
6 February 1685	King Charles II died
9 February 1649	Burial of King Charles I at Windsor
27 March 1625	Accession of King Charles I
27 March 1894	Society of King Charles the Martyr formed
1 April 1813	Finding of the body of Saint Charles, K.M., at Windsor
26 April 1661	Canonisation of Saint Charles: Convocation unanimously approved the office for 30 January
14 May 1662	Royal Warrant directing the use of the office for 30 January in all churches
29 May 1630	King Charles II born
29 May 1660	King Charles II restored

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

SOLEMN MASS OF SAINT CHARLES

11 a.m., Saturday 26 January 2007

Mount Calvary Church, Baltimore MD

The Rev'd Jason A. Catania, SSC, Rector

The Very Rev'd Gary W. Kriss, D.D., Preaching

Haydn – *Missa brevis Joannis de Deo*

Followed by LUNCHEON & ANNUAL MEETING

Reservations (\$15 per person by 20 Jan.) to Mount Calvary Parish Office,
816 N. Eutaw Street, Baltimore MD 21201-4624

Directions please phone (410) 728 6140