

## 2011 Dues Notice

**Please Remember to Pay your \$15 Annual Dues by the Due Date, 30 January.** Your dues notice is enclosed; please send payment (in U.S. dollars) to Mr. Ruff in the envelope provided. For convenience, you may pay in advance for *any number of years at the current rate*. You will be relieved of annual dues payments and may be protected from rate increases depending on when they occur and how far into the future you pay. Life Membership, available for \$360 (\$250 for those 65 and over), is even more convenient. Either of these options will reduce your clerical work and is conveniently available on the regular, pink dues form.

Tax-deductible donations to the general fund may be made now or at any time; these and special purpose donations are tax-deductible, but dues and goods are not.

The words of the *Holy Bible* apply to us, our behavior, and our circumstances. The breadth of the Bible and its widely applicable text have made the Good Book valuable as a resource for the troubled, for decision making, for meditation, and as a supplement to prayer when we are joyful, thankful, doubting, vexed, or pondering serious problems. In the Gospel we read, "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given" (*S. Matt. xiii: 12*), puzzling, but perhaps referring to caring for others and using our talents, more than to money and material assets. The same principle applies to giving money away and to receiving it. Those members who have been designated Benefactors do not stop giving because of their achievement; they continue to be generous. Nor do members of the Order of Laud stop doing things to benefit the Society. This is often the case with boards of non-profit entities, where a trustee's *primary* responsibility is to give and raise money. Those who already have given at the highest levels, are most who give even more. Life Members, despite their relief from paying dues, tend still to make annual donations, like members who pay ahead. Please remember the vital importance of donations in enabling our witness to our Patron's Cause, and the Society's. Thank you to all who generously and regularly contribute, within their respective mean. Memberships renew automatically on 1 January unless cancelled in writing before that date.

### *Become a Patron of our 2011 Gatherings*

Please support thr *Annual Mass* (29 January 2011) and the *Mass Commemorating the Recognition of King Charles the Martyr's Cultus* (7 May 2011).

Notices of these gatherings, suitable to be copied and posted, appear on pp. 3 and 4 and on our website. Please seek to post them at places you patronize or send some to friends. Strategic placement may attract potential members to the gathering, where most new members enroll. Please invite a friend or colleague to accompany you to the mass and luncheon. Seriously consider becoming a **Patron** or **Donor**. Use the purple slip enclosed. Your tax-deductible contributions support expenses of the masses—the music, flowers in memory of departed members, and our Select Preacher's travel expenses, as needed—all dedicated to the greater glory of God.

#### GATHERINGS *A.M.D.G.* IN 2011

*Annual Mass* ☉ 11 a.m., Sat. 29 January 2011  
362<sup>nd</sup> Anniversary of the Decollation, K.C.M.  
Notice, p. 3; details, pp. 2 and 5

*Saint Paul's K St.*  
2430 'K' Street, N.W., Washington DC 20037

11 a.m., Sat. 7 May 2011 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Mass:  
*Recognition of the Cultus of King Charles the Martyr*  
Notice, p. 4; details, pp. 5-6

*Church of the Resurrection,*  
119 East 74<sup>th</sup> St., New York NY 10021

2011 GATHERINGS

**XXVIII Annual Mass in Washington, D.C., 11 a.m., 29 January 2011**

**THE 362<sup>ND</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROYAL MARTYRDOM**

*Saint Paul's 'K' Street, Washington, D.C., 11 a.m., Saturday 29 January 2011.* We are honored and very pleased as we are soon to be enjoying the gracious hospitality of the The Rev'd Dr. Andrew L. Sloane, rector of Saint Paul's, and the people of the parish, as we did most recently in 2003. Notice of the Mass appears on the next page (copy it and post) and also on our website. You are invited to support the expenses, including music and flowers, as a Patron or Donor using the purple slip included in this mailing (tax-deductible).

Our *Select Preacher* at the mass will be *The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC, OL*, sometime rector of Saint Paul's. A Society member for many years, Father Martin is widely known as American Region Superior of the Society of Mary and a spokesman for the spiritual benefits and witness of all the Catholic Devotional Societies and their value to parishes and the church today. Those of us, speaking from my own experience, who have worshiped in a parish where the regular devotions pertinent to these Societies' aims remind us of important verities, help embed them in our souls, and to know their value to ourselves, our parish, the church at large, and the *worship of God*. What an embarrassment it is that our society is described as 'post-Christian' and that most people think it silly to believe that the *primary purpose* of our existence is to worship our Maker.

*Annual Masses at Saint Paul's*

- |        |      |   |
|--------|------|---|
| II     | 1985 | The Rev'd Canon James R. Daughtry, Rector & Preacher  |
| XII    | 1995 | The Rev'd Dr. Richard C. Martin, <i>SSC</i> , Rector; The Rt. Rev'd Dr. James W. Montgomery, Preacher; Mass Celebrated in the Presence of Bishop Montgomery                         |
| XX     | 2003 | The Rev'd Andrew L. Sloane, Rector; The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, <i>SSC</i> , Preacher; Mass Celebrated in the Presence of The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, <i>SSC</i> , D.D. |
| XXVIII | 2011 | The Rev'd Andrew L. Sloane, D.D., Rector; The Rev'd Dr. Richard C. Martin, <i>SSC</i> , Preacher  |

It may truly be said that the *Annual Mass* of the American Region began at Saint Paul's in 1985, during Canon Daughtry's rectorate, a year after a special region-wide mass on 28 January 1984 at Saint Ignatius of Antioch in New York City. Its rector, The Rev'd Howard T. W. Stowe, celebrated the mass in the Presence of the Region's Episcopal Patron, The Rt. Rev'd Joseph M. Harte, *SSC*, who preached. The service included Veneration of the Relic of Saint Charles, brought from the Priory of O.H.C., West Park, NY. Following the glorious mass were a wine and cheese reception and an informal meeting. It was all organized by Mrs. Eleanor E. Langlois, American Representative, and Miss Marsha S. Krinsky, chapter secretary. The presence of Eleanor Langlois and Bp. Harte was a clear sign that this was no ordinary gathering: At that time, the two comprised the entire leadership of the American Branch (Region) and said they hoped that 1984's would be the first of many such Region-wide gatherings. Eleanor's predecessor, Mrs. Elizabeth Carnahan, was surely present too, in spirit: Forty years earlier, in 1944, at All Saints, Austin TX, she acquainted her rector, Fr. Joseph Harte, with the saint who would become his patron saint throughout his ministry.

In 1984 Mrs. Langlois and Bp. Harte boldly voiced their hopes that such gatherings continue. Thereupon, Saint Paul's chapter secretary, Everett Courtland Martin, with evident enthusiasm, spontaneously offered Saint Paul's as the venue for the celebration of such a mass the following year. The success of the mass at Saint Paul's 'K' St. on 2 February 1985 made it clear. *Those hopes were*

# SOCIETY OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR ANNUAL MASS



*REMEMBER!*

## **SOLEMN MASS OF SAINT CHARLES, K.M.**

**11 a.m., Saturday 29 January 2011**  
**Saint Paul's Parish, Washington DC**  
**The Rev'd Dr. Andrew L. Sloane, *Rector***

***Preacher, The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC, OL***  
**Sometime Rector of Saint Paul's**

**Charles Wood, Mass in F**  
**Robert McCormick, *Director of Music***

### **Followed by Catered LUNCHEON**

Reservations required, \$25 per person:  
Make check payable to "Saint Paul's" – Memo line "SKCM"  
**Send to:** Saint Paul's Parish Office,  
2430 K Street, N.W. • Washington DC 20037 • **by 21 January.**

Driving directions, *etc.*, [www.saintpaulskstreet.com](http://www.saintpaulskstreet.com)  
General and Membership Information, [www.skcm-usa.org](http://www.skcm-usa.org)

# **SOCIETY OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR**

## **350<sup>th</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF THE RECOGNITION OF THE *CULTUS* OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR**



*REMEMBER!*

### **SOLEMN MASS OF S. CHARLES, KING & MARTYR**

AT THIS SEMISEPTCENTENARY CELEBRATION WE REMEMBER AND GIVE THANKS THAT THE CONVOCATIONS OF CANTERBURY & YORK, MEETING JOINTLY ON 26 APRIL 1661, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE STATE SERVICE FOR THE 30<sup>TH</sup> OF JANUARY, '*KING CHARLES THE MARTYR*', TO BE INCORPORATED INTO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, 1662.

**11 a.m., Saturday 7 May 2011**

**Church of the Resurrection, New York City**

**The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC, Rector**

***Preacher*, The Rev'd Canon J. Robert Wright, D.Phil.(Oxon.), D.D., F.R.Hist.S.  
Professor of Ecclesiastical History, The General Theological Seminary**

**Mozart – 'Pastoral' Mass (Mass No. 5 in G, K. 140)**

**David Enlow, M.Mus., FAGO, Organist & Choir Master**

**Followed by Catered LUNCHEON**

Reservations required, \$20 per person:

Write check to 'Church of the Resurrection' – Memo line 'SKCM Luncheon'

**Send to:** Church of the Resurrection Parish Office,  
119 E. 74<sup>th</sup> St., New York NY 10021 **by 22 April.**

General information, [www.skcm-usa.org](http://www.skcm-usa.org)

Membership information and inquiries, J. Douglass Ruff, [douglassruff@aol.com](mailto:douglassruff@aol.com)

*realized*. We may say that the Annual Mass & Meeting, as it was called then, had its *origin* at Saint Ignatius in 1984, and that it was *established* at Saint Paul's in 1985. Therefore, *in retrospect*, we regard the 1984 mass at Saint Ignatius, NYC, to have been the First of our Annual Masses. So reckoning, the 2011 Annual Mass at Saint Paul's will be our twenty-eighth. Another of our Annual Masses was at Saint Paul's in 1995 when Father Martin was rector, making the upcoming one in 2011 our fourth at Saint Paul's.

Furthermore, the association of that year with George Orwell's prophetic novel, full of forbidding omens and portents, may augur favorably as we annually gather to venerate our Society's Patron, so keen on his duty—which he honored to the death—to protect the Church and her Episcopal governance and to work for Christian Unity, then as now against such formidable and seemingly insuperable odds. In his Christ-like submission, he was powerful then. He is a powerful patron for us now. Some of Orwell's imaginings had started to come true before 1984, but if humanity moves more toward Our Lord—and this depends on each individual's obedience—the vision of 1984 may not represent how humanity becomes. We are not the slaves of a cruel determinism, and must remember that we live in History, and that God works in History, intervening in human affairs.

*"More than Conqueror."*

**"Remember!"**

*Holy Charles, Pray for Us!*

***11 a.m., Saturday 7 May 2011***

***First American Region Celebration of the Recognition of the Cultus  
of King Charles the Martyr***

26 APRIL 1661 • SEMISEPTCENTENARY OF THE RECOGNITION OF THE *CULTUS*, K.C.M. • 26 APRIL 2011

***The Church of the Resurrection, New York City, 11 a.m., Saturday 7 May 2011.*** For the second time—and this time in Spring, a beautiful season in Manhattan, especially on the Upper East Side—we shall be privileged to meet at the church where we had such a successful Annual Mass (and luncheon) in 2005. The church's beauty, its inviting, prayerful atmosphere, the very edifying traditional worship, its adornment with beautiful music, and the warm hospitality of clergy and people will be enjoyed thanks to the invitation of The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, *SSC*, rector.

***Society Gatherings at Resurrection***

XXII Annual Mass 2005 The Rev'd Canon Barry Swain, Rector; The Rev'd David Peters, Preacher  
350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Recog- 2011 The Rev'd Canon Barry Swain, Rector; The Rev'd Canon J. Robert Wright, Preacher  
nition of the *Cultus* of K.C.M. Professor of Ecclesiastical History

The correct date was not overlooked: Easter can occur no later than 25 April. In 2011 it is almost that late, 24 April. The event whose anniversary we will be celebrating was on 26 April, so it would likely be commemorated on one of the proximal Saturdays, the 23<sup>rd</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup> of April. The first of these is of course Holy Saturday and the second, Easter Saturday. The date of Easter defines the variable part of the Liturgical Year. Put rubrically, "Palm Sunday or any of the fourteen days following" is of precedence (Rubric No. 3, "Rules to Order the Service", 1662 BCP); in 2011, Saturday 23 and Saturday 30 April are the 6<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> days following Palm Sunday, respectively; and thus our celebration, 7 May, is scheduled for the earliest available Saturday. Why is the rubric's wording so obtuse? When it was drafted, the choice may have been to avoid offending the growing Puritan party, who had church only on Sundays, even Christmas. Referring to Palm Sunday was acceptable.

Our **Select Preacher** for this occasion is to be **The Rev'd Canon J. Robert Wright**, D.Phil. (*Oxon.*), Fellow of the Royal Society of History, the Saint Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History at The General Theological Seminary, Historiographer of the Episcopal Church, assisting priest at, and author of a recent history of, Saint Thomas Fifth Avenue, President of The Anglican Society, and a distinguished member of our Society. Since meeting him first at the conferral of an honorary degree upon him and then at our 2002 Annual Mass in New York, at which he preached, the Editor has had the privilege of becoming acquainted with the prolific and talented Professor Wright, who has been helpful and supportive to him in his work toward a Society History.

Canon Swain serves as Superior-General of The Guild of All Souls in America. Centered at the Church of the Resurrection is the Guild's Chantry work, specifically at the Shrine of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, with its excellent statue and setting. The work done there is excellent, too, daily intercession on behalf of the souls of our Holy Dead, and all the Dead known and unknown who find themselves in the intermediate state. We urge you to visit it and pray for the souls of your beloved dead and the Society's. Our Necrology will appear in the program for the day's mass. Our *Necrological Calendar* appears in the new *Devotional Manual*. In it are listed the known dates of death of members of the American Region, ordered as the days of the year, to facilitate daily or weekly prayers for their Souls.

For a discussion of the nomenclature of this commemoration, please see the 'Editor's Miscellany', p. . Also to be found there will be some information on the 7 May commemoration of the Exaltation of S. Charles, which commemorates the replacement, on that date in 1660, of the status of King Charles in Guildhall Yard, City of London.

## ***Commemorations of Royal Martyr Day***

**2011 – U.S.A. – A. Donald Evans, Chapter Liaison**

*N.B.:* *Royal Martyr Day services are likely to be irregular in 2011, since 30 January falls on Sunday. Different churches may compensate for this differently. Please check the contact information provided. Churches usually having commemorations may have none this year, add a commemoration of S. Charles to the Sunday mass(es), may anticipate the Decollation of King Charles, or transfer it to a weekday. Furthermore, Candlemas is on Wednesday 2 Feb. and may be celebrated then or who knows when. Liturgical rules are either not known, not consistent, or widely ignored.*

*The Dec. SKCM News is finalized over a month before 30 January, so many parishes' service schedules are not available. Hence contact information is provided here. If you have a commemoration most years, please send your information and we'll add it to this standing list: The total number of commemorations, if it could be determined, would be more than twice the number that appears here. If you send particular information each year, that will of course be added too. Send reports of the event when it is fresh in your mind. This information furthers the Observance, which is one of our Objects. Please also bring errors to our attention.*

AL Saint **Charles**, King & Martyr, Huntsville; the parish's patronal feast. Check website.

CA Saints Andrew and **Charles**, Granada Hills, Fr. Gregory Frost, Rector 818 366 7541

CA <sup>†</sup>Pro-Cathedral of Saint Mary of the Angels, Hollywood, Fr. Christopher Kelley, SSC, Rector 323 660 2700

CA Saint Peter's, Oakland, Fr. Roderick Pomeroy, Rector 510 655 4951

CA Blessed Sacrament, Placentia, Canon David Baumann, SSC, Rector 714 528 2995

CA All Saints', San Diego, Fr. Tony Noble, Rector 619 298 7729

CA Advent of Christ the King, San Francisco, Fr. Paul Burrows, Rector 415 431 0454

CA Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, Bp, Francis Gray, Interim Dean 415 749 6300

CA Christ Church Parish, San Mateo, Fr. John Altberg

CO Saint Michael and All Angels, Denver, Fr. Ralph Walker, SSC, Rector 303 777 5181

CO <sup>§</sup>Saint **Charles** the Martyr, Fort Morgan, Fr Bill Kindel, Priest-in-Charge 970 867 6228

DC Ascension & Saint Agnes, Fr. Lane Davenport, Rector 202 347 8161

DC <sup>†</sup>Saint Paul's, K Street, Fr. Andrew L. Sloane, Rector 202 337 2020 Annual Mass 11 a.m. Sat. 29 Jan. 2011

FL <sup>†§</sup>Most Holy Guardian Angels, Lantana, Fr. David Kennedy, SSC, Rector. Low mass usually at 7:45 a.m. with breakfast afterwards. As with all 2011 listings, check details *per* the *caveat* at the beginning of this list.

GA Saint Francis of Assisi, Jonesboro, Fr. Michael Stranz, Vicar

GA Saint Paul's, Savannah, Very Rev'd Dr. William Willoughby III 912 232 0274  
 IL Ascension, Chicago, Fr. Gary Fertig, Rector 312 664 1271  
 IN Saint Andrew's Anglican Church, Evansville, low mass with homily 6 p.m., Fr. Robert Todd Giffin, Rector  
 IN <sup>^</sup>Saint Paul's, Mishawaka, Fr. David Ottsen 574 144 9090  
 IN Holy Trinity, Peru, Fr. Douglas Hungerford  
 KY Saint Michael and All Angels, Lexington 859 277 7511 Norman Jefferies II  
 LA Saint Luke's, Baton Rouge, Canon Brien Koehler, Rector 225 926 5343  
 MA Advent, Boston, Fr. Allan Warren, Rector 617 523 2377  
 MA \*All Saints, Ashmont, Dorchester, Boston 617 436 6370 [www.allsaints.net](http://www.allsaints.net) Fr. Michael Godderz, SSC, Rector  
 MD \*Grace & Saint Peter's, Baltimore 410 539 1395 Father F. S. Thomas, SSC, Rector  
 MD Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, 410 728 6140  
 MD Saint Luke's, Bladensburg, Fr. Mark W. Lewis, Rector 301 927 6466  
 NE Saint Barnabas, Omaha, Fr. Robert Scheibhofer, Rector 204 558 4633 (Great Plains Chapter, Nick Behrens, Chapter Secretary 402 455 4492)  
 NE Saint **Charles**, Fairbury (Beatrice), Fr. Richard Moon, Rector 402 223 5515  
 NV <sup>§</sup>Chapel of the Holy Family, Saint Jude's Ranch, Boulder City 1-800 492 3562  
 NY Garden City, Cathedral of the Incarnation (Dio. of Long Island) 516 746 2945  
 NY Resurrection, Manhattan, NYC [www.resurrectionnyc.org](http://www.resurrectionnyc.org) Fr. Barry Swain, SSC, Rector. 212 879 4320 Commem. of 350<sup>th</sup> Anniv. of the Recognition of the Cultus of KCM, 7 May 2011, 11 a.m.  
 NY <sup>^</sup>Saint Paul's, Clinton & Carroll, Brooklyn, NYC, Fr. Peter Cullen, Rector 718 625 4126  
 NY Saint Ignatius of Antioch, Manhattan, NYC, Dr. Andrew Blume, Rector 212 580 3326  
 NY Saint Mary the Virgin, Times Square, Manhattan, NYC, Fr. Stephen Gerth, Rector 212 869 5830  
 NY All Saints' Cathedral, Albany, Very Rev'd Marshall Vang (recently ret'd, no successor named) 518 465 1432  
 NY Saint George's, Schenectady, Fr. William McSwain (recently ret'd, no successor named) 518 374 3163  
 OH Saint James, Cleveland, Fr. Cyril Crume, Rector  
 OR Saint Mark's, Portland, Fr. Mark Lillegard, Rector 503 223 2383 [www.stmarks@stmarksportland.org](mailto:www.stmarks@stmarksportland.org)  
 PA \*Saint Clement's, Philadelphia, Canon Gordon Reid, Rector 215 563 1876  
 PA Saint Mark's, Philadelphia, Fr. Richard Alton, Rector 215 735 1416  
 PA Good Shepherd, Rosemont, Bp. David Moyer, SSC, Rector 215 525 7070  
 RI \*Saint John the Evangelist, Newport, Fr. R. Trent Fraser, SSC, Rector 401 848 2561 [saintjohns-newport.org](http://saintjohns-newport.org)  
 RI Saint Stephen's, Providence, Fr. John D. Alexander, SSC, Rector 401 421 6702  
 RI Saint John's Cathedral, Providence, Canon Harry Krauss, Dean 401 331 4622  
 SC Holy Communion, Charleston, Fr. M. Dow Sanderson, SSC, Rector 843 722 2024  
 SC <sup>‡</sup>Chapel of Saint **Charles**, K.M., Mayesville Richard Hines [rth@rthconsulting.com](mailto:rth@rthconsulting.com)  
 SC Good Shepherd, York, Fr. Donald Lowery [goodshep@cetlink.net](mailto:goodshep@cetlink.net) 803 684 4021  
 TN All Saints Mission, Chattanooga  
 TN Chapel of the Apostles, University of the South, Sewanee, Chad Krouse [chad.m.krouse@gmail.com](mailto:chad.m.krouse@gmail.com)  
 TN **Tennessee Chapter**, Chapter Secretary, Greg Smith ([gregsmithdtm@charter.net](mailto:gregsmithdtm@charter.net), 615 310 4765).  
 TX Good Samaritan, Dallas, Fr. William Warnky, Rector 214 328 3883  
 TX Holy Cross, Dallas, Fr. R. Michael Tuck, Rector 214 528 3855  
 TX Holy Nativity, Plano, Fr. Garin W. Dickinson 972 424 4574  
 TX Good Shepherd, Cranbury, Fr. Stuart Smith, Rector 817 326 2035  
 TX Incarnation, Dallas, Fr. Larry Smith 214 521 5101  
 TX Saint **Charles** the Martyr, Daingerfield, Fr. James Slack, Rector 903 645 7414  
 TX Saint David of Wales, Denton, Fr. Sandy Hermann, SSC, Rector 940 387 2622  
 TX Saint Francis, Dallas, Fr. David Allen, SSC, Rector 214 351 1401  
 TX Saint Joseph, Grand Prairie, Fr. Terry Jordan, Rector 972 642 6959  
 TX Saint John's, Corsicana, Fr. Edward Monk, SSC, Rector 903 874 5425  
 TX, Saint Mark's, Arlington, Fr. Timothy Perkins, SSC, Rector 817 277 6871  
 TX Saint Matthias Athens, Fr Donald Perschall, 5:30 p.m.903 675 3210  
 TX Saint Stephen's, Sherman, Fr. Martin Yost, SSC, Rector 903 892 6610

* Shrine	‡ Chapel
△ Statue	§ Depiction
† Stained glass window	
<b>Charles</b>	Dedications

L E G E N D

TX Saint Vincent's Cathedral, Diocese of Ft. Worth, Bedford, Very Rev'd Ryan Reed, SSC, Canon John Jordan, SSC  
817 354 7911

TX Trinity NE Texas, Fr Greg Crosthwaite 972 991 3601

VA Saint Matthew's, Newport News, Fr. Daniel Warren, M.D., Rector

VA \*Saint Luke's, Manakin-Sabot (Richmond), Fr. Michael Kerouac

WI †Cathedral of Saint Paul, Fond-du-Lac, Fr. Theodore McConnell 920 921 3363

WI All Saints' Cathedral, Milwaukee, Very Rev'd George Hillman, Fr. Roger Jack Bunday 414 271 7719

WI †Chapel of Saint Mary the Virgin, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Canon Arnold Klukas, Ph.D., Vicar 262 646 6500

## 2011 – Canada

(Please see above; *caveat* prior to U.S.A. Commemorations expressing that Royal Martyr Day services in 2011 may be irregular or inconsistent with a parish's usual practice since 30 January falls on Sunday.)

### *Anglican Church of Canada*

King's College Chapel, University of King's  
College, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Saint Peter's Cathedral, Charlottetown, Prince  
Edward Island

Saint Bartholomew's Anglican Church, Toronto,  
Ontario

Saint Martin in the Fields Anglican Church,  
Toronto, Ontario

Saint Mary Magdalene's, Toronto, Ontario

Saint Matthias (Holy Cross Monastery and Parish),  
Toronto, Ontario

Saint Thomas Anglican Church, Toronto, Ontario

Saint John the Evangelist Anglican Church,  
Montréal, Québec

### *Anglican Catholic Church of Canada:*

Cathedral Church of Saint John the Evangelist,  
Victoria, British Columbia

Cathedral of the Annunciation, Ottawa, Ontario

Saint Aidan's Parish, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Parish of Our Lady and Saint Michael, Edmonton,  
Alberta

Christ the King, Calgary, Alberta

All Saints, Renfrew, Calgary, Alberta

Holy Redeemer, Claresholm, Alberta

Holy Trinity, Medicine Hat, Alberta

Holy Nativity, Barrhaven, Ontario

Saint Athanasius, Belleville/Roslin, Ontario

Saint Mary's, Chapleau, Ontario

Saint Edmund's, Kitchener, Ontario

The Good Shepherd, Oshawa, Ontario

Christ the King, Tyendinaga, Ontario



## **Trustees Elect New Order of Laud Member The Rev'd Vern E. Jones, OL**

At its meeting on 8 September 2010, the Board of Trustees elected The Rev'd Vern Edward Jones, of Redwood City CA, the newest member of the Order of Blessed William Laud, Archbishop & Martyr. Father Jones was instrumental in founding two missions dedicated to Saint Charles, one in Buffalo OK and the other in Laverne OK. Buffalo and Laverne are about twenty-five miles apart, just slightly to the east of where the 55-mile-wide Oklahoma panhandle protrudes, not far from either Texas or Kansas. Fr. Jones, who joined the Society c. 1953, founded the Church of Saint Charles in Buffalo in 1957 and served as its vicar 1960-71, seeing it consecrated in April, 1965. He also established Saint Charles Parish in Laverne, serving as its vicar 1973-77; it had no building of its own and gathered in a home. Although neither is still in existence we nonetheless rightly honor Father Jones for his zeal in establishing these outposts. They were untenable without a mission priest to serve them. When Fr. Jones was a mission priest there and served five parishes in the Panhandle; he himself was based in Woodward OK. The church in Buffalo had its parish mass on Monday because the five churches could not all have their primary mass on Sunday. Now in his early 80s he lives in California, where he served as Rector of Saint Peter's, Redwood City, for twenty years. Since his retirement there he has served forty-eight congregations, a few for up to a year. Fr. Jones is a graduate of The General Seminary and served a 6-year term on its Board of Trustees. The sixtieth anniversary of his 17 December 1952 ordination to the priesthood will fall in 2012.

Father Vern Jones has exhibited exemplary dedication to the Society and its Cause and has given honor to King Charles the Martyr, our Patron: He remains on the membership roster, having been a member for almost sixty years. His place in our Society's history has been notable, if not unique: 'Unique' is a word we rarely use. We know of no other member responsible for *two parish dedications*. This Laudation is based on the text of the Letter of Commendation telling Fr. Jones of his election to Membership in the Order:

CONFERRED 21 SEPTEMBER 2010

**You, The Rev'd Vern Edward Jones**, are elected to Membership in the Order of Bl. William Laud for your significant achievements to the Society's benefit over your nearly six decades as a member. To our knowledge you are the only member holding the distinction of founding two congregations dedicated to the Martyr King. Both in the area of the Oklahoma Panhandle, Buffalo OK was the first and Laverne the second of these mission congregations. (Neither, unfortunately, any longer exists.) Your achievement was difficult, as a missionary priest responsible for a 'circuit' of five churches, important and exemplary for the Society's American Region, and to our knowledge, unique. Dedication to pastoral work has characterized your entire ministry and was clearly a major factor in making your work in Oklahoma possible. The devotional lives of the people of those missions would have been enriched by knowledge of King Charles the Martyr. Even as you have been and continue to be a committed and devout priest and client of the Martyr King, may he, a powerful patron saint for you, continue to intercede for you and your work as you persist in your ministry and persevere in your earthly pilgrimage, finally joining him, the martyr throng, and the holy angels and saints, into whose fellowship we beseech GOD to admit us.

### **Trustees Designate Four New Benefactors**

Each of the following members has made (or made, while living,) donations judged by the Board of Trustees to be commensurate with its established standards, exemplary, and of material benefit to the Society. At a meeting on 8 September 2010, that Board designated them Benefactors of the American Region, S.K.C.M.

**Newly Designated Benefactors**

Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ph.D., of Little Neck NY  
Mr. Charles Jerome Briody III, of Washington DC

*Designated Posthumously:*

Professor Bernard P. Brennan, Ph.D., OL, d. 2006, late of Brooklyn NY  
The Rev'd Canon Robert H. Pursel, Th.D., d. 2009, late of Bloomsburg PA

**Newly Elected Order of Laud Member**

The Rev'd Vern Edward Jones of Redwood City CA

**Society Membership**

1992-present  
1997-present

1981-2006  
1985-2009

c. 1953-present

***Members of the Order of Blessed William Laud, Abp.,M.***

Nick F. Behrens  
Professor Bernard P. Brennan, Ph.D., Ben. †2006  
Elizabeth Ballantyne Carnahan †1972  
Gary Adrian Cole †1994  
Richard G. Durnin †2007  
William M. Gardner, Jr.  
The Rev'd Canon Robert S. H. Greene, SSC  
The Rt. Rev'd Joseph M. Harte, SSC,  
D.D., S.T.D., D.Min. †1999  
Professor Martin Joseph Havran, Ph.D. †2000  
Lee Hopkins  
The Rev'd F. Washington Jarvis, L.H.D., D.Litt.  
The Rev'd Vern Edward Jones  
The Rev'd David C. Kennedy, SSC, D.D.  
Eleanor Emma Langlois †1999  
Everett Courtland Martin, Benefactor †2004

The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC  
Robert Nicely Mattis †2000  
The Rev'd Alfred J. Miller, D.D. †1984  
The Rev'd Canon Marshall V. Minister †2010  
The Rev'd Canon Edmund W. Olifiers, Jr.  
James Bailey Parker  
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Benefactress  
Charles F. Peace IV  
Stephen C. Petrica  
Alexander Roman, Ph.D.  
*The American Region Founder,*  
The Rev'd William Harman van Allen,  
S.T.D., D.D., L.H.D., D.C.L., LL.D. †1931  
The Rev'd Ralph T. Walker, SSC, D.D.  
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Benefactor

***Benefactors of the American Region, Society of King Charles the Martyr***

Charles Barenthaler  
Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ph.D.  
Professor Bernard P. Brennan, Ph.D., OL †2006  
Charles Jerome Briody III  
Emily Stuart Brown, R.N. †1989  
The Rev'd Osborne Budd †2001  
The Rev'd Wilbur B. Dexter †2005  
Mrs. Wilbur B. (Kathleen M.) Dexter †1994  
The Rev'd Kent L. Haley  
Richard Towill Hines  
Alan R. Hoffman †2006  
Jonathan A. Jensen  
Allan F. Kramer II  
The Rev'd Dr. Joseph Walter Lund  
Everett Courtland Martin, OL †2004

Paul W. McKee  
The Rt. Rev'd James Winchester Montgomery,  
S.T.D., D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.  
Sarah Gilmer Payne, OL  
The Rev'd Canon Robert H. Pursel, Th.D. †2009  
John Douglass Ruff, Esq.  
Philip Terzian  
James Noël Ward  
The Rev'd Canon Dr. Charles Everett Whipple †2009  
Suzanne Schellenger Williamson †2007  
John Arthur Edward Windsor  
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., OL

***† Requiescant in pace***

Departed Benefactors and OL members are designated with a cross, viz., †, and year of death.

## **The London Celebrations 2010 and 2011**

The Rev'd Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D.,  
President, American Region, S.K.C.M. (U.S.A. & Canada)

This year, for the first time since the 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Royal Martyrdom, 30 January fell on a Saturday. For that reason, the Royal Martyr Church Union, which normally observes Saint Charles's Day on the Saturday closest to 30 January, effectively came together with the S.K.C.M. for a joint Eucharist in the Banqueting House. The preacher was Dr. Colin Podmore, a lay theologian, who is Secretary of the House of Bishops of the General Synod of the Church of England. He spoke at length about efforts to maintain charity in the current times of division in and among the churches of the Anglican heritage, and especially for respect of conscience for all those who seek to be faithful to the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Dr. Podmore, a Parish Clerk, was joined in procession by David Roberts, the secretary of the R.M.C.U. and this year Master of the Worshipful Company of Parish Clerks. Eastern rite clergy also joined in the procession.

The congregation was the largest that I have seen it since the 1999 celebration. No one had to sit on the floor this year. At the time when both Sacred Species were exhausted, about twenty of the faithful were still waiting to receive. Although no wine remained, there were sufficient breads again to confect the Body of Christ. Those final communicants received in one kind. These details and direct observation would put the congregation at over 100. The weather was beautiful, and certainly in that respect made it easier for people to attend.

Members of the R.M.C.U. went to a corporate luncheon thereafter and thence to Saint Mary-le-Strand for solemn evensong, led by The Rev'd Michael Burns, vicar of Saint Charles Potter's Bar and chaplain to the Union. Saint Mary's has a small professional choir that does an excellent job, as does its organist. The church is not large, and the hymnody especially filled the building with wondrous sound.

In honor of the 350th anniversary of the Restoration on 30 May this year, the R.M.C.U. also had a celebration that weekend along with a walking tour of 'Restoration London', which included several Restoration-era properties not normally open to the public, which was very well attended.

S.K.C.M. members who may wish to attend the British observances in 2011 are reminded that 30 January falls on a Sunday. This may result in various changes, depending on the organization involved.

S.K.C.M. events will be on Monday the 31<sup>st</sup> at the Banqueting Hall, beginning with devotions outside at the site of the Royal Martyrdom at 11:40 a.m. followed by sung Eucharist inside beginning at noon. Members and other attendees often gather for lunch at the nearby Clarence pub thereafter.

The Royal Stuart Society Evensong at Saint George's Chapel, Windsor, will also most likely be the 31<sup>st</sup>, but this will need to be checked against other obligations of the Chapel due to change in date. It is expected that the R.S.S. will also sponsor a wreath-laying at the equestrian statue of Saint Charles at the top of Whitehall at 11 a.m.

We have received word that the R.M.C.U. will meet at 11 a.m. on Saturday 29 January, at Saint Mary-le-Strand, as usual. (Nearest underground stops: Temple, Circle/District Line; or Charing Cross, Northern Line.) Members and supporters will gather for lunch nearby at a venue to be determined.

**2012 ♦ 2014 ♦ 2016 ANNUAL MASSES** (all Sat. at 11 a.m.)

***XXIX Annual Mass: Chapel of Saint Mary the Virgin, Nashotah House, Nashotah WI, 28 January 2012***

Invitation from The Very Rev'd Canon Prof. Robert S. Munday, Ph.D., Dean and President<sup>(3)</sup>  
Select Preacher, The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL)  
The Rev'd Canon Prof. Arnold W. Klukas, Ph.D., Vicar of Chapel, Preacher at 2007 Annual Mass  
Many priests first learned of devotion to Saint Charles as seminarians  
Over the years, >10% of our members have been alumni, assoc. alumni, faculty, staff or trustees of Nashotah House.  
During the Editor's 15 years on the Board, *no fewer than fifteen* of his fellow Trustees were Society members.

***XXX and XXXII Annual Masses (2013 and 2015) have not yet been scheduled or planned.***

***XXXI Annual Mass: Cathedral of Saint Vincent, Bedford TX (Diocese of Ft. Worth), 25 January 2014***

A good number of members and supporters of the Society reside in the Dallas-Fort Worth megalopolis.  
Invitation from The Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, *SSC*, D.D., III Fort Worth (our Senior Reigning Bishop-Member)  
Bp. Iker's predecessor, The Rt. Rev'd Clarence C. Pope, D.D., was also a Society member  
The Rt. Rev'd Joseph M. Harte, *SSC*, D.D., S.T.D., D.Min., O.L., Episcopal Patron 1972-99, II Suff. Dallas before Ft. Worth split off to become a separate diocese.  
Dean of the Cathedral, The Very Rev'd Ryan Reed, *SSC*  
Select Preacher, The Rev'd Martin C. Yost, *SSC*, Rector, S. Stephen's, Sherman TX  
Several DFW area gatherings organized by The Rev'd Martin C. Yost, *SSC* (Diocese of Dallas) have enjoyed success.  
Trigintennial Annual Mass (30 yrs; 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Mass)

***XXXIII Annual Mass: Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston SC, 30 January 2016***

Invitation from The Rev'd M. Dow Sanderson, *SSC*, rector  
Select Preacher, Father Sanderson  
First S.K.C.M. Annual Mass to have been held at Holy Communion was ten years earlier, in 2006  
The Rev'd Daniel Lee Clarke, Jr., *SSC*, curate. Both Fr. Sanderson and Fr. Clarke are Society members.  
Many parishioners of Holy Communion belong to the very successful Charles Towne Carolanas SKCM Chapter.

<sup>(1)</sup> On 29 May 2010 we commemorated the 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Restoration. On 7 May 2011 (at New York's **Church of the Resurrection**) we will commemorate the 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Recognition of our Patron's *Cultus*.

After 2012's 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the 1662 BCP, the era of Semisepcentennial Anniversaries winds down/We then move into an era of 400<sup>th</sup> Anniversaries, Quadricentennials, also called Quatercentenary Anniversaries. A common improper usage is to call several such anniversaries 'Quatercentenaries', in one of the innumerable examples of adjectives made into nouns, like calling 'financial reports' 'financials'. Although their usage is often taught with an excess of pedantry, that the terms ending in '-centennial' are nouns, while those ending in '-centenary' are adjectives and do not stand alone. In fact, both terms may properly be used in adjectival and nounal senses.

In point of fact, the quadricentennials have already begun. I attended one in 1999 in Antwerp, the 400<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of van Dyck's birth. Charles's was in 2000,

'Quadri' and 'quater' are both prefixes meaning 'four'. Please note that 'quater' signifies four, but is easily confused with 'quarter' meaning one fourth. Uses of 'quater' include 'quaternity', a godhead of four persons; 'quatrain', a poetic stanza of four lines ('quatorzain' is a 14-line stanza, like the French word for 14, 'quatorze'. A sonnet is a particular form of quatorzain, the latter term usually reserved for an irregular 14-line poem.); 'quatertens', the Ember Days. That being perfectly elucidated, in Italian '*quattrocento*' literally means four hundred, but it is used when referring to the XV Century, which we might call the fourteen-hundreds, as in sculpture of the *quattrocento*. The thousands place is simply ignored.

## ***Goods Items***

***Exclusive Neckwear and S.K.C.M. insignia*** may be ordered using the cream-colored form enclosed. All the neckwear is in stock, the 'White Rose' neckties and bow ties, and the rep stripe neckties and bow ties. Our neckwear is hand cut and sewn of the finest custom woven silk, all in England and exclusively for us, and provided by the respected Ben Silver Company of Charleston SC. The quality of the silk and the neckwear's manufacture are such that we believe these are among the longest wearing ties available. *Please disregard the note on the cream-colored form: all neckwear is now available*. Similarly, our own unique ***lapel rosettes*** are provided by the venerable family firm,

Dexter Rosettes of Gwynedd Valley PA. The ribbon and the rosette made of it are of our own design, and registered for our exclusive use. The ties are likewise registered, reserved for the Society's use.

The neckwear and rosette designs were developed in collaborations of the Society (your Editor and another member) with the respective manufacturer. Society member Earl Fain IV of the Ben Silver Company presented excellent neckwear project proposals, including designs, for consideration and approval. The result was the 'White Rose' fabric, used for neckties and bow ties.

The rosette project was championed by James Bailey Parker, OL, and involved the late C. Dexter Schierenbeck, founder and principal of Dexter Rosettes, who with Mr. Parker's and Dr. Wuonola's conceptual input proposed actual designs. The three came rapidly to consensus on the final design. They are made in the usual manner of a rosette. The small wheel-like framework of the device's perimeter is wound with a custom silk ribbon, red with a narrow golden stripe. The 'rose' inside the wheel is white silk, folded and fanned out to fill the wheel's circle and tied in the center with red thread. The rosettes were introduced in 1995. The firms providing our rosettes and neckwear are known in the world of insignia to be of the highest quality. So also is the Mainline Philadelphia firm that produces our silver medals; it also manufactures medals for a sister Anglican Devotional Society, The Guild of All Souls.

**ALL INSIGNIA AVAILABLE FOR 30 JANUARY**

**ORDER BY THE 15<sup>TH</sup>**

***Rosettes \* Neckties and Bow Ties, Both Patterns \* Sterling Medals***

In 1996, the '*White Rose*' neckwear was first offered, followed by the handsome *rep stripe neckwear* of a design entirely Mr. Fain's. The neckwear and rosettes harmonize because they all utilize the same colors, an intense medium red, gold, and silvery white, chosen because they are the livery colors of the Stuart Dynasty.

The 1¼ inch *Sterling silver medal* is the Society's oldest insignia item, having been designed in the first decade of the XX Century by the Foundress. It appears, from a number of examples we have seen, owned by our older members, that for about seventy years the medals were die-struck in bronze (solely). Keeping tabs on a die is a common difficulty, exacerbated when a very large batch is manufactured and it is not needed for decades. We find an example of this in 1947, "As the Tercentenary drew nearer it was decided to 'retrieve' the die of the Society's medal from Burns, Oates, and Washbourne. This was duly done and at the meeting, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> October, the committee were told that the die had now been found and that 50 medals had been struck at the cost of 2:6d (£3:00 at 1999's currency value), not including tax, which would be sold to new members at cost." The whereabouts of the Society's die must have been forgotten again by the next time more were needed, as several decades ago (c. 1980) facsimile medals of the same design had been executed in a composite material of bronze like appearance, but not in sufficient quantity to permit them to be made available in the U.S or Canada. (*The White King*, I, p. 12) [Perhaps we may someday have use of the die to strike silver medals for members in the Americas. -Ed.]

these medals were first manufactured in 1990 by a Philadelphia firm, Gene Zweigle Silversmiths, using the *cire-perdue* or 'lost wax' process, in which medals are cast in a mold made from a waxen model of an original, die-struck medals. (A medal loaned by the late Robert N. Mattis was the 'original' used.) The lost wax process is used to make bronze statues, such as those of Rodin, of which multiple copies are desired.

A mold, like a die, is typically used only every few years, and is also liable to be misplaced or forgotten. Mr. Zweigle went out of business in the mid-'90s. Since the mold was not provided to us, a new one was made by the family firm of John Fish & Son, Bryn Mawr PA, founded (1888) before our

Society, who now make the medals for us. The present mold is from a superb example of the early, die-struck, bronze U.K. medals; it is a very fine, sharp impression with no wear, showing every detail perfectly; the resultant medals are of superb quality. (The medal used was loaned to us by Fr. David Kennedy, who enrolled in 1974.) It is theoretically impossible for the cast product to be sharper than its progenitor; this is visible under high magnification, but not to the naked eye. The mold is in the safekeeping of the Fish firm. At first, we offered bronze and silver medals, but the cost of custom manufacture exceeded materials cost by so much, the price difference between the bronze and silver medals was minimal; therefore, only silver medals are still manufactured in the American Region.

The bronze medals develop the classic, dark patina characteristic of that metal and highly desired in sculptures of the human form as you have seen in the statues of public monuments or in museums, precisely because it is non-reflective. Although silver tarnishes, its advantage for a medal worn as ours is, is that the lettering on the medal, the King's image on the obverse (front), and the stylized stary crown on the reverse, all rendered in relief, are more visible in reflective, argenteous brightness than in dull, dark bronze. Each artistic medium, bronze or silver, suits its purpose; "The medium is the message."

The design of the Society's *cloisonné insignia* in red, gold (yellow), and blue on a white background is an adaptation of the Society's simple, bold logo. Commissioned by Mrs. Langlois in 1978, the colorful design was created by the Taiwanese manufacturer supplying the intermediary, Pacific Trading Co., with which she dealt. The same design was rendered as lapel pins (thumbtack style), ¾ inch medals (charm bracelet size), and one-inch medals, which may be worn suspended from the neck on a red cord or ribbon, like the Sterling silver medals. Of this design, the lapel pins are by far the most popular; production of a new batch was necessary in 2004. A "Canterbury Cross" medal had at its center the same circular design as the preceding items; the four branches of the cross emanating from the center were of red cloisonné enamel. No longer available, it was worn (inappropriately, some said) like a pectoral cross, hanging lower than the silver medals.

Other personal items have been considered over the years. These include silver miniature medals as worn with formal attire, silk scarves of the same fabrics as our neckwear, blazer patches, and so on. Our budget limits investment in goods items like these. Not surprisingly, there is a minimum order requirement associated with each item's manufacture and is necessary because equipment set-up time for a small run is no less than for a large run. These fees increase average cost of the item significantly and increase the amount we must charge for them. Also, Society funds are rendered illiquid when placed in inventory, which accordingly must be kept to a minimum.

Because the neckwear and rosettes harmonize so well, they may tastefully be worn simultaneously, as may either with the silver medal. To wear more than two such items would be excessive, a state of dress described in a homey way as "all dressed up like a Christmas tree". The rosette or lapel pin is not to be worn on an outer garment (such as a Macintosh or Chesterfield), but on the lapel of a suit coat or blazer. An exception would be at the burial of a Society member in inclement weather, when necessitated for identification. (Etiquette advice was kindly provided by Mr. Fain.)

**Supplies of rosettes and the popular rep striped neckwear are again in stock. Order them now! If ordered by the 15<sup>th</sup> they will be shipped in good time to be worn on Royal Martyr Day.**

Also available (see enclosed price sheet and order form) are historical, liturgical, and devotional literature and a variety of depictions of the Royal Martyr—paintings, statues, and shrines, famous and obscure—some as photographs, others as postcards. Blank, single-fold note cards in a variety of sizes are commercially available at stationery and craft stores. These may be used to create your own Caroline greeting or note-cards, as some members do. With a good color copier and the right

paper the photos and postcards may be copied for such use. It is not practical for us to offer such items for sale due to (i) manufacturers' minimum order requirements and (ii) the imprudence of having too large a portion of our funds tied up in illiquid goods items..

### ***Editor's Apology***

Despite our intent to publish this magazine and our e-publication regularly, difficulties have so far prevented adherence to an orderly schedule. Multiple problems with two laptop computers and internet connectivity have been responsible. Most editors find that late submission of articles, editorial workload, and production cause most delays, but these have not been major problems for us, although they have occurred. Most of our delays have been computer related. The Editor personally apologizes for the consequence—late publication. Inability to communicate with contributors resulted in a higher number of errors than usual and also impeded his highly valued regular correspondence with members and inquirers. My policy on email correspondence has been to reply within a day on average, at most, 48 hours. If you did not receive a response to an email sent to the Editor, please resend it. The emails archived at the ISP were decimated by same: Time was insufficient to maintain the growing archive, which exceeded its limit. My best efforts to manage these problems were inadequate. Please accept my personal apology.

### ***Email Communiqué Editorial Committee***

After 1¾ years of providing his editorial and writing skills to improve our *Email Communiqué*, **Lee Hopkins** leaves that rôle. Since its first issue in March, 2009, he also made suggestions about editorial style and policy.

Taking a seat on the Editorial Committee is another contributor to *SKCM News*, **Dr. Suzanne Bowles**, an academic historian. She is Associate Professor of History at William Paterson Univ., Wayne NJ, where she teaches and conducts research in the fields of early American history, Anglican history, naval history, American

religious history, and British royalty. Sue has contributed to the scholarly literature and published a number of books. She is a member of Saint Michael's Episcopal Church, Wayne NJ (Dio. of Newark), where she serves on the vestry.

### ***Errata and Addenda*** **December 2009 *SKCM News***

p. 27. King Charles the Martyr Church, Shelland, Suffolk was mentioned in the August 1949 issue of *C&K* from which the poem at p. 20 in this issue is quoted. We know that the Editor, Mr. Hope-Nicholson, had definite opinions, well illustrated in his description of the chapel's interior:

Not to mention “. . .three pictures . . . of a regrettably saponaceous colour . . . the colour [scheme] of the interior is what strikes the visitor—the nave has been washed pink, the window splays yellow, the beams coral, and the chancel, Reckitt's blue—Dr. Russell's idea of the rainbow!” The Chapel's main benefactor, Russell was also a benefactor of and the president of Brasenose College, Oxford. Having thus reflected on the choices of the chapel's benefactor and proprietors, Mr. Hope-Nicholson then suggested changes he would wish to be made to the fabric at Shelland. Today's restorers would shudder at his disregard for original features, period characteristics, and earlier intent, *to wit*, his wish for removal of the chapel's dominant feature, the triple-decker pulpit now undergoing restoration. (*SN*, Dec. 2009, p. 27)

H-N was outspoken. In his account of the 30 Jan. 1949 mass at S. Thomas, Regent Street (*White King*, Vol. I, p. 23), Hope-Nicholson laments that the traditional Latin sequence was sung not to its “traditional and exquisite plainsong melody”, but to a “trashy hymn tune”.

## June 2010 SKCM News

Throughout. The page numbers at the beginning and end of each portion of the *Editor's Miscellany* were intended to provide continuity by compensating for their interstitial layout. Erroneous in many cases, they are useless as cross-references. We apologize for the confusion and will keep the *EM* integral in future.

p. 4, middle. Geography error. Of course, even without a map, we knew that the Great Lakes area is also shared between Canada and the U.S.

p. 22, Canon Middleton's Obituary. Admiral Morison himself originated the idea of the Naval history. After conferring with Morison, Pres. Roosevelt became a champion of the idea, perhaps, like many in authority, passing it off as his own. Interviews and meetings in Washington, conferences with Japanese commanders and defense ministry officials, *etc.*, continued. It was about 1960 that the final volume of fifteen was published. Morison retired as a Captain, later attaining a Rear Admiral's rank in the Reserve. 'Admiral' was a title he preferred to 'Professor'.

p. 31. Footnote 23 (p. 31) should be deleted. In footnote 24 itself (p. 31), and its number, where it appears in the text (p. 29, ¶4, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence), '24' should be corrected to read '23'.

p. 36, ¶ 6. 'Dundall' should be '**Dundalk**'.

p. 43. The date of *Europe's Physician*, 2006, and its price, \$59.95, were omitted from the bibliographic information at the top of the page.

Its author, Hugh (Redwald) Trevor-Roper, Baron Dacre of Glanton, died on 26 Jan. 2003. He was a preeminent historian of the Stuart Era and of the Third Reich. His many essays illuminate the XVII Century. His remarkable command of detail is not distracting; rather, his understanding of each detail's significance helps to reveal the realities of a difficult-to-reconstruct time.

We have commented many times about the XVI Century's cataclysmic religious pendulum swings in England. These continued in the XVII Century, as the excruciating transition from a

Medieval society and culture inexorably occurred, under a series of rulers, each as different from any of the others as can be imagined: James I, Charles I, Oliver Cromwell, Charles II, James II, the first cousins William and Mary, and the simple, beloved Queen Anne. Trevor-Roper's grasp of the details and his feeling for the *gestalt* were insuperable; even more remarkably, he imparted this familiarity to his readers in an easy manner, free of pedantry. All of us who have an interest in this period have felt his influence. The Editor suggests seeking out his original works; you will enjoy this masterful historian's way of bringing another time to life. My personal favorite is *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution* (1992), a collection of fifteen essays. None of us will agree with his opinions or his viewpoint 100%. No two people do. But we're all grown-ups here, are we not? You will gain in understanding as you read.

p. 54. The illustration accompanying Frederic Charles Spencer's poem is not of that poet, but of de Vere, a poem of whose appears in this issue with the repeated picture (p. 53), this time correctly placed. We are still searching for a picture of Spencer and apologize for the mix-up.

### ***We Thank our Contributors***

We are grateful to all members who made donations in 2010. (Our 2010 fiscal year began on 1 Oct. 2009 and ended on 30 September 2010.)

The new 2011 Fiscal Year began on 1 October 2010. In this December, 2010, issue we recognize, with gratitude, the FY 2010 contributors to our General Fund, listed below, valued supporters of our work and witness.

Dues receipts entirely support production and distribution of *SKCM News* and *Church & King*. Beside these, we would have no witness or publicity, we could not afford even our modest administrative expenses, *were it not for your donations. These receipts are essential.*



In our June 2010 issue were recognized contributors to our American Region gatherings. Those appeals were already complete at that time. Your contributions in 2010 enhanced the beauty of the Annual Solemn Mass in Baltimore and the Solemn Mass in Omaha commemorating the Semisepcentennial of the Restoration. We also recognized those who supported the creation and production of our newest publication, the *Devotional Manual* (2010), as patrons and as reviewers. **We sincerely thank each of you.**

### Summary of 2010 Donations

<i>Number of Donors</i>	<i>Purpose of Donation</i>	<i>Total (USD)</i>
28	Annual Mass & Restoration Mass	\$2,445
12	Devotional Manual Patrons	1,200
63	Unrestricted Donations	1,495
<b>92</b>	<b>TOTAL DONATIONS FY2010</b>	<b>\$5,140</b>

Remember that your donations to the Society are now tax-exempt. Of course, dues and purchases of goods are not.

### Numbered Footnotes

*Note:* We are experimenting with footnote placement. In this issue we are putting the shorter, explanatory notes at the end of each section. Sections are groups of articles as arranged in the Table of Contents. This placement will make it easier to flip from a novel term, a significant passage, or a puzzling statement to the corresponding footnote. Related but longer definitions and explanations denoted with footnote numbers will appear before the *Editor's Miscellany (EM)*. Germane but tangential subjects, because of their nature or complexity, will be denoted with the superscript <sup>'TT'</sup> followed by a number, and placed in our final pages with the renewed *EM* in a section called 'Tangential Topics'. We mention the magazine's arrangement explicitly so you are aware of our efforts to make *SN* more readable. Lengthy notes appear at the end so the article itself is not dwarfed.

<sup>1</sup> Another semantic matter is the use of the term '*cultus*'. Its unfortunate cognate and synonym, 'cult', is common in vernacular usage, where the connotation of 'cult' is negative, overall. There does not seem to be another word for the group, organized or not, of those who share veneration of a patron saint, holy object, or the like, or the practices associated with that veneration, besides that one Latin word. Please do not think of Jim Jones and his followers' consumption of Kool-Aid® on their Honduran picnic, although that is the popular word-association. Going back to classical antiquity, the word meant the system of worship of a deity or group of allied deities, and the rites and cultic objects specific to that worship. The Canaanite cult of Asherah in which the Hebrews seem to have participated for a time was an example. (That usage was preceded by the now obsolete use of 'cult' to mean 'worship' or 'veneration'.) The word 'cult' as used in 'cult of Apollo' came to mean the religion's rites and ceremonies themselves, its externals, in contrast to the truth and inner meaning of it. Some emperors claimed divine paternity, and not only emperors. The classical gods were prone to promiscuity. The horse-riding Walküre, whose chief was Brünnhilde, known even in comic books from her armor brassière and steer-horned helmet, resulted from Wotan's philandering, with the earth-goddess, Erda. Godly philandering extended to humans, too, for example, the Wälung race in *Der Ring des Nibelungen* were fathered by Wotan, chief god of Norse and Germanic mythology, the basis of Wagner's epic work, with a mortal woman. She was the mother of the first Wälungs, Siegmund and Sieglinde, siblings separated since youth. The two are thrilled to be reunited, especially since Sieglinde's crude, brutish husband—who initially abducted Sieglinde and killed their mother as Siegmund escaped, and forced Sieglinde into marriage, a literal trophy-bride—is away from the hut, spontaneously engage in doubly taboo intercourse in which the hero Siegfried is conceived. The passionate love duet, subdued compared to that in *Tristan und Isolde*, is filled with dread and apprehension of Hunding's return. (continued on page 48)

**Donors to the General Fund during Fiscal Year 2010**

1 Oct. 2009 to 30 Sept. 2010

(63 Contributors; \$1,495)

**\$45 - \$100** (10)

William Paul Anderson  
Dennis P. Casey, Esq.  
Paul W. McKee, Benefactor  
The Rev'd Canon Edmund W. Olifiers, Jr., OL  
Gregory V. Smith  
Philip Terzian, Benefactor  
The Rev'd & Mrs. Elijah B. White  
Col. James W. Davis, Jr.  
Dr. Galen Blaine Ritchie  
Prof. Charles C. Taliaferro

**\$20 - \$35** (18)

Robert L. Hamaker  
The Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D.  
Allan F. Kramer II, Benefactor  
Rodney Roehner  
F. Powell Johann, Jr.  
The Rev'd Dr. Richard C. Martin, SSC, OL  
J. David Murphy  
Philip W. Nielsen  
The Rev'd Paul E. Sanford  
The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D.  
Robert T. Booms  
Charles A. Calverley, Jr.  
John Clark  
The Rev'd Deacon Brian Francis Duffy  
The Most Rev'd Mark Haverland, Ph.D.  
The Rev'd Philip C. Jacobs III  
Arthur L. Johnson  
Elizabeth W. (Mrs. Enoch) Jones  
Malcolm E. Jones  
Benton H. Marder, Jr.  
The Rt. Rev'd Rodney R. Michel, D.D.  
William A. Nickolds  
Alexander Roman, Ph.D.

Charles Barenthaler, Benefactor

William H. Franklin  
The Rev'd R. Trent Fraser, SSC  
Miss Violet D. Greene  
The Rev'd Kent L. Haley, Benefactor  
Douglas W. Hoffman  
The Rev'd Richardson A. Libby  
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Benefactress, OL  
Dr. Stuart E. Prall  
David D. Butler-Chamberlain, Esq.  
Dr. Thomas H. Kiefer  
The Rev'd J. Charles King, Ph.D.  
The Very Rev'd Canon Harry E. Krauss  
William L. Younger

**Up to \$15** (35)

Richard T. Hines, Benefactor  
Robert W. Scott  
Alfred L. Toombs  
Mrs. Beverly A. Tschida  
MSgt George L. Voltz  
A. Weldon Walker III  
The Rev'd Dr. Ralph T. Walker, SSC, OL  
Capt. Edward J. Ward  
The Rev'd Canon Prof. J. Robert Wright,  
D.Phil.(Oxon.), D.D., Th.D., D.Cn.L., F.R.Hist.S.  
The Rev'd Martin C. Yost, SSC  
The Very Rev'd Dr. William Willoughby III  
Charles J. Bartlett  
Charles K. Latham III  
Miss Pamela Warren  
The Rev'd Daniel Lee Clarke, Jr., SSC  
The Rev'd Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D.

*New Member Fiscal Year 2010*

The Rev'd Robert L. Shafer, Jr.

***Others for whose Support and Kindnesses during 2010 We Are Grateful***

**XXVII Annual Mass, Baltimore, 30 January 2010**

Grace & Saint Peter's Parish, Baltimore  
The Rev'd Frederick S. Thomas, Jr., SSC, Rector & Annual Mass Host  
Mr. John M. Marks, Organist and Choirmaster  
Mr. Charles F. Peace IV, Host Parish Chapter Secretary  
The Rev'd Canon W. Gordon Reid, Select Preacher  
The Rt. Rev'd John L. Rabb, Suffragan Bishop of Maryland, Presence at the Annual Mass

**Restoration Semiseptcentenary Mass, Omaha, 29 May 2010**

Saint Barnabas Parish, Omaha  
The Rev'd Robert F. Scheibelhofer, Rector, Celebrant, & Restoration Mass Host  
Nick F. Behrens, OL, Great Plains Chapter Secretary, Central States Representative of the Monarchist League, and S. Barnabas Music Director  
The Rt. Rev'd Daryn K. Williams, Bishop of the West (ACA/TAC), Select Preacher  
The Rt. Rev'd Stephen Strawn, Ordinary, Bishop of the Missouri Valley (ACA/TAC), Presence at the Restoration Mass

**Solemn Pontifical Votive Mass of the Decollation of Saint Charles, Mayesville SC, 7 Feb. 2010**

The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D., VIII Quincy, Patron of the Society's American Region, Celebrant and Preacher  
The Rev'd M. Dow Sanderson, SSC, & The Rev'd Daniel L. Clarke, SSC, Clergy of Holy Communion, Charleston SC  
Richard T. Hines, Benefactor, and Patricia Mayes (Mrs. Richard) Hines, restorers of the Chapel of S. Charles, K.M., Mayesville, and Hosts of Barbeque Luncheon

**Devotional Manual**

Alexander Roman, Ph.D., Co-Author  
The Rev'd John B. Pahls, Jr., S.T.M. Collect for the Society  
Richard Toporowski, Ph.D., Latin Consultant  
Miss Emma Butterworth, Permissions Department, National Portrait Gallery, London  
The Rt. Rev'd William C. Wantland, J.D., D.Rel., D.D., Auctor and Grantor, *Imprimatur*  
The Rev'd Canon Robert S. H. Greene, SSC, OL, *Censor Librorum*  
Mr Albert Wolfram, Principal of L&W Group, Spring City PA, our printing firm since 1988

**Historical and Archival Research Activities**

Hodges Archive Room & Staff, Henry Knox Sherrill Library, Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge MA  
The Rev'd Professor David Siegenthaler, D.D., Archivist  
Mrs. Nancy K. Ehlke, History Research (Dedications)  
The Rt. Rev'd William C. Wantland, J.D., History Research (30 Jan. Proposals at Convention)

## ***“Death and Eternal Life of Charles I”***

*(title assigned by the Editor; appeared without title)*

Vanquished in life, his death  
By beauty made amends:  
The passing of his breath  
Won his defeated ends.

Brief life and hapless? Nay:  
Through death, life grew sublime.  
“Speak after sentence?” Yea:  
And to the end of time.

[Anon., C&K, Aug. 1949]

[Untitled, title assigned by the Editor. Quoted in Tercentenary Sermon 31 Jan. 1949, preached by The Rev'd D. S. Millar, Vicar of S. Columba, Grey Lynn NZ, at S. Mary's Cathedral, Auckland, New Zealand]

**Jesu, Mercy!**



### ***Requiescant in pace***



**Mary, Pray!**

#### **Notices of Death**

The Rev'd Marlin Leonard Bowman, *Obit.* 7 Feb. 2010, *Aet.* 79

Patricia Mayes Hines, *Obit.* 29 May 2010, *Aet.* 61

The Rev'd Herbert Stearns Stevens, *Obit.* 10 May 2010, *Aet.* 88

The Rev'd Charles L. Stewart, *Obit.* 4 May 2006, *Aet.* 92

#### **Obituaries**



The Rev'd Canon Robert Howard Pursel, Th.D., Benefactor. *Obit.* 23 Nov. 2009, *Aet.* 67, was born in 1941 in Bloomsburg PA and resided there until his death. He was a graduate of Bloomsburg High School and Bloomsburg State Teachers' College. He earned the doctorate in theology from Trinity College, Toronto. For 24 years, he was rector of nearby All Saints Episcopal Church, Selinsgrove, and retired on 1 Aug. 2009. Father Pursel enrolled in the Society in 1985, the year he became rector of Selinsgrove. As it happened, because Dr. Pursel was a friend of S. Clement's Church, Philadelphia, and visited as often as he could, the Editor had the privilege of knowing him. It was then of note that he died on S. Clement's Day. Fr. Pursel was a devoted Catholic Christian and an ardent client of the Royal Martyr. Canon Pursel and his wife, Janice, had celebrated their 25th wedding anniversary on 28 July 2009.

The Rev'd Marlin Leonard Bowman, *Obit.* 7 Feb. 2010, *Aet.* 79. Father Bowman, rector of S. Clare of Assisi, Avery CA, died due to complications of surgery. In 2009 there had been a celebration of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his ordination by the notorious Bp. James Pike. Born in Santa Barbara CA, he graduated SF State College in 1953, and earning the M.Div. from CDSP in 1958 after service in the military. He served as rector of S. John the Baptist, Capitola, and then worked in the New Guinea Islands assisting the Anglican Church of Australia. When he was appointed rector of S. James of Jerusalem-by-the-Sea, Long Beach NY in 1969, it was expected he would close it down. Instead the majority of his ministry was served there. He 'retired' in 2000. He had become a Society member in 1986 and held a Royal Martyr commemoration at S. James each year, always duly reported for *SKCM News*. In these he was innovative, including special features such as rare liturgical elements, unusual prayers, Caroline texts paired with music of the period, and local instrumental soloists. He held them all together through his enthusiasm for the Martyr-King. When he moved back to California, he was appointed rector of S. Clare's. His survivors include sister, Adele Bowman Anderson, Phoenix, brother, Eldon, Prescott AZ, and many nieces and nephews. (This obituary is based partly on that in the 4 April 2010 issue of *The Living Church*.)

Capt. John Stanford Coussons, Ph.D., *Obit.* 31 Dec. 2009, *Aet.* 78, was born in Minden LA in 1931. He received the baccalaureate degree from Louisiana College and was awarded the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from LSU, where he studied history under the direction of T. Harry Williams. Joining the faculty of The Citadel in 1958, he spent his entire academic career of 41 years there as a History Professor. He served as Chairman of the History Department 1977-89. In addition to his primary



appointment, he was active at the military college, serving as advisor to two cadet companies, the sailing team, the Junior Sword Drill, The Honor Committee, and Saint Alban's Chapel. Dr. Coussons was commissioned in the U.S. Naval Reserve in 1952, and remained on active duty until 1955. He was recalled to active duty in 1961 during the Berlin Wall Crisis. He was retired at the rank of Captain. He was a member of the Society, having joined the Charleaton Chapter in 2003, soon after it was organized. He was a member of the SC Historical Society, the Washington Light Infantry, and the Sons of Confederate Veterans. He was a communicant and long-time vestryman of the Cathedral Church of SS. Luke and Paul and served two terms as Senior Warden. His obsequies at the Cathedral on 4 Jan. 2010 were followed by

burial in the churchyard. He is survived by his sister, Ellen Elizabeth Coussons Wooldridge, and brother, William McCoy Coussons, nieces, nephews, and grand-nieces and nephews.

The Rev'd Canon James Pernet DeWolfe, Jr., *SSC*, *D.Min.*, *Legator*, *Obit.* 28 Jan. 2009, *Aet.* 90, was born in 1918 in Mount Vernon OH and died in Fort Worth. He came from a family of many Episcopal priests, going back to the American Colonies. After graduation from The General Theological Seminary in 1942 was ordained priest by his father, Bishop James P. DeWolfe (Bp. of Long Island 1942-66). He served parishes in New York and Missouri before settling in Fort Worth, where he was instrumental in founding All Saints' Episcopal School. He retired from his position as rector of All SS, Fort Worth, in 1984 to care for his wife, Doris, and returned to his position after her death. Fr. DeWolfe enrolled in the Society in 1990 and was among the most faithful in filing an annual report of his observance of 30 January. A card or note stating where he celebrated mass, the number in attendance, and other salient details arrived like clockwork a few days after the feast. Fr. DeWolfe was made an honorary canon of Fort Worth in 1965 and awarded the *D.Min.* by General in 1972. He was a member of the Society of Mary and the Board of Trustees of SPEAK and its Executive Committee. Canon DeWolfe's will included a legacy to S.K.C.M.

Patricia Mayes Hines, *Obit.* 29 May 2010, *Aet.* 61, was a guardian of tradition. She died in the town of her birth, and her ancestral home, Mayesville SC, "a town full of ghosts from a better, nobler age. She was a direct descendant of 'Squire' Matthew Peterson Mayes, a signer of the South Carolina Ordinance of Secession in 1860. A highly respected political animal and much sought after for endorsements, Mrs. Hines also excelled as a wife, mother, neighbor, and guardian of the flame of tradition." She was the wife of Society member and benefactor Richard T. Hines. He and their children James Williams and Kathleen Mayes Hines, survive. (This obituary draws largely from Timothy R. Stanley's piece in the *Charleston Mercury*.)

Patricia worked in the critical position of executive assistant for domestic affairs during the Reagan administration, and served in several other important directorial rôles. Under President George H. W. Bush, she was named Deputy Assistant Secretary of the U. S. Army. In such positions she mentored a large number of young conservatives and assisted them in their careers.

Together, she and Richard created the Chapel of Saint Charles, King & Martyr, from an abandoned church building in Mayesville, which they purchased in 2006. "Its exotic mix of Carolingian and Confederate iconography . . . testifies to the family's loyalty to a still-living past,

stretching . . . back into an English Arcadia, when piety and order were in abundance. Mrs. Hines was as much a Cavalier as a Confederate.” The Chapel was the venue for a Royal Martyr Day celebration on 7 Feb. 2010, only a few months before her untimely death.

The Rt. Rev'd Noël Debroy Jones, CB, *Obit.* 28 Aug. 2009, *Aet.* 76, was born in 1932, on 25 December as is apparent. He graduated Saint David's College, Lampeter, and trained for ordination at Wells Theological College, serving in Newport curacies until invited by Bp. John Mort of Northern Nigeria to be vicar of Kano. After two years he joined the Royal Navy and was appointed chaplain of the Inshore Flotilla based in Singapore. Among the not notoriously devout ‘tars’ he was admired; men on ships moored away from the one on which he was conducting Sunday services hired water-taxis at their own expense in order to hear him preach. He became known as, in the words of his official obituary, “an inspirational priest with a high moral purpose and a delightful preaching style: humorous, down-to-earth, direct and eschewing a surfeit of theology.” The Editor had the privilege of meeting Bp. Jones on several occasions, because he was a naval chaplain colleague of The Rev'd Peter Laister. In addition to a stellar career in the RN—where an early performance review contained the recommendation, “This man should be chaplain of the fleet”, through his rise to that very top position—Bp Jones met his wife in Singapore. She and their son and daughter survive him.

His naval career was not all meditation surrounded with soothing organ music. Once while stationed in Hong Kong a riot broke out among some Chinese workers. He calmly left his lunch and disarmed one of the rioters who was armed with an axe. He went through the Royal Marines commando course and was qualified to wear the coveted green beret. He was appointed to 42 Commando and participated in the massive amphibious operation that was part of British withdrawal from Aden. Part of the last unit to leave, he entered a hospital building to find it occupied by turbaned enemy and narrowly escaping. Perhaps most difficult was his assignment during the Falkland Islands conflict of 1982, breaking the sad news and consoling families of the fatally-wounded combatants. Appointed honorary chaplain to the Queen in 1982, chaplain of the



fleet and archdeacon of the RN in 1983, he was appointed CB in 1986, its badge seen in the photograph here.

After twenty-seven years as a chaplain in the RN, Jones was appointed to one of England's most obscure sees, Sodor and Man. Man is the Isle where Manx cats originate, where the language is Manx, and which is symbolized by that peculiar heraldic device, the triskelion, three legs (human, not feline) joined at the thigh; they are generally rendered as armoured to avoid surgical challenges. No one is really sure where, what, or whether Sodor is, possibly part of the Hebrides (*vide infra*), but the diocese was part of the Norwegian province of Trondhjem from the XII Century and Man was added to its name by a scribe's error. Man became part of the province of York in 1542 while retaining its own Convocation. During its earliest known history, the Isle's control was contended between Scotland, England, and Norway. For about two centuries Christianity, planted by the Irish and extirpated by the pagan Vikings was suppressed. The smaller isles, Súdreyjar, ceded by Norway's Magnus VI to Scotland in the Treaty of Perth(1266). The main island around which those are situated is properly named Mann.

Man became a center for smuggling in the XVIII Century, necessitating tax legislation in the British Parliament, under which, however, the hereditary Lord of Man retains his throne, suzerainty of the Isle, and patronage of the See. Henry IV had granted control of Man to the Earl of Derby, in the Stanley family. Thus Man does not fall under the British Crown, having accepted certain tax and financial regulations in consideration of retaining self-rule. Technically it is a Crown Dependency. The bishop sits in the upper house of the Tynwald, a tricameral legislature, and in the British House of Lords, but without vote. Good thing, too, because the Bishop has to tend to the diocese's dozen priests. A minority of the populace are C of E, more being Methodist. Although the diocese is small, the bishop must be capable of dealing with a complex governance situation. The main ‘industries’ of the Isle of Man today are tourism and gambling.

Manx troops shared in the Royalist defeat of the XVII Century; and still in the XX Century, Bp Jones shared their loyalty to King Charles I.

Early in the reign of Bp Jones, a churchman in the diocese of only twelve priests opined that he ran the diocese “like an aircraft carrier”, possibly in contrast to a predecessor who chose a more secluded, Manx way of life.

While in that see, Bp Jones was active in the controversies of the period, particularly giving lectures and meeting with individuals to enhance understanding around the issue of female ordination, while traveling extensively, including to North America, as head of the U.K.'s Forward in Faith organization.

***God's Irishmen:  
Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland***  
**by Crawford Gribben**

reviewed by Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.

*God's Irishmen: Theological Debates in Cromwellian Ireland* by Crawford Gribben. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 284 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-532531-7. \$85.00.

This book is part of the Oxford Studies in Historical Theology series. Its author is a Lecturer in Renaissance Literature and Culture at the University of Manchester and a Fellow of the Royal Society. Rather oddly, the Faber engraving of Oliver Cromwell's portrait ("warts and all") is on the dust jacket even though the Lord Protector plays very little role in the book. The subtitle is also misleading in that the theological debates under discussion take place exclusively among Protestants. These quibbles aside, this book is a well-researched examination of the rival theologies of Protestants in Ireland during the period of Cromwellian rule, 1649-1660. This rule was directed by the lord lieutenant: first Cromwell himself, followed by his son-in-law Henry Ireton, then Charles Fleetwood, and then Cromwell's son Henry. None of these political leaders could cope effectively with the religious confusion caused by aggressively competitive Protestant groups. (Gribben stresses that these are really not yet denominations.) The book, however, concentrates on theology rather than politics.

Gribben's thesis stresses two points: 1. The rivalries among Protestants made any attempted conversion of Roman Catholics difficult if not impossible, and 2. The Protestant theological debates set the stage for centuries of sectarian quarrels.

Immediately prior to the Cromwellian invasion there were four identifiable religious groups in Ireland. There were the "Old Irish" who were native to Hibernia, spoke Gaelic, and were Roman Catholic (though their Catholicism was well-mixed with local pre-Christian folk religion). There were the "Old English" who were descended from Anglo-Norman settlers. They were Catholic and, to some extent, had intermarried with the Old Irish. There were the "New English" who had arrived in the 1500s and were Anglican. Finally there were the Ulster Scots Presbyterians who had come over a period of several centuries. Into this mix came four new Protestant affiliations all of whom were represented in Cromwell's army: Baptists, Independents (or Congregationalists), English Presbyterians, and Quakers. The one viewpoint all Protestants shared was their disdain for the Roman Catholic Church which they identified as the Antichrist. Apart from that they spent most of their time and energy quarrelling with each other. Evangelization of the Irish Catholics became a low priority and, realistically, an impossibility.

Gribben concentrates on these four new types of Protestants. He spends very little time on the Ulster Scots and even less on the Anglicans. The bulk of the book is devoted to analyzing the differences among the four dissenting sects on five key issues: conversion, baptism, church government (polity), miracles, and direct revelation from God acting through the Holy Spirit (what Gribben calls "the possibility of the extraordinary") and the ecclesiastical role of women (which had nothing to do with ordination but rather giving public testimony in the congregation). If one were to chart this one would get twenty permutations – thirty, if one includes Anglicans and Ulster Scots as well! Gribben stresses that doctrinal borders among these Protestant proto-denominations were somewhat fluid and certain individuals occasionally drifted from one group to another. There were

also shifting alliances among them depending on what issue was at stake. For example, Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Independents differed on church governance but all practiced infant baptism. Thus they could ally against Baptists on that issue. However, Baptists and Independents agreed on a congregational church polity which put them at odds with Anglicans and Presbyterians. No wonder there was mass confusion and no wonder the Irish Catholics were mystified by Protestantism! This section, Chapters 2 through 6, may prove tedious to readers who are not passionately interested in detailed explications of rival theologians and their sermons.

Gribben makes several good points in both the Introduction and Conclusion. The most obvious is that the discussion of Irish religion is much more complex than a simple Catholic-Protestant dichotomy. More to the book's point, though, is that the Protestants were so hostile to each other that they made no headway in converting the Catholics. The Cromwellian government seemed incapable of coping with the theological disarray, not to mention the intransigence of the Catholic majority, and was itself torn between enforcing uniformity and accepting toleration.

This book may be of limited interest to our members, [especially at \$85! —*Ed.*]. Charles I gets a couple of mentions, but plays no role here. However, if the reader enjoys theological disputation and XVII Century sermons, there is much to be learned.

*[Suzanne Bowles received a Ph.D. in History from Syracuse University. She is Associate Professor of History at William Paterson University. Her areas of specialization are early American history, naval history, American religious history, Anglican history, and British royalty. Under her maiden name, Suzanne Geissler, she has published numerous books and articles on these themes, including Lutheranism and Anglicanism in Colonial New Jersey (Edwin Mellen Press, 1988). She is a member of Saint Michael's Episcopal Church, Wayne, New Jersey, and serves on the vestry there. In addition to her ten years as a book reviewer for SKCM News, Sue has now begun a spell on the Editorial Committee of our e-Publication.]*

## ***“Anglo-Catholic in Religion”: T. S. Eliot and Christianity***

**by Barry Spurr**

reviewed by the Editor

*“Anglo-Catholic in Religion” T. S. Eliot and Christianity* by Barry Spurr. Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2010, xiii + 325 pp., illustrated (b/w), qpb. ISBN: 978 0 7188 3073 1

POST: Lutterworth Press, P.O. Box 60, Cambridge CB1 2NT [UK WEB www.lutterworth.com](http://www.lutterworth.com) EMAIL: [orders@lutterworth.com](mailto:orders@lutterworth.com) TEL +44 (0)1223 366951

(Page numbers in parentheses refer to the book under review.)

Saint Katherine Cree and Saint Andrew's by the Wardrobe are churches in the City of London. They have connections with our Society: Just this month (November 2010) the UK Society's AGM (Annual General Meeting) is set for the former. Its second name, 'Cree', is a corruption of 'Christ Church', and 'Saint Katherine' (of Alexandria) the name of a church absorbed by Holy Trinity Priory, 'The Christ Church', founded in 1180 by Maud, wife of Henry I. At Saint Katherine Cree, there is a statue of the Martyr-King in remembrance of Miss Callender, beloved UK Circulation (member) Secretary post-WW II to 1962. Of course, the Society was founded at Saint Margaret Pattens, where the Annual Mass and First Evensong the previous evening were celebrated until its vicar, Fr. Fish, our cofounder, died in 1906. The mass was sung regularly at Saint Mary-le-Strand (as the R.M.C.U. now do) from after V-E Day until 1969, the year our Society was granted annual use of the Banqueting Hall on 30 January by the government agency having charge of it. The City churches' names have suffered 1,000 years of corruption; a few have uncertain derivations, not a few are amusing, but all of



them have a millennium of history. Study of the City churches of London could be the work of a several lifetimes. Another few lifetimes could be spent investigating the now non-existent ones. Many of the latter were destroyed during the Blitz of World War II. Of the hundred or so destroyed in the London Fire of 1666, Sir Christopher Wren rebuilt, planned, or supervised the rebuilding of, fifty-one, most notably, of course, Saint Paul's Cathedral.

As work on the Society's History proceeds, one sad occurrence often comes to mind. That is the destruction of the U.K. Society's archives when, during the night of 29-30 Dec. 1940, Saint Andrew's-by-the-Wardrobe was fire-bombed. The archives were there because that Church was the Society's 'headquarters'. Each of the City churches has a multitude of traditions and historical connections, well-known to David Roberts, R.M.C.U. Secretary/Treasurer, who is just now at the end of his one-year term as Master of the Worshipful Company of Churchwardens, its work and the wardens themselves being of and among the City churches.

The City churches exerted an attraction to young T. S. Eliot, whose work for Lloyd's Bank was in the City. At the time he did not know the reason for his interest in them—perhaps it was historical and vaguely aesthetic, given involvement of the noted architect Christopher Wren, a Royalist, working largely in the Classical style of that period. Or, was Eliot's a spiritual attraction? He was a seeker, exploring Buddhism, Eastern Orthodox spirituality, and Western mysticism, reading Evelyn Underhill, and much more. He spent time in Oxford where he began to get a 'feel' for Anglo-Catholicism, and in Paris, where he experienced Roman Catholicism as long it had dominated and pervaded Continental European culture.

In response to a proposal to demolish nineteen of them, Eliot wrote of the City churches in 1921 that the "least precious redeems some vulgar street. . . . The loss of [their] towers, to meet the eye down a grimy lane, and of [their] empty naves . . . will be irreparable and unforgotten." Among the ones he came to frequent the most were Saint Mary Woolnoth and Saint Magnus the Martyr. In this context we encounter what struck me as the most remarkable revelation contained in Spurr's masterful work. It is masterful as history, biography, and as a 'character study', and is inspiring as a detailed, personal vignette depicting Anglo-Catholicism's Faith, practice, liturgy, piety, and charitable works for the betterment of society, during the post-apical, preconiliar period of the 1930s to '50s, as a believer's exposition of the poems and essays of Eliot in relation to his Anglo-Catholicism, and most importantly, as an exposition of an exemplar's life, a life lived in conformance with the Faith, humbly and imperfectly but thoughtfully and expectantly. It was a time of decline, yes, but not perceived as such then. There were excuses—the War was the preponderant one—and the depth and suddenness of the descent was hardly imagined by anyone, despite Eliot's prophetic words.

We reckon the apex as 1933, the year of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses in Britain and the U.S., being the Centenary of Keble's Assize sermon (14 July 1833) by which historians mark the start of the Oxford Movement. The period was characterized by exuberance at the success of the Tractarian and the ritualist movements primarily theological, of course, which stimulated a renewal of decorative arts and the emergence of new talents in design, architecture, and practical craftsmanship-and elegant artisanship. which became intermixed. The enemies of joy and of these movements, which saw nothing wrong with responsible enjoyment of God's creation, called the period of the 'teens, '20s and '30s 'triumphalist', as if it was wrong for good to triumph. For some reason this name-calling unnerved Anglo-Catholics, who ought to have ignored the sour-grapes sentiment, then lost confidence and found themselves weakened when the language and liturgy of their worship was challenged. When our highest calling is the worship of God, and we know that He

desires our worship and that He is gratified when we fulfill His desire, it follows that to supplement that worship with adjuncts and adornments that symbolize our exuberance—glorious music, stately liturgy, and sumptuous accoutrements that illustrate every detail of our rich heritage—is natural, not a Taïzean minimalism of whitewash, its shades of white decorated with only a few accidental drops of colored paint. God wants us to take our faith seriously and to follow His precepts, yes, but not to go around with a cowed and defeated outlook, a bleak imagination, and a hangdog posture. Some( may think these negatives are the only results of our relationship with God and His saints. People who think the faith is all about being glum, guilty, and unhappy typically try to make others as unhappy as themselves. Joy characterized Charles I's court—the joy of civilized people, not the licentious and debauched. (See an upcoming *Communiqué* feature article for a clear illustration of this.) Properly, Christmas brings “tidings of comfort and joy”, “tidings of peace, tidings of Jesus, redemption and release.”

George Early, a life-long friend of Eliot, captured a moment of realization that is jarring, because it is so simple. The fact that came as a revelation to Eliot is taken for granted by the world's lowliest Christians (poor, unwashed, illiterate, hungry, and suffering from starvation combined with the effects of dread diseases), yet was arcane to the brilliant, educated, cultured, urbane, and perceptive Eliot. In an unpublished reminiscence, “Eliot as a Friend and a Man of Prayer”, Early, a lay brother in the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham, wrote:

What sticks in my mind is his description of the impression made on him by people praying, I think in a church, or it would not have been so obvious, but certainly outside a time of service. He suddenly realized that prayer still went on and could be made. It wasn't simply of historic and cultural interest. People did pray and he might.

How fortunate we are that Early recorded this revealing recollection of Eliot's that came out of their conversations. It might never have seen the light of day: Once Eliot knew about prayer, he might have been too embarrassed to disclose his initial impression of it. Early might have thought it too personal to disclose. The words are valuable, because they help those of us who pray instinctively to realize what a great gift it is.

Some who are as clueless about XX Century literature as Eliot was of the practice of prayer might well think that the poet would have been boring. A person with only a vague knowledge of him, or none, upon reading a brief encyclopedia entry, might well find his first impression confirmed. Eliot's life went counter to the direction that the general public might consider normal. Was he a reactionary? Had he rebelled against U.S. Midwestern Unitarianism—a religion without a god, a religion which began as a variation of Congregationalism, which itself grew out of the religious views and beliefs of New England settlers, Puritans, Pilgrim non-conformists, and dissenters of various kinds, not a wholly homogeneous collection by any means? Surely there were some conflicting and contentious beliefs and practices; after all, such differences exist even within a single denomination. (Some feel that ‘denomination’ is a pejorative term used by Catholics; it is a purely descriptive term, meaning ‘so named and thus distinguished from others’, just as denominations of paper currency are denominated differently to distinguish them from others worth different amounts of money.) Did conflicts about important beliefs among Congregationalists lead to de-emphasis of those teachings and thus favor Congregationalism's development into Unitarianism? Unitarianism, when it rejected the doctrine of the Trinity as embarrassingly obscure, complicated, unreasonable, and unfathomable, tied up with the divine and human natures of Jesus, the actions of the Holy Ghost, miraculous things like that Archangelically-announced event called the Annunciation, at which was disclosed what

would later be termed the Incarnation, when Jesus was “conceived by the Holy Ghost, [and] Born of the Virgin Mary” (Apostles’ Creed; see note just below\*), which (for Unitarians) had too many impossibilities all rolled up together, and the diagram to ‘explain’ the Trinity, with ‘EST’ connecting each vertex of a triangle with the Triune God in the middle, and ‘NON EST’ connecting each of the triangle’s vertices with the others, “incomprehensible” as said of each of the persons of the Trinity (Athanasian Creed)—found out that without beliefs, they had no God at all in Whom to believe. The toothpaste couldn’t be put back into the tube.

\* Later formulated more explicitly in the Nicene Creed, “Begotten of his Father before all worlds, . . . And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, And was made man”.

Born in St. Louis MO, Eliot emigrated to England. His family included his intellectual mother, his father, a successful man of commerce and industry, and an uncle and a grandfather who were prominent Unitarian clergymen. He became an intellectual effortlessly, although he did not complete his doctoral studies and thesis straightaway. He renounced his American citizenship to become a British subject. His customary socializing with a fashionable set of avant-garde literati and dilettantes, among whom he met his wife, Vivien, ended in 1927-8. He was marginalized, ‘frozen out’, and frankly rejected by these self-liberated literati, as conformist in their own habits, beliefs, and disbeliefs as those whose conformity they mock, the bankers and solicitors in bespoke suits and Oxford shoes. This is the same today in North America, where the talk is of inclusivity and diversity, but these ‘ities’, supposedly virtues, are confined to superficialities: differences among people, like skin color, nationality, marital status, and so on. In contrast, holding diverse beliefs and philosophies relating to things of mind and heart and soul, the things that really matter for the sake of our immortal souls and eternal life is discouraged, or worse.<sup>(1)</sup> In 1928 there appeared a concise statement, from which this book’s title comes, in which he clearly declared himself to be a royalist in politics, a classicist in literature, and an Anglo-Catholic in religion. He had been privately baptized and confirmed on two successive days in 1927. He was thought to be a Tory. He became a regular churchgoer. He worshiped not only on Sundays, but attended many of the masses his parish church offered daily. He was a life member of the Society of King Charles the Martyr. For much of his life he was a roomer. He worked for the publisher, Faber & Faber, having responsibility for a portion of their varied catalogue of books, and worked in a dreary London office. In addition to a variety of essays, some rather long, he wrote poems. The entirety of his poetic oeuvre fits into one book of ordinary size. As he rose to prominence—the Nobel Prize in Literature and appointment to the Order of Merit, to name two, both in 1948—he continued to lecture more frequently and more widely, but publically remained distant, reserved, and reticent to say anything very specific about his poetry, his personal life, or the causes with which his name was associated. His writing of course is precise, but apart from his poetry and plays, the words of which speak with impact, it is characterized by a vagueness and non-committal attitude. There is an exception, of interest to us. His writings about church matters reveal a passion.

Boring books sometimes seem to be in the majority, but Spurr’s recent book about T. S. Eliot’s religious belief, practice, expression, and views is most assuredly not to be found in that neighborhood, although another book about Eliot was, for me. All Eliot books appeal to me at the bookstore or in the catalogue, but not all pass the acid test of quality and durability, examination by reading. This demonstrates that a book’s subject determines neither inherent interest nor a reader’s. Not only did I have trouble putting Spurr’s detailed and perceptive study down, but Spurr’s insight into that very private, self-possessed, reserved, and discreet churchman makes the book magnetic. I

say 'churchman' rather than 'poet' because his religion occupied a position of such centrality in his life, unusual for a public figure. Even in medieval times when church and monarch were inextricably tied, very few monarchs were holy men. Among such, King Louis IX of France and King Charles I of Great Britain were rare in their deep faith and devotion. That those descriptors characterize Eliot with regard to his religion is not a surprise. From what I know of his poetry, they characterize it too, and his responses to questions about it. For a man whose life was about words, he was very sparse with them. Having admired Eliot since I first learned of him, I would place him, among public figures, as one of those who worked the hardest to keep his personal life private. One's private and personal places would usually include one's religious practice. Among famous persons who have converted to Christianity, Eliot is among the more interesting. An intellectual whose peers were avant-garde poets, artists, and opinion leaders is expected to be either irreligious or antireligious. With most of them, the story would end there. But Eliot's 'before and after' pictures are, religiously speaking, polar opposites. His upbringing in a family of, if one may say it, of dogmatic Unitarians, some of whose members exhibited perfectly the Unitarian ideal of the XIX Century in the U.S.A. is so drastically different from his extreme Anglo-Catholicism—also a late XIX Century phenomenon. Its roots are in the undivided Church of East and West, most Anglo-Catholics would say, a smaller branch of the tree than those of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, but their proximal forebears were the XVII Century divines of the Church of Charles and Laud. Strikingly, the roots of Unitarianism go back to the Apostolic Age as well, many of Unitarianism's philosophical roots being entangled amongst those of the heresies of the early church, when the creeds were being written, defining orthodox faith as *not* believing those heresies. The deviation from the norm is often easier to recognize and define than the norm itself, which populates the center cut of the bell-shaped curve.

Spurr specializes in poetry, but his insight is no more limited than are the areas of human experience that poetry expresses. Words are a poet's tools. Spurr's insight into Eliot himself, the book's subject's 'life lived', is demonstrated throughout the book. Although organized into logical chapters (the main sequence of chapters, One through Five, is chronological) everywhere appear illustrative quotations from Eliot's *oeuvre*, details of his life, interactions with colleagues, his practice of religion, ecclesiastical policy on matters of doctrine, and his attitudes about society at large. The latter constitute an ill-defined area, social policy, sometimes related to religion and sometimes not. From the details and background Spurr supplies concerning the latter category of Eliot's thoughts and endeavors, I feel a stultifying vagueness, lack of commitment, and absence of any sense of mission. The quotations Spurr includes communicate no more than a half-hearted sympathy for the organizations or their causes. Concomitant activities—attending meetings, serving on boards, speaking at symposia, and writing vague essays about the perceived, but imprecise purpose of the organizers of the symposium—did not provide inspiration or potential applications commensurate with Eliot's intellect or consistent with his world view. Spurr speculates that his involvement in such causes was instinctive for TSE, coming out of the 'do-gooder' mentality of his Unitarian past. His heart was not in them, though. Those who sought his involvement may have hoped for more support from him, perhaps a brilliant, compelling written justification of their cause. An image that sticks in my mind is that of TSE and a long-time friend, the friend not really on the same religious or philosophical wave-length, but not merely an acquaintance at an 'open air' mass sponsored by such a group at Saint Anne's, Soho, on a bleak, rainy day, standing under a shared umbrella being exhorted on the subject of the day. (177) There is no inspiration, no excitement, no mutual recognition of a shared objective. Surely the two of them and the entire gathering are thinking 'Why am I here?' and

using any bit of creativity they can muster to satisfy their wish, 'Get me out of here', like a child, bored with his playmates, who says, 'I think I hear my mother calling.'

In contrast, Eliot's writings on ecclesiastical issues, which included even a popular pamphlet for distribution, show passion. One such cause was a so-called ecumenical scheme to unite Anglicans in India with a Protestant group, the latter having no Apostolic Succession and no interest in it. The Anglicans supporting the scheme were mostly oblivious to the doctrinal concern. Those who recognized the concern saw it only as an obstacle to their scheme and tried to sweep it under the rug. A doctrine was, to them, not an expression of belief important to one's soul, not a treasured, commonly-held belief handed down through the ages, but a paragraph on a piece of paper, a useful political tool but no more. A few of the global Anglican bishops opposed it, their leader being Bishop Frank Weston of Zanzibar (pictured on p. 163), but most of them were gutless, then as now. The scheme passed, showing, I suppose, that it was a good match, since the Anglican bishops proved that they placed no higher value on Apostolic Succession than did their partner.

Another subject about which Eliot felt strongly was the language we use in worship. Worship is largely 'deprioritized' now. Mass is moved to Saturday because golfing, especially a Sunday morning tee-time, is more important. Worship is not just something we do. It is not just the most important thing we do. Worship of Him is *the reason* God has put us here. Rather than becoming dispirited, Eliot used his powerful abilities to express himself for the cause of orthodox faith, urging those in power and those in positions to influence them, to do the right thing. It makes a traditionalist grieve to read Eliot's prophetic query and his answer to the bogus, elitist rationale that people do not and *can not* understand the classic, noble language of which we are heirs:

"Must we look forward to the day when the collects of Cranmer are revised for use in Anglican Churches to make them conformable to 'contemporary English'?" \*

(T. S. Eliot and the Language of the New English Bible', *The Sunday Telegraph*, 16 Dec. 1962, p. 7.)

\* Not for long a rhetorical question: Such changes were permitted by the 1965 Alternate Services Measure; its provisions came into force in 1966. Its implementation and hastily undertaken Prayer Book revision throughout Anglicanism shared in the exuberance that followed the Dec. 1965 closing of Vatican II. That enthusiasm extended to a realistic hope for true Christian unity, which was precluded by subsequent events even as the 1979 U.S. prayer book was being approved. Eliot died in 1965. He prophesied the failure of these initiatives before they were implemented, and gave the reasons.)

"O God, the Creator and Preserver of all mankind, we humbly beseech thee for all sorts and conditions of men . . ."

(BCP 1662, collect "to be used at such times when the *Litany* is not appointed to be said")

"Among those to which it belongs, [the classic] will find its response among all classes and conditions of men."

(Eliot, *On Poetry and Poets*.)

Is not the disregard of such considerations, in large part, that which has deracinated Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism in the Britain, Europe, North America, the Antipodes, and some scattered former colonies during the last four or five decades? Did anyone honestly think that depth of faith, belief in the church's teachings and adherence to the same, sodalities and the veneration of saints, level of commitment, or attendance would benefit from any such changes? The trend ever since Vatican II and since the Anglican bodies began liturgical experimentation was perceptible early enough to have given the order, "*Volte-face!*" Spurr has also written a book on this subject, *The Word in the Desert*.

Whenever the above topic is mentioned in *'Anglo-Catholic in Religion'*, the author bemoans the deterioration of all things Anglo-Catholic. To some extent Anglo-Catholicism has suffered the same trends as Anglican and Roman churches in general, deterioration of Western culture clearly having an influence. In Britain the A-P churches may have fared the worst, since they were most inclined to 'follow the leader' (Rome) in adopting all elements of the liturgical 'reforms'; when revisionist thinking came along for the ride, some of these churches have been totally lost, depending on the views and tenure of their respective incumbents and to some extent lay leadership, and no longer the traditionalist bastions they once were. But there are positives. Some churches are reverting to the old practices of worship, traditional doctrines are again being mentioned, and the congregations at Tridentine celebrations are not all old people: The young are discovering the old mass, reacting with awe and wonder, incredulous that it was abandoned, not passively or through some hardship, but actively encouraged. Australia's modernization may have been more thorough and authoritarian than in the States. In my experience many churches use traditional language to some extent, which is better than to no extent. Further, many churches offer traditional liturgy, no place exactly the same as another, but Tridentine liturgy and ceremonial are not rare, and the Extraordinary Use is growing in popularity even in liberal RC dioceses, often standing room only to the feigned amazement of diocesan authorities. Although encouraged by Benedict XVI, at a local level it can be discouraged in subtle ways. Spurr's book is perhaps overly pessimistic. The situation is dire, yes, but there are some signs of hope. There are seekers after truth and beauty, as always, but our liturgical lights have been hidden under bushels. Many among the young are seeing it for the first time. (Do not think that we speak only of RCism. Although it is both looked to by A-Cs and suffers from the same difficulties, RCism is years 'ahead' of Anglicans and the introduction of the new has been more authoritarian.)

In addition to researching this book using documents from the collection administered by Eliot's widow, Spurr had access to a collection of letters exchanged between Eliot and Mary Trevelyan. These give glimpses into day-to-day details of Eliot's Anglo-Catholic life, praying the Rosary, attending daily mass, his scrupulous observance of the Eucharistic fast and of Holy Days of Obligation, including some favorites that he added to his personal rule. The additions seem to have been unaccompanied by any subtractions, interesting because adding more to one's rule of life would be expected of a youthful enthusiast, not a man of his years. Once when he was unwell, he missed early mass, fearing that if he heard mass, he would then feel too poorly to discharge an obligation of his secular vocation, all revealed in a letter to Miss Trevelyan. I sensed that he revealed such details to her as if she sat in the rôle of spiritual director. Deviations from one's regimen are easy to excuse: After all, it's all arbitrary anyway, isn't it? It is that easy to be dishonest with oneself. Each of us would do well to emulate his rigor. A friend of this reviewer who had interactions with him in Boston, to which he made regular trips for activities at Harvard, made it clear that Eliot observed his regimen of worship to the fullest extent possible, even when travelling, and taking advantage of Bowdoin St.'s service schedule, complementary to that at Mt. Vernon & Brimmer. The rigor with which Eliot submitted to his routine of worship, the utter seriousness with which he regarded his regular confessions, and his lay participation as sidesman and warden paint a picture of a very devout, committed layman. Many public figures only a fraction as notable as he would have dispensed with the latter as superfluous. We suppose Eliot tithed and that S. Stephen's coffers must have swelled nicely in 1948, considering the cash component of a Nobel award. In fact Spurr's insight into TSE was developing already during his academic formation; this book surely fulfills a dream, or *the* dream, of his lifetime, pursued, from his days in graduate school, and nurtured by his own devotion and discipline, much like Eliot's, until its publication this year. The book's quality (no

superlatives suffice) clearly shows that Spurr was destined to satisfy this crying need in Eliot studies. For those of us who as laymen have long admired Eliot, the book surpasses all of our fantasies, fulfilling our wonderings with such satisfaction. And we surely feel more than a little abashment, knowing that he, in the manner of a saint, would not be pleased that we think well of him because of his exertions of pious discipline. He tried to observe our Lord's admonition not to appear unto men to fast.

An American Note. One deficiency, from this reviewer's perspective, is the lack of information on Eliot's time in the United States, apart from the influences he encountered growing up, the letters he exchanged regularly with his mother, and mention of Saint Mary depicted, orbed and with a fishing boat (Our Lady of Good Voyage, Gloucester MA), an allusion to whom appears in 'The Dry Salvages' (p. 158). Those of us who have dwelt in the Boston area would have wished to learn more about the time he spent in Boston and Cambridge, where I imagine he lectured and met with colleagues, and Cape Ann, where he sailed as a youth. I know that he worshiped at Boston's Church of the Advent, a Tractarian foundation (1844) established in its own building under Fr. Grafton's leadership, and the Bowdoin Street church, the Advent's home 1864-1889, and afterwards a mission of the Cowley Fathers. Those churches still occupy the same buildings situated on the flanks of Beacon Hill, atop which is the seat of Massachusetts's government, Bulfinch's State House. Cowley's work in Boston was dear to Fr. Benson despite Grafton's break over the American house's independence. Benson for all practical purposes retired in Boston. Either Spurr had no access to potential sources or contacts or was unable to spend the much less productive time to broaden his work to include this facet of Eliot's life. For the time he spent in the academic environs of the Charles River's North bank was infused with Anglo-Catholicism just as the rest of his life was, not that one would expect otherwise. He did not leave his beliefs behind in Kensington as some people do when they vacation. Note that the infusion was more Eliot's than Cambridge's, the latter having had relatively few, but remarkable intellectuals thought of as distinctly 'fringe' by most Harvard faculty. Cram, Charles Eliot Norton, and Santayana.

In a book on Eliot's religion, the Boston experience would have complemented the rest and provided some American examples of his constancy in observance of his Faith and its disciplines, validating in a small way the immense body of London experience. Perhaps there are some other locations in the Americas (or elsewhere, such as Stockholm to receive his Nobel Prize award from the King of Sweden) where he made several visits and where sources of information are available. Even more surprising, in an overall sense, is that there is no index entry for Harvard University, the oldest institution of higher education in North America. Harvard is mentioned several times in the book. Harvard and Yale, the first two of the four earliest-founded Ivy League colleges, their collective name having nothing to do with *Hedera helix*, but derived from the Roman numeral for four. Harvard and Yale, the pair most alike, yet having the fiercest rivalry, were established after the paradigm of Oxford and Cambridge, but to train Puritan/Congregationalist ministers rather than C of E priests, Harvard's foundation being the result of a legacy of his library from the minister, John Harvard (M.A., *Cantab.*), an Emmanuel man. A stained glass window in a chapel at London's Southwark Cathedral memorializes the young philanthropist with a seal bearing the Harvard motto, VE RI TAS, on a bright red (crimson) field. Nearby is a window depicting King Charles the Martyr.

Another benefit of incorporating some of Eliot's more diverse experiences is that stories and anecdotes of gatherings including achievers in different areas of specialization might well have

revealed parts of Eliot's character and personality not apparent when he was among his English Anglican, and A-C confreres. A decade into the XXI Century, this may be an impossible task.

Conclusion. A practicing Christian in diverse and liberal company can experience jealousy, feel disadvantaged, and sense the rejection of having been marginalized, because he forsook parts of a 'normal' life experience in order to give proper place to his Christian commitment, consequently experiencing severe isolation. What Christian who is serious about implementing his beliefs does not wistfully read the following observation and find it unspeakably poignant?

"The division between those who accept and those who deny Christian revelation I take to be the most profound division between human beings." (p. 115; from *For Lancelot Andrewes*, 1928)

Similarly, it is tempting to dismiss certain doctrines that are inconvenient for us, or that have consequences, if accepted, that are obvious to others and embarrassing to oneself.

"Love of God and sound doctrine are inextricable."

The book is so highly revelatory of significant aspects of Eliot—his pious practices, both personal ones and also those of liturgical participation, his associates and on what subjects and in what circumstances he interacted with each, the objects (church buildings, sculptures, paintings, written works of prose and poetry, *etc.*, but generally always having an esthetic dimension, or needing one) that were significant to him, favorites as it were, the thoughts and concepts to which his mind always returned and referred, such as the incarnation—and their interrelationships that its overall organization was surely a challenge. Each new bit of information suggested to this reviewer many questions, how did it relate to this, that, and the other aspect of TSE. The chapter organization, which is at a high level chronological, reflects this and must have been challenging for the author. The time periods significantly overlap: 1888-1917, 1917-27, 1915-33, 1918-39, 1927-65, and the date-defying chapter, "Anglo-Catholic in Literature". The portrayal of Eliot, the whole person, that Spurr achieves is so *true*, so complex like ourselves, not the arm's-length view of a unidimensional author's oversimplification. Including TSE's religious beliefs and practices as Spurr has done reveals the real T. S. Eliot as no other writer about him ever has. Important to Spurr's magnificent accomplishment, too, is his thorough and sensitive analysis of each of the Christian (and especially, Anglo-Catholic) allusions in the poetic oeuvre of the book's subject. We are left to say, theatrically or operatically, '*Bravo, Barry Spurr! Bravo!*'

In fact the index could be better. I selected several subjects to use as tests and found that none was indexed in the form in which I first put it, and several were not indexed at all despite their appearances in the book. To be useful, index entries must be based on the queries and subjects the index user would have in mind, like the names of folders in a filing cabinet. Another nicety, a list of illustrations with their page numbers would have been helpful. The long section of entries under "**ELIOT, T. S.**" (3½ of 12 pages) is not helpful. Because Eliot is the focus of the entire book, a given query often needs to be looked up twice, in the index proper and in the list of subjects under 'Eliot'.

The illustrations are well-chosen and properly interspersed throughout the text, not relegated to special sections. A few of the photographs have a lot to say. The one from Gloucester, a fishing and lobstering town Northeast of Boston, near the tip of Cape Ann, evokes feelings of Our Lady's loving care as she cradles like a baby the model of a fishing boat, depicted in almost distracting detail. Like the St. Gaudens statue of a ship's captain at the helm in nearby Marblehead, it evokes emotion at first sight from those of us who have known people lost at sea, or rescued from the likelihood of that fate. The cover photo, a color image of the sanctuary at Saint Stephen's, Gloucester Road, Eliot's parish in



Kensington, London, is striking in its vast predominance of red and gold, although apart from the statuary of the reredos, there is no rewarding detail and little by way of precious objects, splendid decorations, or elegant appurtenances, unless the unusual structure atop the reredos is a feretory of the protomartyr, as this reviewer has fantasized. Displayed in a bookstore, the book's front cover would grab one's attention. As for Spurr's accurate characterization of many Anglo-Catholic priests as 'theatrical', one might note that Jean Cocteau described opera as "the red and gold disease". Although the year's two greatest feasts, Christmas and Easter, share the liturgical color, white (not white and gold as Spurr says), most priests choose red when a photography session is being planned.

This book's strength derives largely from Spurr's own experiences of Anglo-Catholicism. As is inevitable, a few mistakes remain. A few important subjects could have been treated with more clarity. I will detail them in the spirit of a fellow seeker after wisdom and truth, praying that their mention will not at all diminish any potential reader's interest in the book or detract from the content and message of Dr. Spurr's magnificent work.

In a parish where use of the English Missal and its rubrics is customary, the most thumbed book on the sacristy shelf is sure to be Adrian Fortescue's *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described* as the primary authority on ceremonial details, above Lamburn's *Ritual Notes*.

Reckoning the time of day by hours divides the daylight period into twelve hours of variable length depending on latitude and time of year, the sixth hour being noon. Jesus's death on the cross, is reported in the Gospel to have been at the ninth hour, about 3 p.m.

For those readers with no familiarity with Roman or Anglo-Catholicism, the explanation of the *Angelus* should have been more complete—more thorough and more rigorous. "Thrice-daily repetition of *Aves*" is not adequate. As much as the centrality of the doctrine of the Incarnation in Anglo-Catholicism is emphasized, the meaningful Versicles and Responses (for Protestants, note that these are Biblical) should have been included. They are the substance of the *Angelus*, the *Ave*, the refrain. Speaking of the Incarnation, why the word 'Word' is capitalized is not really explained at all. Referring readers to the *English Missal* provides no explanation either. Although Bibles are going out of style, along with books of any sort, I daresay more people have an Authorized Version of the *Holy Bible* on the shelf than have an *English Missal* lying about. Here in the U.S., hardly any libraries, even big city libraries, would have the latter among their holdings. *Missale Romanum*, yes. The context in which it arises is the beginning of the Gospel of S. John and discussion of the Incarnation's importance. Here's my attempt to explain why 'Word' is capitalized. The personal pronoun 'his' is applied to 'Word' in that Chapter (S. John: i), giving the clueless reader a clue that this is no ordinary 'word'. It is a synonym or euphemism for Our Lord Jesus Christ; as a proper name it is capitalized. For our Salvation to happen God had to transmit His teachings to the people on earth. God, in the second Person of the Trinity, took on a human nature (through his mother, Mary) in addition to his Divine Nature. Three Persons comprise the Trinity, so Their Names are capitalized, too. God made flesh on earth, Jesus transmitted His teachings, which were the teachings of God, to us. They were transmitted in words, so God Incarnate is called the Word, an example of metonymy, a rhetorical or literary device in which the name of a person or a thing is substituted with something it suggests or an attribute of it. To show that we are awed and humbled at the thought of the Incarnation, we genuflect during the Last Gospel at the passage, "And the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us." (S. John i: 14) Divided at the comma, the same passage serves as the third versicle and response of the *Angelus*; we acknowledge the Creator's condescension to us, His creations, by genuflecting at that point in the *Angelus*, too.

Likewise, this reviewer knew with certainty after a cursory perusal of "*Anglo-Catholic in Religion*" that the book in his hands was *the* Eliot book he had been longing for, for several decades. This was indeed the Eliot book that covered the neglected subject of the poet's personal religion. No writer treating Eliot as his subject had enough interest in the topic, enough sympathy with Eliot's sympathies, or, bluntly, enough knowledge of religion (Christianity in particular), of the Western Church, (of Roman Catholicism), of Anglicanism, and of Anglo-Catholicism during its late triumphalist phase of the 1930s, '40s, and '50s, to understand fully.<sup>(2)</sup> Some may have worried that the hoped-for exemplar would prove to have feet of clay. The term 'triumphalist' is an unfair over-simplification (insufficiently acknowledging the prayerful, meditative, and pious aspects of Anglo-Catholicism, all of which are enhanced by celebrations of the Holy Sacrifice), and can be more or less successfully realized depending on the architecture, decoration, and ornamentation of the actual church building; its furnishings, decorations, vestments, and other accoutrements; and Sacred Ministers and an acolyte corps who are well-trained, precise, and un-self-conscious; but whatever the level of triumphalist spectacle, it is accompanied by devotional aspects of significance as the worshiper communicates with his God as he will in the Heavenly Jerusalem amidst the throng of Angels and Saints. "This do," said our Lord, "in Remembrance of Me." In the celebration's solemnity He comes to us, and reciprocally our worship pleases Him. To worship at our best pleases our Heavenly Father, as we satisfy our highest calling, to worship Him in the beauty of holiness." his elevating spiritual communication is accompanied by an opportunity to commune with the living God by receiving the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar that "we may dwell in Him and He in us." All of these spiritual and visually sensual elements are enhanced by the other senses, the smell of exotic incense and the infinite musical possibilities afforded by a first rate organ with a virtuoso choir and supplemental instruments as appropriate to the particular music. To term his Faith "Eliot's sympathies" is an attempt to draw in the secular person who may find a new world opened to him; "sympathies" as used here refers to one's attitude toward his religion, but is too casual, as though speaking of his religion as one of many 'preferences', like the choice of Sancerre over Chablis or Pauillac over Saint-Estèphe. To recognize in his poems the allusions and quotations from Scripture and the prayers of special significance to Anglo-Catholics and to understand that the practice of his religion was not merely important to Eliot, but *pervasive* and *central*, required specialist knowledge. It had to be an 'inside job'. Spurr was more than equal to the task.

Among poetry he has read, this reviewer at once felt an affinity with Eliot's. His poems are very rare in their appeal to him. They exerted a magnetism before this reader had even an inkling of what it would mean in his life. Clearly the work of a lifetime for Dr. Spurr, a life spent contemplating Eliot from every possible angle, still may not have sufficed for Spurr to realize what broad impact the book might have, *will* have. The fact is, that if many would read "*Anglo-Catholic in Religion*", many things would change. The book is revelatory; the word is not chosen lightly. The Christian, the Anglican, and the Anglo-Catholic, each member of those groups who considers himself serious about the Faith he professes, will realize through Eliot's example—he really *lived* his Faith, including every detail of its practice—that there are unrealized blessings available to him. The realization of this potential is not through 'casting a wide net', flailing one's arms to grab every novelty that comes along, the resultant syncretical conglomeration more distracting than the sum of the single novelties. No, the way is to focus on what we know, or should know, to be our Faith's core. Our Lord said, "I am the way and the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (*S. John* xiv: 6) It seems too simple. We think, 'More must be needed.' But the celebrated intellectual, Eliot, followed that simple way. Awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature and made a member of the Order of Merit, both

in the span of one year, the Year of the Lord, 1948, he continued as before to attend daily mass and say his prayers. Through this book, T. S. Eliot will become an exemplar and the inspiration for many.

Were Eliot's efforts to champion the causes of Faith, Goodness, and Truth ineffective? Were his causes lost causes, and are ours? Did not the Stuart Dynasty's efforts to achieve its Causes fail? Did not the world think Our Lord's Cause was lost?

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." (*Is. lv: 8*)

Jesus succeeded in atoning for our sins and rose from the dead. His was the Victory. King Charles won the incorruptible crown, and so may we; the Victory will be ours if we persevere and if we remain faithful. We know from the information Dr. Spurr imparts in his book that Eliot believed in that final Victory, too. What a gift we have in Dr. Spurr's account of T. S. Eliot's practice of religion.

Let us continue in the Apostles' fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> We have all experienced a vague discomfort when we realize, perhaps intuitively, perhaps from very subtle looks, body language, and by reading between the lines, that our beliefs are not considered acceptable by those in whose company we find ourselves. It is becoming more and more common in what was formerly called the "Christian West" for our fellow humans to think—and sometimes, to say,—not merely that we are peculiar or a little on the fringe, but that our beliefs are bad, not healthy beliefs to impart to our own children, not good for society, unsuitable to be voiced in public, and perhaps even 'hate speech'. (In fact some of his statements have been considered for categorization as 'hate speech. Google these things if you are interested. You may find that your results begin to take on a political character; we do not wish to get into that sort of thing here.) There may be objections that my words are too negative, too harsh. They may say that this subject isn't 'nice'. Surely it's ok to be Christian—not in all countries, of course—but many people's Christianity is only nominal, and many Christian bodies (call them what you will, denominations is what they used to be called) have no beliefs at all other than that traditional beliefs are dangerous. Such people find it easy to accommodate themselves to those who work to remove Christianity from Western society. Our Lord warned us about being persecuted for His sake

The examples of this in the XX Century are many, worldwide, systematic, and horrifying. What is not widespread is knowledge of the particulars of these persecutions, the ones of the XX Century and the ones now ongoing.

We in the Society of King Charles the Martyr know something of the totalitarian regime emplaced by Oliver Cromwell. It did not tolerate public expressions of orthodox Christian belief. Even before the beheading of King Charles, those supporting Cromwell—Puritans, Presbyterians, and various dissenters—had taken actions against freedom of conscience, belief, its expression, and expression of political thought.. These actions included the abolition of the bench of bishops, the abolition of the House of Lords, the abolition of the Prayer Book, the illegality of conducting public services from it. All these things were put into effect in the 1640s. Bishops and priests were 'deprived', meaning that they lost their salary and benefits. Some lived with supporters ('patrons') in the country, some went underground and continued to conduct worship secretly in homes (in Cornwall, there were a few backwaters where public church services using the Prayer Book continued), and to train priests, some went into exile, and some were imprisoned and convicted in unfair trials. A few were executed, but those who were denied the customary rights and freedoms of Englishmen were many. Those in the U.S. who remember 'trial by liturgy', a chaotic period of years preceding the 1979 book, where liturgies were constantly changing, replacing edifying public worship with dreadful, always changing

novelties, with the Green Book, the Zebra Book, and the Blue Book in turn, supplemented by countless booklets, some crudely typewritten, all in a vain attempt to create an environment from which the emergence of the 1979 book would be greeted as a good thing, the change would be an end to change, a relief from the chaos and the answer to a maiden's prayer. These multiple changes, like bursts of gunfire, did get the attention of churchpeople. When members of a church gathered at coffee hour, the talk was not of the weather or of a sports event, but about the words of the service, sometimes a single word, changing which would seem minimal in comparison to the sudden replacement of the C of E's Prayer Book by the *Directory of Public Worship*.

For many generations most historians were of the Whig school, and the whiggish influence still exists. A bright light has shined on studies of the Stuart period in the works of a new generation of scholars who 'reassess' the biased history of the past. Little more than fifty years ago, few historians had the courage of Winston Churchill, who in *The New World* (Volume 2 of his *History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, 1956) wrote that "As misfortunes crowded upon him [King Charles] increasingly became the physical embodiment of the liberties and traditions of England. . . . In the end he stood against an army which had destroyed all Parliamentary government, and was about to plunge England into a tyranny at once more irresistible and more petty than any seen before or since." You'll find nothing like that in any textbook. Most High School teachers would think it wrong.

<sup>(2)</sup>It has been observed, and quite rightly, that the decline of Anglo-Catholicism resulted from a number of factors. They will be briefly detailed but not analyzed here, for such matters are not our Society's direct concern, although we are influenced as a Society by their general effects. First, society as a whole has experienced an entropic decline.<sup>(2a)</sup> Pervasive media influence has hastened this to what some now see as a complete degeneration of societal principles. Other analyses focus on the decline of traditional religion as a result of liturgical 'reform'. Changes purportedly designed to stem the flow of adherents from those churches have been followed by hemorrhaging of members. Another influence opposing the order and precision Spurr identifies as key characteristics of Anglo-Catholicism, is the trend toward informality, examples in the business world being the decline of the neckties and three-piece suits, or of dressing nicely for church, or dressing up for air travel (a puzzling but undeniable fashion of the '40s and '50s). Expensive attire used to be a mark of a wealthy person. This is still so in some situations, but today there are situations where a sweat-suit and Fendi accessory convey the same message. Yet other observers, most alarmingly, bluntly attribute the decline to a loss of faith on a large scale. It is difficult to argue against this view, since Gallup polls report that only about half of RCs in the U.S. believe in our Lord's real presence in the Eucharistic Elements, not to mention acceptance of the officially-held scholastic/Thomist definition of transubstantiation. Even fewer accept or adhere to teachings requiring mass attendance on Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation. The societal decline mentioned first in this note is thought by some to be a consequence of the existentialism and nihilism that followed WW II.

<sup>(2a)</sup>Some historians describe this phenomenon as occurring over centuries, the interpretation dependent on an individual's philosophy. As Lee Hopkins said in a recent book review (*SKCM News*, Dec. 2009, pp. 43-5), the Dark Ages can be considered a misnomer of a period during which Christianity flourished and provided a harmonious influence within society. It was a society in which diverse types, classes, and callings coexisted in a Christian context accepted by most. While there are those who romanticize those Ages, others view the prevalence of Christian values as a form of oppression. They may feel those centuries were dark, because the light of the 'enlightenment' had not yet illuminated men's hearts. Of course it was actually the abandonment of religion. These

naysayers emphasize the imperfections of the era, *e.g.*, that not all were integrated into society, including Jews (as non-Christians and usurers they were suspect and many lived in ghettos even then), sufferers of Hansen Disease (formerly called leprosy), who were shunned (although it must be remembered that they suffered from a dread disease, an affliction that was not understood at all, contagious, and resulted in grotesque deformities due to skin and mucous membrane ulceration at sites varying among victims, the face, however, often taking on a characteristic leonine look), gypsies, who had no interest in integration into society, and unbelievers, suspected of a variety of enormities, including witchcraft. Overemphasizing the exceptions distorts an overall picture of society's concord. Likewise, there exist dichotomous perspectives of every historical movement, including the Enlightenment, colonization of Asia, Africa, and North and South America, Renaissance, the fall or emasculation of the royal Dynasties of Europe (1600s to 1900s), the American Revolution, Industrial Revolution, opening of China and Japan, consolidation of the European powers (from the many small kingdoms, principalities, grand duchies, *etc.* into entities resembling those of modern Europe), totalitarian movements of the XX Century, decolonization of Asia, Africa, and South America, empowerment of the resource rich but impoverished countries of the 'Global South' and so on.

## ***The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I***

**edited by Thomas N. Corns**

reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne

*The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, Thomas N. Corns (Ed.), Cambridge University Press, 2009, ISBN 978-0-521-11870-5 (paperback re-issue of the initial publication of 1999)

This collection of scholarly essays presents a variety of topics and opinions, with an afterword by Kevin Sharpe, author of the controversial 1992 reassessment *The Personal Rule of Charles I*.

John Peacock, in "The Visual Image of Charles I" explores coins and medals, statues and portraits, as well as the 'self-representations' of the King as expressed in court masques.

Jonathan P. Wainwright's "The King's Music" provides an "examination of the musical culture at the court of Charles I", including a discussion of the King's early musical endeavours: "Prince Charles was himself a skilled performer on the bass viol (having been taught by Alfonso Ferrabosco) and according to John Playford, 'could play his part exactly well on the Bass-Viol, especially of those Incomparable Fancies of Mr. Coperario to the Organ.'"

I found Sharon Achinstein's "Milton and King Charles" to be something of an oddity. The writer's lengthy sophisticated description of 'Popish-plot Thinking', as she calls it, is really nothing more than a torturous way of saying that the King's enemies were using this sort of thing to stir up anti-Royalist sentiment, and her comparison of the celebration of peace during the Personal Rule to the Orwellian slogan "War Is Peace" does seem a bit unfair and inaccurate, as the kingdom actually was at peace in those days.

"Reviving the martyr king: Charles I as Jacobite icon" by Laura Lunger Knoppers, is one of the best and most thoughtful of the essays, discussing another aspect of the King's legacy, how he was viewed by the supporters of King James at the time of the so-called "Glorious Revolution". (I am reminded of Scott's description of General Dalziel in "Old Mortality", with his long beard unshaven as a token of mourning for Charles I.)

Altogether, this is a thought provoking collection, investigating ways—both sympathetic and hostile—that the Royal Martyr has been depicted and perceived, and the sometimes unforeseen results of those perceptions.

*[Sarah Gilmer Payne, Benefactress, OL, of Martin GA, has been a regular contributor to these pages for twenty-five years. Chief among her many interests are the Royal Martyr, the times in which he lived, and her many pets and animals, especially the equines. One of Sarah's current projects is an annotated bibliography of works on King Charles, his reign and his times, and the development of his Cultus. As we work to increase awareness of the Royal Martyr's place in history and his critical role in preserving Anglican Identity, it will a valuable resource.]*

### **Omission from Review of *The English Civil War* by Diane Purkiss**

*A portion of Sarah Gilmer Payne's recent review of *The English Civil War* by Diane Purkiss was mistakenly omitted (Dec. 2009, p. 49, after the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraph, "... foregone conclusion.). It reads:*

While scrutinizing, grossly misconstruing, and condemning King Charles's every word and action, Purkiss simply takes it for granted that his enemies were the aggrieved party, and glosses over the illegality of their proceedings.

One would think that any tribunal in which a death warrant had been made out in advance of the sentence, and then had its date altered, would in and of itself suffice to show the nature of those involved, but apparently some consider such things unimportant

### **Continuation of "The Tate Gallery, 1972"**

*Sarah Gilmer Payne's recent commentary on the Tate Gallery's 1972 exhibition, *The Age of Charles I: Painting in England, 1620-1649* was accidentally truncated (June. 2010, p. 51 following line 2). It reads:*

This lovely and informative catalogue was published to accompany the Tate Gallery's Exhibition of 15 November 1972 – 14 January 1973.

Many of the extraordinary works of art reproduced here will be familiar to the reader; all are breathtaking, and expressive of the unique charm and style of the time of Charles I; significantly, they date from 1620, before the King's accession, reflecting his lifelong love of art, beginning with his early years as Duke of York and Prince of Wales.

The author reminds us that "the ideal Charles I exhibition can only be mounted in the imagination", inviting the viewer to visualize the magnificence and unmatched scope of the King's collection, picturing it as it would have been seen in its XVII Century surroundings.

Although impossible to reassemble that collection, yet there are many beautiful things here to captivate and inspire—there are works by the endlessly fascinating Artemisia Gentileschi, and William Dobson, who so perfectly captured the essence of the Cavalier.

A section is devoted to Rubens, and another to van Dyck in England, which discusses the influence of his transformative genius.

There is a chapter on the enchanting miniatures of the period, and one on sculpture: the rich detail of Bernini, and the quintessentially XVII Century style of Le Sueur

I found Samuel Cooper's poignant chalk drawing, 'A Dead Child', disturbing and unforgettable.

The many portraits, so rich in the flamboyant dress of the times, reveal new details with every viewing.

The introduction and commentaries are very well done, giving me one more reason to look back on the 'Seventies with nostalgia and affection.

# The Rule of Twenty-Four

by David D. Butler-Chamberlain

## INTRODUCTION

The New World has had only a handful of kings. The Holy Roman Emperor Charles V created his son, Philip, King of Chile, so he would rank with his bride to be, England's "Bloody" Queen Mary I. England's, and our Charles I, Martyr, ruled over the colony of Virginia. In Virginia, the King was a king after death, the Royal Arms remaining proudly over the capitol at Williamsburg throughout Oliver Cromwell's terrorist dictatorship.

In Hawaii, King Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma reigned and ruled from the king's accession in 1855 until his untimely death in 1864. Their Hawaiian Majesties are remembered in the Episcopal Church each year on 28 November and, hence, their story may be found in *The Proper for the Lesser Feasts and Fasts*, pp. 458-9 (2003). Both the traditional and the so-called contemporary collects for Blessed King Kamehameha IV and Blessed Queen Emma remember the words of King Charles I, Martyr: "[G]rant that we, with them, may attain to the crown of glory that never fades away . . . ."

For a time, thinly populated Canada was ruled by the French and then by the British king or queen. In 1876, not coincidentally, on the centennial of the American Declaration of Independence, Benjamin ("We authors, Ma'am . . .") Disraeli persuaded parliament to add Empress to Queen Victoria's titles. In the XIX Century, Mexico was briefly ruled by emperors, Augustin de Iturbide and Maximilian I. Though widely believed to have assumed the imperial dignity, Haiti's Toussaint L'Ouverture in his self-dictated constitution merely appointed himself governor general for life.

Tenuously a succession of tsars ruled and reigned in Alaska. Following the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine, arguably and more tenuously, Tsar Alexander I ruled and reigned over Alaska and over Fort Ross in Alta California. Alexander I, whose death in 1825 at forty-eight was mysterious and whose coffin was empty when opened in the 1920s, acquired a cult of orthodox believers in his immortality à la King Arthur, Merlin, and, by some accounts, the Emperor Charlemagne, who sleeps surrounded by his knights to rise in defense of the West. "Sleepers, awake," as J. S. Bach memorably wrote.

Rather than death-defying chevaliers or paladins, Sonoma County, California, acquired Fort Ross and the wine industry. But, in any case, emperors and kings are clean different things, being both pagan and pre-Christian and post-modern and post-Christian.

## ARGUMENT

When I began law practice in the late 1970s, I did a lot of criminal defense work. In an ordinary murder case, there was an idea called "The Rule of Twenty-Four." The idea was that the police, and, if possible, my private detective, should look for the motive for the killing twenty-four hours or less before the killing because people, even most perpetrators, can't stay enraged much longer. And the idea was that the police, and, if possible, my private detective should look for physical evidence within twenty-four hours following the killing because people, even most perpetrators, have the sense to throw the gun in the Raccoon River or to ask 'Mama' to wash the blood-strained Levis.

Of course, these were ordinary murders, murders with boning knives taken home from the kill floor at the packing house. My 1970s murders were about emotion, anger, words shouted in a bar or during an August picnic outside a house in a poor neighborhood, a house without air conditioning. A murder involving statecraft, revenge at the highest levels, making a statement (showing the flag), might have a fuse decades, even generations, during which slowly to smolder.

Two weeks ago Saturday, the space shuttle *Columbia* went down [in 2003, when this essay was first drafted —*Ed.*]. It was intriguing to watch the mainstream media buy immediately into the federal government's line. At nine in the morning our time – before debris fell fully to earth – the local CNN affiliates solemnly pontificated that “terrorism had nothing to do with *Columbia*'s destruction.”

I heard that, turned off the radio, and took my Alsatian, Icon, for a long walk in Waterworks Park. Des Moines drinks the water, much filtered, from the Raccoon. It's excellent water.

The next morning, at eight o'clock our time, NPR announced that Colonel Ilian Ramon, the Israeli on the *Columbia*, was one of the eight pilots who took out the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981. Ramon's F-16 bears the marks of two kills on its nose. The first is because of a Syrian fighter jet. The second commemorates Operation Opera, in which Ramon was the youngest fighter pilot, which put paid, for a time, to Iraq's nuclear longings I'd call that motive. Nevertheless, the federal government and its licks-pittle, toad-eating press had already spun us: “Terrorism not suspected, officials stress”, solemnly intoned the *Des Moines Register* on Sunday, 2 February.

[In 2003, as your Editor was about to enter the sanctuary of Saint Paul's, Washington DC, for the Society's XX Annual Mass, he was told of the sightings of glowing debris in the atmosphere along the trajectory of *Columbia*'s reentry. The sightings were numerous because there are many 'trackers', aficionados of manned space flight, who gather for such opportunities to view the craft. They knew when it should have been visible with their binoculars. As we left the church less than two hours later and gathered for the luncheon, the fact of the craft's disintegration was reported and so was the cause—or rather, what was *not* its cause.]

One could envision the *Register*'s editorial board, their foreheads deeply etched with thoughtful furrows – though without, in these politically correct days, of course, Edward R. Murrow's trademark cigarette, pretending to decide whether to rubberstamp the federal government's lie of the day.

Of course (“It's physical, only logical.”), the local paper's editors drank the government's Kool-Aid. That same morning in paragraph fifteen of a sixteen paragraph story the *Register* finally did actually disclose Colonel Ramon's bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor.

By the following Wednesday, the *Des Moines Register* had reprinted an opinion piece by the ever-predictable Richard Cohen out of the *Washington Post*. The article was an elegy for Colonel Ilian Ramon. At least as reprinted in the *Register*, Cohen's elegy, a sloppy salmagundi of art, the Holocaust, feelings, and people-who-need-yadda-yadda-people, was perfectly silent regarding Ramon's bombing of Saddam Hussein's nuclear reactor.

I'm not enough of an amateur missile scientist to know about opportunity. I am enough of a trial lawyer to recognize motive. Edgar Allen Poe wrote a short story, “The Purloined Letter,” the point of which was that the letter in question was always in plain view on the top of a cluttered worktable.

#### CONCLUSION

In the days of King Charles I, Martyr, kingship was dangerous work. As Alfonso XIII, like Jesus, a King before birth and a descendant of King Charles I, Martyr, famously observed, “Being a King is a dangerous profession. But it is devilishly well paid.”

Today, at least in America's school books, the people reign and rule themselves. Hence, we like the old kings and queens, need to be strong lions and wise foxes. Ask yourself this: Would King Charles I, Martyr, Maria Theresa of Austria-Hungary, England's Elizabeth I, or II simply accept the conclusion that Saddam Hussein had neither (1) motive nor (2) opportunity to shoot down *Columbia*? Would any of these sovereigns buy into these two notions before all the debris from the shuttle had hit the ground?



We all saw the black map of East Texas with the red and yellow streak of *Columbia*, like Icarus, falling slowly to earth. In high school in California's San Mateo County, I did drama. It is funny how words stick in the human mind: It must be like that for a dog like Icon with scents. Immediately, the map made me think of a line in Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, "See, see, where Christ's blood streams in the firmament."

In order to govern ourselves, we Americans need to look. But far more, in order to govern ourselves, we Americans need to see those things at which we look. And in order clearly to see, we would give ourselves, like the kings and queens of antiquity, like at his best, Charles I, Martyr, more than twenty-four hours before ruling out motive in *Columbia's* fall from grace.

© Reserved by the author 2003, 2010

*[David D. Butler-Chamberlain, Esq., is a lawyer practicing in Des Moines, Iowa. He is a specialist in both Iowa courtroom and Iowa Star Chamber litigation (e.g. dissolution of marriage under Chapter 598, Iowa Code, and the "Child Abuse List" maintained by the Iowa Department of Human Services under section 235A.19, Iowa Code).*

*[Mr. Butler-Chamberlain earned a B.A. degree at San Francisco State (history & humanities, 1973) and a J.D. from Stanford and Willamette Universities (1978). For two years between undergraduate and law school, Mr. Butler-Chamberlain operated the 30 Stockton trolley coach for the San Francisco Municipal Railroad through the Financial, Chinatown, Pacific Heights, Cow Hollow, and the Marina districts.*

*[Mr. Butler-Chamberlain has driven manual transmission automobiles all his life. He has the good fortune to operate a 1998 Morgan Plus VIII, now nicely broken in with 30,000 miles all driven by him. In November 2010, he delightedly married Mary Carey Butler-Chamberlain at the Cathedral Church of Saint Paul in Des Moines. Both the Bishop of Iowa and the Dean of the Cathedral officiated at the marriage ceremony.*

*[Readers interested in seeing the graphic depiction of the red-orange streak over the blackened states of Texas and Louisiana should go to Wikipedia's entry for the Columbia disaster, the eleventh illustration in the article as of this writing, 20 Dec. 2010.]*

## ***The Sickly Stuarts: The Medical Downfall of a Dynasty***

**by Frederick Holmes**

reviewed by Stephen C. Petrica

*The Sickly Stuarts: The Medical Downfall of a Dynasty* by Frederick Holmes. Stroud, U.K., Sutton Publishing, 2003. \$29.95, illustrated, ISBN 0-7509-3296-1. With reference to a review by Elizabeth Lane Furdell, Ph.D. (Univ. of So. Florida) in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 350, No. 19, 6 May 2004.

Holmes raises an interesting question, that is, how health affects the longevity of a dynasty or other political regime. The matter does not seem to have been systematically addressed by historians. Holmes's thesis is that pervasive ill-health shortened the life of the Stuart dynasty and thus hastened the rise of parliamentary power.

I was surprised at the amount of data available to Holmes about the medical histories and causes of death of so many royals; his medical 'sleuthing' is quite interesting. Evidently, some of the conclusions are more convincing than others, but except for one case I don't know enough about the monarch and his reign to assess their validity.

In that one case Holmes offers the psychiatric diagnosis that King Charles I suffered from Delusional Disorder, on the grounds that he believed in the Divine Right of Kings. As a metaphor for a man of a medieval mindset facing early modernity, it might conceivably work to say that Charles was "delusional". But as an actual medical diagnosis, it is risibly indefensible. The *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* (DSM-IV, the 'Bible' of Psychiatry) requires that

“an individual’s cultural and religious background must be taken into account in evaluating the possible presence of Delusional Disorder.”

Whatever modern-day people think of the Divine Right of Kings, it was an entirely normal medieval belief. Therefore it is utterly untenable to assert that Charles I suffered from this psychiatric disorder.

Furdell’s review in *NEJM* is sound, particularly her comments on Holmes’s amateur status as an historian and her observation that he ignores all non-medical factors—social, political, and religious currents—affecting the reigns of the Stuart monarchs.

(Dr. Furdell exemplifies some of the weak arguments and poor information used by Holmes. Her knowledge of the period exceeds the author’s. She points out that the references include an “unremarkable encyclopedia”, “gossipy ‘social’ histories”, one by a romance novelist, and “dated biographies”. However, three recent scholarly works on the medicine of the period are not cited. Furdell, however, speculates that Prince Henry’s death in 1612 “led inexorably to the reign of Charles. . . the Civil War.” Henry’s death did lead to the reign of Charles, but surely the Civil War was primarily and proximally caused by the rebels’ objections to the King’s rule, and generally, to the rise of Protestantism throughout Europe as well as growing anti-Monarchical sentiment. –*Ed.*)

*[A long-time member of the Society and recently elected member of the Order of Laud, Stephen C. Petrica holds the degrees M.Div. and M.P.H., trained in psychotherapy at Yale, and also studied at Johns Hopkins. He has worked in the field of mental health for many years as a therapist, researcher, administrator, and consultant. He served twelve years in the priesthood of the Anglican Province of Christ the King before entering the Roman Catholic Church. He is currently preparing for {re}ordination in the Diocese of Madison (WI), and is eager to see how the Anglican Ordinariates develop.]*

RECOMMENDED

***Sophia of Hanover:***  
***From Winter Princess to Heiress of Great Britain 1630-1714***  
**by J. N. Duggan**

*Sophia of Hanover: From Winter Princess to Heiress of Great Britain 1630-1714* by J. N. Duggan. Peter Owen Ltd, 2009. ISBN-10: 0720613426 ISBN-13: 978-0720613421

Recommended by Father Swain.

BRIEFLY REVIEWED

The Editor’s commentaries, below, include quotations excerpted from H-Net Review Publications, with permission. The author of each H-Net Review is credited above the commentary on it, on the line denoted by an asterisk.\* Quotations from the review or the book itself are so noted if not obviously distinguishable from context.

***The Reformation of the English Parish Church***  
**by Robert Whiting**

reviewed by Katherine French (SUNY New Paltz) ) for H-Net Review Publications\*

Citation: Katherine French. Review of Whiting, Robert, *The Reformation of the English Parish Church*. H-Albion, H-Net Reviews. November, 2010.

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=30773>

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Illustrations. 318pp. \$99 (cloth) ISBN978-0-521-76286-1

“ . . . [A] lavishly illustrated follow-up to his 1998 book *Local Responses to the English Reformation*.” The book covers rood screens and galleries and moves from those, locally significant often bearing painted figures of the most venerated, popular patron saints, to an exhaustive coverage of every type of furnishing, decoration, vessel, and article in the church, using churchwardens’ accounts, wills, episcopal records, and royal or chronicle descriptions of religious practice. “Whiting lays out the basic theology that brought [the physical alterations] about, making distinctions between moderate, traditional, and nontraditional parishes.”

The author goes into remarkable depth, down to artisans, certain of whom are known to have both created the accoutrements and then also taken responsibility for their removal, dismantling, or concealment. His perspective is that the people generally welcomed the Reformation, a view totally at odds with Duffy’s. Whiting attributes the acceptance of the Reformation’s changes to law and order, following the rules, not to theological or sentimental agreement: “Duty, conformity, obedience: these mental attitudes appear to have been at least as powerful as spiritual convictions or material interests in inducing men and women to accept the reformation of their parish churches.” Katherine French of SUNY New Paltz bluntly states that “this is an unconvincing argument”, going on to cite Duffy’s very influential body of scholarly work in this area. “Whiting’s book shows the continued debate among historians that surrounds the pace and implementation of the Reformation. While Whiting does not deny the role of the Crown in ushering in England’s Reformation, his England is one where the citizenry is generally welcoming of change, rather than stubbornly resistant as perhaps best argued by Eamon Duffy’s numerous publications.”

Some ask why we review books that focus on events that happened during the century before King Charles’s accession (1625). Henry VIII began his reign (1509-47) as a Roman Catholic, and was favored by the Papacy with three Golden Roses and the Title, *Fidei Defensor*. These Roses showed esteem and recognized England’s importance in the configuration of Europe’s countries and dynasties (That configuration was threatened as the Reformation gained strength, and every country’s polity, ecclesiology, economy, and geopolitical alignment changed as the Western World moved from the medieval era into the unknown.), and ‘Defender of the Faith’ in recognition of Henry’s theological proficiency and orthodoxy. The latter title has been redefined, shall we say, over the centuries as its use has continued. More than a decade ago the heir-apparent alarmingly suggested that the C of E be demoted to the status of any other religion in the realm by dropping one little word, the definite article, radically transforming the title to, “Defender of Faith”. We return to Henry. The nuances of his reasons will never be known. He was tired of his Queen, Catherine of Aragon, and peeved that he had not produced a son to carry on the Tudor line, in which Henry was only the second king. I say ‘he’ because use of ‘she’ ignores the reality that the events of fertilization and genetic recombination, as they govern a baby’s sex, would have depended on Henry’s X chromosome, not Catherine’s biology. Henry thought that ending the marriage was the only possible way out. The pope was not willing to annul the marriage. His reasons may have been geopolitical and dynastic more than moral. Annulments were granted in many cases, as were permissions for RC royals to marry heretics, but neither was strictly proper. Henry, in a selfish and perhaps impulsive

way, made the English Church to be under his protection and governance, not the Pope's. His own Chancellor, Sir Thomas More would not enable the annulment, as a matter of conscience. He was beheaded in 1540. Meanwhile Thomas Cranmer's ascendancy proceeded apace. Warham as Abp of Canterbury was unable to be of much help to Henry, because his principles would not allow it. He did sign the petition for the Pope to grant a divorce, and enabled more of the clergy to assent to Henry's being "Supreme Head" of the church by adding the phrase "so far as the Law of Christ will allow" to the assent document. Warham's sympathy with Protestantism was nil; he died in 1533, avoiding a showdown, and was replaced by Cranmer, who accepted with seeming reluctance. Whatever he thought, he became Henry's chief instrument, enabling his selfish wants. He started by annulling Catherine's marriage with Henry (1533) and performed the same service regarding the royal marriage with Anne Boleyn (1536). In the case of Anne of Cleves, Cranmer both married and divorced them. Under the Six Articles, Cranmer had to banish his own wife (1539), who was the niece of the Lutheran, Osiander, and had been kept in seclusion from their 1532 secret marriage. When Henry died in 1547, Cranmer became a chief counselor to Edward VI and over the next few years was instrumental in the destruction of images and relics and abolition of the old ceremonies. The First Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549) is considered his greatest achievement. Mary I came to the throne in 1553. By the time Cranmer was burned at the stake in 1556 he had recanted his 'reforming' views, affirmed papal supremacy, and renounced it again. In the 100 years until the beheading of King Charles, Roman Catholicism was out again when Mary Tudor died. How easily the situation could have turned is difficult to realize today. Note that Elizabeth I (Good Queen Bess, the Virgin Queen) kept the other Mary, Mary Stuart, Mary Queen of Scots in

## ***A Mirror for Magistrates and the Politics of the English Reformation*** **by Scott Lucas**

reviewed by Jeri L. McIntosh (Univ. of Tennessee) for H-Net Review Publications\*

Citation: Jeri L. McIntosh. Review of Lucas, Scott, *A Mirror for Magistrates and the Politics of the English Reformation*. H-Albion, H-Net Reviews. June, 2010.

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=30491>

Amherst: Amherst University Press, 2009. 288 pp. \$39.95 (cloth) ISBN 976-1-55849-706-1

The *Mirror for Magistrates* contained material for office-holders in England; the material was designed to raise the quality of governance from a Protestant point of view and published during Mary I and Elizabeth I's reigns. The book under review is "a work aimed at scholars rather than students or non-specialists."

It is hardly surprising that the literature from the mid-1550s "reflect[s] Protestant dissatisfaction with Marian policies." The Editor laughed. After all, the Protestants had made a good start at extirpating England's old religion. It had been place for nearly a millennium, while the agitated forces of change had slowly gathered strength during the previous decades. These were philosophically allied with Protestant forces on the continent, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melanchthon, *et al.*, and heartened and emboldened by their successes, jumped at the opportunity to undercut Catholicism's doctrine and values in England but initially, primarily papal authority when Henry VIII chose to defy the Pope for his own selfish reasons. Soon, he succumbed to temptation as the flattery of others, and then pride and his own hubris led to compromise of his previously sound religious beliefs. After all, Henry had been favored by receiving, from three successive pontiffs, Leo X, Adrian VI, and Clement VII, the prestigious and exclusive Golden Rose. This was for two reasons. First,

Henry was very intelligent, traditional, articulate, and inclined to theological and religious studies, subjects, and debates. His talents and inclinations lay behind Leo X's conferral of the name 'Defender of the Faith' (1521), which British monarchs still bear (the 'F.D.' on coinage is its abbreviation in Latin), and which was borne even during the long period when the Vatican was detested, as the fact of the award's origin was repressed or conveniently forgotten. The second reason that English kings received the Pontiff's attention was that England was highly regarded for its insularity particularly for scholarship and for the high level of academic training received even by those who were to become ordinary parish priests. England was called 'Mary's dowry'. Some of the old terms still survive as testimony to those days of Faith: The wild flower we call Queen Anne's lace is known as 'Our Lady's lace'.

The book "contributes to a growing conviction amongst scholars of religion in late Tudor England that the religious situation was fluid and far from predictive of the nearly unbreakable alloy of the political state and the Anglican church achieved in the late Elizabethan period." How differently things might have developed had Mary's constitution been as strong as her Faith. The Protestants feared the possibility of such an outcome, so emboldened had they become, vividly exemplified by Ridley's vile confiscation and removal of the image of Our Lady of Walsingham. He brought her to London, Cranmer's residence in Chelsea. Later she was burned in a London street, kindled by missals and breviaries, the blaze accompanied by the fiendish jeering of citizens-become-automatons at an auto-da-fé turned on its Hegelian head.

"Lucas's . . . description of the legacy of Mirror literature as manifesting itself in the growth of parliamentary rights and personal liberties strikes me as a tad Whiggish. but one usually comes under pressure to state something grandiose in a conclusion." The scholar admits susceptibility to influence! Even the seemingly beneficial increase in personal liberties is not an unmitigated good for society, as we may now feel, seeing the results of a few free speech 'victories' achieved in the last five decades.

"This work itself could serve as an example of careful scholarship and breath-taking insight."

### ***The Church of Mary Tudor by Aldershot Ashgate***

**in *Catholic Christendom, 1300-1700 Series*, Eamon Duffy & David Loades, Editors**

reviewed by Melissa Harkrider (Wheaton College) for H-Net Review Publications\*

Citation: Melissa Harkrider. Review of Duffy, Eamon; Loades, David, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor*. H-Albion, H-Net Reviews. October, 2009.

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=25723>

In *Catholic Christendom, 1300-1700 Series*. Aldershot Ashgate, 2005. 348 pp. \$114.95 (cloth), ISBN 978-0-7546-3070-8.

Since Duffy's 1992 monograph, *The Stripping of the Altars*, "numerous studies have reexamined traditional religion in sixteenth-century England and demonstrated the vitality of Catholicism in this period. Mary I's own popularity, the appeal of the restored church, and the initiatives of Cardinal Reginald Pole. . . have received careful attention. . . . Yet the historiography of the Marian church continues to be shaped by the prevailing view of its ineffectiveness in comparison with the Elizabethan church that succeeded it."

Mary "remained insular in her religious views. . . . [She] focused on the restoration of the sacraments and on religious education. . . . [D]evotion to the Mass was the centerpiece of Mary's

faith." Since she viewed the denial of our Lord's presence as nothing less than blasphemy, Loades concludes that "she, rather than her bishops or advisers, was the driving force in the persecution of Protestants during her reign."

Mary's episcopate was weak. Some were young and inexperienced, others old and worn out from defending the old religion against the temporarily halted Protestant assault. For none of them was the time adequate. Long-term the education initiative, supported by the Queen and her Cardinal, was a sensible but as things turned out, it was a distraction since it had no short-term benefits and was expensive. The money could have been used elsewhere, and although the endowments were very generous they were inadequate. Fund shortages also inhibited needed expansion of the strategically important clerical community of the Abbey.

Duffy discusses new research on Pole's effectiveness and thinking, achieving a favorable reassessment of both, based on reinterpretation of a letter from Pole to Carranza, and the writings and Inquisition trial of the latter, The influence of Carranza and other Spanish clergy was greater than previously thought.

"[T]his collection's depth and ranges provides [sic] a valuable reassessment of Mary's religious policies and the vibrancy of Catholicism during her reign."

***Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland:  
Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin***  
**by James Murray**

reviewed by Sarah Covington (Queens College, CUNY) for H-Net Review Publications\*

Citation: Sarah Covington. Review of Murray, James, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590*. H-Albion, H-Net Reviews. October 2010.

URL: <https://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=31022>

Cambridge Studies in Early Modern Britain History Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 209. 374 pp. \$120 (cloth). ISBN 978-0-521-77038-5.

Among Reformation studies, Ireland's is one of the most complex, although the Reformation was ineffective there. "Ireland did not get a Protestant Reformation, but an English Protestant Reformation, imposed from above and by statute, and existing within a larger context of Tudor colonization and dispossession. . . . [It failed] even as political and military conquest proceeded forward with violent effectiveness." James Murray's book is "an essential contribution based on original research. . . ."

The English conquerors of Ireland alone were dominant with an area around Dublin known as the English Pale, or simply, *the Pale*. There, the term *beyond the Pale* originated.

There, too, the Anglo-Norman elite, "Catholic and English to the core"—had developed its identity over the course of centuries . . . claiming St. Patrick's Cathedral as . . . its 'most potent symbol' and upholding the principles of the papal bull *Laudabiliter* (1155), which was used to justify the conquest of Ireland by the English Crown. Indeed, the 'threat of the Irishry,' including the perceived 'fundamental lawlessness and inherent canonical deviancy of Gaelic Irish politics and society' did . . . much to define this Pale community. . . ."[Single quotation marks demark a quotation from Murray's book; double quotation marks, quotations from Dr. Covington's review.]

Rarely has the Editor seen a review that described the book under review with such excitement and color that a reader would be compelled to order it or to step out and purchase it immediately—if the price were not \$120—but the Editor, situated as he is in the Boston area, will likely find it at a public library. Space does not permit including more detail from the review, but it reads like an espionage and counterespionage thriller as it details the deception and conniving among Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh, Viceroy, Lord Deputies, Lord Chancellors, and clergy having various responsibilities. The English establishment was remote and mostly forgotten by their rulers back home, except when Ireland was thought useful as a political tool, as it was by Charles I, whose army included many Irish recruits. You can imagine that during the Great Rebellion, things really got interesting. Cromwell's involvement there earned him an enduring place in Irish parlance: The deprecation reserved for one's most despicable enemy was and is, "The curse of Cromwell be upon you!"

Because both play roles in this book, take care to avoid confusion between 'our' Oliver Cromwell and Thomas Cromwell. The latter was an interesting case of meteoric political rise to power, a simple cloth-dresser who was befriended by Cardinal Wolsey. Soon he was Vicar-General and Henry VIII's chief adviser and instrument. He was responsible for the visitations and the reports (many fraudulent) which provided much of the rationale for dissolution of the monasteries. Cloaked in religious garb, made of the cloth of Protestant protestations against 'papistical' practices, the real reason was Henry's venality. He wanted the monasteries' wealth, much of which came from mass stipends, endowments, and offerings given by pilgrims to their shrines, and their lands, with grants of which he ingratiated himself to those whose support he needed. It was a short-sighted policy, the money all having come from ordinary Englishmen, the cash flow ceased when no more requiem masses were said and there were no more saints' shrines at which prayers of intercession were offered, both having been abolished with the old religion. Thomas Cromwell himself profited handsomely from the dissolution, receiving two large estates. His fall was even more sudden than his rise. He arranged the marriage of Henry with Anne of Cleves which took place in January, 1540, and was scapegoated by Henry when soon he became dissatisfied with the marriage. Created Earl of Essex in April, 1540, Cromwell was beheaded that July. His meteor's bright trajectory ended with the thud of his head. In August, 1540, Henry married Catherine Howard, a Catholic. After the beheadings of More, Fisher, Cromwell, and Lady Jane Grey, his Protestantism quickly came to a temporary end. Cranmer was such a hypocrite that he followed Henry through all the oscillations, and even banished his own wife. He was burned at the stake under Mary I, but we remember him for writing all those collects. —*Ed.*]

\* We are now able to publish excerpts of H-Net Reviews in *SKCM News*. We may quote several sentences of the review, honoring H-Net's conditions requiring that we include their Citation and URL (as shown) and acknowledge them, which we happily do. Use the URL for access to the full H-Net Review. Following the Citation and URL is a line with additional bibliographic details that usually appear with *SKCM News* reviews.

*[The Rev'd Donald H Langlois has selected from H-Net Reviews those of interest to Society members. We thank him for adding value to SKCM News by assisting us in this way. Because we have long had a desire (but not the time) to report the scholarly literature on our subject, the Editor invited Fr. Langlois to participate in our work, which invitation he accepted. To the work he brings his commitment to the Cause and the expertise of a professional librarian. As some of you know, Fr. Langlois is the son of the late Mrs. Eleanor E. Langlois, American Representative 1972-87. Fr. Langlois is very supportive and has been a Society member since 1972 or before.]*

The ancient Egyptians ridiculed the Greeks' belief in divine intercourse with humans, saying with pride that their gods, who were spiritual, a distinct difference from the Greek gods, who were sensuous and behaved as though they had human emotions, had never come to Earth. Some of the Roman emperors deified themselves. Some cases where godly status is attributed to rulers seem to be largely hyperbolic and metaphoric. Even in modern times divinity is a property of the Japanese emperors. In Puccini's *Turandot*, when Calaf, a foreign prince, implores the Emperor Altoum to lift his ban on Princess Turandot's reception of suitors—a ban emplaced to curtail the bloodshed consequent to their inevitable failure to answer her questions correctly (a capital offense)—he addresses the frail Sinian Emperor, '*O figlio caeli*' ('Son of Heaven'), in a tense exchange that includes a triple entreaty, the second request of higher pitch than the first, and the third higher than the second. The escalation is reminiscent of the Holy Saturday liturgy in which the symbolic meaning of the Paschal Candle is proclaimed as its surrogate is carried forward, and after each wick of the trident is lit, "*Lumen Christi*" ("The light of Christ") is sung, a minor third higher each time. Perhaps because Christians deplored polytheistic pagan worship of a pantheon of gods and even demigods, some definitions of 'cult' began to assume a negative connotation. One definition of 'cult' is a religion with beliefs regarded as "unorthodox or even spurious".

<sup>2</sup> Examination of the traditional calendar will reveal many examples such as the following two. The Confessor died on 5 January 1066. His canonization was in 1161 and the translation of his relics, on 13 October 1162. The primary commemoration of him was on the latter date, falling during what is generally a fair-weather season in England. 'Saint Luke's Little Summer' (corresponding to America's 'Indian Summer') occurred around 18 October, Saint Luke's Day. Saint Thomas Becket's shrine is at Canterbury, site of his martyrdom on 29 December 1170. Chaucer's pilgrims did not primarily keep that date, but sought the holy blissful martyr on the feast of his relics' translation, 7 July. Popular acclamation deemed Becket a saint at once; his canonization in 1173 was not at the deliberate pace customary then. England's patron then, Edward the Confessor waited almost a century for official canonization. Becket is still in the General Calendar of the RC church, and has assumed a place among the traditional saints' days of early Christmastide. Edward's commemoration was confined to certain local calendars in 1969. The Angelic Doctor's teacher, *Doctor Universalis* (S. Albertus Magnus, OP, B. D.), died in 1280, was beatified in 1622 (342 yrs.), and canonized in 1931 (309 yrs.).

New England's weather patterns (or lack thereof) are expressed in the saying, 'If you don't like the weather, wait a minute.' Reveling was unaffected because it was largely nonexistent, but not as rare as saints' days. Recall, they didn't even have Christmas. Is that the *real* reason Thanksgiving was invented? by a resourceful Puritan who found a godly reason to put on the feedbag? Puritan zeal to ban sports was so fervid that James I felt compelled to issue his *Book of Sports*, later reissued by Charles I, in which permitted sports were specified. The Puritan townfolk were resourceful making sport of spitting on a pilloried neighbor, or bombarding a local goodman in stocks with any rotten eggs, fruit, or vegetables at hand.



***A Gambling Man: Charles II's Restoration Game* by Jenny Uglow****and a review thereof by Megan Marshall**

*A Gambling Man: Charles II's Restoration Game* by Jenny Uglow, Farrar, Strauss & Giroux (2009), 580 pages, illustrated, \$35. ISBN 978-0374-28137-3; and a review that appeared under the title, "Return of the King" by Megan Marshall, "*The New York Times Review of Books*", Sunday 10 Jan. 2010, p. 16.

The review by Megan Marshall unmistakably reveals a fact-filled book, a fast-paced journey through the reign of the faithless and feckless King Charles II, the oldest son of our Royal Martyr. The book's title, to the Editor's ear, suggested a less than scholarly tone. So it proved to be. The book was disappointing where, in several places, it revealed the author's adulatory view of the 'Merry Monarch' rather than a more appropriate critical scrutiny. Such lapses in judgment were evident when the chartering of the Royal Academy, the Plague of 1665-6 (it started in late 1664 and peaked in Sept. 1666), the Great London Fire of 1666, the rebuilding 'plans' after the fire, and the top secret diplomatic negotiations that led to the long-secret Treaties of Dover and compromised the country, his first obligation after the church, were discussed. In light of Steve Petrica's comments (p. 48) on an armchair psychiatrist's view of Charles I remind me to avoid diagnoses altogether), the King's favorite occupation, possibly meeting the criteria for sex addiction is glossed over by recounting a few well-worn anecdotes, while the impact of his escapist behavior (together with excessive drinking) on his inclination and ability to attend to important affairs of state might have been given higher weight in assessing his reign. The Editor cannot help but contrast Charles II's behavior with the advice and admonitions of his father's famous letter to him. The Tudor and Stuart periods have been experiencing refreshing and relieving reassessments by a new generation of scholars who seem to be free of the deeply internalized whiggishness of most historians ever since the Restoration. This king is open for a frank assessment of his kingship since his predecessors as ruler of Great Britain and Ireland were both larger than life: his father, King Charles I, the Royal Martyr, and Oliver Cromwell, styled the "Lord Protector". Neither was a successful leader, although each had his strong points. Remarkably, each had traits that inspired heroic loyalty. Each was in command of his character and actions; Charles was principled and appeared to be of wavering principles, or even dishonest, as he tried to negotiate by playing one party against the other as his father had taught him—'Kingcraft', James I called it. Cromwell was pragmatic—unprincipled and a good planner, but then always cloaking his actions in a moral framework devised after the fact. That framework often was convincing at the time but later shown to be an artifice. The Protector's public thanksgivings to God were largely claims of Divine favor toward himself. Charles was scrupulously polite, with friend or foe, while Cromwell was temperamental, blustering, and impetuous, Charles was deliberate and careful, thoughtful to a fault, but then became inflexible. He showed none of the openness that was perhaps too evident leading up to the decision. When the different participants in negotiations compared notes, Charles could appear two-faced. Afterwards, he was characterized as stubborn. We feel this to be a virtue insofar as the inflexibility was loyalty to principles, but it was not a good trait when circumstances had changed and reassessment of a situation was required. Charles took advice from many sources, and like a good executive, truly valued even-handed advisers, Juxon being a prime example. Cromwell went into a rage when an adviser dared to offer an opinion contrary to his own. But the controversy between them and their supporters, grouped into shifting alliances, was so intense at that chaotic crossroad of history, that the controversy lives on to the present. The conflict affects our Society and the Objects it pursues. While Marshall and to some extent Uglow are clearly

aware of the intensity of the conflict between the King and Parliamentary forces—after all, it erupted into armed conflict—neither of them appears to appreciate fully how a *religious* supporter of the Royalist side in that conflict would view things, and hence, how a person sympathetic to King Charles I would view the history that followed, that is, the beheading of King Charles, the rule of Cromwell, and the Restoration of Charles II. For example, such a person would see ‘Restoration’ as having a broader meaning than the mere restoration of monarchy as Britain’s form of government. Rather, that person would see Charles II as having been the rightful king all along (he was crowned in Scotland in 1651), and Cromwell, as a usurper. Of course, under Cromwell’s military dictatorship, the Royalists were circumspect about expressing their views, for fear of persecution and prosecution. But at the time of the Restoration, the Royalists’ viewpoint became customary again or even became law: Whereas Cromwell’s Parliament, from which his opponents had been purged, had abolished the bench of bishops, outlawed the Prayer Book, and adopted a measure providing that Charles II would *not* automatically accede to the throne, as was customary, upon his father, Charles I’s death. But these and all other actions of the rebels’ Parliament were nullified. We as a Society, not as a matter of policy, for we are apolitical, but as admirers of King Charles, tend to think favorably of the Stuart Dynasty and negatively of Cromwell.

The book and the reviewer at hand have a distinctly secular viewpoint. The matter of the Church’ Establishment is never mentioned, although it is central to understand Charles I and his behavior. The King was a loyal son of the Church, as he had been instructed, and he understood and favored its traditionalist views and teachings even though care had been taken that he have chaplains and tutors who leaned toward Calvinism, not traditionalism. Had the religious dimensions of the period been appreciated by Uglow, the fawning over Charles II’s ‘accomplishments’ such as being around when the formal foundation of the Royal Society occurred in 1662 and they needed a charter would have been replaced by some analysis of the actual amount of time he spent with his mistresses and with his male friends, drinking to excess. Instead he is admired for his ‘vision’ as he compared the smoky atmosphere of industrial London to the clear sky of Paris and, *mirabile dictu*, preferred the latter. Any fool could make the same observation and draw the same conclusion: Paris’s air quality was better. It probably also seemed nostalgic, as he thought about the bordello life style he enjoyed there.. The reviewer outdoing the author in her enthusiasm, Charles is praised for going out during the heat of the 1666 fire and somehow showing skill and strategic capability by manning a bucket brigade and then hiring several of the best known architects of the era to rebuild it. Again, anyone could have told you the names of those gentlemen, Christopher Wren already notable during Charles I’s reign. Of course they said, ‘Yes’, savoring the prospect of a large government project. But the King lacked imagination and strategic vision: It was obvious in him, whether passing the bucket to the next man, or randomly mixing substances seeking a great discovery with no theoretical basis, the latter being the key weakness dooming Alchemy to failure. The supposedly philosophical words that accompanied Alchemy had no relation to the properties or constitution of matter, just as homeopathy has no rationale as a method of healing, since the active principles used are present at concentrations too low to have any biological effect. The only good thing is that it causes no toxic effect either. Oh yes, and since the ‘remedy’ contains almost no active ingredient, there is no cost of goods so the full retail price goes directly to the bottom line.. The most that can be said for alchemy is that their apparatus (glassware) was adopted by early German, Swedish, and Swiss chemists, enabling those of more disciplined minds, with a theoretical foundation, to elucidate the structure of matter in only a few decades of experimentation. This occurred in the middle of the XIX Century when modern chemistry began to emerge with pioneers like Justus von Liebig in Germany, Antoine Lavoisier and

Pierre S. and Éleuthère du Pont de Nemours in France, the Scot, Archibald Scott Couper, Baron Jöns Berzelius in Sweden, or Johan Kjeldahl in Denmark. French chemistry suffered a setback when Lavoisier, who had disproven the archaic phlogiston theory and who, based on that, had discovered Oxygen, (although Priestley was the first to isolate it), was beheaded by the high-minded revolutionaries in 1793, but the du Ponts, who had met Thomas Jefferson, were established by him on land he selected on Delaware's Brandywine Creek. Phlogiston is a good illustration of the use of hypotheses to advance knowledge, using the scientific method. It did not exist, put simply. Some investigators considered it the absence of something: It is hard to conceptualize theories when 'non-things' are involved to work theories or observations about something that is nothing. Others thought it was a property, but not a thing. This is not unrelated, to continue the many negatives, to the Divine Person, God. "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made."(*S. John* i: 3) Random experimentation is a slow process: Remember the roomful of typewriters and all those monkeys furiously typing, trying to come up with a Shakespeare sonnet? Compare the three centuries during which alchemy afforded no useful results—only some exotic symbols suitable for decorative calligraphy—to the 50 years of progress from a 1960 transistor radio the size of a cigarette pack to today's device of the same size that holds over a thousand songs.

Charles II's father urged him in clear terms to support the Established Church. He got off on the right foot: two important things can be said in his favor. He opened the Savoy Conference in 1661, instructing the team of twenty meant to come up with a new prayer book. They reached an impasse and he assigned the project to Convocation, who carried it out in short order—about a year! The other important action that Charles I pursued was to restore the bench of Bishops. At the time of the Restoration only six bishops remained in England. Had no further consecrations occurred, all those six were dead by 1670. There had been a large risk that the English Bench of Bishops would die out. Those who had been stalwarts were the first raised to vacant sees. Those newly consecrated were solid, but not contentious during the Commonwealth. The King could be faulted for advancing moderates over hard-line Royalists and Catholics, but he may have been wise. Those inclined to be contentious may have had difficulties, because each diocese had its share of Puritans, Presbyterians, and dissenters. Keeping the old antipathies below the surface was probably prudent. Of those two initiatives, his father would have been well pleased. In the area of irreligion, not observing the discipline of his faith, Charles II was remiss; his father would not have been pleased. Inattention to worship was not the worst thing, but the drinking bouts, mistresses, and other liaisons would have given grave scandal to his father who had such high hopes for him. *Basilikon Doron* was written to instruct, Henry, Charles's older brother how to behave when he became king.

If Charles II had stuck to business, he might have had an heir to be heir-apparent, which would have meant (not to indulge in too much alternative history) no 'Glorious Revolution', no William and Mary, no Nonjurors, no Hanoverians. . . Just imagine! It is clear that one person can make a difference, as is truly said. Charles II's behavior was formed during his 20s, influenced by the French court, and when he was empowered like an absolute monarch, accepted, by one and all, in their relief and giddy disbelief that the Commonwealth was no more. One historian has summarized the situation clearly: "Indolent, sensual, and dissipated by nature, with the great turn of fortune which gave him full opportunity to indulge them, to surpass all bounds of decency and control. . . [H]is personal ease and pleasure alone decided every measure. . . ." These moral aspects of the 'Merry Monarch', as Charles II was called, receive inadequate attention.

Charles II dealt with the regicides, even the ones already dead, with unseemly harshness that would have displeased his father, who had discouraged any exaction of revenge. Cromwell's body

was exhumed from Westminster Abbey, pulled through the streets tied onto a wooden sledge, tried in Old Bailey, propped up against the bar (shrouded, probably the discreet option), then hanged, cut down, and drawn and quartered. The trunk was thrown into a deep pit right on the scene and the limbs mounted on four city gates. The official newspaper, *Mercurius Publicus*, reported in its 31 Jan, 1649 issue on these proceedings, in which Bradshawe and Ireton accompanied Cromwell in the pantomime trial and execution, “. . .they were taken down and their heads cut off, their loathsome trunks thrown into a deep hole under the gallows.”. The head was reserved for special treatment, consumption by carrion birds while mounted on a pole atop Westminster Hall, where it remained for three years (some sources say, until 1684). The repulsive relic of Old Noll’s noggin finally ended up at Cambridge’s Sidney Sussex College, where he trained in the law (1616-20). Charles II also took delight in the executions of remaining regicides and their collaborators, choosing to be present in person for many of them including disembowelments, which were accompanied by a horrible stench. The prohibition of “cruel and unusual punishments” by Article VIII of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. is understandable as we read some of these accounts. *E.g.*, the pudenda of Attorney Cooke (who concocted the so-called tyrannicide brief, justifying tyrannicide as the proper charge and some sort of death as penalty for treason, the charge as) were severed with a sharp knife (mercifully not dull!) and waved in his face. The squeamish next-to-be-executed, Preacher Hugh Peters, was made to watch Cooke’s dispatch at close range. Charles II’s interest in these activities weakens Uglow’s characterizes Charles II as the patronizing the Royal Society at the time of its foundation while worrying about London smog and tobacco smoke. (I hav found no mention of salt.)

Uglow calls Charles II “the boy king, in exile after his father’s execution [*sic*] in a populist uprising [*sic*],” a statement that is wrong on several counts. It is rendered in full below. On the one hand, calling him a king at that time is an acknowledgement of Charles II’s immediate accession to the throne upon his father’s beheading. The ‘good news’ about Uglow’s attitude ends there, however. We know that the descriptive term, ‘beheading’ is accurate, while in the word ‘execution, many infer just proceedings—trial, just consideration of both sides’ arguments, verdict and sentencing, all according to Hoyle—and will not use the word execution in Charles’s case. In his case there was not a just verdict or sentence, they were dictated in advanced, while the opposition to the Royalists was orchestrated by Cromwell and his Army. It was far from a “populist uprising” as Marshall calls it. Some supported the King and others, Cromwell. Each of them had some support from nobles and some from the merchant classes. Both groups relied on their historic supporters, and there was no grass roots uprising to speak of, although there were some peasant and working class elements. The motivations of the powers on each side were economic self-interest, religion, but that was not simple at all. Among noblemen and the mercantile classes were many who thought the church had too much authority and too much land and other assets. And in conflict with their covetous desires, the King felt called to restore to the church a portion of the assets that Henry VIII had rapaciously confiscated. We have often quoted Sir Winston Churchill’s statement that Charles was ‘beloved of the people’. This was not the universal view, of course, but there was no “populist uprising”. Royalist forces and Parliamentary forces were both organized; fighting men from Scotland and Ireland, and some from the continent, essentially mercenaries, were recruited by both sides, a customary practice when ‘raising an army’ in those days. Mercenaries risked more than their lives. Getting paid was a chancy proposition, especially if one ended up on the losing side. When Cromwell’s New Model Army was mostly done with its battles and skirmishes against the Royalists, they remained unpaid for a long time: Cromwell now faced the same problem the King had faced, a need to raise taxes to raise funds. (Had they never heard of the Laffer curve?) The ‘exile’ of Charles II was not a severe, government-

imposed exile; it was essentially self-administered. Of course he would have been apprehended if he were found by or brought to the attention of the authorities. He would probably have been re-exiled, unless there were an attempt to reclaim his throne. But for almost two years, from 30 January 1649 to 1 January 1651, he was 'around', being crowned at Scone in Scotland on 1 January 1651. Thereafter he spent time in France and Holland, where there were members of the English court in exile all during the Protectorate, his mother and younger brother James in Paris, and his sister Mary, her daughter and his niece Mary (the future Mary II), and his cousin Rupert in The Hague. That one sentence mis-stated the facts several times over. Communication between these exiled courts and those in the know in England was regular, frequent, and excellent. The court in the Hague was allied religiously with Rupert's mother, the Winter Queen (King Charles I's sister, Elizabeth of Bohemia, who had married the protestant Elector Palatine of the Rhine, and King of Bohemia; the couple were called the Winter King and Winter Queen because they were 'out in the cold', spending most of their time in the Hague), and ministered to by Bishop Duppa, translated to Winchester, one of the most powerful sees, in 1660. The Anglican court in Paris was under the religious leadership of John Cosin, deprived of his position as Dean of Petersborough and made Bp. of Durham upon the Restoration. So it became well-known when the end was coming and it would be safe for Charles II to return to a happy welcome. As an indication of Cromwell's flaws, his rhetoric during the rebellion against the king was directed at the lower classes, just as in XVIII, XIX, and XX Century revolutions, overthrows, and *coups-d'état*. Only eleven years after Louis XVI was guillotined, and all the ensuing violence, chaos, confusion, needless bloodshed, riots, the terror, Thermidor, changes of systems of government, and all the rhetoric about human rights, they found they had made tremendous progress! They were back where they started, and arguably, worse.

Eleven years before, in 1793, they had a king, in 1804, they had an emperor. Napoleon I was placing an Emperor's crown on his own head, having brushed Pius VII aside in order to perform the act himself. He reversed his stated positions again and again, to suit his egotism, ambition, and selfish ends, rationalizing his acts as supposedly serving the necessities of France, the people, and even Europe itself. The various 'reforms' of the Revolution were one by one done away with, the last to go being the Republican Calendar on 1 January 1806. I doubt there were any tears shed for that sophomoric monstrosity excepting the simpletons who devised it. It might have been the result of a Junior High School Team project, "Construct a calendar to accompany the metric system."

Uglow's book, *A Gambling Man*, and the reviewer, Marshall—Jen and Meg—are a bit amateurish in their history too. Following the fawning rhetorical question asking, "*why a biographer of Jenny Uglow's caliber* [Editor's emphasis] and aesthetic interests . . . would take up the oft-told tale of Charles II's restoration." After thus setting up the sentence of errors, here it is with a few notes to provide a rudimentary explanation. I urge you to follow up independently and inform yourself.

The boy<sup>a</sup> king,<sup>b</sup> in exile<sup>c</sup> after his father's execution<sup>d</sup> in a populist<sup>e</sup> uprising, grows up<sup>f</sup> to return as monarch, only to face epochal<sup>g</sup> disasters like the plague and the Great fire of London.

<sup>a</sup> Charles II turned 19 (born 29 May 1630) four months after his father was beheaded (30 Jan. 1649). He was a boy when Prince of Wales, but not as king, based on his chronological age and the experience and worldliness he gained around the French Court. That experience served as training for the licentiousness that characterized his entire reign.

<sup>b</sup> Here, I chalk up a point for Jen and Meg, who both recognize that Charles II became king at the moment his father died by the axe. Hardly a subtlety, this is not known or understood by most authors and journalists. "The king is dead. Long live the king!" is its poetic expression and proclamation.

<sup>c</sup> Exile. Not technically. He was hunted and if caught would have been taken in. Because he hid in the Oak tree, a nickname for Restoration Day is “Oak Apple Day”. The concern was that he would lead a plot to recover the throne, as he and his supporters tried to do. He was in Britain in 1651, when he was crowned King of Scots at Scone. But exile had not been imposed on him. When he left Britain, his exile was self-imposed. It was different in 1688 when James II fled, was apprehended, and turned over to the authorities. His son-in-law and nephew, William III of Orange, let him go. How was he caught? Someone at the docks saw the royal arms on a horseshoe.

<sup>d</sup> We prefer ‘beheading’ or ‘decollation’ because they are purely descriptive, not partisan. Here the writers use ‘execution’ without a second thought. Our Society’s preference is in deference to our Cause; it is not reasonable to expect ordinary reporters to even know of the point.

<sup>e</sup> We have frequently cited Churchill’s *The New Age*, in which he states that even while Charles I was under army custody, “he had no fear for the security of his person. . . . [A]s his misfortune crowded upon him he increasingly became the physical embodiment of the liberties and traditions of England.” Although King Charles had not commonly used the expression, on the scaffold he said, “I am the martyr of the people”, and the peoples’ reaction validated his assertion. During his trial he asked, if he himself were not to receive justice, what justice others might have?

<sup>f</sup> Did Charles II ever really grow up?

<sup>g</sup> To say that the plague and the fire were “epochal” is an overstatement. While each of them was horrendous, neither was a time or event in history that marked the beginning of a relatively new or distinctive development. Those events just happened, and King Charles II was just as much a victim of them as the entire populace. The review reflects the book in bringing up the obvious idea of implementing improved building codes, but the City’s structures of timber were replaced with new ones also of timber. It didn’t indicate high leadership and executive skills for Charles to have “attempted unsuccessfully to enforce regulations against building the cheap timber structures that jutted out over London’s narrow streets.” To foresee what Charles foresaw required no foresight at all: “As he’d foreseen, the flimsy houses burned like kindling. . . .” Charles was even unable to implement a new street plan to provide an improved link with the river commerce of the Thames.

Another sophomoric, rather unprofessional comment from Meg was that “Uglow shows proper restraint in barely mentioning Charles II’s nickname, ‘the Black Boy’.” It referred to his swarthy complexion, the result of Medicean heritage. Henrietta Maria’s mother was Marie de Médicis; Henrietta’s pallor gave no clue that she harbored the ‘swarthy gene’, clearly recessive. If use of the nickname were prevalent, a good historian could not be content with “barely mentioning” it. One’s wish would be to offend no one, but concern about the term seems immature and excessively PC to this reviewer. It appears that norms of our XXI Century are being applied to the XVII. It is plain that this use of ‘black’ is hyperbolic, not derogatory or racial; ‘boy’ is used jokingly in reference to his youth and repeatedly mentioned “athletic body”, unlike ‘50s use of ‘boy’ for the ‘shoeshine boy’ in a hotel lobby, which is classist, demeaning, condescending, and racist. Also, I found it inappropriate to endorse Uglow’s recasting Charles’s Restoration as a fable for our times, going on to compare him with the present U.S. President. Bringing current politics into such a subject is wrong, makes the book date quickly, and in this case very strained.

Uglow is correctly characterized by Marshall who observes that she “writes in the grand tradition of historical pageant, . . . and as an heir of much-admired popularizers like Barbara Tuchman and Antonia Fraser.” I was unsure about using the word ‘popularizer’ when it came to mind, but Marshall put me at ease. To popularize is, of course, not an entirely bad thing—people need to understand history—and ‘popular’ can mean that the book is not written in a stultifying style.

*A Gambling Man* is a fast and easy read, and benefited from careful editorial work. Its weakness, however, lies behind the sweep of the pageant: many details were inadequately researched. The masterpiece by Robert Graves, *I, Claudius*, covering the same time period as Suetonius, is but a historical novel, as is *Julian*, Gore Vidal's, of that apostate Emperor, grandson of the great Constantine. Your Editor submits that the narrative of these follows history more closely and captures the essence of their stories' "sweep" better than Uglow's. With that deficiency, the author's credulousness and naïveté were poor partners, since the combination of factors kept Uglow from achieving a full understanding of the Restoration. An important example of this, for Society members, is the failure to appreciate the importance of religious and ecclesiastical factors, yet another case of looking at a different time with today's eyes. It is as if low church attendance and low level of interest in and knowledge of any church related subject makes these unimportant. With this book, Uglow may have decided to minimize the church-related content so readers would find the book more interesting. 'Church is sooo passé.' But how interested are people in science? The foundation of the Royal Society could as easily have been omitted.

This reader would have found it interesting to learn of Charles's rôle in selecting new bishops, since the strength and composition of the bench were and continued to be important considerations. Many parliamentary actions of the XVIII and XIX Centuries might have been different had the composition of the bench been different. For example, Charles chose many 'moderates' and avoided controversialists and those he felt tended to extremism. Those are valid concerns, but surely also weakened the bishops' ability to advocate and take strong traditionalist stands. Early in the Restoration period this bias had few consequences, so enthusiastic and eager was Parliament to please the King. But after a few decades the Whig ascendancy was apparent, and so was its cause. With time, Charles became less engaged with affairs of State and Church, as he became more withdrawn, escaping into his unreal world. Uglow could well have discussed the extent to which this was due to lack of interest, lack of confidence (often both a cause and consequence of isolation and withdrawal), or lack of energy.

## ***Death of King Charles the Martyr***

### **Poem by Aubrey Thomas Hunt de Vere**



Aubrey Thomas Hunt de Vere (10 Jan. 1812 - 1 Jan. 1902) was born and died at Kilcornan Parish, County Limerick, Ireland. After studies at Trinity College, Dublin, de Vere devoted himself to work as an essayist and poet following in the tradition of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Wordsworth (the latter was a close friend). De Vere met John Henry Newman in 1838, and would remain in frequent contact with him as a correspondent and regular guest through the end of Newman's life. Initially attached to the Tractarian movement—described in detail in *Recollections of Aubrey de Vere* (London and New York: Edward Arnold, 1897) de Vere became a Roman Catholic in November 1851 during the wave of prominent conversions that followed the

Gorham Judgment. He explained his decision in a chapter of his autobiography entitled "My Submission to the Catholic Church":

To me it was plain that the "Anglican Church" had been tested and found wanting, and that true loyalty could now be exercised alone toward that Church universal, into which alone, and not into any local Church, the Christian is baptised. While the Gorham controversy was raging, an eminent

statesman read me a sentence in a pamphlet published a few days later. It affirmed that not to repudiate, as a body, a heterodox judgment pronounced by an authority which the Church of England as a body had long since recognised as supreme, was to accept that judgment; and it ended, I think, with words like these, "She has now to choose between the portion of the bride and the mess of pottage." Most of the High Churchmen remained with her. I sided with the minority and left her. Which class changed their position, and which changed their principles? It was those who refused to do the latter whom the world stigmatised as weaklings. It was those who affirmed, and acted on that affirmation, that loyalty was due, both to the State in civil things, and also to the Church, one and universal, in spiritual things, whom the world pronounced disloyal.

De Vere remained a Roman Catholic until his death in 1902 after a long and successful writing career.

De Vere's poem, "Death of King Charles the Martyr", was published when the poet was 29 and appeared in his second volume of verse, *The Search after Proserpine: Recollections of Greece, and Other Poems*. Its thirty-six lines in four stanzas were written when the *Book of Common Prayer* still contained the State Services, including the "Form of Prayer with Fasting to be used yearly on the Thirtieth of January". No other poem in this substantial collection of sonnets, songs, and miscellaneous poems inspired by de Vere's continental travels touches on themes connected with the Great Rebellion.

The first stanza of the poem transcribed here alludes to the theological opinions of the Roundheads, who "deemed themselves" "Elect" and so predestined to carry out the regicide. The fourth stanza quotes Andrew Marvell's famous lines from "An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwell's Return From Ireland":

He nothing common did or mean  
Upon that memorable scene,  
But with his keener eye  
The axe's edge did try;

Nor call'd the gods with vulgar spite  
To vindicate his helpless right,  
But bowed his comely head  
Down as upon a bed.

### ***Death of King Charles the Martyr***

1.

**E**LECT they deemed themselves, e'er Time  
Had birth, to do a deed sublime:  
Therefore, not base, though red with crime,  
Like rocks the judgment-workers stood

Unmoved among the multitude;  
Like rocks by thunder shaped, that keep  
At bay a dark and moaning deep,  
And fling their sunset shadows o'er  
A sea-like breadth of barren shore.



2.  
Not for themselves those warriors wrought  
And steel-robed Flamens—nor for aught  
That fascinates the meaner thought.  
They knew, accepting thus the sword,  
Their names should stand for aye abhorred.  
Of future men they knew that none,  
And of the living, one, but one  
That deed aright could estimate—  
For Charles was equal to his fate.

3.  
In London was great silence then  
As in a dying lion's den:  
And many hundred thousand men  
Breathed slowly and with reverent awe,

Believing not the things they saw.  
Far thunder shook the firmament:  
And lightning o'er the sunlight went.  
A Nation hung upon one breath—  
A Nation's heart grew cold as death.

4.  
Then looked the King with eye serene  
And more than coronation mien  
Upon that "memorable scene:"  
And, breathing still the lower air,  
He heard the Church's ancient prayer  
Entoned with customary sound.  
A little while he stood uncrowned:  
Then bowing to the axe his head,  
Himself the Benediction said.

"Death of King Charles the Martyr", from *The Search after Proserpine: Recollections of Greece, and Other Poems* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843), pp. 158-9.

## *Editor's Miscellany*

### 'Old Noll'

Some nicknames make very little sense, that is, their resemblance to the original name is more remote than most. These include Jack for John, Peg for Margaret, Pip for Philip, and 'Noll' for 'Oliver', 'Noll' came to be applied to Cromwell. To us, it seems unlikely that Cromwell would have been enough of a regular chap even to *have* a schoolyard nickname or to engage in light-heartedness or frivolity. This has been the prevalent view over the years, as well. A common simile for the unlikelihood of a particular behavior, was to say that it "was like accusing Cromwell of levity." (A. Repplier) He was loud and blustering, and seemed audacious and confident, but may have lacked confidence; he often seemed morose and withdrawn. When challenged or presented with an alternate plan to his own, he got furious. He often seemed angry. He could be impulsive, but then stubbornly stuck to what he had blurted out in haste.

But there is at least one occasion when he is known to have clowned around, and the word that came out of it is still in use today. At a boring meeting, or one in which he had lost interest, he was playing around with some paper, perhaps left on the table by a lawyer. He fashioned a paper hat out of it, the sort that children often make, by folding the paper in half lengthwise and then making further folds to produce a hat or cap, pointed front and back, and putting it on his head: Oliver's origami. In former years, the dimensions of foolscap were about 13 × 16 or 17 inches (half of which is 8½ × 13 inch, about the size of A4 paper in Europe and the standard letter size or legal size in the U.S.). Some say that paper in that size is called foolscap after Oliver Cromwell's horseplay. The yellow 'legal pads' in that size are sometimes referred to as foolscap. Another hypothesis is that the name's origin was a watermark which depicted a jester's hat and two bells.

A nickname is still a proper name, so 'Noll' is capitalized. When not capitalized, 'noll' is a slang term for 'head'. Other slang terms for head are noodle, noddle, noogin, and noggin. ('Nod' is slang for the nape of the neck.) Cromwell is said to have had an extraordinarily large head. Its prominence, the slang terms

for ‘head’, despite the weak association of ‘Noll’ with ‘Oliver’, combined to form a nickname having an exceptionally strong association with the person who bore it.

### **The King James Bible**

The coming year, 2011, marks the Quadricentennial of the Authorized Version of the *Bible*, generally better known in the United States as the King James *Bible*, short for ‘King James Version (KJV)’. There is copious misinformation about it. One of the funniest American mistakes about The Authorized Version of the Bible is that in the South of the U.S. it is not uncommon to hear it called the Saint James Bible. King James himself, as intelligent as he was, and as active as his mind was, would never have claimed to be saintly; his self-confidence extended only so far. The phrases “Appointed to be read in Churches” and “Authorized King James Version” generally appear on the title page and are often confused. We understand that the first phrase goes back to the first printing, but that the apparent endorsement, “Appointed to be read in Churches”, had no official sanction—is it an example of XVII Century advertising hype? If anyone can enlighten us further on these phrases, please do so; the information would interest members.

For the most part, different editions of *Eikon Basilike* have different frontispieces—the same subject but differing in many details—and also differ in the quotations on their title pages. There the printers exhibited a license not exercised on the book’s Royal text. Typographical errors and peculiarities differ, too, and can help to confirm an edition’s identification, or to identify pirate editions

### **1662 Book of Common Prayer**

Another upcoming anniversary of interest to Society members is the Semiseptcentennial of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, in 2012. It and the Authorized Version of *The Holy Bible* are among the greatest of God’s gifts not only to Anglicanism, but to civilization as a whole, and, along with Shakespeare, probably the most definitive influences to shape our English language. Many credit the period of the Stuart Dynasty with three great contributions to *Ecclesia Anglicana*, these being the two books just named and the retention of that church’s government by bishops in Apostolic Succession, a consequence of the martyr’s death King Charles I died, that Apostolic institution having been enjoyed by Anglicans down to the present day. Arguably, the value placed on all three has been attenuated in recent decades.

Efforts on the two books were given high priority, respectively, by King James I and his grandson, King Charles II, each of whom chose the ‘best of he best’ for the work, personally exercised strong leadership, and displayed overall his high sense of urgency for timely and high quality execution of the project for which he had assumed responsibility. The first of these initiatives was undertaken early in James I’s reign in England. It began with the Hampton Court Conference, called in 1604. The Prayer Book project was initiated by Charles II immediately upon the Restoration of the Crown and the Church. (The actions of Parliament under the control of Cromwell and his army were nullified, restoring the Bench of Bishops, the House of Lords, the Legitimate Parliament as it was before Cromwell started to ‘purge’ it, and the Book of Common Prayer, and also voiding the legislation enacted to prohibit Charles II’s automatic succession under previous laws.) Each king set aggressive standards for completion of his working group’s task, and underscored its importance by personal involvement in his respective project.

Regarding subjects of misinformation, lore, and speculation, can **William Shakespeare** be far from the top of the list? In lieu of hard facts, it is speculated about the 54 writers and scholars engaged by King James I to

produce the *Bible's* Authorized Version, that William Shakespeare “might have been among them. Although there is no conclusive evidence of the Bard’s participation in the project, it is nevertheless intriguing that the 46<sup>th</sup> word of the 46<sup>th</sup> Psalm is ‘shake,’ and the 46<sup>th</sup> word from the end of the Psalm is ‘spear’. Shakespeare, who was fond of cryptograms, was 46 years old at the time.”

Concerning ‘facts’ about the Bard, it seems to the Editor that none is firm, none can be documented, none is verifiable, but admittedly many are “intriguing”. Let us pray that some found document(s) will enable resolution of the authorship debates and tell us whether the Bard was a Recusant. And a list of the plays . . . . If the author or subject of the original documents deliberately obscured their content or existence, the authorship controversy will have an indefinite lifetime. And then there are the questions about the Sonnets. (from the *‘Time’ Almanac Powered by Encyclopædia [sic; not the Editor’s archaism but just as it is printed on the cover] Britannica*, 2008, p. 791)

For creative literary historians this must be a fertile area for scholarly publication since every little bit can lead to a publication and suggests new lines of investigation.

The year 2011 marks the Quatercentenary of the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible, published in 1611. The following year, 2012, brings us another of those Semiseptcentenary opportunities, the 350<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Even apart from their religious aspects—How can we remove the religious aspects from the Holy Bible?—these two books are among the human race’s proudest accomplishments. How is it then that rather than celebrate them in the Anglican Patrimony we are so fortunate to have inherited, they are abandoned for banal translations or even worse, paraphrases, of the Bible, and hymns with execrable lyrics and scoring. What hellish chop-shop of writers and composers produces such vapid products, and why? The new lections are not only dumbed-down in their words, they are shortened. Some of the Epistle lessons are only two or three verses, and so many of the verses are unacceptable that the reference to the Bible text is choppy, a few verses, then a verse or two omitted, &c.. The antiphonal Psalmody is replaced by deracinated verses, after each of which the congregation repeat the ‘ditty’, such as “God is great in His greatness” or, even easier to remember, “God, Your greatness is great.”

### **The Coronation Oath**

\* We refer to Charles I’s Coronation Oath frequently. What was it? The actual words were,  
“The things which I have here promised, I shall perform and keep. So help me God, and the contents of this Book.”

Perhaps this sounds vague to you. Disappointing and anticlimactic, is it not?. The promises referred to were in the preceding part of the service, where the Archbishop of Canterbury read to the King the entire oath, including the promises. In addition, the Bishop of Rochester, John Buckridge, read ‘The Admonition of the Bishops for the privileges of the Church’. The King was then escorted to the High Altar by the Bishops of Durham and Bath & Wells, where he made his solemn Oath in the sight of all the people to observe the promises.

Allow me to state a further caveat: The Bible used was not the entire Bible. This did not constitute an attempt to interject some kind of technicality to compromise the Oath, but a practicality. The entire Bible, if illuminated and in a precious cover, would have been huge. The portion used was the *Textus Evangelii*, an ancient volume said to have belonged to King Athelstan (925-40), now among the Cottonian MSS in the British Museum. It was brought by Sir Robert Cotton by barge *via* the Thames just as the King was transported a short time later.

The King “laid his hand on the book, and kissed it *super Evangelium S. Joannis*. The Bible [*sic*] was the great one covered with gold, which usually stands upon the Altar at Whitehall.” (quoted from Laud’s *Diary*) (All these details are taken from Wordsworth’s ‘blow-by-blow’ account, *Coronation of King Charles I*, for providing copies from which, we thank Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben., OL. The report is

not always self-consistent since a number of sources were used in assembling it. First-hand accounts do vary; several important ones could be cited.)

In summary,

“In so great a ceremony, and amidst an incredible concourse of people, nothing was lost, or broke, or disordered. [Actually one of the doves broke off the scepter (?) and fell to the floor, angering the King. It was quickly replaced. –*Ed.*] The theatre was clear, and free for the King, the Peers, and the business in hand; and I heard some of the nobility saying to the King in their return, that they had never seen any solemnity, although much less, performed with so little noise, and so great order.” (Laud’s *Diary*)

“In concluding this account of the Coronation of King Charles I, it should be remarked, first, how closely the service followed the ancient *Liber Regalis* for the Coronation of the Kings of England; secondly, how clearly the rite sets forth the Divine source and gift of the King’s office; and, thirdly, with what religious solemnity and personal devotion King Charles submitted himself to his hallowing, investiture and Coronation.” (Wordsworth, *op. cit.*, p. 73)

When you attend the splendidly symbolic Candlemas liturgy, just a few days after the annual commemoration of the Beheading of King Charles, recall his Coronation on Candlemas, 1626. Think of the responsibility he felt as that day approached. Charles, Prince of Wales, had been 24 years of age when his father died in March of 1625. He was king instantly, and had legally acceded to the throne. This immediate change is bluntly made in the popular exclamation, “The King is dead. Long live the King!” The life of members of the Royal Family was not an exercise in lounging about for those who took the Right even a little bit seriously. And Charles took it *very* seriously. Once his older brother, Henry, was dead (1612), he was heir-apparent immediately, too. Charles was chief mourner at Henry’s obsequies, as he would be again when his mother died in 1619, and his father, in 1625.

### ***Blogs and Social Networking***

Submitted 3/6/2010 to <http://www.theanglocatholic.com/2010/01/king-charles-the-martyr/>

Presently Publications Editor of the American Region of the Society of King Charles the Martyr, may I comment on #2 by Robert Andrews, speculating on an “underground cult”? Since its founding in London in 1894 and its establishment in the Americas, specifically New York, in the same year, the Society has been very public, to the best of my knowledge lacking any elements of secrecy.

I might add that I am in the midst of research for a history of the American Branch and would appreciate any information on the Society’s witness in the U.S. and Canada, esp. 1900-1950, a period on which we have hardly any information.

As for the Royal Martyr’s sainthood, it is the case that there are many seeming contradictions and obstacles from our limited perspectives. Similarly, it is beyond our human capabilities to envision how we all might be one, as our Lord and the Father are one. Nonetheless, we should pray for such unity, as our Lord commanded (*cf. S. John 17: 11-21*). Taking our Lord at His Word, King Charles and Abp. Laud corresponded with the Pope and with the Ecumenical and other Patriarchs. Their bold initiatives, in response to our Lord’s Words to His Apostles, can only be described as Ecumenically Prophetic or . . . naïve. For decades, widely ridiculed prayers for Russia’s delivery from ‘Godless Communism’ seemed naïve, too. (*Cf. Jarvis, F. W. Sermon, 31 Jan. 2009; SN, June 2009, pp. 21-14*)

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D.  
Publications Editor, S.K.C.M., American Region

### **“Charles I Is my Hero”**

An ‘official’ Facebook page, entitled Society of King Charles the Martyr, was created by admirers of King Charles, many of whom are members of the Society in the U.K. or in the American Region. These include Adam

Barner (U.S.), Philip Corbett (U.K.), John R. Covert (U.S.; American Region Webmaster and member of the Board of Trustees), Dr. Alex Roman (Canada), Nancy Ehlke (U.S.), Janice Gunther (U.S.), Thomas J. W. Mason (U.K.), John Moock (U.S.), and Fr. Lee Nelson (U.S.). The link is:

<http://www.facebook.com/home.php?#!/group.php?gid=2216761378>

There is a Facebook page operated by Marga Graham of the Univ. of Leeds, U.K.:

<http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=69296502880>

Entitled "Charles I is My Hero" its designer is a university student. The page was intended mainly for postings by students in Great Britain and the United States but has facilitated discussion of Charles I and his reign among individuals in several different countries. The Facebook page also promotes interest in Charles I among another generation of students.

Questions, comments, or concerns about these social networking pages should be addressed to their respective administrators.

## ***Nomenclature of the Commemoration of the Recognition of the Cultus of King Charles the Martyr***

( A discussion of the commemoration, to celebrate which we gather on 7 May in New York)

Following on from the discussion on page 6, where we dispensed with the matter of the date of our 7 May Semiseptcentenary Celebration at the Church of the Resurrection on East 74<sup>th</sup> Street in New York City, what is it we are to be celebrating? Its name is not a concise one. First, what is *cultus*? The word sounds rather exotic, at least in Latin. In English it sounds a little dubious, like the fringe groups, whose extreme interpretations of certain parts of the Bible (sometimes only a few verses) dominate their practice of religion.

"Whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it." (*S. Luke ix: 24*) Martyrdom seems, to the Editor, more straightforward than handling poisonous snakes. For him, handling any snake, poisonous or non-poisonous, is unthinkable, and as a natural products and medicinal chemist he opines that ingestion of arsenic is ill-advised, even considering the first principle of pharmacology, articulated by the Swiss physician and alchemist Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim, known for some reason by the Latin nickname Paracelsus, "The [An agent's] toxicity [or effect] lies in the dose." He states theoretically what is known empirically, that for any agent, there are doses at which no effect is detectable, doses at which a desired effect is manifested, and doses at which it is toxic.

The feast we will celebrate in the New York Spring is that which in S.K.C.M. circles is traditionally called the Canonization. We do not know the date of the name's first use. Another feast of Royal Charles you may have noticed in the *Kalendar of Anniversaries* is the **Exaltation of S. Charles**, applied to the 1660 replacement of his statue in Guildhall Yard on 7 May, coincidentally the date to which our celebration of the Recognition of his *Cultus* is transferred in 2011 (its actual anniversary being on 26 April). Father Hope Patten, restorer of the Shrine, O.L.W., and a devotee of the Royal Martyr, used to say, "This tradition begins today", after or during an event at which the success of one of his brainstormings was evident. Some people, including some Society members, object to use of the word 'canonization' in reference to King Charles, thinking that that term should be reserved for a codified process such as used today by Rome and many Orthodox bodies. Some people, including some of these, object for the same reason to using the word 'Saint'. This reservation would appear to be on less solid ground than the former for two reasons: (i) The State Service itself uses the words 'saint' and 'martyr' in reference to King Charles, and (ii) 'saint' is commonly used in broader senses, including in local veneration, a typical precursor of formal canonization. I know many who have these reservations and who are also among the most ardent clients of our Royal Martyr. So we're trying terms other than 'canonization' since Charles's was not an event but a process, and will continue to use Saint, Martyr-King, Royal Martyr, and King Charles the Martyr interchangeably.

Sharing our devotion to the Martyr-King with others is the thing that makes our worship of God, veneration of our Blessed Martyr-King, and fellowship with each other—fellow clients of the Royal Martyr—at our Annual

Mass and other gatherings so exhilarating. The Editor has talked around this semantic matter [concerning 26 April] in several previous issues. He has selected a term that is purely descriptive, or so he thinks. This is analogous to speaking of 30 January as commemorating King Charles's 'beheading' or 'decollation', describing what actually occurred that day, no partisan 'angle' being said or implied. The word 'execution' means to put to death as a legal penalty, which is interpreted as implying 'legitimate', the denouement of a justly imposed sentence, based on a verdict properly reached as the result of a free trial, conducted so as to prove or disprove the charges, and so on. We know that the sentence he desired to be carried out in the matter was dictated by Cromwell before the charges were completed, before the trial started, and before the predetermined verdict was announced, so we don't use it. Most proximally to the Martyr's beheading, the death warrant itself was a defective document, having been re-dated over its signatures, and several of those, altered. This was necessitated because those signatories were no longer present when the verdict was reached, having left in disgust at the proceedings' irregularity.

The procedure used to approve the State Services involved Parliament, the Church, of which Convocation was the body having jurisdiction, and the Monarch. This is quite unlike canonization by acclamation, and also nothing like the RC process involving examination of the life of the candidate for sainthood (or beatification), his writings, and miracles worked through his intercession, with or without the application of his relics, a quasi-judicial process with advocates for the candidate and to ensure fairness an opponent, the so-called "devil's advocate", as well as experts such as psychiatrists to examine the worthy's life and medical experts to speak to the *bona fides* of putative miracles—not directly but by assessing the likelihood of the supposed miracle having occurred by a medically explicable process. Charles's was a post-Reformation process involving both Church and State, the latter still involved at that time and even today, with the Established Church in post-Reformation England, where Parliament takes up Church matters and the Monarch heads that Church. The date we celebrate accords primacy to the Church's part in the process, in which approval by Convocation was central. In this case the Convocations of both Provinces, Canterbury and York were unusually meeting jointly, and on 26 April 1661 unanimously voted approval of the State Service for 30 January, clearing the way for its incorporation into the new Book of Common Prayer.

We don't say that the *cultus* was 'established' in 1661, because it began at the moment of our Martyr's beheading, when he was first invoked, when his blood was first collected by soaking pieces of linen cloth with it. Thus when Convocation approved the State service to be incorporated into the new Prayer Book that was underway, the *cultus*, which was already in existence, but rather gave it formal sanction or recognition. Furthermore, the *cultus* was recognized, yes, but it was *authorized* for the Church of England alone, such being Convocation's authority.

As for the form of address, or style for the Martyr King, the State Service's title uses "King Charles the Martyr" and the first rubric, "Blessed King CHARLES the First". The State Service also has collects in which he is explicitly called 'saint' and 'martyr', viz., (i) "this thy blessed Saint and Martyr, and all other thy Saints and Martyrs", (ii) "in whose sight the death of thy Saints is precious . . . our martyred Sovereign", and (iii) "thy anointed blessed King Charles the First", *inter alia*.

The second of these examples ("in whose . . .") contains one explicit reference to King Charles as martyr ("our martyred Sovereign"), preceded by words implying his Sainthood by context and proximity ("in whose sight the death of thy Saints . . .") The first example ("this thy. . .") uses both 'saint' and 'martyr' explicitly of Charles, and is followed by a reference to his being among the saints and martyrs, *i.e.*, "and all other thy Saints and Martyrs". The third example states his saintliness using "blessed", the term used for a worthy who has been Beatified in the RC process, the last step before canonization.

Celebrating a canonization anniversary *per se* is also unusual. The formal ceremony of canonization, rather, is usually performed on a date of significance, often the date of the saint's death, especially so for a martyr; the 'heavenly birthday' as it is generally put. King Charles, anticipating his martyrdom, called the day his "second marriage day").

Apart from the worthy's date of death, the date most often chosen for the canonization ceremony is the translation of the relics of the worthy or *beatus*, which, if the canonization's date is planned in advance, is then

performed one year before that date, a sort of circular logic.. This plan affords the opportunity of making that date the actual feast-day. This establishes a second day for the official universal or local commemoration, useful when the *dies natalis* falls at an inconvenient time of year, perhaps coinciding with other major saints' days of the Universal calendar, or near Christmas or Easter. In medieval times, commemoration of a saint was desirably a Summer event, allowing processions and celebrations at the culmination of pilgrimages to popular shrines when the weather was fine, and also providing a day off for workers during fair weather.<sup>2</sup> The abolition of such a wealth of saints' days conferred a benefit—fewer holidays—for overseers on farms and for the growing mercantile class as, after the Reformation, mass production and factory work became common, affording more opportunities for exploitation than farm work and cottage industry, which were self-managed. For the 'progressives', a side-benefit of the feasts' abolition was that vestiges of the Catholic past were extirpated. Is it apparent that the Whig and Protestant politicians were sympathetic with the mercantile class? In Britain, they were in a position to govern the Established Church accordingly.

The above note is of relevance to our celebration on 7 May 2011 in New York, and also to the nomenclature we in the Society use. You are encouraged to send in your comments, suggestions, and outlandish miscellany you come across. I found a specious explanation for the retention of old Roman martyrs in the 1662 BCP and will include it in future as space permits.

## *A Kalendar of Anniversaries – December through May*

† Of your Charity, Pray for the Souls of Notables marked †

☼ Rejoice on the Heavenly Birthdays or Commemorations, and Ask the Intercession, of Saints marked ☼

- Dec. 9†** Sir Anthony van Dyck, primary portraitist of King Charles I, died, 1641
- 12 ☼ Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, Patroness of the Americas and of Mexico, appeared, 1531
- 23** **Baptism of S. Charles, K.M.**; month-old Charles Stuart baptized at Holyrood Palace, 1600
- 25 Nativity, O.L.J.C., Christmas Day: Its celebration was prohibited under the 'Commonwealth', 1649-59
- 29 ☼ Thomas Becket, Abp.M., martyred in Canterbury Cathedral at the altar, 1170 (7 July, transl. of relics)
- 31 Birth of Prince Charles (*King Charles III*), son of *King James III & VIII*, 1720
- Jan. 1** King Charles II crowned at Scone, 1651
- 5 ☼ King Edward the Confessor died, 1066 (feast-day, 13 Oct.)
- 10 ☼ William Laud, Abp.M., beheaded, Tower Hill, 1645
- 15 King Charles I brought to Saint James's, 1649
- 17 Royal Warrant purporting to abolish the State Services, 1859
- 21 ☼ \*Beheading of Louis XVI, King of France, 1793
- 27 Sentence pronounced on King Charles I, 1649 *"I may speak after the sentence—ever!"*
- 28 ☼ Charlemagne, Emp.C., First Holy Roman Emperor, 814
- First regular Annual Mass of the American Region at S. Ignatius of Antioch, NYC, 1984
- 29 K. Charles's last contact with family (met with Princess Elizabeth, 14, and Prince Henry, 9), 1649
- Equestrian statue of King Charles I at Charing Cross decorated for the first time, 1893
- 30** ☼ **Decollation of S. Charles, King & Martyr**, Whitehall, 1649 *"Remember!"* Accession of Charles II.
- Society of King Charles the Martyr's first yearly Mass, S. Margaret Pattens, London, 1895
- First Society of King Charles the Martyr Annual Mass held at Banqueting House, Whitehall, 1969
- 31 † Death of *Charles III*, called Bonnie Prince Charlie, Rome, 1788
- Feb. 2** Presentation, O.L.J.C., Purification, B.V.M. **Coronation of King Charles I**, Westminster Abbey, 1626
- "Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life."* —Rev. II: 10
- 6 † King Charles II died, 1685

- 8 † \*Mary, Queen of Scots, beheaded at Fotheringay, 1587  
 9 **Interment of S. Charles, K.M.**, S. George's Chapel, Windsor, 1649  
 18 ☼ Claude la Colombière, SJ, C., chaplain to Duchess of York, 1682  
**Mar. 1** ☼ David, B.C., Patron of the Welsh Principality, c. 544  
 6 Henry, Duke of York (*King Henry IX*; Henry Benedict Cardinal Stuart; Cardinal York), younger son of *King James III & VIII*, born, and that day Baptized by Pope Benedict XIII, 1725  
 16 ☼ John de Brébeuf, SJ, Apostle of the Hurons, Patron of Canada, & Companions, MM., 1649  
 17 ☼ Patrick, B.C., Patron of Ireland, c. 461  
 19 ☼ Joseph, Spouse of B.V.M., Foster-Father of O.L.J.C., Patron of Canada & a Good Death  
 24 King James VI of Scots acceded to English Throne, upon death of Elizabeth I, as King James I, 1603  
 26 † Brian Duppa, Bishop, composed the first office for 30 January, died, 1662  
 27 † King James I & VI died at Theobalds House **Accession of King Charles I**, 1625  
 Easter Tuesday meeting of Mrs. Greville-Nugent and the Rev'd J. L. Fish founding S.K.C.M., 1894  
 29 ☼ John Keble, Pr., 1866  
 31 ☼ John Donne, chaplain to James I and Charles I, Pr., 1631  
**Apr. 1** **Finding of the Incurrupt Body of S. Charles, K.M.**, at Windsor, 1813  
 ☼ Charles, Emperor of Austria & King of Hungary, "Prince of Peace", 1922  
 7 ☼ Tikhon of Moscow, C., XI Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, 1925  
 23 ☼ George, M., Patron of the English Kingdom and the Order of the Garter, c. 303  
 24 Prince Charles invested as a Knight of the Garter, 1611  
 26 ☼ **Canonization of S. Charles, K.M.**, Convocation approved the State Service for 30 January, 1661  
 26 First church in the New World titled Saint Charles the Martyr, Fort Morgan CO (1951), dedicated, 1957  
**May 1** **Marriage of King Charles I** (by proxy), Notre Dame Cathedral, Paris, 1625  
 7 **Exaltation of S. Charles, K.M.**; his statue replaced in Guildhall Yard, 1660  
 14 Royal Warrant directing the use of the Office for 30 January in all churches *et c.*, 1662  
 21 ☼ \*Henry (VI) of Windsor, K.C., venerated at Eton and King's College, murdered in the Tower, 1471  
 27 ☼ Augustine of Canterbury, OSB, Abp., C., Apostle of the English, First Archbishop of Canterbury, 604  
 29 **Restoration Day.** King Charles II born, 1630; restored, 1660

### The Devotional Societies

**Society of Mary**, The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin\*, SSC, American Region Superior. Write: Lynne Walker, Memb. Adm., Society of Mary, P. O. Box 930, Lorton VA 22079-2930 Annual, \$10; Life, \$250.

**The Guild of All Souls**, The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain\*, SSC, Superior-General. The Rev'd Ralph T. Walker, SSC, D.D., Warden. Write: The Rev'd John A. Lancaster\*, SSC, Secretary-Treasurer, P. O. Box 721172, Berkley MI 48072 Annual, \$5; Life, \$20; Posthumous, \$20

**The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament**, The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman\*, SSC, D.D., Superior General. Write: The Very Rev'd Dr. William Willoughby III\*, Secretary-General, S. Paul's Church, 1802 Abercorn St. Savannah GA 31401-8104 Annual, \$5; Life, \$100

### The Guild of the Living Rosary of Our Lady and S. Dominic

Please note: To learn more about the pious Guild of the Living Rosary or to join in the prayers, write to The Rev'd Canon David M. Baumann, SSC, Chaplain, Rector of The Episcopal Church of the Blessed Sacrament, 1314 N. Angelina Drive, Placentia CA 92870-3442 [www.guildlivingrosary.com](http://www.guildlivingrosary.com) Devotional materials are sent by email; please include your email and postal addresses with dues if you enroll; annual \$5; life \$40. Multiple Rosarians pray daily decades using various, rosal mysteries but with a common intention, for a week or a shorter time. This is truly a corporate recitation although it is neither simultaneous nor conjoint: Unity in diversity makes this Rosary 'Living'.



We thank Canon Baumann, a supporter of S.K.C.M.'s Cause and work, for including the intentions listed below. We also appreciate the regular appearance of like intentions in *The Intercession Paper* of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, and for which we thank Dean Willoughby, who is a member of S.K.C.M. (members started on facing page), as are Canon Swain, our host on 7 May 2011 in New York, and our Select Preacher on 29 Jan. 2011, in Washington, D.C. Canon Swain and Fr. Martin are Superior-General of The Guild of All Souls, and American Region Superior of The Society of Mary, respectively.

Week of 9 Jan.: For the proper and Godly ordering of Divine Service, especially at the Altar (William Laud, 10 January)

Week of 30 Jan.: For the Apostolic Succession, defended by King Charles I (Saint Charles's Day, 30 January)

## SKCM News — June, 2010

ISSN 1540-045X

**British Headquarters** – [www.skcm.org](http://www.skcm.org)

*Joint Presidents*

The Rev'd Edward R. C. Thompson  
The Rev'd Barrie Williams, Ph.D.

Mrs. Irene Sillitoe, *Vice President*

Robin J. B. Davies, *Chairman, Sec./Treas., & Editor*  
22, Tynning Road  
Winsley  
Bradford-On-Avon  
Wilts., BA15 2JJ UK

*Chaplains*

The Rev'd Charles Card-Reynolds LONDON  
The Rev'd Barrie Williams, Ph.D. NORTH

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

**American Region** – [www.skcm-usa.org](http://www.skcm-usa.org)

\*† The Rev'd Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D., *President*  
[BILL4329@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:BILL4329@HOTMAIL.COM)

\*J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., *Secretary, Treasurer, & VP*  
5500 Friendship Blvd., Ste. 2009 N  
Chevy Chase MD 20815-7212 US  
[DOUGLASSRUFF@AOL.COM](mailto:DOUGLASSRUFF@AOL.COM)

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., *Publications Editor*  
P. O. Box 79212, Waverly MA 02479 US  
[WUONOLA@EARTHLINK.NET](mailto:WUONOLA@EARTHLINK.NET)

\* The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D., *Episcopal Patron*  
\* John R. Covert, *Webmaster*  
\* A. Donald Evans, *Chapter Liaison*  
\* William M. Gardner, Jr., *Assistant Treasurer*  
\* Paul W. McKee  
\* The Rev'd Canon James G. Monroe, Ph.D., *SSC*

The Society was founded at Saint Margaret Pattens, Eastcheap, City of London, on Easter Tuesday, 27 March 1894, by Ermengarda (The Hon. Mrs. Patrick) Greville-Nugent (née Ogilvy) and Co-Founder The Rev'd James Leonard Fish.

Also in 1894, the Society was established in the Americas (New York City) by The Rev'd William Harman van Allen.

An asterisk (\*) designates a Trustee of the **Society of King Charles the Martyr, Inc.**, and a dagger (†), an Officer of the Board of Trustees of the same, a non-profit, non-stock, tax-exempt entity, incorporated in 2008 under the General Laws of the State of Maryland. Called the **American Region**, it serves members in Canada and the United States of America.